

From: Margaret Drew <margaret.drew0@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:02 PM
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,

Margaret Drew
14 Lakeland Ave
South Yarmouth, MA 02664
margaret.drew0@gmail.com

From: amy rager <mablemay10@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Amy Rager and I live at 4 Coppersmith Way Townsend, MA. I work at NCCI Gardner 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 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,

CO Amy Rager

From: Patricia Brouillard <patsymay521@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:26 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Fwd: Police reform bill S2820

I am sorry I forgot to send my phone number. It is 978-475-7047.

Patricia M. Brouillard

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Patricia Brouillard <patsymay521@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 3:46 PM
Subject: Police reform bill S2820
To: <Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov>

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to you as a registered voter regarding the current Police reform bill (Senate bill S2800, House bill S2820) passed by the Senate and under review by the House.

I am opposed to 3 aspects of the bill, and they are: Changes to Qualified immunity for state and city/town Police, Firefighters, EMT's, Paramedics; The complete ban on chokeholds; The restriction on the use of tear gas. I urge you to not support this bill because of these above-mentioned issues.

Sincerely,

Patricia M Brouillard

19 Hall Ave

Andover, Ma 01810

From: Janice Jones <beaglejones@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:08 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform

Dear Representatives,

We all certainly agree that the murder of George Floyd was horrific. We all can agree that there are instances of police abuse of power. I'm also certain that we can agree that there are GOOD police officers.

It is egregious that the overwhelming majority of dedicated and good police officers in this Commonwealth have been lumped together with the bad in S2800.

What is reprehensible was the HASTE with which the Senate passed this bill.

I respectfully request that the House of Representatives take the time necessary to carefully gather information, consider and debate the important issues at hand.

I request that the Members of the House seek input from police at all levels of

law enforcement. After all they are the subject of this legislation.

I most importantly ask that all of you work together in a spirit of cooperation

with the men and women who have sworn to SERVE and PROTECT.

This process need not be - nor appear to be adversarial!!!

This process should rather bring all parties together to draft a police reform bill which enhances the abilities of law enforcement to do their job in addition to addressing the failures of those officers who have abused their powers.

My hope is that the House of Representatives will do what the Senate failed to do.

I hope that through open and transparent dialogue the citizens, the police and the lawmakers can come together and to draft the BEST BILL.. Many

Senators, in their debate, claimed to support the police, however the tone of their comments spoke volumes to the contrary. It is no wonder that the members of law enforcement felt attacked and greatly disheartened!

I hope that as the bill goes forward, the Representatives in the House can undo some of the harm caused. An overwhelming percentage of our law enforcement professionals are deeply caring, dedicated, educated and committed to serving their communities. We need these brave men and women. We do not want to see them leave the profession they love and take their talents elsewhere. None of us want to be unappreciated in our jobs - imagine how they feel being villainized.

In closing, I ask you to remember that our Law Enforcement Officers go to work each day not knowing what dangers lie ahead. Their families share these same fears. Must a Police Reform Bill also erode the protection of Qualified Immunity to compound their fears?

Please bring all your Colleagues together to pass a bill which strikes a fair balance protecting and supporting our Good officers while addressing the failures of others.

Respectfully,
Janice M. Jones
25 Pheasant Hill Lane
Methuen, MA

From: Marci Ferry <marci.ferry@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Marci Ferry and I live at 36 Williams St, Beverly Massachusetts. I work at the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department House of Correction, as 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,

Marci Ferry

Sergeant

Suffolk County Sheriff's Department

House of Correction

From: Dan Rogers <rdanrogers1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:55 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Email Testimony S2820

Hello Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

I am a MA citizen writing to you today to voice my support for the Reform Shift Build Act. I support 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.

Regards,

Dan Rogers

From: Greg Hudon <GCHudon@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800 Police Reform Bill

Dear Representative's Aaron Michlewitz and Claire Cronin,

I am writing to you regarding the recently passed S.2800 legislation which is now before the House of Representatives. As a local Police Officer for 23 years, I urge you to vote no on this legislation and any legislation which removes Qualified Immunity and Due Process for police officers. I implore the House of Representatives to do what the Senate failed to do, and hold public hearings so that common sense and fairness can be restored to this process. I am certain there is common ground where significant police reform can be realized, including standardized training through a POST program.

Qualified Immunity and Due Process for Police Officers who make split second life and death decisions are an absolute necessity to do this job. I am deeply concerned and frustrated with the current legislation.

Specifically, what concerns me, my family and my fellow police officers is the current Senate bill:

- Eliminates collective bargaining rights of police officers.
 - Removes due process rights of police officers.
 - Exposes police officers and their families to personal liability even when acting in GOOD FAITH (qualified immunity).
 - Municipalities and individual officers will face frivolous lawsuits.
 - Unnecessarily puts the lives of police officers in danger!
- Creates a police licensing board that is staffed by organizations who sue our communities and advocate for the elimination of police services.

I encourage you to listen to the voices of the law enforcement community and make decisions based on facts, and on actual Massachusetts data. This bill does not reflect Massachusetts Law Enforcement performance history. Massachusetts has one of the lowest annual rates for deadly force incidents in the nation at 1.2 incidents per one million people. Massachusetts police officers have successfully handled millions of calls for help, often involving volatile and violent individuals without incident.

This proposed bill will destroy the morale of police officers and guarantee a mass exodus from this profession. Those with enough time to retire, will. Those with very little time on, will quit. Those of us in the middle will reluctantly stay, practicing risk avoidance to mitigate the inevitable slew of frivolous lawsuits. Qualified Immunity and Due process do not absolve a police officer from improper conduct, but rather is a common sense and reasonable protection which the courts have upheld for decades.

Respectfully,

Greg Hudon

From: Michelle Dhanda <michelle.dhanda@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:06 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please preserve and build upon the accomplishments of the Senate police reform bill.

Dear House Judiciary Committee,

Please support the vital reforms in the Senate police reform bill, such as the following:

- * Creating an independent and civilian-majority police certification/decertification body
- * Limiting qualified immunity so that victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages
- * Reducing the school-to-prison pipeline and removing barriers to expungement on juvenile records
- * Establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to move money away from policing prisons and into workforce development and education opportunities
- * Banning racial profiling by law enforcement and prohibiting police officers from having sex with those in custody, which can obviously never be consensual and is strikingly not yet illegal

Please go further than the Senate bill by:

- * Strengthening use of force standards, e.g., by outright banning chokeholds and tear gas
- * Fully prohibiting facial surveillance technology (rather than imposing just a one-year moratorium)
- * Lifting the unnecessary cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund

Sincerely,
Michelle Dhanda
69 Richmond St
Dorchester MA 02124

From: William Ferioli <billnmela@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:07 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,

William P. Ferioli
24 Colonial Post Dr.
Bridgewater, MA 02324

From: Kellie Defelice <kelliedefelice@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:06 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2800

To Whom it May Concern,
My name is Kellie Defelice.

I am a MA resident. I am a Military wife. I am a Law Enforcement wife. I am a teacher. I am the cousin of a firefighter. I am the daughter of a nurse. I am the friend of many first responders. I have lost family members to drug addiction. I have had family members saved by law enforcement with Narcan. I am a mother who wants my child kept safe.

Last week my husband, a MA Transit Police Officer was on his way home from his shift. He came across a Northeastern University police officer who seemed distressed. He pulled over to see if he needed assistance. The Officer was waiting for help to arrive but there was a man laying on the road with no pulse and a needle in his arm. The Officer there didn't have Narcan because they don't carry it. My husband grabbed his and administered it. He saved that man's life but now he could be sued for that kind of response. Will he stop next time? Risking his family? What if that's your son, daughter, niece, nephew, etc. next time?

My cousin was 27 and overdosed on a train in Norwood. Police responded and saved his life. He was suicidal so they brought to the hospital to be saved. They saved his life. The hospital discharged him within an hour. He stepped in front of a train 5 minutes after his discharge. 5 minutes later. You want others to take over for the police. Those police officers saved my cousin. The others let him go and are the reason he is dead. Officers in Boston de-escalated the situation when his brother who is also an addict had scissors and was a threat as he was high on meth and paranoid. His mom who already lost a son watched as police saved his life and she didn't lose another son.

There are over 800,000 police officers in this country. There are millions of interactions with police in this country. Yet only 1,004 people were killed in this country last year by police and only 41 of them were unarmed. The majority of police Officers never shoot their service weapon at anyone in their career. Then the small amount who do? The majority are justified and in self defense. Do we have an issue in this country? Yes. Was George Floyd murdered? Yes. Is it a reflection on all police officers? No. The facts don't lie. The majority of police officers don't kill anyone.

Do we need more training for police officers? Sure. Do we need to defund them? Absolutely not. Do we need to take away qualified immunity which protects them from frivolous lawsuits? Absolutely not. Do we need a bill

rushed through because of incidences in other states? NO. How many MA police officers killed unarmed people this year? Last year? The year before? We have the best police departments in this country and yet you are all throwing them under a bus and acting like they are murderers. This is a disgrace. I am 100% against racism. I am 100% against police officers that murder someone like George Floyd. However, you are holding police officers in our state responsible and that's reprehensible. That is not okay. That is unacceptable. Should we hold you responsible for all the actions of politicians? You should hope not. Will you give up your qualified immunity? Will judges?

If this bill passes, you will see us lose so many good police officers in a state that may need work but overall does a fantastic job with policing. You will see our crime go up. You will see more addicts die. More cops will die. You have wording in this bill that encourages anyone, civilians with no training to do harm to police they "think are doing wrong". If you think that doesn't open up major floodgates to police being killed and assaulted you are not awake.

I urge you to do the right thing and not pass this bill. I urge to educate and train our police officers while supporting them and not making rash and ridiculous bills. More training? Great idea. No chokeholds? Already not allowed and great to put it in writing. The rest? Dangerous, not thought out and a gut reaction to things happening in other states.

Sincerely,
Kellie Defelice
732 Pembroke Woods drive
Pembroke, MA 02359

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Stephen Saia <sls2727@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:05 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Mr. Stanley....I do not usually send correspondence to you...but had to as this is just another horrible bill that the Liberal politicians are trying to sneak in under the radar. The police, firefighters, school nurses and teachers have difficult jobs as it ...now, they would have the added stress of worrying about lawsuits and being sued. Such a disgrace!!

Please!!! ...do not vote in favor of this disgusting bill.

Thank you...
Stephen Saia
Lincoln Heights - Waltham

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone
Get Outlook for Android <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_ghei36&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-

fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk
13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=HKpjLJ8o2yPDrRbfv4hZyhiElNEystR8nmAH7Cb6Mhs&s=8GuLFI6w
5zw_MPqYyS5cxnUb0hJXLJfHT17sxHHf0nU&e=>

From: Sarah Koolsbergen <sarahkoolsbergen@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:04 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Rogers, Dave - Rep. (HOU)

Subject: House Police Reform Bill Under Consideration

Dear House Committee on Ways and Means:

Please preserve the vital reforms in the Senate's police reform bill, S.2820 that includes:

- * Creating an independent majority-civilian Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Commission charged with certifying and decertifying law enforcement officers;
- * Reducing the school-to-prison pipeline;
- * Removing barriers to expungement on juvenile records;
- * Establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to move money away from policing and prisons and into workforce development and education opportunities;
- * Establishing stronger oversight and limitations on the procurement of military equipment by law enforcement;
- * Banning racial profiling by law enforcement;
- * Creating an African-American Commission and a Latinx Commission;
- * Requiring racial data collection and reporting on people stopped by the police;
- * Prohibiting police officers from having sex with individuals in custody, which can obviously never be consensual and is strikingly not yet illegal.

Please go further than S.2820 by:

- * Strengthening the use of force standards, e.g., by banning outright chokeholds, tear gas, and no-knock raids;
- * Ensuring stricter limits on qualified immunity so that police officers are held accountable when they violate someone's rights, and victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages;
- * Prohibiting completely facial surveillance technology (rather than imposing just a one-year moratorium); and
- * Lifting the unnecessary cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund.

Thank you,
Sarah Koolsbergen
Massachusetts resident

<[From: Nancy Gray <nanhaydon@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:04 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)
Subject: S2820](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=1e_oHgarFnl3ywPg7Ci2ow1U4n2Ro1IeZEgO-ettSA&s=yOoNwK6TW4ZsM6gc6m7s8dC_24jRilWxY-muWJphWzU&e=> Virus-free.
www.avast.com <<a href=)

Dear Rep. Cronin and Rep. Michlewitz,

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.

Nancy Gray
781 646 4590
Member, League of Women Voters of Arlington
Mothers Out Front[
Arlington
From: jcarroll <jlcfuzz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:04 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Written Testimony on Senate bill S2800

Dear Representative Coppinger,

My name is Jeanne Carroll and I live in West Roxbury. 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,

Jeanne L. Carroll

From: Jessica Rush <rushjessical16@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Accountability Bill

To Whom It May Concern,

I was hoping to address a couple concerns with the S. 2800 that I am hoping to see addressed in the House version of this bill.

1.) The Senate bill lists "tampering with a record for use in an official proceeding, as defined in section 13E of said chapter 268" as a decertifying offence. I understand that this bill does create a commission for body cam usage, but I hope to see disabling or intentionally obstructing a body cam explicitly included as a form of tampering with a record. I was informed by Senator Brownsberger that, as the bill is written, inappropriately disabling a body cam would not necessarily constitute tampering with a record for official use.

2.) I don't know if this has been explored, but has any consideration gone into uses of AI and facial recognition other than for law enforcement purposes? For example, many remote proctoring services use AI and facial recognition to flag suspected cheating, the footage of which is then reviewed by a human. As schools, including public colleges and universities, are largely going to be remote in the fall due to COVID, they will presumably increasingly rely on remote proctoring services, however as the Senate bill is written it seems that this would be prohibited. I completely support a moratorium, if not a complete ban, on facial recognition for law enforcement purposes, however I am concerned about how this may impact other sectors.

3.) I completely, unequivocally support this bill's limits on qualified immunity, and I hope to see this included in the House bill as well.

4.) I understand that the Governor's version of the bill included monetary bonuses for law enforcement officers completing additional training, and that this was not included in the Senate version. I hope that these bonuses are not included in the House version either.

Thank you,
Jess Rush

From: TODD <TOFFICER477@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:03 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Todd Barreira and I live at 152 Hudson St. Fall River ma. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Office 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,

Todd Barreira
Sent from Xfinity Connect ApplicationFrom: Cindy Dow
<cmdow131@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: FW: Bill S.2800

I am writing to you in opposition of Bill S.2800 as it currently stands.

While I do agree with the certification program as other professional groups require and are held accountable to; I am deeply concerned of the thought of limiting a police officer's qualified immunity, removing school resource officers and potentially taking away the tool of pepper spray.

I do understand and completely agree that it is time to reform however I feel this bill is being rushed through without enough thought and input. I implore you to give more consideration to this bill - start slowly by getting the certification process developed and rolled out and then add addendums where needed.

As the mother of a police officer who is thoughtful, kind and a great community leader, as well as being a Massachusetts voter my entire life I beg you to reconsider pushing through a bill with all of these contents for fear of jeopardizing our honorable civic servants. Please, I truly believe there will be serious unintended consequences to the police force as a whole as well as society.

I thank you for your time and welcome your feedback,

Cindy Dow

Quincy, MA 02171

From: CAROL DZENGELEWSKI <carol2of2@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Do Not Strip Law Enforcement of Qualified Immunity

I am 100% against stripping Law Enforcement of qualified immunity. This action would take away their protection and due process. The good men and women who serve the people of this Commonwealth and it's cities and towns put their lives on the line every day and have continued to do so even though they have been unjustly vilified in the news media. Prejudice, judging a group of people by the actions of a few, based on race, religion, the language that someone speaks or even the uniform they wear is wrong, And there seems to be a lot of that happening here. If you take away qualified immunity, you need to ask yourself how many good law enforcement personnel will continue on the job and who, if anyone, will take their place.

The men and women in Law Enforcement deserve our respect and our support and the public deserves well-trained dedicated Law Enforcement personnel. Do not strip them of qualified immunity.

Carol Dzengelewski
39 Concannon Circle
Weymouth MA 02188

From: Jeanne McKnight <jeannemcknight@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:02 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Garlick, Denise - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill S-2800

Judiciary Committee:

I hope the House Judiciary Committee will support the Senate bill that passed this week S-2800. I know there are changes the House could make, AND THAT I SUPPORT, to make the Reform Bill stronger, but the important thing is that the Senate and House approve a bill during this soon-to-end legislative session. HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda <

to intervene and to de-escalate and would require maintaining public records of officer misconduct. HB.3277 An Act to Secure Civil Rights through the Courts of the Commonwealth, State Representative Michael Day would end 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.

Whether these more progressive changes are made or not, though I hope you will vote for S-2800.

Jeanne McKnight,

100 Rosemary Way, #336

Needham, MA 02494

781-449-5371

From: Sarah Koolsbergen <sarahkoolsbergen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Rogers, Dave - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: House Police Reform Bill Under Consideration

Dear House Committee on Ways and Means:

Please preserve the vital reforms in the Senate's police reform bill, S.2820 that includes:

- * Creating an independent majority-civilian Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Commission charged with certifying and decertifying law enforcement officers;
- * Reducing the school-to-prison pipeline;
- * Removing barriers to expungement on juvenile records;
- * Establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to move money away from policing and prisons and into workforce development and education opportunities;
- * Establishing stronger oversight and limitations on the procurement of military equipment by law enforcement;
- * Banning racial profiling by law enforcement;
- * Creating an African-American Commission and a Latinx Commission;
- * Requiring racial data collection and reporting on people stopped by the police;
- * Prohibiting police officers from having sex with individuals in custody, which can obviously never be consensual and is strikingly not yet illegal.

Please go further than S.2820 by:

- * Strengthening the use of force standards, e.g., by banning outright chokeholds, tear gas, and no-knock raids;
- * Ensuring stricter limits on qualified immunity so that police officers are held accountable when they violate someone's rights, and victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages;
- * Prohibiting completely facial surveillance technology (rather than imposing just a one-year moratorium); and
- * Lifting the unnecessary cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund.

Thank you,
 Sarah Koolsbergen
 Massachusetts resident

<[From: George Demeris <\[george.demeris@gmail.com\]\(mailto:george.demeris@gmail.com\)>
 Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:01 PM
 To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)
 Subject: S.2820 Testimony](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIsl6rchf_GkGDD&m=pIwOsOO_5lGBTEvyiFHh7PyZ8HWk6MMjF-gM-f6oZBM&s=noie8MfykQaCUiOCruWvWOH3HPBAiSvyg5BxPMu-yac&e=> Virus-free.

 www.avast.com <<a href=)

To The Honorable Representative Whelan,

I appreciate you taking the time to reach out to members of the commonwealth for our input in regards to bill S.2820. I know you requested name, organization, and telephone number. I can provide those, but I need to stress that I am a MEMBER of my employing agency, and I do not speak on BEHALF of my employing agency. I do however, speak for the Sharon Police Association, as I am the Sharon Police Association President.

Name: George K. Demeris Jr.
 Organization: Sharon Police Department/Sharon Police Association
 Telephone: 508-654-2557

I understand that you must be receiving a large volume of emails and calls to your office, and once again I thank you for taking the time to read and listen to as many as you can. Simply offering the opportunity to be heard is more than the Senate allowed.

-Section 221 addresses who will be on the independent police officer standards and accreditation committee. In it, it states that a person who has "been personally involved in or impacted by the criminal justice system". What type of impact? Is this person to be a convicted criminal? Somebody who has had their civil rights violated? Somebody who has successfully sued a police officer, or unsuccessfully done so? Any of these or similar types of people I believe provide a biased point of view, and should be no part of an accreditation committee. Police Officers are often compared to Doctors in regards to liability. When a doctor contends with a malpractice committee, is a patient who has had a botched surgery a member of that committee which passes judgment? I ask you to reconsider this language in the bill.

-Ch. 147A, Section 2., (d) "A law enforcement officer shall not use a chokehold..."

This chapter states that this method is completely unusable, even if the officer is in imminent danger of being killed. I believe the bill language should reflect that in the case where deadly force is being used against an officer, he or she should be allowed to employ a chokehold if it has the opportunity to end the conflict.

Ch. 147A, Section 2., (f): Namely, the section about K9's ("dogs", as they are referred to in the bill). The language seems to only change the use of force in regards to K9's in a crowd setting, stating that the K9's may only be utilized on a person if it is proportionate to the imminent harm displayed towards officers or others. I believe this needs clarification, as K9 use in crowd control events is very different from tactical events where in patro dogs are tracking armed and dangerous suspects. Whereas a K9 may not simply be sent to apprehend a protestor unless they are actively displaying assaultive characteristics, if a suspect has a knife or blunt weapon and is hiding in a wooded or urban area, a K9 apprehension of the suspect (or even simply a display of the K9 by barking) can non-lethally end a scenario, whereas if the K9 is only able to track a suspect, but then another officer has to go hands on with him, it may result in the serious injury or death of the suspect and or officer involved. Responsibly deployed K9's save lives when they apprehend armed and dangerous suspects. They allow for the officers to go home safe, the suspect his day in court, and the victims a modicum of justice. These are life SAVING tools, and must be allowed to be used.

Thank you for taking the time to read my suggestions. I can only hope that these ideas permeate the minds of the Honorable House of Representatives, and allow for a reform bill that serves ALL members of the Commonwealth, as we are members as well, and should also be privy to fair and equitable treatment, as well as due process.

If you have any questions or wish to converse about any of this, I can be reached at this email, or by cell phone at (508) 654-2557. Thank you for your consideration.

Very Respectfully,
George K. Demeris Jr.
K-9 Unit, Sharon Police Department
President, Sharon Police Association
From: CHARLES RAMSBOTTOM <camgr@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:59 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Charles Ramsbottom
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: Mike B <miccaell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:58 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 qualified immunity

Dear Representatives,
I am deeply concerned with the provision of the bill that significantly reduces qualified immunity for members of the Commonwealth Police Force. This will make already difficult and dangerous police work to be even more

difficult by adding a fear to be sued for any decision that often needs to be taken in a split second time and in the life threatening circumstances. Not only it will make the police to be less efficient, and its work even more dangerous, but it will also make joining the police a lot less attractive for next generation of officers. We desperately want the best young people of all communities to become good police officers dedicated to serving their communities and the whole Commonwealth. The society owes its emergency workers and especially those who risk their life to protect other people. They should not feel vulnerable to the frivolous law suits, when their life and often the live of the others is dependent on their ability to act quickly and decisively.

Sincerely,

Michael Brodsky,
Resident of the Town of Brookline
Brodware Design LLC
617-645-0380

From: Trina Novak <kermittf@rcn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:58 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform and Racial Equity legislation

To the HWH Judiciary,

Following years of issues, which have finally come into prominence over the last several months, I think we should concentrate on these legislative actions:

1. Creating a Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) system to certify police officers and enable de-certification for misconduct and abuse;
2. Establishing civil service exam review and oversight to review examinations for appointment and promotion of peace officers;
3. Creating a commission on structural racism to study how the systemic presence of institutional racism has created a culture of structural racial inequality; and
4. Adopting clear statutory limits on police use of force and requiring an independent investigation of officer-related deaths.

Let's make Massachusetts a leader in the United States as we face the inequities caused by Racial Injustice. Let's emphasize the Peace in Peace Officers.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Trina

Trina Novak
33 Gilbert Rd.
Needham, MA 02492
kermittf@rcn.com

617-549-2023 (cell)

From: jakexl <jakexl@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:57 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill I am writing this email to inform the committee that a yes vote on the police reform bill will not only hurt your constituents but will impact your electability. Removing funding and adding oversight committees will only make an offi...

From: Josh <anubisjj20@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:56 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Josh Johnson and I live at 6 Thunder Bridge Ln. Middleton. I work at MCI-Concord 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: 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.

Sincerely,

Josh Johnson

From: Jenn Quinn <jquinn107@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:54 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Jennifer Quinn and I live at 14 Ashburnham Street Fitchburg, MA 01420. I work at MCI Shirley 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,
Jennifer Quinn
From: bredsoxfan9 <bredsoxfan9@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Respectful Matter

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Jared Almeida and I live at 750 Davol st Fall River, Ma. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Office and I am a CorrectionalOfficer for the past 9 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 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,
Jared Almeida

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From: Rich W <richwu508@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

Dear Senator,

My name is Richard Wu and I live at 350 Foundry St Easton 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,

Richard Wu

From: RALPH GARON JR <ragaron22@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:53 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: July 16, 2020

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Ralph A Garon Jr., and I live at 29 Fidler Terrace, Lowell MA 01850. 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: 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.

Sincerely,
Ralph A Garon Jr.

Ralph A Garon Jr.

From: PETER PIZZI <bernbudd08@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:53 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,

From: kenall13@aol.com

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:51 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

THIS IS PURE STUPIDITY, ARE U COMPLETE TOTAL IDIOTS OR JUST ANTI USA THUGS.

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: Maria White <maria.white@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:51 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,
Maria White

Sent from my iPhone
From: Michaela Dauplaise <msking0408@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

To whom it may concern:

My name is Michaela Dauplaise and I live in Westfield . 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.
Michaela Dauplaise
162 Honey Pot Road Westfield
4135197369

Sent from my iPhone
From: jtank1977 <jtank1977@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is John Tainsh. 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 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
John Tainsh

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S9, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From: Sonja Darai <darai@fastmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Provost, Denise - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: S. 2830 & Critical Policing Reform

Hello Honorable Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin + the respected members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committee. I am writing in support of S.2820 which will bring critical reform to the criminal justice system in the Massachusetts Commonwealth. I urge your honors to expedite this bill to pass it in to law and take every opportunity to strengthen it.

We must fully eliminate the loopholes that prevents police accountability and ban qualified immunity. We need to also create strong decertifying problem officer standards. We must completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the terrible case resulting in Breonna Taylor's death.

I write as a survivor of violence, a trained human rights investigator, a graduate of public health, an experienced policy & programming director of antiviolence initiatives at local & state level, and a colleague to municipal police officers. I am committed to this growing movement, will be following these issues closely, and providing you and my elected officials my expertise and personal experience.

Respectfully,

Sonja Darai, MPH, MA

Somerville, MA

CC: Honorable State Rep. Denise Provost
From: Josh Wunschel <wrenchel2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: My Testimony

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Joshua Wunschel and I live at 253 Chestnut Street, New Bedford Ma 02740. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Office 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 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,
Joshua Wunschel
From: Michaela Dauplaise <msking0408@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:48 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

To whom it may concern ,

My name is Michaela Dauplaise and I live at 162 Honey Pot Rod Westfield MA , 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,

Michaela Dauplaise

Westfield MA

4135197369

Sent from my iPhone

From: Eileen McLaughlin <emarymac334@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:46 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S2820

Dear House Ways & Means Judiciary Committee , as a registered nurse who also has family members in both law enforcement and Correctional Services I find this bill disturbing that any of us can be Civilly sued for doing our jobs.

We all work with vulnerable populations of people because we want to support and help ALL people.

This bill will bankrupt working families not just police and fire but also nurses who have been on the front lines caring for families during covid 19.

Please veto Bill S2820 , S2800

Respectfully yours,

Eileen McLaughlin RN

8 Gail Ave, Middleborough, MA 02346

From: Beverley Baughan <blbaughan@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:47 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,

Sent from my iPhone
From: James Clark <jimc3rd@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone From: James Clark <jimc3rd@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Mary Zocchi <mbzocchi@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill s2800

I do not support this bill which was not properly vetted. It was not evaluated properly and then it was just pushed through. Qualified immunity is necessary for first responders and the police. Without qualified immunity, citizens will be endangered and the number of law suits will proliferate.
Please Do Not Approve this bill!

Mary Zocchi
508 435-5775

Sent from my iPhone
From: Derek Heaslip <derek_heaslip@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:44 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill (S.2820)

We are writing to express that we are AGAINST the passing of Bill (S.2820). There are many well thought out ways to enact positive and meaningful reform but the passing of this bill will have very destructive, unintended consequences. This bill is nothing but a knee-jerk reaction to satisfy the mob mentality that is so prevalent in this country today and does not represent the will and desire of the majority of people in this state.

Sincerely,

Derek and Stacey Heaslip
From: Joe's MacBook Pro <JoeMeehan44@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:42 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,

All the Best!

Joe Meehan

40 Quinaquisset Ave

Mashpee MA 02649

(508) 364-3770

JoeMeehan44@comcast.net

From: Christine <christinelemay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:42 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,

Christine Kusser
Quincy MA

From: Barbara Johnson <wnjbaj101@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:41 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,

Barbara A. Johnson
From: MARY O CONNOR <maryoconnor1@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:40 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,

Sent from my iPhone
From: Jordan Paurowski <jordanp@bu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:34 PM
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,

Jordan Paurowski
1564 Commonwealth Ave Apt 15
Brighton, MA 02135
jordanp@bu.edu

From: Steve Taylor <stevenwtaylor@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:39 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

From: Kathy Doherty <kdots6665@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:39 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Opposition to Senate Bill 2820

>
> ?
>

> July 16, 2020

>
> Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

>
> My name is Kathy Doherty and I live at 13 Cook Street, Charlestown MA 02129

>
> 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. Please do the right thing for all.

>
> Thank you for your time.

>
> Sincerely,
>
> Kathy Doherty
>
>
> Kathy Doherty
From: DONALD Donahue <donahue38@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:38 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Ayers, Bruce - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Consequently, the provision to scale back or eliminate "Qualified Immunity" will alter the principles of local police work. Police action of running/chasing and capturing a perpetrator of an immediate crime will change. Who in their right mind "would take down" a perpetrator who committed that immediate crime? Obviously, ethics and the professional obligation of that potentially responding officer would be ripe with confusion to "subdue".

If Qualified Immunity is part of this bill watch crime soar. Never mind inside my beloved city of Boston, but watch it happen in other cities to include my adopted city of Quincy. The elimination or modification of Qualified Immunity should not be part of the Police Reform Bill.

Donald Donahue
38 Wallace Road
Quincy, MA
From: Cindy <cindylou790@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:38 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,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Renee <rayderrico@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:37 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,

Sent from my iPad
From: Tracey Seier <traceyseier@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Lawn, John - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Please pass a strong police reform bill

Dear House of Representatives and Representative John Lawn:

My name is Tracey Seier, and I live in Waltham Massachusetts.

For far too long, Boston has had a reputation for being one of the most racist cities in the country, and our policing in Boston contributes to that reputation. We have long accepted a separate and unequal life for minorities in our city and in the Boston Metro area. And over policing is a part of that.

Everywhere in the Commonwealth, Black and Brown people are stopped more in traffic stops, are more likely to be abused by police officers, are more likely to be jailed for minor things. Our poorest teens have police officers in their schools, ready to charge them with crimes if they make any error. While their rich White peers have rock climbing gyms and theatres in their schools.

We need to fundamentally change our ways.

Massachusetts led the country in Marriage Equality. Massachusetts can once again lead the country in police reform. We can reduce violence in our communities, end over-policing of minor things like drug possession, forbid violent police officers from ever serving in the commonwealth again, end the careers of police officers who lie under oath or plant evidence on citizens. We can make sure that rapes are solved. We can have a police force that matches the complexion and culture of their community, with training in social work, mental health crisis intervention.

Please quickly pass the Bill to Reform Police Standards and Shift Resources to Build a More Equitable, Fair and Just Commonwealth That Values Black Lives And Communities of Color.

Tracey Seier
From: Luis DeJesus <luisd85@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Luis DeJesus and I live at 203 Gardner Ave Somerset MA 02726. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center 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: 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.

Sincerely,

Officer Luis DeJesus

From: Bill Harris <signerwill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a

member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: Maryanne Galante <mgalante02368@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:36 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,
Maryanne C Galante
Randolph Mass
02368

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brian Devlin <devlinbrian@rocketmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill S2800

I am a resident of Douglas Massachusetts and I am writing to you in regards to Police Reform Bill S2800. First and foremost I am completely against this bill. I grew up in a law enforcement family with my father being a 30 year veteran of the Massachusetts State Police. He sadly passed away in 2000 and would be appalled at what is taking place right now. I, myself am a 15 year veteran of the Massachusetts Department of Correction at MCI-Cedar Junction with the rank of Sergeant. If you would like to discuss anything feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Brian Devlin, Sgt. Ma Dept. of Correction

From: Anna Roberts <anna.roberts1994@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Pass Bill S.2800

Hello,

I'm reaching out in full support of Bill S. 2800 to call on the Massachusetts House of Representatives to pass this bill.

My name is Anna Roberts and I currently work with ICF, based in London, UK. My phone number is +44 7340489901. I am a voter in Middlesex County, from Hamilton, MA, 01982.

For too long police and police unions have faced limited to no consequences in their use of force and in their treatment of minority populations. It is high time that the Massachusetts State government passed policies reflective of the public at large, not serving the interest of police unions. The DOJ--under Trump--who has expressed clear support of police officers, recognized the abuse within Springfield, MA and produced a scathing report. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-findings-investigation-narcotics-bureau-springfield> <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.justice.gov_opa_pr_justice-2Ddepartment-2Dannounces-2Dfindings-2Dinvestigation-2Dnarcotics-2Dbureau-2Dspringfield&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=8Oo1fBqlpiDaamtQ3rIfPXE7tMzQ86Qrny84xDLWmKA&s=c5h25_ac0LwrBo8SZtFvfZQsG_wCIz-ENY7Ez1k8nA&e=>

Massachusetts is not exempt from the criticism raging across the nation right now. Our state--and the police in it--are actively complicit. Police

are meant to serve and protect the people. A vast majority are actively failing in this and must be held accountable. The systems and the processes governing law enforcement MUST change. Please please please pass Bill S. 2800.

Best,

Anna

From: Leonard Rizy <ljrizy64@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:35 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Honan, Kevin - Rep. (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 Rizy

333 Market St.

Brighton MA 02135

From: Carmine Luongo <cluongo@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:33 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by

dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,

From: Jen Hodgkins <jenhodgkins@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:32 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,

Sent from my iPhone
From: Paul Briggs <pbriggs7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:31 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S.2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Paul Briggs I live at 755 Whittenton St. Taunton, Ma. 02780. I work at MCI-Cedar Junction and am a Lieutenant. 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,
Paul Briggs

Sent from my iPhone
From: Mary Anne Murray <maryannemurray@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:30 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: Frank Teague <fteague@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:30 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: Donald Desrochers <dedesrochers@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:30 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Lidia Desrochers
Subject: Testimony on the S.2820

Request that the House preserve the reforms in the Senate bill, such as the following:

- * Creating an independent and civilian-majority police certification/decertification body
- * Limiting qualified immunity so that victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages
- * Reducing the school-to-prison pipeline and removing barriers to expungement on juvenile records
- * Establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to move money away from policing prisons and into workforce development and education opportunities
- * Banning racial profiling by law enforcement and prohibiting police officers from having sex with those in custody, which can obviously never be consensual and is strikingly not yet illegal

Request that the House expand the Senate bill by

- * Strengthening use of force standards, e.g., by outright banning chokeholds and tear gas
- * Fully prohibiting facial surveillance technology (rather than imposing just a one-year moratorium)
- * Lifting the unnecessary cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund

From: Danielle Loynd <daniloynd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:29 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Proposed Police Reform

To Whom it May Concern,

Growing up in a small community, I have always known many of the first responders, both employed by the state and those who work on a volunteer basis. These men and women are some of the most selfless individuals, and often stop to assist whether they are on the clock, or off of it.

I do strongly believe that police reform is necessary, and that community based policing/engagement should be more prominent throughout the commonwealth, however by removing qualified immunity I believe there will be more harm than good. Many of these men and women will walk away from professions that were once seen as honorable, because the risk against their own wellbeing will be very high. I fear that in the end we will be left with individuals who are in their profession for a paycheck, rather than the good of their community.

The calls that police officers, EMS personnel, and firefighters run to are often the situations that others run away from. If they are willing to take a risk to protect us, as citizens of Massachusetts, I strongly believe that the bill should be reconsidered, so we can continue to protect them as well.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Danielle Loynd

From: Patrick Ryan <patrickry8@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:27 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Patrick Ryan. I am a Correctional Officer for the Worcester County Sheriffs Department. 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,
Patrick Ryan
From: Lindsay Foley <lindz05@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:26 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Regarding s2820

I am a resident of Massachusetts and a registered nurse. I do not support this legislation and the implications it will have on public service professionals. I urge you to stop this legislation known as S2820 in its tracks. I do not support its passing.

Lindsay Wright
83 Harvard Street
Whitman, MA 02382
508-930-9741

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Carolyn Lynes <carolynlynes@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:25 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Keep Senate Police Reform Bill S/2820

Members of the House,
I urge you to preserve and build on the vital reforms in the Senate bill S/2820 such as:

- * Creating an independent and civilian-majority police certification/decertification body
- * Limiting qualified immunity so that victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages
- * Reducing the school-to-prison pipeline and removing barriers to expungement on juvenile records
- * Establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to move money away from policing prisons and into workforce development and education opportunities
- * Banning racial profiling by law enforcement and prohibiting police officers from having sex with those in custody, which can obviously never be consensual and is strikingly not yet illegal!

In addition I want you to go further than the Senate bill by

- * Strengthening use of force standards, e.g., by outright banning chokeholds and tear gas
- * Fully prohibiting facial surveillance technology (rather than imposing just a one-year moratorium)
- * Lifting the unnecessary cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn Lynes,
586 Central Ave
Needham Hgts,
MA 02494
781-559-3667

From: Douglas Turcotte <dougdoall@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:24 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,

Mr. and Mrs. Douglas L. Turcotte
From: Christopher Peckham <christopherapeckham@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:24 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Christopher Peckham and I live at 196 McCloskey St, Fall River, Ma. I work at the Bristol County Sheriff's Office 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 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,
Christopher Peckham

From: Mike Bettencourt <mikebett_508@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:24 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: BILL 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Michael V Bettencourt and I live at 52 Gellette Rd, Fairhaven Ma. I work at the BristolCountySheriffs Department and am a K9 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,
MICHAEL V BETTENCOURT

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=BDLmGTSj031k75QQ9AZmAB1V7xL2AKUSAwwUXWPpnes&s=o_c9AgTe tFLhPRcYFDLAcKeLtPBNpfd0uXRfhPOQqdQ&e=>>
From: elamacchia <elamacchia@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:24 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

Re: Testimony re S.2820, the Senate's Police Reform Bill

Dear Rep. Cronin and Rep. Michlewitz,

I am shocked beyond words at what happened to George Floyd earlier this year. Therefore, 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.

Elaine LaMacchia
617-817-7635
Revere, MA 02151

From: WAYNE HOFFMAN <wayho67@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:23 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Read

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Wayne Hoffman and I live at 76 Elvira St. Bellingham Ma. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a Corrections Officer 1. 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Wayne Hoffman

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

13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ZsQKlRhjgXr53gFmooJIywQoglmFa7RO7s7iTm2eKeY&s=Bb3OywKX
Az78yvuy7BwdnJmTpKzXwtzL_uHo9PE8Ewc&e=>

From: Robert <chopperbob51@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:24 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, Robert P. Pepin SR.
From: Brandon Vtec <brandoncmoniz@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:23 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Brandon Moniz and I live at 5455 north main st. I am an employee of the Bristol county sheriffs office. I 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 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,
Brandon Moniz

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: 2012aliciar <2012aliciar@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:23 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Alicia Renaghan and I live at 5 Cole Ave, Sutton, MA 01590. I work at MCI-Norfolk 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: 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Alicia Renaghan

Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy Note8.

From: Kevin Cooper <kcoop21@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:23 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Kevin Cooper and I live at 16 Outlook Rd in Marshfield, Ma . I work for the Massachusetts Department of Correction at Old Colony Correctional Center in Bridgewater and currently hold the title of 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,
Sgt. Kevin Cooper

Sent from my iPhone
From: Philip Hamilton <pkhamilton45@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:23 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony re S.2820

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 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.

Philip K. Hamilton
Lexington, MA
781-861-3939
From: Marlene Pollock <marlenepollock929@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:21 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Coalition for Social Justice in support of Police Accountability

July 17, 2020

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

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

Re: Testimony in Support of Police Accountability -- Use of Force Standards and Qualified Immunity Reform

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

On behalf of The Coalition for Social Justice, I write in strong support of the many provisions in S.2820 designed to increase police accountability. In particular, our organization urges you to:

1. Adopt strict limits on police use of force,
2. End qualified immunity. Police accountability is a must. Victims of police violence must have their day in court, and police must be held to a high standard.

Our organization has been active in southeastern Massachusetts for the past 25 years. We have active chapters in Brockton, New Bedford, Fall River, and Falmouth. We have been active in criminal legal reform for the past decade, and played a leading role in the 2018 Reform Bill. We also are currently playing a leading role in the movement to hold Sheriff Hodgson accountable for his questionable practices in the Bristol County House of Correction and the Correia Detention Center.

We have seen our share of police overreach: in the death of 15 year old Malcolm Gracia at the hands of the New Bedford police; with excessive racial profiling through "stop and frisk" policies; warnings given to young Black men to stay inside during the summer months, amounting to the police acting like an occupying force; instances of racial attacks against innocent people at the hands of the Dartmouth Police, for which the town had to pay handsomely. We know that any city or town in Massachusetts is open to this kind of abuse because structurally there is no way to hold police who commit acts of malfeasance accountable. This has to stop. The police cannot feel they are above the law. That kind of attitude leads to murders like George Floyd's, which can no longer be tolerated.

Massachusetts must eliminate the shield of qualified immunity in order to enforce limits on the use of police force. Too many people have been seriously injured or killed as some police have violated people's civil rights without consequences. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820.

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

It seems to us that a great deal of funding is given to repression rather than going with effective tried and true programs that can prevent unlawful behavior and reduce unnecessary injuries and deaths. If we can redirect monies to successful programs and interventions, we could greatly reduce crime. For example, strong jobs programs for young men ages 16-25 have been effective in keeping people on the law-abiding path. Well-funded drug treatment and mental health programs are essential and badly needed.

There is another way, and we need to change our priorities so that our citizens can be helped rather than lost in this needless cycle of state sanctioned violence.

Sincerely,

Debra Fastino

Executive Director, Coalition for Social Justice

56 North Main St.

Fall River, Ma. 02720

508-982-3108

--

Marlene Pollock
Organizer
Coalition for Social Justice
New Bedford & Cape Cod
508-982-8751

Learn more about CSJ's work:

https://youtu.be/scwkT1Ic6ZY?list=PLkDkZsSMuETz_2Whez0pX8R-Q0tz102x7
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_youtu.be_scwkT1Ic6ZY-3Flist-3DPLkDkZsSMuETz-5F2Whez0pX8R-2DQ0tz102x7&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=yc94U3-obLa4xdPuxNlWPetiram-GIyGyRl_OzWhVd0&s=970y7t8tJEhOD2pGkfdscjp7mK9H8kGVbJI_1r_tme0&e=>>

From: J Butler <j.lbutler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:21 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,

Regards, Lisa

From: Michael D Irish <misha4him@juno.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:20 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,
Michael David Irish
Centerville

Sent by the electronic secretary for Peace of Mind Property Maintenance.
Have a blessed day!

From: Stephen Panzini <spanzini@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:20 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); McGonagle, Joseph - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

Dear Chairperson,

My union has been advised that the house is drafting their version of a police reform bill.

Although the incident that was the catalyst for all this reform happened a thousand miles from here I can see we are being governed by mob rule and do not want to hear facts about incidents that happen here in Massachusetts. I know it doesn't fit the agenda right now. Police are not shooting unarmed people on a regular basis like they are claiming in the media. I have been a police officer in the city of Everett for 23 years. Just a few months back with covid we were heroes going in to unknown sicknesses without the proper equipment for ourselves to save lives. We not only exposed ourselves but our spouses and children. Massachusetts has the best trained officers in the nation and that's why we don't have the issues other parts of our country are experiencing . I ask the speaker and the house to show a little political courage and common sense.

Some of the concerns I have with this haphazardly written bill on the senate side.

- This is union busting at its finest
- Circumventing our CBA's. It's unions that built this country and protect its work force right down to the 40 hour work week.
- Stripping due process. There already is a system that does work to get rid of problem officers. I have seen it first hand. My department has fired numerous officers over my 23 years. I have also seen bosses reduced in rank when they did not handle situations properly. The media is putting out a false narrative that problem officers can never be fired. That's just a lie.
- Qualified immunity. Everyone knows this will lead to frivolous lawsuits, taking officers off the street During these invests and cities losing tons of money. Police are routinely in hazardous situations and have seconds to make a decision. Only to have everyone else especially the media on Monday say they did this or that wrong. I would be perfectly fine with going 32 years and retire without shooting at any one. Unfortunately when we fight for people who can't fight for themselves we are put in those situations.
- Citizens Interviening In an arrest because in their untrained opinion believe something being done is excessive. Meanwhile not knowing what the defendant was being arrested for or understand the training you have. This will definitely cause citizens to get hurt. Further escalating violence!
- These boards the state wants to create with naacp/aclu and political appointee members on them. These organizations routinely sue cities and police departments for various issues. They not only would be biased for their organizations client they have zero law enforcement experience. There is a clear conflict of interest. The majority of the board should be compromised from experienced expert law enforcement from various ranks in the state of Massachusetts. Retired judges not activists ones who understand the law.

I ask that you consider all these points while drafting the responsible house version of this bill and realize how important these are to have a safe civil society

Respectfully, I will be holding the line. Will you?

Sgt. Stephen Panzini

Sent from my iPhone

From: Todd Neale <toddneale@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:20 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police reform bill

I am sending you the attached as a concerned citizen of the commonwealth. This bill is moving to fast and not all concerned parties are being heard. I did not create the following but do agree with the points of issue.

Thank you in advance for considering the following

Todd Neale

Citizen of Royalston

Massachusetts

Written testimony is due almost

1. Qualified Immunity - do not accept the talking point that there is not much of a change here. Not only did they make it more difficult to get Qualified Immunity (essentially turning it into a fact issue to be decided at trial, as opposed to a legal issue a judge could weed out early) - but - the real sneaky part is that they removed an element from the State Civil Rights Act, and also provided a provision for attorneys fees to be awarded to plaintiffs. These two changes are huge - will create tons of new state law claims against public employees to be brought in the state courts - as opposed to Federal Courts - where they will cost employees and Cities and Towns so much.

<https://nolanperroni.us3.list-manage.com/track/click?u=fdb5064f10a7ad27e13aff127&id=5fc55f0fa5&e=db4alab9f1>

The Boston Police Patrolmen's Union worked with Atty Kesten to get out this important opinion.

2. Indemnification - Some legislators are pointing to the lack of changes in the State Indemnification Law (GL c. 258) as a reason that officers should just not worry - suggesting they will still be defended against all of this expected onslaught. DO NOT ACCEPT THAT. First - GL c. 258

discriminates against municipal officers. Indemnification for municipal employees (police, fire, local officials, etc.) is discretionary. They do not have to do it. On the other hand, people like legislators, and the State Executive branch enjoy mandatory defense and indemnification for up to \$1,000,000.00 if they violate the civil rights laws

Also - don't forget - the Massachusetts State Police have a special statute of their own - GL c. 258, Sec. 9A - that provides mandatory defense and indemnification for up to \$1,000,000.00 for civil rights violations as long as they are not willful or malicious. MUNICIPAL OFFICERS ARE THE ONLY ONES WORKING WITHOUT A NET.

3. Due Process Rights - Obviously there is so much wrong with this bill - but the idea that your careers may be put into the hands of a inherently political board, mostly non-law enforcement, many with anti-police agendas, and of the law enforcement is mostly management, is alone disheartening enough. Here are some thoughts:

First - That board should be made up of a majority of law enforcement professionals, with representatives of management and labor, with appropriate and limited non-law enforcement representation. JUST LIKE EVERY OTHER PROFESSIONAL BOARD IN THE COMMONWEALTH.

Second - the way the bill defines a "sustained complaint" is that it views it as final once the CITY makes its decision. It does not allow for an unbiased review by an arbitrator or civil service - both rights which most have relied upon forever. This is shocking. In fact, both bargaining law and civil service law acknowledge that the city level process is biased - and more, even says that employees have no right to a disinterested or unbiased or even full hearing at the city level. THE REASON FOR THIS IS THAT THE LAW PROVIDES THESE APPEALS TO ARBITRATION AND CIVIL SERVICE. So - with this bill, officers will be stuck with only the permissibly biased, final decisions of local officials. This cannot stand. Just cause protects good officers - not bad officers. Every good public manager and Chief knows that if they follow correct process, they are able to remove unfit officers.

Third - the Governor's bill did not allow the Board to do its own investigations into complaints, and to be a place where people could complaint directly. The Senate changed this and now allows this political board to ignore local IA findings clearing officers, to ignore arbitrators and civil service officers, to ignore DA findings of justified force, etc - and simply do their own thing. This is wrong. This review board should be required to use the facts and findings of unbiased officials, should not be independently creating their own fact findings (which are insulated from appeal other than a legal "abuse of discretion" type appeal). This independent function should be removed and it should be consistent with the Governor's bill in that the board has a review function only.

The entire reason that public employees need just cause protections and appeals are to protect against political influence - just like what is going on now. Will your Rep be taking this protection away from other municipal workers? from teachers? from themselves?

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[From: Susan B. Leeming <\[sbleem@verizon.net\]\(mailto:sbleem@verizon.net\)>](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=wQAfnVlSVt5a0dcLPGFGM3dBQBmyt5QXO7TccykBgHU&s=N8OR4OW_ALWKuvwZFxsZBrs4JEgbXNyZ9HC2LrBKZ6E&e=>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:19 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,

Susan B. Leeming

From: Lisa Mackin <lisamackin@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:19 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

I would like voice heard regarding the Police Reform Bill.

I'm most definitely against the violation of civil rights and to the use of unnecessary force by any police department. The situation with George Floyd was tragic and should never have happened. Training and evaluations wouldn't be the worst idea, as this is accepted protocol in many industries. Massachusetts has an exceptional track record. Our officers are educated and well led for the most part.

I am against limiting qualified immunity.

Who are any of us to determine as bystanders what the appropriate action is to take as these police officers are under incredibly stressful and dangerous situations. Look at Michael Chesna, a Weymouth police officer killed with his own gun two years ago this week, as he simply answered a call about an erratic driver. A police officer has to react swiftly using a gut reaction. We have to trust our officers to make the correct decision for that moment in time. We can't be back seat drivers and question every move made after the fact.

If qualified immunity is limited, you'll see the police force dwindle as retirees give up on their roles and young people find other professions where they are respected for a job well done not beaten down and spit at by the very people they serve. This latest witch hunt that is trending in America, where the masses have determined that the police force is at fault or that by pulling down statues we can realign history, is a farce. Until people in general start to respect each other and stop fighting vehemently like spoiled children until their opinion is accepted as the norm - we're in deep trouble as a country. Why can't people accept the fact that there is always going to be opposing perspectives? That's what our country was built on.

Limiting Qualified Immunity is not the answer.

Sincerely,

Lisa Mackin

From: Keith Crowley <keithncrowley@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:19 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform Bill

Representatives,

Please take careful consideration in reviewing the content of this email as it immensely impacts the importance of Police Officers performing their job, and keeping the community safe. Safe you may ask?

Safe by removing guns, drugs, and violent criminals from the streets in which members of the commute walk. They may walk alone or with their spouse, children, significant partners. Maybe even just their pet. They have a right to feel SAFE! The data does not lie. Crime has increasingly gone up over recent years. More crime = a greater push for safety amongst members of the community. Please do not let the decision be based solely on political motivation.

My name is Keith Crowley and I live in Methuen. 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.

Keith Crowley

18 Landmark Dr
Methuen, MA 01844

From: Gerry Murphy <gerrymurphy368@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: SB 2820 Public testimony

Gerry Murphy, Quincy Fire Department, IAFF local 792. 617-767-5640

Please preserve full qualified immunity for public safety personnel. I have often been called upon to restrain violent, combative patients to keep them safe from themselves or from causing harm to others. These patients have been under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, suffering from head injury, shock, hypoglycemia, dementia or a experiencing a behavioral emergency such as a suicide attempt.

I worked in concert with fellow firefighters, ems providers, and most often, a lone police officer to restrain the patient so they could be transported to the hospital and receive treatment. The motivation of all personnel engaged in restraint was ensuring the safety and care of the patient. Frequently, it requires the sustained effort of 5 or 6 people to control a strong violent patient.

In the deliberation over review and reform of policing in general, I feel more consideration is needed for the split second nature of violent behavior and how little reaction time is available when faced with a sudden threat. Sometimes mistakes are made in an instinctive attempt to defend oneself and others which might be avoided with the luxury of time and distance.

Opening the door to personal liability will prove harmful to public safety personnel and the public in general. In conclusion, over 17 years and thousands of calls, I have never witnessed a police officer, firefighter or EMT act with malice towards any patient.

Respectfully, Gerry Murphy

From: Barbara McGuirk <bjmcguirk2027@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:19 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,
Barbara J. McGuirk

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Carrie Dern <carriedern@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:18 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,

Carrie Dern

From: Mark Penney <mepper75@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:18 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,

Mark Penney

North Reading, MA

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sam Carver <scarver85@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Samuel Carver and I live at 24 Dean St. Mansfield, MA 02048. I work at MCI-Norfolk and 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: 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Samuel Carver

From: Rich Wetherell <wetherell111@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Richard A Wetherell Jr and I live at 14 LedgeWood Dr Boylston 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,

Richard A Wetherell Jr

Sent from my iPhone From: Michael Harrington <mikeh72799@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:17 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

Hi, i live in quincy. I am a supporter of all of our first responders, including but not limited to, Police, Fire, Ems and so on and so forth. The bill that is being pushed (S.2800) is ridiculous and embarrassing, especially that fact that it was approved over night at 4a.m with no real discussion or public input. That bill is putting my family at risk personally as i have family who are in law enforcement, and it's also putting the public in complete danger. People are going to take advantage of this for their own monetary purposes and ruin lives just because they want to. You really need to rethink this.

We will remember this come November.

Sent from my iPhone
From: David Fadul <davidfadul27@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:15 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: In Support of S.2820

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

I'm writing in favor of S.2820 to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it. I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no-knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Thank you,

David Fadul
Boston, MA
From: Keith lake <krlake01@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:15 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

Massachusetts should not be one of the first in the nation to roll out these new "police reforms", Massachusetts should be the example that other

states are basing their reforms off of. Massachusetts has some of the lowest numbers for officer involved shootings, excessive use of force complaints, and race based complaints. The commonwealth is already above and beyond many other states in progressive policing. Politicians are forcing this knee jerk reaction bill to pander to the extremists. You cannot allow qualified immunity to be taken away from the officers that should be the example for the rest of the country. This will lead to hesitation and officers lives being taken. It will destroy families and livelihoods. Policing in Massachusetts is not the national problem and should be held up as a guiding light for other states to follow. Do not allow this bill to pass and instead highlight the positive progressive work done by all Massachusetts Law Enforcement officials.

Thank you

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Max Monn <michael_monn@alumni.brown.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:15 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820 support

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

I am writing you in support of bill S2820. This action to protect black lives and dismantle the systemic racism that causes direct harm to communities of color is long overdue. We have seen the horrific effects of unchecked power and racist policing for many years but now is the time for change.

Best regards,

Michael Monn

From: Pat Moore <patch450@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:15 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,

Patrick MooreFrom: Tim B <tjbl23@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:14 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Qualified immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Timothy Bariamis and I live at 230 Granite St. in Leominster, MA. I work at NCCI Gardner 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,

Timothy Bariamis

From: John D. Maak <maaker55@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:14 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

From: Tim Warren <twarren22@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:14 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S2820

This bill is a slap in my he face of every hardworking public employee!! To not even have a discussion on this topic is a joke!! Police are taking way too much of the blame because of an incident that happened in another part of the country. Our representatives are a joke and for them to turn their backs on police when not too long ago during the marathon bombings

everyone hid under the protection that police provided. If this passes good luck finding qualified candidates for the job in the future.

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Rosemary Morel <mormmmr@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:12 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,

Rosemary Morel
Methuen MA

From: Mike Dalton <mdalton84@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:11 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Michael Dalton and I live at 4 kayak trl, Norton 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 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Michael Dalton

From: John Callahan <mcall0728@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:11 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,

John Callahan
80 Spring Meadow Lane
Hanover, Ma
Sent from my iPhone
From: lmquealy@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:10 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

To whom it may concern,

I would like to formally express my concern with the recent act that has been passed on police reform and was expanded to include nurses and fire fighters. I think that this act, as written, will present significant long term negative impacts to the existing first-responder teams and negatively impact the future of these departments due to fear of repercussions beyond what is reasonable. These first-responders risk their lives daily for us and deserve nothing but the utmost respect. I would like to respectfully request that we conduct a serious evaluation, including broader public input before approving this act

Thank you for your time

From: Ana Cruz <acruz@gbls.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:03 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: We Need Police Accountability with Key Provisions from S.2820

Dear Chairs HWM & Judiciary,

I strongly 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,

Ana Cruz
1569 Beacon St
Brookline, MA 02446
acruz@gbls.org

From: ttbeale@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:10 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Thomas Beale and I live in Plympton, MA and work at MCI Norfolk and as a Correction Officer. As a constituent, I'm writing to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work everyday to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. This reform took several years to develop. I'm dismayed in the haste this bill was passed however 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 each frivolous lawsuit.

Less than Lethal Tools The fact 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 hand 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 the 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 items never heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.

I'm 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'm asking you think about the police officer you need to keep your streets safe from, violence and not to dismantle proven community policing practices. I'd also like you to Officer alone in the cell block, surrounded by up to one hundred inmates, not knowing when violence could erupt. I'm asking for your support and ensuring whatever reform is passed you do it responsibly..

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Thomas P Beale

From: BARBARA CAUFIELD <barbara.caufield@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public

safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: Kathleen McKeown <kmckeown21@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

To whom it may concern:

Taking away Qualified Immunity presents many problems that just don't make sense. Please reconsider this part of the reform bill. Having public employees take on this personal risk is unfair. In this very litigious society, we will see an increase in frivolous lawsuits and public employees will stand by and do nothing for fear to lose their home and savings. How is that good? Perhaps an unintended consequence of this bill.

Insurance companies are probably meeting now to devise some type of insurance policy they can sell to cover public employees. It will be very expensive as insurance companies never want to pay out. They know the odds of potential claims. And the odds of many claims being filed is very good.

Please reconsider this part of the bill. And you cannot do that, then add yourselves to the bill and remove your qualified immunity.

Take a stand. Don't fall into the mob mentality. Do what is right.

Davin Hearn
18 Sunset Hill Road <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>
West Roxbury MA. 02132 <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>
617-828-2285

From: Kimberly MARRONI <marroni@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

Hello Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin:

I am writing in support of S2820 currently being considered by the Massachusetts House of Representatives. This bill is a crucial part of reforming our police departments and addressing systemic racism within our society. In particular I support the restrictions on obtaining military grade property, the banning of choke holds, and the restrictions on the use of chemical weapons, rubber bullets and dogs. The emphasis on training and de-escalation tactics is an absolutely necessary part of law enforcement reform.

In addition, I support the change in the requirement for school resource officers only at the request of school superintendents. There have been too many stories from students, particularly students of color, of the racism they have encountered or observed from SROs. Studies are clear that the criminalization of matters that should be handled by schools are hugely detrimental to students both during their time in school and afterward.

I know there has been a tremendous amount of resistance from the law enforcement community regarding this bill, particularly with respect to the modification of qualified immunity. In my opinion the changes made by the bill are reasonable and will help to hold police officers accountable for their actions.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Kimberly Marroni
80 Holly Ridge Road
North Andover, MA 01845
978-681-0997
From: Ocola, Paloma <pocola@g.harvard.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:08 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 Testimony

Dear members of the House,

The proposed bill S.2820 does not do enough to prevent police violence against Black people or deal with the problem of the over-criminalization and mass incarceration of Black communities. I am hoping that it can be strengthened in the House.

To be clear, if there is a single drop more of spending needed to implement these changes, in either training and training commissions, I do not support it. We already see in other communities around the country where a lot of this same legislation exists that Black people are still being targeted, hurt, and killed by police. You might see this as a first step but if this bill goes through as is, it is not enough. I do not want any one of you to think that this is enough.

It is important that we chip away at qualified immunity, which continues to save violent officers from losing their jobs. All of these bans on specific policing practices mean nothing if qualified immunity isn't abolished, and I hope that this bill becomes stronger in weakening it. If a police officer commits a fireable or chargeable offense they should not be able to continue being a police officer in any community. Choke holds were banned in New York City the day Eric Garner died by one, and his murderer remained a police officer for five more years after killing him.

The way forward is to find a way to fire an officer permanently, but also shrink the role and powers of police. The millions of dollars used to increase the scope of policing should be used to fund Black and Brown communities. I want to see a decrease in police officer's responsibilities. I want to see legislation that decriminalizes minor offences, that stops pretextual traffic stops and street stops and frisks. Policing should not be waiting around for someone to make a minor infraction, or waiting to target a random passerby hoping to uncover an infraction, to give them a ticket and rope them into our debilitating legal cycle. This cycle is entirely fueled by preying on Black and Brown communities, the poor and the working class, and will always disproportionately harm these communities no matter how much training is implemented. S.2820 does not get us to the place where we need to be, and I am afraid that all of you will stop there.

The legislative session is scheduled to end July 31. I expect to see better by then or by the return in the fall.

Thank you,
Paloma Ocola
Cambridge, Massachusetts

From: Dante Monaco <dante.monaco@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: DO NOT SUPPORT bill S2820.

I DO NOT SUPPORT bill S2820.
Dante Monaco
Jamaica Plain, MA.
Thank you!

Get Outlook for iOS <[From: Alyssa Krinsky <alyssahkrinsky@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)
Subject: S.2820](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_o0ukef&d=DwMCAQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nZyrC9JLud0-ZmJny2e83DIZR2DUEsGjyIZUF6ahejU&s=IeetUlFU3bj2_tuAvn_LH2a5Z4Y4dKIrfSAOsxT0UAI&e=>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

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

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

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

Alyssa Krinsky, Brookline Mass
From: Stanley Watson <stanwatson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

The recently passed Senate Bill needs serious modification in the House. There are lots of details to plow through but in short, this is an expensive bill assembled in a haphazard manner with an apparent emotional urge for the State Legislators to be in the forefront of progressive action resulting from events that occurred elsewhere. The absence of public notice and hearings is testament to the knee-jerk nature of the legislation.

There are at least ten new Commissions established by this Bill of a dozen or more people with executive directors, administrative staff, lawyers, researchers, consultants and contractors for each Commission. There are travel and entertainment expenses, expenses for Boston office suites, and millions in new social welfare spending that I fear will be 75% consumed by the administrative bureaucracy. As a taxpayer, I don't want to buy this! I see this bill costing \$100million per year so that you legislators can hide behind a facade of altruism.

I see independent fundraising and government appropriations that become administrative slush funds supporting legalized graft and corruption by the Commissions.

I don't see reform coming from this Bill. I see an uncoordinated mess of bureaucracy that does not help the Black and Latino communities. I see a misguided assault on the police forces of the towns, counties and State. The bill strips the policeman of their authority, their dignity and their personal safety.

I see an imbalanced approach to community development where these Commissions are heavily populated by minority participants in order to fix the vote for any and all decisions or recommendations from those committees.

I see policemen victimized by the process with no recourse through established union contracts or the Civil Service Commission.

I see age and disability discrimination as it appears all new State Police must be cadets under 26 years of age and with no disabilities. I see no ability for a municipal police officer to transfer into the State Police thereby blocking qualified, experienced candidates from the force, as the Bill prohibits crossover and advancement. Crazy.

So many more sloppy details. An officer can get sued for civil liability for up to 4 years after an incident yet the Bill allows for the destruction of body cam video after 180 days. Why wouldn't this be kept for at least 4 years as a means of defense for an officer accused? Haphazard.

You expect the police to be race neutral while requiring them to specify perceived race for any traffic stop. Haphazard and incongruent.

Why is the Latino Commission smaller than the African American Commission by 2 people? Haphazard. Why are there dates for nominations and appointments set for the Latino Commission and not for the others. Haphazard.

I could go on.... You get the picture. You Liberals want the Police to serve and protect your political agenda, not the people, so you mask your agenda as "law." This is not lawful. Please read our Constitution again. This is a free society where people are free to succeed and free to fail. If people fail, the rest of us are not obligated to carry them on our backs.

This isn't Seattle. This isn't Minneapolis. Let's not be the next lawless metropolis.

Thank you.

Stanley Watson

MA Citizen

978-257-1444

From: STEPHEN LUPIEN <lupien.stephen@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Stephen T Lupien and I live at 20 Woodland Road, West Bridgewater 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 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Stephen T Lupien

Sent from my iPhone From: Brian Hearn <brianhearn13@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

To whom it may concern:

Taking away Qualified Immunity presents many problems that just don't make sense. Please reconsider this part of the reform bill. Having public employees take on this personal risk is unfair. In this very litigious society, we will see an increase in frivolous lawsuits and public employees will stand by and do nothing for fear to lose their home and savings. How is that good? Perhaps an unintended consequence of this bill.

Insurance companies are probably meeting now to devise some type of insurance policy they can sell to cover public employees. It will be very expensive as insurance companies never want to pay out. They know the

odds of potential claims. And the odds of many claims being filed is very good.

Please reconsider this part of the bill. And you cannot do that, then add yourselves to the bill and remove your qualified immunity.

Take a stand. Don't fall into the mob mentality. Do what is right.

Brian Hearn

18 Sunset Hill Road <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>
West Roxbury MA. 02132 <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>
617- <tel:617-697-9640> 828-4679

Sent from my iPhone
From: melbos@email.com
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

From: Craig Swindell <windellsay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:06 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); 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,

Craig Swindell

From: Elizabeth Heffler <heffler@natickpolice.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:06 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S2800

To whom it may concern,

I have been a Natick police Officer for 24 years. During this time I have been awarded (locally) Officer of the year and (Nationally) NSRO District 6, Distinct Service award recipient. I hold a BA in psychology and criminal justice. I also hold an MS in Mental Health Counseling. I am a NSRO Practitioner, which is the highest level of training nationally, a School Resource Officer can have. Lastly, I am a member of the Massachusetts Juvenile Police Association, conference board.

I tell you all this not to boast about my accomplishments but to demonstrate my commitment to the people of my town, Natick Massachusetts. I am in fear of the removal of Qualified Immunity. I am a good Officer and by "good Officer" I mean I care for the people I service. Early in my career I had to arrest one of my Sargents. That was not easy but it was right. While my son battled cancer, I still answered calls from parents/students/teachers/administrators that were in need. I made sure I was on duty as long as my son was not admitted to the hospital. To say I am committed to my town is an understatement, but I am not an unusual Officer. There are thousands of Massachusetts Officers that are the same, if not better.

The issue of Qualified Immunity, for me is, just because I am a good Officer, doesn't mean I will not be civilly sued for the interactions I have with the public. There are no protections for frivolous lawsuits. I cannot afford an attorney to go to court every time someone does not appreciate what occurred at a scene. I read the social media responses to varied events. Untrained individuals become experts and take issue with things they don't understand or they don't see the full picture. I fear people will now take those opinions and start filing frivolous lawsuits against good officers like me. I do not want to ever go to a scene and have to choose between helping a person in need or the financial stability of my family. Is it not bad enough, I carry a final good bye letter in my vest, incase an incident takes me? Now, daily I will need to be concerned about civil lawsuits.

Massachusetts has been a leader around the country with our training and policies, for law enforcement. Having said that, nothing is perfect and can always be better. There are many good parts to the bill S2800. As you can see, I enjoy training and welcome it. I staunchly disagree though with the removal of Qualified Immunity.

Thank you for taking the time and reading my thoughts. I usually only practice my civic duty at the ballot box, so this testimony is new to me. I truly appreciate the time an effort you all put into governing of state. Thank you again

Officer Elizabeth Heffler, MSC

Sent from my iPhone
From: lee marques <marques630@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:06 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Lee Marques and I live at 990 Dighton Woods Circle, Dighton, MA. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Department and am a Correctional Officer of 6 plus years and counting. 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.

Sincerely,
Correctional Officer Lee Marques
From: Stanley Watson <stanwatson4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:05 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

The recently passed Senate Bill needs serious modification in the House. There are lots of details to plow through but in short, this is an expensive bill assembled in a haphazard manner with an apparent emotional urge for the State Legislators to be in the forefront of progressive action resulting from events that occurred elsewhere. The absence of public notice and hearings is testament to the knee-jerk nature of the legislation.

There are at least ten new Commissions established by this Bill of a dozen or more people with executive directors, administrative staff, lawyers, researchers, consultants and contractors for each Commission. There are travel and entertainment expenses, expenses for Boston office suites, and millions in new social welfare spending that I fear will be 75% consumed by the administrative bureaucracy. As a taxpayer, I don't want to buy this! I see this bill costing \$100million per year so that you legislators can hide behind a facade of altruism.

I see independent fundraising and government appropriations that become administrative slush funds supporting legalized graft and corruption by the Commissions.

I don't see reform coming from this Bill. I see an uncoordinated mess of bureaucracy that does not help the Black and Latino communities. I see a misguided assault on the police forces of the towns, counties and State. The bill strips the policeman of their authority, their dignity and their personal safety.

I see an imbalanced approach to community development where these Commissions are heavily populated by minority participants in order to fix the vote for any and all decisions or recommendations from those committees.

I see policemen victimized by the process with no recourse through established union contracts or the Civil Service Commission.

I see age and disability discrimination as it appears all new State Police must be cadets under 26 years of age and with no disabilities. I see no ability for a municipal police officer to transfer into the State Police thereby blocking qualified, experienced candidates from the force, as the Bill prohibits crossover and advancement. Crazy.

So many more sloppy details. An officer can get sued for civil liability for up to 4 years after an incident yet the Bill allows for the destruction of body cam video after 180 days. Why wouldn't this be kept for at least 4 years as a means of defense for an officer accused? Haphazard.

You expect the police to be race neutral while requiring them to specify perceived race for any traffic stop. Haphazard and incongruent.

Why is the Latino Commission smaller than the African American Commission by 2 people? Haphazard. Why are there dates for nominations and appointments set for the Latino Commission and not for the others. Haphazard.

I could go on.... You get the picture. You Liberals want the Police to serve and protect your political agenda, not the people, so you mask your agenda as "law." This is not lawful. Please read our Constitution again. This is a free society where people are free to succeed and free to fail. If people fail, the rest of us are not obligated to carry them on our backs.

This isn't Seattle. This isn't Minneapolis. Let's not be the next lawless metropolis.

Thank you.

From: Ruth Kohls <rjkohls@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:04 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Sena, Danillo - Rep. (HOU); Eldridge, James (SEN)
Subject: I support the Senate police reform bill, S.2800.

Members,
The League of Women Voters advocates against systemic racism in the justice system and supports preventing excessive force and brutality by law enforcement.
As a concerned, voting citizen and member of the League of Women Voters I urge you to support the inclusion of the following measures in the Senate police reform bill, S.2800:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda
<[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.](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_voteliz_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3DK-2DR-26eid-3DARAoqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-255B0-255D-3D68.ARCpDWxSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPOtPwTxxZ2JtqfZomTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlW0GxpWGCmB-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab81GKdWQqCJ16NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZzdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYTnFPi6&d=DwMFAQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=qx7nUHb1DuIQY1CGz-iHQcOcmCYBE8SK3kPaHU24EPo&s=mx2wCnFsNlLXcfi-6MYaMAnk7hKnOKXfSjDr6Ffp2N0&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.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Thank you,
Ruth E.J. Kohls
rjkohls@gmail.com
14 Prescott Road
Acton, MA 01720

From: David Wenstrom <wenstromstudio@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:05 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,

David Wenstrom

Newtonville MA 02460

From: L F <fowlkeslorraine@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:04 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: test

From: john macdougall <john05141988@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This

provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: lc42561 <lc42561@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:11 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Louis Cavagnaro
154 Salem St.
Boston, Ma. 02113
617 974 8010

I am against taking qualified Immunity from law enforcement officers.

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

From: Susan Furtado <sfurtado1026@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2800

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this email to you to express my grave concern over the Senate Bill S2800. I am extremely disappointed at what the Massachusetts State Senate did with the passage of Senate Bill S2800. Not only did the Senate basically label all the honest men and women of law enforcement, to include officers of color, as racist but they also attacked every public sector employee and union with this poorly crafted bill. I am still not sure why this was rushed through so abruptly in the middle of the night. There were no public hearings as well. That just screams back door shadiness!

The loss of Qualified Immunity is a principle that is fully supported by the United States Supreme Court in case law and protects public sector employees from good faith errors while in the performance of their duties. Qualified Immunity does not protect unlawful conduct by public sector employees, it never has and does not shield officers from unlawful conduct. The Senate Bill not only affects law enforcement but fire, medical and educational employees, as well as municipal and elected officials. The potential financial cost to the Commonwealth and individual public sector employees will be massive. In addition to this, the effect on law enforcement will be profound with every officer in the Commonwealth

second guessing everything they do and choosing inaction over action out of fear of civil litigation for just performing their duties. This will transcend into every public sector job and field, how is this good for the state and its citizens? The Senate Bill will create a potential atmosphere that emboldens criminals and clogs up the court system with frivolous law suits. I personally do not want police officers not responding to calls based on the fact they might be sued if they look at someone the wrong way.

Another important issue in the Bill is the loss of collective bargaining rights and due process. The Massachusetts House has a long and proud history of supporting labor unions in this state. Why has the Senate decided to strip bargaining rights away from workers in this state? On top of that, take away a persons due process rights to appeal and protection from over reach or retribution by employers for any reason that they deem fit. This is wrong on so many levels and violates basic citizen's rights.

I am in full support of accreditation and certification of law enforcement. I believe a code of standards is absolutely necessary. However, I do not support the loss of Qualified Immunity or Collective Bargaining. The Commonwealth is heading down a slippery slope right now. Look at the rest of the country. This isn't an over reaction or a doom and gloom scenario. When you take away law enforcement's ability to enforce the law, you will have crime and utter chaos. I do not want to live in a society like that, nor do I want my children growing up with this.

I hope that the House of Representatives will be what you were elected to be, representatives of the people. The Senate seems to be pandering to a very dangerous progressive agenda that puts public safety and the financial well being of the Commonwealth at risk. The process needs to slow down. ALL sides must be heard from. Public hearings need to take place and language needs to be thought out to be fair on all sides. The majority of citizens in the Commonwealth do not have issue with the police. This is coming from a liberal agenda that is nothing but terrifying to the average tax paying citizen. Let's not forget, two months ago everyone wanted the police departments to help with their birthday and graduation parades. What changed? Why are they all of sudden the enemy? They are hired to do a job. That job is protect and serve. Unfortunately, with this Bill they won't be able to do either.

I thank you for your time and consideration with this matter. I hope that you will think carefully, reasonably and with some foresight. Thinking long term how Senate Bill S2800 will affect the whole Commonwealth and its citizens.

Regards,

Susan Furtado
71 Emerald Dr

Lynn, MA 01904
781-593-6932
From: DALE HARRISON <elad0226@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2800

Good afternoon,

I am writing to express my complete opposition to the misguided bill regarding police reform just passed on Beacon Hill. Especially concerning are the following 2 items:

- setting up a committee of non professional civilians to set police standards??? This is absolutely inappropriate. For other professions, for example the medical profession, a board of certified peers in that profession is used to set standards and evaluate performance.
- Secondly, removing police immunity is a huge step backward. These officers are making split second life or death decisions in certain cases, and their intent has to be considered and they must be protected from frivolous and ruinous lawsuits.

Boston has a remarkable police force, one that has been held up as a national model. Commissioner Gross is outstanding, and tells things as they are. He has worked very hard to ensure policing is fair and just.

This bill is pandering to the interests of a very vocal minority, many of whom looted and burned during the protests, while the police were told to stand down. Our MA police officers put on their uniform every day, and vow to protect and serve. They should not all be lumped into the same category of the few officers that disgrace the uniform. This bill will remove their needed immunity while performing their duties. ALL lives matter, including those of our brave police officers. I implore you to not pass this bill as written.

Regards,
Dale Harrison

From: David Boucher <horzradish@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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,
David Boucher

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Melanie Reissfelder <melanie_914@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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: Eve Fairbanks <Efairbanks7@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:52 PM
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,

Eve Fairbanks
247 Lincoln St
Hingham, MA 02043
Efairbanks7@gmail.com

From: JHunter <jhunter3223@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 5:00 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Jon Hunter and I live at 28 Nickerson St, Plymouth MA . I recently worked at the Bristol County Sheriff's Office as 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,

Jon Hunter

From: Margi <margim@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:59 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Margaret Mannke

From: Emily Campbell <elckd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:57 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

Dear Committee Members,

I struggle to understand how anyone could think passing this bill could be a good idea.

I am horrified to see you buying into the opinion that our police are systematically racist. I absolutely cannot deduce that, despite what happened to George Floyd (and others) and the resulting protests. We know about 1000 people are killed annually by police nationwide (and by and large the cases are justified), but while lots of comparisons and analysis goes into how many are black vs. white, and the percentage of the population they make up. I think a much clearer illustration of the job the police are doing would be comparing how many times they interact with the (often hostile) public. How many officers X how many 911 calls, traffic stops, undercover investigations? How many people were charged with resisting arrest last year? How many times were the police forced to chase suspects, were they spit on, head-butted, cussed at, drawn on - SHOT

AT? I am genuinely impressed with the level of professional restraint they demonstrate.

You don't need to create another committee to oversee them, report on them, retrain them, reform them, or shift their resources (defund them). YOU NEED TO DEFEND THEM. They DEFEND US from the most dangerous & despicable. They willingly put on the uniform everyday and risk their lives for us. Don't you dare kowtow to political pressure for imagined inequities. Don't you dare put the vast majority of law-abiding citizens who respect and NEED the Police in jeopardy because you are afraid for your own career. We need leadership that can stand up to this political correctness gone haywire.

Sincerely,
Emily Campbell

From: Rodney Petersen <petersenrodneyl@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:58 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Policing Reform Bill

Cooperative Metropolitan Ministries is supportive of the Policing Reform Bill. We have much to learn from the restorative justice movement and police can be at the heart of a humane reform committed to community safety.

Rodney Petersen

--

Executive Director, Cooperative Metropolitan Ministries;
Executive Director, The Lord's Day Alliance of the U.S.;
Visiting Researcher, Center for Global Christianity and Mission, Boston
University School of Theology
Boston, Massachusetts
Rodney L. Petersen, PhD

617-331-1747
petersenrodneyl@gmail.com
www.ldausa.org <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.ldausa.org&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=6g9yKpduUdnLa8WnyNGbt992ZCvw-yjsP2sYhghqQKI&s=TeBtlg7_sTQzx53kFakiG9S5iAQxlmXj3s8FTHBzBrs&e=>>

From: Marie Opera <mopera@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:58 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,

Marie C. Opera
173 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

From: Mimi Hollister <mimi.hollister@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:57 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: 'Kathy Leonardson'

Subject: Regarding systemic racism in the police force

To Whom It May Concern:

I am the Rev. Marybelle Hollister, 7 Glover Square, Marblehead, MA 01945. I am writing as a minister, a citizen of the Commonwealth, a member of the League of Women Voters, and a very concerned citizen about systemic racism here and all over our country.

My plea is to support the Senate police reform bill, S.2800. I also urge you to support including the following measures:

HB.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda 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.

I should think many in the police ranks would support these bills also because they ensure that only responsible individuals are hired and trained as police officers, of which there are very many, and I would guess they cringe at the activities of a vicious few, such as the man who killed George Floyd. Union bargaining rights should not be affected by these measures at all. They are bills that strengthen the culture and guidelines of policing to make it more just and compatible with the safety of the community role that police are supposed to help us maintain.

Racism is too much a part of our history and even our current culture. It is time we became active anti-racists with more than just platitudes and marches. These bills would be a wonderful testimony to the good will of our Commonwealth and its recognition of at least this one very important place where things need to change.

Thank you for looking at reality in a clear-eyed way and doing what is right by all of our citizens.

Sincerely,

Marybelle Holllister

From: hotsauce40523 <hotsauce40523@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:57 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,

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

From: Will <clfmustang@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:56 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: algledhill1@yahoo.com; jlasker@comcast.net; nfergus@yahoo.com; office@paysonpark.org; rainclf@aol.com; seaglass718@gmail.com; esedp@comcast.net; simonlake1977@yahoo.com; srdsmark@aol.com; laurencassidy2016@gmail.com; jclifford3636@gmail.com; jeffcronin@hotmail.com; jenniferdawn9812@gmail.com; economa@aol.com; clifsilver@icloud.com; messina.diane@gmail.com; bkkh@aol.com; herb@philpott.org
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,

Wilfred J. Clifford
93 Riverside St
Watertown, MA 02472
617 924 8618

From: Anne Turtle <anne.turtle@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:56 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support for bills related to racial justice

Now is the time to act on the issue of racial justice.

I urge you to support the inclusion of the following measures:

An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety,
State Representative Liz Miranda
<[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](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.facebook.com_voteliz_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3DK-2DR-26eid-3DARAoqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-255B0-255D-3D68.ARCpDWxSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPotPwTxxZ2JtqfZoMTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlW0GxpWGCmB-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab8lGkdWQqCJ16NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZzdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYTnFPi6&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=dc0VnmqdZid5jTUQgThedMoH-K-MC009Gbo7RNoayRo&s=NHKMVwSo2CtACDENEK7hzipNbKmJW6_UcjkjvdDub_0s&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.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

personally liable if they are found to have violated a person's civil rights.

Thank you for reading my message.

Best regards,

Anne Rippy Turtle

From: John Fabello <fabellojp@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:55 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,

Sent from my iPhone
From: Phillip Medeiros <PMedeiros1979@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Phillip Medeiros and I live at 5 Blossom Ct. Dartmouth, MA 02747 I work at Massachusetts Treatment Center in Bridgewater, MA 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 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,
Phillip Medeiros

From: Minelli, Edward <EMinelli@hullpolice.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: No Changes to Qualified Immunity

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is a request on behalf of the thousands of good police officers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We urge you to think about the ramifications of hasty and uninformed decisions, and their effect on the constituents you serve.

While policing as a whole will always evolve, and always seek to improve - as it has demonstrably done since its inception - decisions predicated on politics will ultimately serve only the politicians.

For years now, police have fostered an interest in cooperation, we have embodied community, we have welcomed transparency and, we have served this Commonwealth honorably.

Admittedly, there have been instances of unscrupulous actions by a few, but to our credit we have made sure that, with due process, they no longer serve the Commonwealth.

We have grave concerns, however, with some of the amendments of S.2800.

Certainly, the rapidity of the development of this resolution epitomizes its' emotional underpinnings; however, we strongly believe that we should never make permanent legislative decisions based on temporary feelings. Some of the decisions in this bill will forever change policing in the Commonwealth, and not for the better.

Due process is a building block of our legal system, and our inalienable rights as citizens of this country. All public servants in this state have a right to appeal, a right that does not alter ones' guilt or innocence, simply a right that balances the power of the state. It is one of the inherent checks and balances built into our Constitution by our

forefathers. To remove such a right, is to remove Constitutional protections from the power of the state, and serves no purpose but to satisfy a political agenda. These protections that have been afforded to all of us are essential if the scales of justice are to remain balanced. Where does this infringement on civil liberties end if due process is lost to an impetuous decision? Can we also eliminate it in civil and criminal cases across the Commonwealth?

Qualified immunity does not protect bad police officers. In *Harlow vs. Fitzgerald* (1982) the United States Supreme Court had the foresight to rule that qualified immunity must exist due to "the need to protect officials who are required to exercise discretion and the related public interest in encouraging the vigorous exercise of official authority" as long as their actions were within the scope of their job. Bad officers operate outside that scope and are punished accordingly. Removing this protection will essentially eliminate discretion in policing. As the courts have demonstrated, it is not feasible to have one without the other. In fact, in the same ruling mentioned above, the Supreme Court also established absolute immunity for judges, government officials and prosecutors. Should we now make judges culpable for their rulings? Should prosecutors and government officials be held civilly and criminally liable for their decisions? The plethora of frivolous suits filed against officers, their towns, counties, cities, and the Commonwealth, would place a massive burden on Massachusetts.

As officers we do not pretend to know how attorneys or judges do their job, but we can plainly observe them in court. Yet, to have officers sit and render judgement of their actions is clearly unreasonable and unequivocally ineffective. However, this legislation wants to establish a POSA to evaluate how officers do what they do, after the fact, with no experience or training as an officer? Again, the Supreme Court demonstrated its unbiased wisdom when it ruled,

" The Fourth Amendment 'reasonableness' inquiry is whether the officers' actions are 'objectively reasonable' in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. The 'reasonableness' of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, and its calculus must embody an allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation." (*Graham v Connor*, 1989)

Unless as politicians and activists we can honestly say that our wisdom supersedes the US Supreme Court, then it becomes essential that the POSA

is comprised of police officers who can objectively evaluate the tenets that the courts have put forth as a metric for evaluation.

In closing, we will continue to pledge to work with you, but mutual respect and cooperation must exist if we are to make constructive and sustainable changes as policing continues to evolve within a changing society. Our voices are critical to building the best possible future of the citizens of the Commonwealth. All we ask is the opportunity to be listened to.

Respectfully,

Sgt. Edward Minelli (on behalf of the Town of Hull FOP union lodge 66)

eminelli@hullpolice.org

781-925-1214

From: KATHY <onerose@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2800

The issue of qualified immunity for police and whether the Legislature should make it easier to sue public officials in civil court generated a lot of heated debate in the Senate.

This is a disgrace! I'm a police survivor and currently have a son on the MSP.
Police should not be sued for doing the job they are very well trained to perform.
Please do the right thing .
Kathryn Shea
MSP Survivor
617-839-9803

Sent from my iPhone
From: Joanne Phelan <phelanjm@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:54 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,
Joanne Phelan

From: Janice Johnson <omi3boys123@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:53 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,

We are counting on you to do what is right for the American people we are tired of this going on.!!!

Sent from my iPad

From: Susan Cleveland <susan.cleveland2@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:53 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform

Hi

I am a resident of Framingham, MA. I am very impressed with the details of the police reform bill. I urge you NOT to dilute it. There must be full accountability for police actions and full consequences. I am particularly concerned that nationwide we track those police who are abusive and accumulate many complaints. Letting them find positions easily in other states is tantamount to complicity. Please have courage that these measures will improve our attitudes towards the police and towards our beloved country.

Adding additional training in the history of slavery, post-slavery, Jim Crow laws and the KKK would make it clear that we are not on an even playing field when it comes to race.

Yours Truly,

Susan ClevelandFrom: Flo <florencecape@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:51 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Take Action

To; Members of the Judiciary Committee

Both as a citizen of the Commonwealth and a member of the League of Women Voters Mass I strongly urge you to support HD.5128 and HB.3277. The time to take action is now! Qualified immunity has for too long been a curtain

behind which too many abusive officers have been shielded. We have talked for years about reforming the criminal justice system and these two pieces of legislation are important pieces of that effort.

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

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda
<[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.](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_voteliz_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3DK-2DR-26eid-3DARAOqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-255B0-255D-3D68.ARCpDwXSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPOtPwTxxZ2JtqfZomTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlW0GxpWGCmB-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab8lGKdWQqCJ16NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZZdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYtnFPi6&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=OhFC8hQ8qzEvscaKAjFxxgFSjzVq-0zL2108CUamz3gus9sZ-j6_sFkLtXEgdiJOi&m=WgxXP6M97IcSdXvRqmLoyAQJ2dZGLpZLFqWgAQ26UG4&s=V8CWVYNUMNLwxZ2YmLgS-hH1jf9CFXGE234hFJIs-qs&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.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sincerely,
Florence Seldin
321 Deer Meadow Lane
Chatham, MA
From: Morgan Fink <morganmfink@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:51 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for S2820

Dear Chairpersons,
I am writing on behalf of Andover Area Solidarity Group to say that I support S2820. I believe the police should not be solely in charge of policing their own misconduct. A year ago, I witnessed a local officer misusing his authority at traffic stops, and I have never made any complaint because I did not want to complain to the police for fear of retaliation.

Thank you for reading my testimony in support of S2820.

All the best,
Morgan Moller
Andover Area Solidarity Group
713-775-7938

Sent from my iPhone
From: Mark Richi <rickm37@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:50 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,
Mark R Richi

Sent from my iPhone
From: Mary Hansen <mhefsp@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:50 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,
Mary Hansen

Sent from my iPhone
From: Larry Mayes <larry_mayes@ccab.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Geoff Foster
Subject: Expungement

To: Members of the Senate and House - Public Testimony on S.2800

Our great state of Massachusetts and its constitution presented in 1780 a model for the US Constitution's Bill Of Rights, approved in 1789. No doubt, this state can also with clear eyes and right thinking support "expungement" under Bill 5.2800.

Within the justice system, provisions should be made to provide some relief in regard to dismissals versus convictions. The courts should have the flexibility to work with persons on a "case by case basis" not with the view that "all is well here" but with a view that expungement of

dismissals can lay the foundation for a person to move forward productively in this commonwealth and beyond.

Expungement can be a pathway for more education and skills, or a pathway to a better job. Frankly, if this pandemic has taught us anything - all or needed to produce, so that we all can do more than survive, but live well!

Our state, needs to do more than provide people a revolving door from the justice system back to justice system, but encourage entrance for them to the marketplace and thus provide the financial means to buy food, shelter for children and families, themselves, and the means to support our aging citizens.

I know that this legislative body can balance the legal creed to "command what is right" by providing a pathway of restoration in the ways mentioned above, while also "prohibiting what is wrong."

Massachusetts has always led, so let's lead on expungement!

Thanks for your consideration,

Larry Mayes, VP of Programs

Catholic Charities

617-464-8596

From: Lindsay Aldworth <lindaldworth1@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:48 PM

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,

Lindsay Aldworth
609 Marys Pond Rd
Rochester, MA 02770
lindaldworth1@gmail.com

From: Eloise Lawrence <eloise.lawrence@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:45 PM
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,

Eloise Lawrence
282 Newton St Apt A
Brookline, MA 02445
eloise.lawrence@gmail.com

From: Stephanie Goldenhersh <segoldenhersh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:41 PM
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. As an attorney who has spent the majority of my career working on behalf of survivors of intimate partner violence in their domestic relations cases, I believe that such reforms are necessary to protect all members of communities of color.

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,

Stephanie Goldenhersh
39 James St
West Newton, MA 02465
segoldenhersh@gmail.com

From: John Mcteague <john.mcteague@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:50 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,

John F. McTeague, Jr.
North Reading, MA 01864

From: Noah Kassis <noah.kassis@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:49 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Sabadosa, Lindsay - Rep. (HOU); Comerford, Joanne (SEN)

Subject: Please strengthen and pass S.2820

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

I'm writing in favor of S.2820 to bring badly needed reform to our broken criminal justice system. Please work as swiftly as possible to bring this bill to the floor of the House and to the Governor's desk. Please strengthen it to fully abolish the qualified immunity doctrine, fully ban no-knock warrants, and completely ban choke holds, tear gas, and rubber bullets. The entire state is watching. This is the legislature's chance to prove that it is working for the people and not for the special interests.

Do the right thing. Please.

Sincerely,

Noah

--

Noah Kassis, he/him/his

23 Prospect Ave, Northampton, MA 01060

Chair | Northampton Youth Commission

Core Team Member | Sunrise Movement Western Mass

Founding Board Member | Jewish Youth Climate Movement

Rising Senior | Northampton High School

From: Jean Hammond <j9hmmnd@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:49 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: HD.5128 and HB.3277

As a member of the League of Women Voters and a registered voter in Bedford, I wish to add my testimony against systemic racism in the justice system and support of preventing excessive force and brutality by law enforcement.

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
<[Jean Hammond
Bedford MA
From: Anisha N <anisha.nakagawa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:48 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)
Subject: Testimony in favor of S.2820](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_voteliz_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3DK-2DR-26eid-3DARAOqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-255B0-255D-3D68.ARCpDwXSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPOtPwTkxZ2JtqfZoMTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlW0GxpWGCmB-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab81GkdWQqCJ16NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZzdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYtnFPi6&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=VdVmXja_2e1MQz0iX5vQYmaQId-do4-xlyodPJHb00U&s=7iDG48UlIF5q1zfznTLWQ3rFgK_M_2Jk_eN-44iiq-o&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.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

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.

We need to make our communities feel safe, not afraid, of the people who are supposed to protect us. As a person of color, when I see a police officer I first feel fear and worry, even though I have never done anything against the law. I NEVER feel safer with them around. This has to change.

This bill will make some of the first steps towards this, it is necessary to end qualified immunity, ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor. We definitely need to enact these measures, and then continue to do more to invest in our communities. These steps are a MINIMUM requirement, and so I call on you to not accept any measures that weaken this bill. Please stand up for me and my community.

Anisha Nakagawa
Cambridge, MA
From: Andrew Crosby <andrewrcrosby@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:48 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please listen

Dear Representatives,

My name is Andrew Crosby. I reside in Marblehead Ma. I am also a Boston Police Officer. I have been with the Boston Police Department for 15 years now.

Bill S2800 is going to hurt the communities and make Police Officers afraid of doing their jobs, in fear of being sued for doing what they believe to be right. After 15 years serving the City of Boston, I am seriously debating giving up my career and finding a new avenue to support my family of four because of the current climate, and the war on police; because that is what it feels like.

We are being punished for something that did not occur in Massachusetts. Massachusetts Police Officers are some of the best trained Police Officers in the country. There is a false rhetoric that cops are going around beating people and constantly using excessive force; which simply is not the case.

If you need the facts you should look into reviewing body worn camera footage of arrests being made and the abuse officers take for upholding the laws that legislators enact. If you really want reform you should start from the top down. If you want to revoke Qualified Immunity, that only provides partial immunity, then also revoke Prosecutorial, Judicial and Legislative Immunity which is Absolute.

This bill is extremely disheartening especially for someone who has dedicated 15 years to helping people.

As a citizen, it should concern all, by the manner in which this Bill passed the Senate; behind closed doors and without a public forum, or input from key stakeholders. Does this not set a bad precedent that legislators can now enact laws or reform without their constituents knowledge? It seems as if we are approaching a slippery slope where constitutional rights might be violated.

Several Senators acknowledged that this Bill was thrown at them with a great deal of pressure from biased organizations such as BLM. They also acknowledged that many were afraid to be the ones to stand against the bill. That does not sound like fair, unbiased and representative legislation to me. Does it for you?

Please, do not give in to pressure by a movement that is pushing a false rhetoric with, quite frankly, what many believe to be an unrealistic goal of abolishing the police. Massachusetts Law Enforcement wants to work together to establish reform that benefits all Massachusetts citizens, Law Enforcement included. We cannot, however, work towards reform if we are not included in the conversation. And, quite frankly, what kind of positive reform will come from a Bill that serves to punish Law Enforcement for showing up everyday to do an absolutely unforgiving job.

As your constituent, I urge you to vote against Bill S2800 and allow for a reform Bill that includes the input of ALL key stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Andrew Crosby

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Gary Enos <gje1123@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:48 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Gary Enos and I live at 49 Elm Street, Medford MA. I work at the Suffolk County Sheriffs Department and am a Corrections Officer/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,
Deputy Gary Enos

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Paul Kotkowski <specialpk00@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:48 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

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.

Please DO NOT pass this bill.

Sincerely,
A concerned citizen of Massachusetts

Sent from my iPhone
From: Colleen Bradley-MacArthur <bradleymacarthur.colleen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: I support police reform in MA

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

I've been following the late night sessions on police reform in MA. I have marched with the youth of MA. We need reform NOW!

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

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

Colleen Bradley-MacArthur, Waltham, MA resident

From: Amanda Ferry <amanda.ferry@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:45 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform is not just good but necessary

As a citizen of Massachusetts, I strongly support police reform and I'm writing to ask you to please pass S.2820 now. 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 would like it if there was a more robust rollback of qualified immunity were stronger, but I understand that getting something good through now is better than quibbling forever over perfect. There is no perfect, only striving towards better.

Jennifer Amanda Nielsen
617-591-8660
Somerville

From: Patrice <ptrcl23@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

Sincerely,

Patrice Hall
Leominster Voter

From: Brian Franklin <bosbf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:42 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Full Qualified Immunity

To Whom It May Concern:

My Name is Brian Franklin, I am a Fire Fighter in The City of Quincy. I am writing in regards to the Qualified Immunity. I feel as a Fire Fighter/ EMT that we should be fully covered by the Qualified Immunity. We should not have to fear a law suit for trying to help save members in our community.

Thank you
Brian Franklin
Quincy Fire Department
email: bosbf@yahoo.com

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
<[From: David Russell <drussell11971@yahoo.com>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMcaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=v1GN3jCGSL4-dgT8wSUvMXO33D1BFKfrrOz-xxybuuw&s=FKeidVbokW_DZnglA5jT77eAVUG6mk6eEbLVTfYeS_I&e=>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:44 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Mass enforcement

I'm in favor of the mass enforcement stance issues

Sent from my iPhone
From: l <hberg40@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:43 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Systematic Racism

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 the inclusion of the following measures:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda 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.

Marcia Hirshberg
40 putting dr
Westwood

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail
Get the new AOL app: mail.mobile.aol.com

From: JANE SCHIPPER <janelesliel@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:43 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by

dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,

From: malli gero <malligero@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:43 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Raise the Age of the Juvenile Justice System

As a former director and past chair of More Than Words I am writing to lend my voice to the many who want to see vast changes to our criminal justice system. It's time we moved young offenders, ages 18-20, out of the adult justice system and into the more developmentally appropriate juvenile system. This change will align with brain science research, extend effective diversion strategies and services, increase public safety and advance equity

Thank you,

Malli Gero

My country. Very Unrecognizable.

From: Francisco "Tito" SantosSilva, M.A. <fsantossilva@utecinc.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:42 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Expungement Testimony

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,

Francisco "Tito" SantosSilva, M.A. | Director of Transitional Coaching
UTEC | 978-856-3902 Ext: 719 | fsantossilva@utecinc.org

Programs: 35 Warren St. | Café UTEC: 41 Warren St.
Mailing: 15 Warren St., No. 3, Lowell, MA 01852

Join our enews <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__tinyurl.com_UTEC-2DENewsSignup&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0aWmzbbAtRu5DyIFm01YoVRMLyVjhjw2WJviE0EOwNc&s=uJoIaWE4H3Jbj2bBrwVdTrdm9vbpoME5TNC3DDlt--c&e=>>
Give today to break barriers in 2020! www.UTECinc.org/donate
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.utec-2Dlowell.org_donate&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0aWmzbbAtRu5DyIFm01YoVRMLyVjhjw2WJviE0EOwNc&s=dJWb-LcWeVobCv8Ypbb10mH4ydmwzNUBdXTJ1ES4OaY&e=>>

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_UTECinc_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0aWmzbbAtRu5DyIFm01YoVRMLyVjhjw2WJviE0EOwNc&s=RWfdG9a05cgKa3VPzKNiFo3yGnp3Vq4CLW3kbMdfd5E&e=>>
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__twitter.com_utec-5Finc&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0aWmzbbAtRu5DyIFm01YoVRMLyVjhjw2WJviE0EOwNc&s=46JclhBtFaAqkMPyesMrk2DdwadR4JorgleqWTkyWrU&e=>>
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.linkedin.com_company_utecinc&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-

fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk
13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0aWmzbbAtRu5DyIFm01YoVRMLyVjhjw2WJviE0EOWnc&s=s1H_vOAF
WZaS2LM5UgD3GisaZJuvzWit4UjJnyXfrno&e=>

From: Martha Collins <martha.collins@oberlin.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:41 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear Representative Cronin and Representative Michlewitz,

I am writing to express my support for S2820, the Senate's police reform bill, and to urge the House to pass similar legislation.

Thank you very much.

Martha Collins
From: Adam Frechette <adamfrichet@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:39 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,

Adam Frechette
Feeding Hills MA

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAFCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=f_T5STxzaYGym02FVBLHcjJ4dUAaBUZY3Tw-4elssEU&s=CwFAvFyXDoPgnNQM1n0JZTqJpZXlKZK4DekbVUyUGrU&e=>
From: Tim Gordon <tgordo49@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:40 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820</p></div><div data-bbox=)

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,
Tim Gordon, Carlisle, MA 01741

From: Christopher Botsolis <chrisbotsolis@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:39 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,

Christopher Botsolis

12 Academy St.

Braintree, MA 02184

From: Gemini <nkacel18@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:39 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

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.

Kristine

--

~~~~~

Plant trees for free by using [www.ecosia.org](http://www.ecosia.org)  
<[Ecosia is a carbon neutral search engine that plants trees.](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.ecosia.org_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=z_XF_RZ7tRTNHd06msYW-PvSXHwf3j4eA9x1N8-4oTE&s=TGyzua4dy_5FHjm5Vqg_4KRQRT-niBS__ka59czo9LY&e=> for all your internet searches.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

From: Barry Ferreira <[barry5o4@yahoo.com](mailto:barry5o4@yahoo.com)>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:39 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2800

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Barry Ferreira and I live at 115 High Hill Rd Swansea MA 02777. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Office and am a Lieutenant. 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,  
Barry Ferreira

From: Harrington, Judi <JHarrington@ALLEGROMICRO.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Letter of Testimony

My name is Matthew Harrington and I live at 1 Debbie Drive, Spencer MA 01562. 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 public servants including myself working for the Department of Public Works in the City of Worcester.

(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 from frivolously unrealistic lawsuits. I deserve to have this continue for me in my job as a Pump Station Operator at the Reservoir Division of the City of Worcester.

(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 the dignity they deserve.

Respectfully,

Matthew T. Harrington

The information contained in this e-mail, including any attachments, is considered PROPRIETARY and CONFIDENTIAL to Allegro MicroSystems. Any use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately to report the error and delete the transmission from your system.

From: Marcela Plosker <marcelaplosker@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:37 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Madaro, Adrian - Rep. (HOU); Gingras, Steven (HOU); Rivas, Gloribel (HOU)

Subject: Reform-Shift-Build Act

Dear Aaron Michlewitz & Chair Claire Cronin,

I am writing to voice my wholehearted support for the Reform-Shift-Build Act. As a resident of East Boston, I get to see and celebrate diversity every day. We are a community made up of many cultures, representing the full spectrum of race that this globe offers. My family and I have fed from that spectrum and we have given back as well. Right now, we are not safe. We have been unsafe for quite some time. We will remain unsafe as long as the current state of policing is maintained. We here in East Boston are not the only ones.

Our State and Nation face a long postponed reckoning with race., We must keep a stern dialogue with how we police one another as part of that reckoning. The Reform-Shift-Build Act opens that dialogue in unprecedented ways. Stringent certifications, inroads towards banning excessive force, review boards staffed by community, and a stronger stance against surveillance technology are just some of the impressive pieces we will be bringing to the state with this Act. Perhaps the most impressive piece to this is a focused reform to the doctrine known as "qualified immunity."

Passing this act while keeping the reform of qualified immunity attached to it would be historical. It would send the appropriate message to the Nation. If we as a people are to be policed, it must be under an entirely reimagined officer. There are glimpses of good in all of us. There are

glimpses of good in our law enforcement. But there is also an unspeakable bad in all of us. As it permeates all of us by degrees, so too does it fester in our law enforcement.

I have witnessed firsthand what can occur when unchecked racist thought and sentiment spills into human behavior. There is no thermometer check for hatred, dislike, annoyance, ambivalence. And that temperature rises and subsides throughout a life. Thoughts are truly free, and should not be governed. Action is governed. But actions are rooted in those thoughts. The action to take another's life, to choke another out, to abuse another, to dominate another, to correct another, without impunity is what I believe qualified immunity too often permits.

Reform, and regulation are necessities for police in Massachusetts and everywhere. But the protective mask of qualified immunity must fall. We face consequences as citizens. Those consequences do not police our thoughts, but they force us to think twice, or even just once before acting. For too long has our police force acted without impartial thought when it comes to another's life and rights.

I am asking you to support the Reform-Shift-Build Act for my family, for East Boston, for Boston, for Massachusetts, and for the entire United States of America. I am asking you to share my voice with your fellow legislators, and amplify it yourself in your championing of this Act.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,  
Marcela Plosker

From: Turcotte Family <turc4fam@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform

I am in favor of Mass law enforcement officers stance on the following issues qualified immunity for officers, due process/arbitration and having members with law enforcement experience on the POSAC board.

From: Jackie Gabriele <jgabel1966@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800 Bill

To Whom it May Concern:

As a resident of Shrewsbury and a parent of a police officer, I would like to start by saying how disgusted I am that the Senate passed the S2800 bill and the fact that they did it without a public hearing. I find it ignorant to support this bill because of political pressures from news and social media. I believe this bill will dismantle the police and result in a spike in crimes.

I am writing to ask you to vote NO when this bill is debated in the House. This bill is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and woman in law enforcement who go out every day and risk their lives to protect others.

The language in Section 55, which authorizes any person to intervene if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive, will result in more police being hurt and killed.

In Section 10, qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for police officers we send out to patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities so they cannot provide and benefit their families. GOOD LUCK WITH POLICE RECRUITMENT.

As your constituent, I ask that you vote NO on bill S2800 or any police reform bill.

Thank you,

Jackie Gabriele

Shrewsbury, MA

From: Lee-Ann Cornelio <lee-ann.charron@outlook.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Lee-Ann Cornelio and I live at 121 Rumford Ave. Mansfield, MA 02048. I work at Pondville Correctional Center and am a Correction Program 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,

(Lee-Ann Cornelio)

Get Outlook for iOS <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_aka.ms\\_ooukef&d=DwMGaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=QWKAwu4pZ42UMAj54SfTn22YHNQo\\_ofeR0uASltIzMc&s=-mjQ8bkhkQqp2y0p-IHcsaFZUMgbpN2cSjDQ9Qnw60Y&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_ooukef&d=DwMGaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=QWKAwu4pZ42UMAj54SfTn22YHNQo_ofeR0uASltIzMc&s=-mjQ8bkhkQqp2y0p-IHcsaFZUMgbpN2cSjDQ9Qnw60Y&e=>)>  
From: Ally Penny <apenny126@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:33 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2800

To whom this concerns,

As a resident of Shrewsbury , I am writing to you today to share my disgust regarding the defunding police bill S. 2800. This bill will make my community less safe and take away our peace of mind living in the suburbs. I believe in law and order and disapprove with the proposed bill, believing it will dismantle the police and result in a spike in crimes and making it more difficult for our officers to protect themselves along with everyone else. I do not want the safety of my neighborhood and town to change. I find it ignorant to support this bill because of political pressures from news and social media. Law enforcement officers already have an incredibly difficult job and taking away resources will make it harder. I think this bill will not only affect police officers but will affect everyone and their safety. As a female, I would feel completely unsafe in a world where police officers feels so scared to do their job correctly. I would be nervous for what the future would look like in a society with less police officers due to them leaving.

As your constituent, I ask you to please vote NO on S. 2800 for the reasons I stated above to keep the communities safe.

Thank you,

Alexandra Penny

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Julie Pozzi <jpozzi@wilmingtonpoliceunion.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:32 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800

To Whom it may concern:

I am writing you today to voice my concern about the Police Reform Bill recently passed by the Senate. As a 25 year veteran of the Wilmington Police Department and Vice President of NEPBA Local 1, I am deeply concerned about how measures within this bill will affect how my fellow



officers and I will continue to do our jobs. The proposal of eliminating qualified immunity for good hard working law enforcement officers is irresponsible. We work everyday with uncertainty, knowing that you could be acting reasonably and in good faith and still be the subject of a lawsuit is one more stress we do not need. Only those who do this job can fully understand the daily obstacles we face.

This rush to reform policing in an area of the country known for its training and education without input from those who do the job is at the very least insulting and negligent. Every profession can improve and evolve, we are all for those aspects of the bill that can improve policing. The last thing an officer on the street needs is one more reason to hesitate or second guess their actions. In other professions hesitation may lead to a missed deadline, in law enforcement it could lead to death. I took this job knowing the personal risk, but I always felt protected by the safeguards that were in place to protect not only me, but also my family from loosing all that we work so hard for. Knowing I could be disciplined or sued without just cause protection is career changing. We have bargained and negotiated in good faith for years for the basic union protections of due process, a fair objective investigation and the right to appeal decisions that may have been unjust. Now we face the possibility of having these rights arbitrarily and unilaterally removed. How does supporting the rights of some equate with diminishing the rights of hardworking well intentioned officers?

I fear if this bill passes, many great cops and all the experience they possess will walk out the door of police stations throughout the Commonwealth. Those debating retirement will no longer struggle with "should I put in my papers"? We have always been held to the reasonable officer standard, because only those who have put on a badge knowingly and willingly faced danger understand why and how we do things. There are things I have seen that I would never want anyone to see, I have felt fear and I have felt protected. Not so long ago during the height of the Covid-19 crisis I felt appreciated, so many expressed thanks for us still going to work and being there for the community. Now 6 weeks later I feel judged, despised, and even worse abandoned. We put our lives on the line for people we don't even know, we are teachers, counselors, parents, and mentors. Most of all the overwhelming majority of us are hardworking cops always striving to be better, to do the right thing, and most importantly make it home at the end of every shift.

The people this bill affects most deserve a say! We are not the disgraced cops from Minneapolis, so why are we being painted with the same brush?

Respectfully,

Officer Julie Pozzi #167  
Wilmington Police Department  
(978) 658-5071  
From: arleen thompson <ajttwins@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:32 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,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[From: Susan Jusell <\[sjusell@yahoo.com\]\(mailto:sjusell@yahoo.com\)>](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=huMwOo4EDPFvuM_gnLGTlk8q1VBiGhBmCvIcN6sxxkKg&s=H6fuh0YHg6ElklughOTjwrthRKEGP4ILWCqeuDo4LVA&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:32 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: In support of our officers

Dear Senator Susan Moran,

My name is Susan Jusell and I live at 17 Stafford Cir Dennis Port. 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,

Susan Jusell

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

<[From: TONI RANDO <toni\\_rando@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:32 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Bill S2820](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIsl6rchf_GkGDD&m=b5mswvEBPA1hn2mpWgJdDkuGSYUZSfdJ-a-UYel_m94&s=R9yiYjwoXPY56sbCkQMwEPWi3XnSn8D6sXBBkxqAK4g&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Good Afternoon,

I have never written about a Bill in my life, but I am so strongly against Bill S 2820 that I had to try and make a difference.

The police officers are out there everyday trying to keep our communities safe! I understand there is some reform needed, but don't punish all the good police officers because of a few bad ones. We will lose so many outstanding officers, whether they retire or walk away, there will be no more recruits. Officers will no longer be proactive or risk a lawsuit trying to apprehend violent criminals to keep the public safe. Why would anyone want to do this job with no protection but a vest?

Everyday a police officer walks out the door to go to work, in the back of their minds they know they may never see their families again. They have to make life or death decisions in a split second. It's not bad enough that they are in danger everyday, now it's worse, they have to worry about being ambushed and assassinated! I wish the people pushing this Bill would walk a day in the boots of a police officer to see what it's like!

Getting rid of qualified immunity is disgraceful! With all they have to worry about just trying to do their jobs, now you want to take away their protection?? You might as well sign their death certificates!

Sincerely,

Toni Rando

From: Gary Kelly <gkellysr@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:31 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,

Gary Kelly

90 Wall Street

Fitchburg, MA 01420

978-503-1121

From: Lynne Roberts <lroberts@mysite.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

This sounds like an overly broad proposition to establish policies based on race. 89 pages!! Aren't we all Americans?? Why allow more and more discontent by establishing policies to benefit a certain group when those benefits already exist for ALL Americans!!!

Too much power for a commission that will be treated like State Employees?? More and more and bigger and bigger government to accomplish what? More duplication of civil protections? Are my fellow Americans (who are being put into a racial group) really having difficulty because of a skin color?

Studies have shown that the police do not arrest/harm/kill more people with dark skin than white skin.

And just what will this Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee accomplish that the Police Organizations can't or haven't? I don't buy that. We have heard for years about how much training police are getting in all kinds of areas in best practices in dealing with our varied challenges and varied American population.

Perhaps I think this will do more to polarize than to unite. Do not exacerbate problems by hyphenating Americans...we are all one!!

Lynne Roberts

Norwood, MA 02062

From: Maureen Murphy-Bott <maureenmurphybott@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:30 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Immunity for police/firemen/women

I do not want to see qualified immunity taken from the people who put their life's on the line for our protection. Firemen, police, ambulance all health care workers need to not have fears when they are making decisions most of us would not have to encounter in our jobs.

Sent from my iPhone

From: jack.grill <jack.grill@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:28 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Support the police

To whom it may concern:

As a citizen of Massachusetts for over 50 years I want to state on record that I fully SUPPORT THE POLICE, both at the State and local levels. I am totally against "defunding" the police departments in any amount and do not want to see individual officers incur any more personal liability than is the current level.

In fact, where possible, please increase funding for the police departments to better enable them to protect our communities and every citizen.....of all shades and colors.

Thank you sincerely,

Jack L. Grill

28 Plantation Rd., Oxford, Ma. 01540

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

From: JAMES-CAHILL JAMES-CAHILL <jimc13@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:30 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Fwd: Senate Bill S2820

----- Original Message -----

From: JAMES-CAHILL JAMES-CAHILL <jimc13@comcast.net>

To: "HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov" <HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov>

Cc: "Alan.Silvia@mahouse.gov" <Alan.Silvia@mahouse.gov>,

"Schmid@mahouse.gov" <Schmid@mahouse.gov>, "Carole.Fiola@mahouse.gov"

<Carole.Fiola@mahouse.gov>

Date: 07/16/2020 3:23 PM

Subject: Senate Bill S2820

I write in opposition to Senate Bill 2820, the Police Reform Bill. Some of the provisions of this bill are not reforms, rather a slow and deliberate dismantling of police departments statewide. These provisions, endorsed by the radical left faction, without any input,

public hearing, and passed in the middle of the night, if passed as is, will result in police officers being killed, seriously injured for fear of acting and being personally sued. This only pacifies the radical left movement, who would like to see a police-less state so they can steal, injure or even kill at will without fear of being caught. it will allow groups like ANTIFA and BLM to continue their violent tirades unabated.

Other provisions, such as all persons have the right to resist against the use of force. If an officer is struggling to arrest or stop an individual from doing harm to another, they have the right to hurt the officer. Likewise, it allows ANY person who observes a Police Officer using physical force in an attempt to restrain or arrest someone, to intervene in behalf of the suspect, and allow the perpetrator to get away.

When faced with a mob like situation, it prohibits the use of Tear Gas, Rubber bullets, pepper spray, etc. but it is ok for mobsters to throw bricks, rocks, fireworks and tear gas against the police and the officers cannot retaliate.

On the banning of No Knock Warrants. The United States Supreme Court has allowed No Knock Warrants for the safety of officers serving warrants. It seems the Mass. Senate seeks to overrule the US Supreme Court. How many people have been killed in Massachusetts in the serving of these type of warrants.

Officers will not be able to use a K-9 against a person. Will a K-9 handler be hesitant to use their dog if someone is lost or to pick up a scent at a crime scene? What if a suspect is located and abuses the dog and the dog bites them? Is it better to let a suspect go after committing a crime.

Now, if the bill is passed it prohibits police from having contact with a suspect for 24 hours. If someone robs a store, gets released, and the next night robs another store and kills someone, are the police prohibited from doing anything until after the 24 hour period?

It is ashamed that 1 officer in another state has disparaged the other 99.9% of Officers who continue to serve with honor and distinction. How many of these instances have occurred in Mass.? 33 Years ago, I attended and graduated from Barnstable County Police Academy. We were NEVER taught the use of a choke hold, nor in my 23 years in Public Safety have I EVER seen anyone use such a hold.

The loss of Qualified Immunity, allowing an officer to be sued personally, is a slap in the face to those who put their lives on the line every day. I would hope that this provision be removed from the bill.

This ill conceived bill should be titled An Act to Abolish Police Departments Statewide.

I would respectfully request that this matter be referred to the Committee on Public Safety for further hearings and input so that everyone can have their opinion heard in the light of day so that a reasonable bill passed that does not cripple or endanger Police Officers.

Respectfully Submitted,

James J. Cahill (ret. Sgt. Fall River Police Dept.)

479 Norman St.

Fall River, Ma 02721

JimC13@comcast.net

From: Deanna Castro <deannacastro@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:29 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820 An Act to Reform Police Standards and Shift Resources

Dear Rep. Aaron Michlewitz and Rep. Claire Cronin,

First, I hope you and your families are well during this pandemic. These are challenging times for our individual and collective health. Not made any easier by the unrest in society that has come to the forefront in recent months. I respect and appreciate the role you play in these very complex, often divisive, far reaching, critical issues. Especially when they have the safety of citizens AND law enforcement officers on the line. I implore you on S2820, formerly S2800, to STOP. LOOK. And LISTEN. This is what my parents taught me at a young age before crossing the street, knowing these simple steps could keep me safe, from getting injured, or worse from death. I taught my children the same rules.

STOP. RUSHING. I understand there's a July 31 deadline. But the impact of making sweeping, broad changes and reform in short order have long standing, far reaching, life altering, and potentially life threatening implications for law enforcement and their families. I read S2820 for hours. And I had already read S2800 last week so I was already familiar. I took notes. I was exhausted, overwhelmed, confused, and VERY, VERY CONCERNED. This is an EMERGENCY LAW necessary for the immediate preservation of the public safety. It took centuries to build structural, systemic racism. We should all be held accountable for that. All. And yet this 89 page document with 80 sections focuses on Law Enforcement as if they are the ones solely responsible for it. Or at least when I read this in totality, Law Enforcement stands to be the most severely impacted by the repercussions of rushing this through especially with such controversial and far reaching impacts that Qualified Immunity changes would mean. Do we know all that needs to be known about Qualified Immunity? Do we know who and what professions will also be impacted? Who doesn't get impacted? Is it distinguishable? What does any change to Qualified Immunity actually solve? What is the downside? What are the consequences? Who will take up this profession with not only this change but all the other proposed changes if enacted? It is not lost on me that it took until Section 78 out of 80 to have anything written and proposed about the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security requiring programs for critical incident stress, peer support programs, address police officer mental wellness and suicide prevention. What do you think this document and all the negative focus on law enforcement has done or will do to their well-being, morale, quality of life, not to mention their safety? I find it shameful and regrettable that an 89 page document with 80 different sections that will forever change, alter, and impact law enforcement officers took the final pages to address HOW it impacts them. And yet they are to withstand all the sweeping reform that will come with the enactment of too much change all at once.



LOOK. At what has been proposed. 89 pages of recommendations for Committees needing 14 members, Councils needing 31 members, countless agencies that impact and support Law Enforcement, etc. Suggestions to gather data, make reports, etc. And what has been done to all the work that Police Chiefs and so many critical stakeholders proposed a couple of years ago after Sgt. Sean Gannon was executed? After Sgt. Michael Chesna was murdered? After the wave of patriotism and support of law enforcement took hold following those horrific acts? Where is all the progress on Criminal Justice reform that stemmed from all that heartache, focus, testimony, collaboration, and cooperation? Where is all the training that was requested? That was pleaded for by leaders in Law Enforcement for training and training facilities? How did we fund all those necessary and critical requests that perhaps would have staved off some of the issues being brought up now years later? We had stakeholders in agreement about what needed to get done. We finally decided to add a fee to car rentals to pay for necessary and much requested additional training for public safety officers. That doesn't show strong support for the need for additional training but now we need it. And how will all the additional credentialing and collaboration and training be funded? I didn't read that part. How much is still undone from all the previously requested suggestions? How much is still unfunded mandates? We are still studying years later Nero's Bill that hasn't been enacted and that is simply providing emergency care for police K9s. We create commissions and committees to study far less important and non-life threatening issues. Anything relating to public safety and public servants should have all that benefit and complete and comprehensive professional, collaborative, focus.

LISTEN. Who was consulted in this sweeping legislative reform? Who did we miss? Why? Areas so critical to public safety and public servants should dot every I and cross every T. All stakeholders should have been informed, consulted, involved, able to provide testimony, be heard, etc. Why would there have been no public testimony in the Senate version? If all law enforcement agencies will be held accountable, were they considered for their part of being the solution to these problems? This legislation clearly lays out multiple law enforcement agencies. Were they consulted over the years about reforms and changes they were eager and willing to make? Were they supported in those endeavors? Why were their calls for changes to training, funding, and reform not supported but they will be forced on them now? Was the Black and Latino Caucus involved and have their concerns been addressed with this legislation? Has the Minority Police Union Chief been consulted? I pray all key stakeholders both inside and outside law enforcement are heard and fully understood before sweeping reform and legislation takes place. Seems to me that 80 articles that take 89 pages to complete is too broad. Can there not be strong and needed compromise so that many pivotal elements can move forward while allowing the very committees and councils being recommended here be formed, given time to collect and review data, and make recommendations with all the proposed timelines established here to allow time to study, collaborate, educate, inform and offer proposals based on sound data and feedback?

I implore you to STOP rushing through this broad legislation. Please find mutually agreed upon items that stakeholders agree can move forward. Accomplish those needed and critical things. BUT please don't rush through all these articles, especially those that involve Qualified Immunity and elements of policing that make policing more dangerous for law enforcement. Let's study the impact of those. Let's take the time to understand their far reaching impact on careers, livelihoods, and lives.

LOOK at all the formerly proposed and current proposed reforms that make policing more professional, safe, and standardized. And look at the training elements and facilities that are being utilized to provide this training. Be prepared to fund these mandates. And not with a car rental fee given a pandemic or any other unforeseen crisis would result in limited or narrow funding. Funding needs to be sustainable and predictable. Where is that funding going to come from now if car rental fees don't generate the proposed or hopeful revenue?

LISTEN. To all the stakeholders who have willingly stepped up with valuable input to share. Police Chiefs, Police Commissioners, Black and Latino Caucus, Minority Police Chiefs, professionals inside and outside law enforcement. Police Officers have much to lose with too much to accomplish in an EMERGENCY LAW enactment. Institutional and systemic racism took years to build and is not entirely the fault of law enforcement. Let's not impose broad changes that would severely punish a profession and put all this responsibility on their backs. We all have a role to play. I'm willing to accept my responsibility for change. Please include others who are also willing to be part of the solution.

Thank you for listening. Respectfully submitted,

Deanna Castro

9 Bridle Way

North Reading, MA 01864

978-821-5660

From: George Saber <saber\_tv@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:29 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Hello,

Police Officers have a tough enough job in Massachusetts

Qualified Immunity should not be tampered with.

Thank you,

George Saber

Saber TV

804 Pleasant ST

Fall River, Ma., 02723

508-496-0239

From: Sheila Harrington <sch.sheilaharringtonlaw@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Harrington, Sheila - Rep. (HOU); Mark Haddad  
Subject: Fwd: [External]: Police Reform Legislation

Please see testimony from Mark Haddad, the Town Administrator for the Town of Groton.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Rooney, Lauren (HOU) <Lauren.Rooney@mahouse.gov>  
Date: Wed, Jul 15, 2020 at 12:35 PM  
Subject: Fwd: [External]: Police Reform Legislation  
To: Sheila Harrington <sch.sheilaharringtonlaw@gmail.com>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark Haddad <mhaddad@townofgroton.org>  
Date: July 15, 2020 at 8:59:37 AM EDT  
To: "Harrington, Sheila - Rep. (HOU)"  
<Sheila.Harrington@mahouse.gov>  
Cc: "Rooney, Lauren (HOU)" <Lauren.Rooney@mahouse.gov>, Dawn Dunbar  
<ddunbar@townofgroton.org>, Tom Orcutt <torcutt@townofgroton.org>, Michael  
Luth <mluth@townofgroton.org>, Steele McCurdy <smccurdy@townofgroton.org>

Subject: [External]: Police Reform Legislation

?

Good Morning Representative Harrington:

I am writing to you this morning to urge you to do everything in your power to correct the grave and idiotic mistake made by the Massachusetts Senate by removing qualified immunity of all municipal employees in the overreacting and far overreaching police reform legislation.

I am at a loss as to why our elected representatives would pass such a ridiculous piece of legislation that is absolutely not needed in Massachusetts. Municipal employees in Massachusetts are going to pay the price because a bad and racist police officer in Minnesota committed a crime that has not happened in Massachusetts. This bill is going to set back both law enforcement and normal municipal operations to the stone age. Why would anyone want to serve in public service with this bullseye on our backs. Our hardworking and dedicated police officers and other municipal employees are being hung out to dry by the Massachusetts Senate. The Senate should be ashamed of themselves. I am personally disappointed in Senator Kennedy for supporting this carnage at 4:00 a.m. with no public input.

I am putting my trust in the Massachusetts House of Representatives to do the right thing and not blindly approve legislation that was drafted by people taking advantage of national politics to push an agenda that has no business in Massachusetts.

Please protect your municipal employees and end the madness. Thank you

Regards,

Mark W. Haddad

Town Manager

Town of Groton

Mark W. Haddad

Town Manager

Town of Groton

173 Main Street

Groton, MA 01450

(978) 448-1111

FAX: (978) 448-1115

[mhaddad@townofgroton.org](mailto:mhaddad@townofgroton.org) <<mailto:mhaddad@townofgroton.org>>

--

111 Main Street Pepperell, MA | P 978-448-9601 | F 978-448-8292

From: bobfr1 <[bobfr1@aol.com](mailto:bobfr1@aol.com)>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:28 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,

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Rebecca Siegel <rebecca.s.siegel@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony on the Policing Omnibus Bill S.2820

Dear members of House leadership;

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

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

Instead of funding for police training and commissions, communities need investments in alternatives to force. We need funding for mental health professionals to respond to mental health crises, not law officers. We need to adequately fund our schools, instead of funding police officers in our schools. We need to fund housing and supports for the homeless, instead of paying police officers to punish them for doing what they need to do to survive.

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,

Rebecca Siegel, Belmont

From: Tracy O'Connor <TLelenoa@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill No. S2820

Dear Sir and Madame:

I am writing today regarding House 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.

What about our Blue Lives? The men and women who put on their uniform every day to risk their lives for every one!

This bill is going to generate hate for all our men and women in uniform. Look what is happening in New York, Seattle and Portland right now! Have you seen what is going on around the world? Officers getting killed every day for no other reason than wearing the uniform.

Officer Natalie Corona, only 22 years old, 5 months on the job. She was speaking to people involved in a car crash and a man walked up to her and opened fire without warning, striking her several times.

Officer Jonathan Shoop was on the job in Bothell, WA for just one year when he was shot to death while on duty.

Sergeant Michael Chesna, Weymouth, MA was hit in the head with a large rock, disarmed and fatally shot by the suspect who also fatally shot Vera Adams in her home.

As I am typing this letter, I am so angry that if this bill is passed it will be putting my Niece Office Jillian Donnelly of the Everett Police Department, life in jeopardy because she wears the uniform.

Yes, there are bad police officers and they will be punished for the crimes they commit. If this bill is passed, we will be losing all the good officers who serve their uniform proudly.

I was at a rally yesterday at Medford City Hall in support for Blue Lives Matter. There were young people with signs "Defund the Police", "Black Lives Matter" and a young black woman standing on a platform yelling "Black Lives Matter". Of course everyone was yelling back that "All Lives Matter". She was in a heated debate with a white gentleman, going back and forth yelling about which lives matter more and she wasn't getting her way and said "OFFICER I WOULD LIKE TO PRESS CHARGES AGAINST THIS MAN". My question is .... If she and her other protesters want to defund the police why did she want help from them?

Please do not let this bill pass as it stands now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy

Sincerely,

Tracy A. O'Connor

132 High Street

Everett, MA 02149

617-794-4582

From: Kathy Lynch <kathy.lynch@me.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to



ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

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

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

Sincerely,

Kathleen Lynch  
Westford, MA

From: tanya s <tls130@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Please consider voting yes on following..

Amendment #114 - Representation on POSAC

Amendment #134 - Opportunity for Appeal

Amendment #137 - Special Commission to Study

Qualified Immunity

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Leo & Laurie Kiley <lmlckiley@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: qualified immunity

Please count myself and my family against the removal of qualified immunity. Without this protection teachers will not teach worried about losing their houses to a destructive student. If an armed home invasion occurs police will not arrest because of the same concerns. Firefighters will not try to put out a fire worried about damaging a home with an axe. Legislators will be sued for passing bad laws. Will judges still enjoy absolute immunity?

Leo Kiley  
Waltham

From: Michael MacDonald <mac7375@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:26 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,

Michael D. MacDonald  
50 Boatwright's Loop  
Plymouth, MA. 02360  
From: tanya s <tls130@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

> ?Hello,  
>

> I am just a Peabody resident and have been aware of the bill that was passed for the police this morning at 4am, I beg you to rethink this decision, this is punishing the good officers and will tie their hands behind their backs. I have two sons age 8 and 2, everything that is happening right now is scary for their future, I don't know if you have children or grandkids but please think about their future and how this will affect them. We need to have our communities safe and have our officers able to do so without fearing for their livelihood. Not all police need to be punished, there are other ways to go about this! Please rethink this bill. Remember, it's about the children and their future.

>  
> Thank you for taking your time and reading this. ????

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Meredith Brewer <gram2330@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:26 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,

Meredith Brewer

Sent from my iPhone From: david weimer <david.weimer@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:25 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Judiciary Testimony

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.

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,

David Weimer  
Lower Allston  
413-884-2702

From: streetrods71@verizon.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

To Whom it may concern:

This bill is not for the good of ALL people. Please do not take away rights from our Police Departments in the Commonwealth.

Sincerely,

Ronald A. Sellon Sr

Susan G. Sellon

368 Franklin St.

Mansfield, MA 02048  
From: Jo-Ann Goodwin <goodwinjoann@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a

member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,  
From: marcia Yousik <myousik48@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

Dear Representative Hecht

I am writing in support of this bill. Although I realize it is not perfect I would be so proud to have this effort at reform begin in Massachusetts. The problem of racism and violence is acute and I will be voting to support the effort to begin the reform.

Thank You

Marcia Yousik

90 Dudley St  
Cambridge, 02140  
617-417-6427

From: Sarah Scalia <sjscalialia@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Regarding Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800)

Chair Aaron Michlewitz & Chair Claire Cronin:

I write to express my strong support for S.2800. In particular, i would like to highlight the following considerations that are very important to me:

1. Prohibiting all police chokeholds -- there is no need for this sort of violent restraint, and we've seen how tragic it's misuse can be.
2. Banning the use of tear gas and other chemical weapons -- these are internationally banned as weapons of war and have no place in our communities as "crowd control"
3. Banning no-knock warrants -- the risk of no-knock warrants FAR outweighs any potential benefits
4. Restricting qualified immunity -- qualified immunity destroys any chance of accountability in our police force

I'm heartened to see a bill like this in the statehouse, but disheartened by the organized opposition of the police unions to these common sense measures to keep our communities safe. I urge you to pass this bill so that Governor Baker can sign it into law and MA can lead the country in promoting safe, just policing.

Regards,  
Sarah Scalia

--

Sarah Jean Scalia  
sscalia@mba2019.hbs.edu | 832.729.9954

From: janice <redpeterbilt7@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

From: Norman Johnston <bignormj1@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:22 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, Norman Johnston Lynn,, Ma. 01905

<[<\[From: drwdevine@yahoo.com\]\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\_\_www.avg.com\_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Demailclient&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=dGGZ9gNQbmBwvBwnr1QG6aHdUs2d2P5O2Cvi5SoN7ro&s=QvoCNuWc-ODQNTerxyJLnQIahLwUEZEWumUUL\_9dke8&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=\)](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-3Demailclient&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=dGGZ9gNQbmBwvBwnr1QG6aHdUs2d2P5O2Cvi5SoN7ro&s=QvoCNuWc-ODQNTerxyJLnQIahLwUEZEWumUUL_9dke8&e=> Virus-free. www.avg.com</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:21 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,  
Donna Devine

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Sharon <cod172@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:21 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: 2800

I am writing voice my opposition to this bill. It is unfair to all members of law enforcement across the Commonwealth. Please consider voting no when it comes in front of you.

Thank you,  
Sharon Butler-O'Dwyer  
Suffolk County

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Pat Pasternak <patpole@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:20 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.

Section 10 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity". 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,

Patricia Pasternak

Somerset  
From: Robin Spinella <robinspinella@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Re: Police Reform Bill

Robinspinella@gmail.com  
781 413 5159

On Thu, Jul 16, 2020, 4:09 PM Robin Spinella <robinspinella@gmail.com> wrote:

My name is Robin Spinella, 33 Century Rd, South Weymouth, MA 02190. I feel strongly that more forethought and collaboration from different groups should be done before passing a reckless bill due to public outcry. Certain things in this bill must be re-visited. Please consider the danger you are putting public servants in. This is not just effecting public servants, but me and my family. As a taxpayer, I rely on these people to help in a time of urgent need. To have them hesitate, due to some of these measures put in this bill, could put me, my family or my fellow citizen at risk.

Massachusetts, please be a leader in reform and due your due diligence. I respect your consideration in this matter and thank you for your time reading my concerns. Please be safe and do what is right for everyone.

Sincerely,  
Robin Spinella

From: Eric Anthony <anthonyduo@earthlink.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:18 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,

Eric and Patricia Anthony (Brighton MA)

From: Mike Burgwinkel <mike\_burgwinkel@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Mike Burgwinkel and I live at 122 Beacon St, Clinton Massachusetts 01510. I work at North Central Correctional Institution (Gardner, MA) and 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,  
Michael Burgwinkel

From: george rushton <georitarush@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities

would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,  
From: JONI ROSS BURKE <jmrburke@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

I urge you not to support any change to Qualified Immunity. Our Nationally recognized Police Dept in Boston and around the Commonwealth Deserve And have EARNED our support, respect and protection. They also deserve and have earned a place at the table at any hearing, committee, etc that directly effects them. It's about time someone stood up FOR THEM as they do for us each and every day placing themselves in harms way with NO HESITATION!!! My name is Joan Ross-Burke And I've been a Boston Resident for 68 years, my entire life. Thank you.  
From: Lindsey Tayne <tayne.l@northeastern.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Pass the Reform, Shift + Build Act

To whom it may concern,

My name is Lindsey and I am a resident of Boston, MA. I am emailing to say that I unequivocally support the Reform, Shift + Build Act.

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 of Massachusetts.

Thank you.

Lindsey Tayne  
Northeastern University Class of 2021  
Candidate for Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering  
tayne.l@northeastern.edu  
From: karen kenary <karenkenary@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

From: melanie Hensel <mh42568@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:15 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 (really, not going to inform about Gang members, to me that seems that you do not care anyone in school, shame on you!). 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 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 (really, there should be at least 10 that are associated with policing). 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,

Melanie Hensel

332 Monson Turnpike Rd

Ware, MA 01082

From: Melinda Adams <adamsmaurofamilyalternate@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:15 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Muratore, Mathew - Rep. (HOU); Moran, Susan (SEN)

Subject: Re: Acceptance of Written Testimony Only

Dear Senator Moran and Rep. Muratore,

My name is Melinda Adams and I live at 125 Alewife Road in 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,

Melinda Adams

From: joe west <jowest9992000@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:15 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: testimony

I think this is a great bill. Everyone should be held accountable when they have negligence. Much like Doctors need to carry malpractice insurance, maybe if police can not follow guidelines and stop themselves from violation the public's human rights, then they should carry malpractice insurance too.

Joe W

From: paultraite@aliusdoc.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: House bill (S.2820) - support for Senate limits on immunity

I urge the House to support the Senate's limitations on qualified immunity. For too long, the very few extremely bad officers in MA have faced too lax consequences for their actions. Similar to physicians, lawyers, and other professionals who can be sued personally for gross misconduct, its time for the very few truly incompetent or down-right bad police to be removable from their positions with this additional mechanism.

Thank you,

Paul Traite, CTO, ICP

AliusDoc LLC

www.AliusDoc.com <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.aliusdoc.com\\_&d=DwMFAG&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=riOC1wOC1Jxscoc4TGulsmXjTlBI2J3TGWtx7VR1OxQ&s=30FBft8EUTrbwOhnOz4oVedCjFTUPSV8nlvBmr83HoQ&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.aliusdoc.com_&d=DwMFAG&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=riOC1wOC1Jxscoc4TGulsmXjTlBI2J3TGWtx7VR1OxQ&s=30FBft8EUTrbwOhnOz4oVedCjFTUPSV8nlvBmr83HoQ&e=>)>

PaulTraite@AliusDoc.com <<mailto:PaulTraite@AliusDoc.com>>

781 267-5264

From: Thomas Higginbotham <[higgybear53@aol.com](mailto:higgybear53@aol.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony House Judiciary Committee

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Thomas Higginbotham and I live at 10 Orchard Street, Berkley, MA 02779. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center 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:** 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.

Sincerely,  
Thomas Higginbotham

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Allison McIntyre <14amcintyre@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:20 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: In favor of S.2820

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



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

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

Allison McIntyre, Somerville  
From: Bill <billharkins@charter.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 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,

Sent from Mail <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_go.microsoft.com\\_fwlink\\_-3FLinkId-3D550986&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=scsuJ\\_UKENKpuX\\_hd6NZ8OnCil8U41ko1LLRdcn2UEo&s=CLwEYgJN Jq8jjjVORTIu\\_GxSYk\\_Og1TNqCP1UxOLvvnQ&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.microsoft.com_fwlink_-3FLinkId-3D550986&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=scsuJ_UKENKpuX_hd6NZ8OnCil8U41ko1LLRdcn2UEo&s=CLwEYgJN Jq8jjjVORTIu_GxSYk_Og1TNqCP1UxOLvvnQ&e=>) for Windows 10

From: rsox00@comcast.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 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 Its completely insane. And your insane if you vote for this garbage. 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, barry franciosi 11 kingsley rd norton ma 02766

From: Michael Parkin <mjpnbaol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 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,

Michael Parkin

New Bedford, MA

From: jillian donnelly <xojillie09ox@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:14 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Fwd: Police reform bill

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: jillian donnelly <xojillie09ox@gmail.com>

Date: July 16, 2020 at 1:10:33 PM EDT

To: Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov  
Subject: Police reform bill

?Good afternoon;

My name is Jillian Donnelly. I am a police officer with the Everett Police Department. I currently work as the School Resource Officer for the Middle and Elementary Schools within my community. I have been an officer for the past four years. I have a Bachelor's and Master's Degree in Administration of Justice from Salve Regina University.

Prior to becoming a police officer I worked many years in human services such as the Department of Child and Family in Middleton Rhode Island, Riverside Community Care specializing in the treatment and rehabilitation of children suffering from mental and behavioral health issues as well as those who have been physically and sexually abused. I also worked at Riverside Community Care in Everett specializing in substance abuse and mental health. I then worked as a Public Safety Officer at Boston Medical Center before entering into the police academy.

The reform bill that has been proposed and passed by the Senate calling for "justice and reform" takes away justice from those of us who have dedicated our lives to protecting and serving our communities. This bill in and of itself is unconstitutional because it strips away our rights to Due Process which every American citizen has a right to.

This bill is a slap in the face to anyone who wears the badge. This bill single handedly strips away our ability to serve and protect because we are not protected! Our job requires us to go hands on in many different situations whether it is a use of force situation or saving a life. Without Qualified Immunity I cannot render aid or protect myself without facing civil litigation which I have to pay for. This bill has handcuffed me and placed me under arrest without even reading me my Miranda Rights.

This job in and of itself already puts a target on my back and because of the disgraceful display of media propaganda and now this "reform" bill I also have a monetary bounty on my back as well. I will be forced with the constant question any time I go into work, "if a kid has a cardiac arrest in front of me, if I render aid I could be sued and potentially fired if I break a rib and am found to use "excessive force" but if I don't do anything and let the kid die in front of me, I have to live with that as well as face the ramifications of being sued, being fired and potentially face federal prison time for failing to act.

It as a lose lose situation every single time and it truly disgusts me. I work in a school system where we have gang members who recruit within the schools. This bill will prevent me from getting information of these kids from school officials as well as not allow me to go hands on without facing serious consequences. When rival gang members start shooting and stabbing each other we will have another Sandyhook scene.

Society is in extremely grave danger because of this bill. The members of the Senate who voted to pass this bill will be responsible for the increase in crime, murders, deaths, lootings, rapes, robberies etc that have been going on in Seattle, New York and across the country with this bill. That will happen here!

Everyone will suffer. This is not why I became a police officer. I hold the line with members who have sacrificed their lives in Afghanistan to come home to be treated like this! This bill allows criminals to increase crime and prevents police from doing anything about it.

This bill allows a civilian counsel who knows absolutely nothing about the job I do to be the judge, jury and verdict about my life. The members proposed in this civilian counsel represent the defendants that will be against me therefore creating a bias and verdict of guilty before I can even argue my case.

Any person with even a shred of intelligence would run for the hills from this job. The good cops like myself who actually do this job with pure motives will be forced to leave this profession because legislators have turned their backs on us who they expect to "hold the line." No one will want this job and without law there is no order. There will be civil unrest across the Commonwealth and once you open up Pandora's box it cannot be closed.

I truly and whole heartedly hope this email does not fall on deaf ears. Peoples lives are at risk. I would plead with you to vote no on this bill and to let this bill be tabled completely until law enforcement officials as well as legislators can communicate and come up with common ground reform.

I thank you for taking the time to read this letter. I hope and pray you take into serious consideration. My name again is Jillian Donnelly, I reside at 18 Maplewood Avenue Everett Ma 02149 and can be reached via email here as well as phone 617-823-7575. Again, thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tom Greene <tom.e.greene@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:12 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,  
I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.  
I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Tom Greene from Boston

From: donny <dffleming71@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

My name is Donald Fleming and I'm a resident of Waltham. I'm against removing qualified immunity for public safety and other government employees. I can't believe this bill passed the senate with this language in the bill. If everyone in this state wants to rally against the police who protect us there won't be an officer left when this bill passes. The damage of removing qualified immunity won't be able to be undone for decades if not longer. To say this bill won't affect good cops is laughable. According to all the protesters out there, there are no good cops. This is why this reform bill was created. This state is going down the wrong path and I hope someone with commonsense steps up to halt this insanity.

From: Camille <cmgbridge@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:10 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,

Camille Gravallese

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Jennifer Fresen <jennfresen@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Support for S. 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

I'm a Massachusetts citizen writing in support of S. 2800.

I'm an organizer with an activist group called Andover Area Solidarity. We organize around issues of justice in our area of the Merrimack Valley, and we often host family-friendly local protests or attend larger ones in the city. Having seen and heard of many instances of Massachusetts law enforcement physically striking peaceful citizens holding signs on public sidewalks at protests in Boston, I now refrain from bringing my young daughter with me to peaceful demonstrations. I'm thrilled to see the increased accountability via independent oversight in this bill around police militarization, and the use of tear gas and rubber bullets against crowds, among other things.

I've read the bill from top to bottom and every section contains a reasonable solution to a widespread issue that deeply impacts the safety of my Black and brown neighbors. They deserve to see these changes, and have their taxes fund agencies that actually serve them. I stand with them in demanding action.

I hope that you will vote this legislation favorably out of committee. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Fresen

Organizer, Andover Area Solidarity

35 Hawthorne Place

North Andover, MA 01845

857-928-6797

From: Ruthie Liberman <rliberman@empathways.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:10 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Support S2800

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.

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.

Most Sincerely,

Ruthie Liberman / Vice President of Public Policy

[rlliberman@empathways.org](mailto:rlliberman@empathways.org) <[EMPath - Economic Mobility Pathways](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.empathways.org_&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH_BN0&s=xju5_ohuDePvNCFqBoGOY1wOknY4okfZuHWglEPXvMg&e=>/617.259.2933</a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

One Washington Mall, 3rd floor, Boston. MA 02108

[www.empathways.org](http://www.empathways.org) <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.empathways.org\\_&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\\_BN0&s=xju5\\_ohuDePvNCFqBoGOY1wOknY4okfZuHWglEPXvMg&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.empathways.org_&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH_BN0&s=xju5_ohuDePvNCFqBoGOY1wOknY4okfZuHWglEPXvMg&e=>)>

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_twitter.com\\_disruptpoverty&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\\_BN0&s=-L8k64ya5tXt9guAMgyNqah5fMeQOF4leGsZjSWpAKg&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__twitter.com_disruptpoverty&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH_BN0&s=-L8k64ya5tXt9guAMgyNqah5fMeQOF4leGsZjSWpAKg&e=>)>  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.facebook.com\\_disruptpoverty&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\\_BN0&s=Qf2oJBboJ\\_Q8YzCmezoIDM7QP0stoQ5GdAukEv4tc0s&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.facebook.com_disruptpoverty&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH_BN0&s=Qf2oJBboJ_Q8YzCmezoIDM7QP0stoQ5GdAukEv4tc0s&e=>)>  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_vimeo.com\\_empathways&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\\_BN0&s=xju5\\_ohuDePvNCFqBoGOY1wOknY4okfZuHWglEPXvMg&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__vimeo.com_empathways&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH_BN0&s=xju5_ohuDePvNCFqBoGOY1wOknY4okfZuHWglEPXvMg&e=>)>

13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\_BN0&s=\_DF1X-  
\_PsNgvzC6MoUrH8Senmvf1XP8VtqNXX3yA2CQ&e=>  
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-  
3A\_\_www.linkedin.com\_company\_economicmobilitypathways&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPK  
XpkYvev9V-  
fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk  
13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-  
F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\_BN0&s=Fj4nmHyrAy7NmCgvQzVsga3OWECO4kleJ7moVHhatt8&e=>  
  
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-  
3A\_\_www.empathways.org\_&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-  
fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk  
13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=KpqhxbahpGtrGHxM7XUN-F2s2EBDSnDucn7tGoH\_BN0&s=TyTNuf5-  
3lYkUIUNf2YGSLDU9j7dvkDrrzIPvtz987g&e=>

From: Rita Costa <ritajohn12@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: MA Bill S.2800

> We need your help  
> I am writing to you regarding Massachusetts Bill S.2800. I am very  
upset about how this bill is being quickly pushed through, while it will  
have tremendous repercussions on our police departments, tying their  
hands, and preventing them from doing their jobs. While there are portions  
of the bill that may bring about higher standards for our officers,  
removing qualified immunity as one of their rights is simply unacceptable.  
As a registered and active voter, I am disheartened by the actions of  
politicians that I have voted for, who are responding with a knee jerk  
reaction to the loud actions of the few, while ignoring the majority of  
the population. I look forward to your reply, and I respectfully ask that  
you consider not supporting the removal of qualified immunity for our  
police officers.  
>  
> Regards,  
> Rita Costa

From: Robin Spinella <robinspinella@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

My name is Robin Spinella, 33 Century Rd, South Weymouth, MA 02190. I  
feel strongly that more forethought and collaboration from different  
groups should be done before passing a reckless bill due to public outcry.  
Certain things in this bill must be re-visited. Please consider the  
danger you are putting public servants in. This is not just effecting  
public servants, but me and my family. As a taxpayer, I rely on these

people to help in a time of urgent need. To have them hesitate, due to some of these measures put in this bill, could put me, my family or my fellow citizen at risk.

Massachusetts, please be a leader in reform and due your due diligence. I respect your consideration in this matter and thank you for your time reading my concerns. Please be safe and do what is right for everyone.

Sincerely,

Robin Spinella

From: Raynold Jackson <rayjtrails@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 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,  
Raynold Jackson  
Townsend, Ma

From: Tina Collins <teemarie\_collins@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Fw: Police Reform Bill 2820

Dear Members of the House Committee on Ways & Means,

I am writing to you today out of concern and extreme frustration over Bill S.2800 that was passed by the State Senate today, currently changed to Bill S.2820 in the House. This bill has been hastily thrown together and is a knee-jerk reaction to what is currently happening now in this war on police. As you know, Massachusetts has a fantastic police force at the municipal and state levels and yet there is an agenda some have to destroy the great policing that is done here. This Bill, as written, robs police officers of the same Constitutional Rights extended to citizens across the nation. It is misguided and wrong. The fact that it

has been so hastily pushed through the Senate without any transparency only leads credibility to my comment about a hidden agenda.

There are MANY aspects of this Bill S.2800 that I, and many of your other constituents, find troubling but I will just list a few here that are definitely of the greatest consequence if passed as written:

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.

4. Removal of requirement for State Police Colonel to be appointed from within the department: This should NOT be removed as it should be extremely important for the Colonel of the State Police to have first hand working knowledge of how a department works and the appointment should definitely come from within the MA State Police department. If for some reason this requirement is removed there should be a requirement that the person have at least 20 years experience in law enforcement and at least 10 years in a high profile leadership role within law enforcement.

I hope you will be sure to stand against those that would do harm to our state by unfairly persecuting and removing rights from those people that put on a uniform to keep us all safe every day. It has never been more important that our elected officials fight for our brave men and women in blue. It is already a thankless job and it will be near impossible to get anyone to want to do the job if this horrendous reform bill is passed without some major overhaul.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration of the points I have made here today.

Regards,

Tina Collins

19 Bonney St  
Westwood, MA 02090

508-326-1411

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android  
<[From: Bob Villeneuve <\[bobvill12@gmail.com\]\(mailto:bobvill12@gmail.com\)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=41DufqoMPwGIDRHTBRKitiM2XL6hbhFs_eZPndH17us&s=cqwn_aLXNe7wKfu-Zz6DVJRmTFJlZv51OfExzi8KUC4&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

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,  
Robert Villeneuve  
53 Steepleview Dr  
Hampden, MA 01036  
From: [rjsawler <rjsawler@comcast.net>](mailto:rjsawler@comcast.net)  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:09 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,

Richard and Joan Sawler  
112 Fuller Street  
Halifax, MA. 02338

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Carrie <sprout425@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Written Testimony S.2820

Dear Senator Cyr,

My name is Carrie Diauto and I live at 42 Papnomett Rd, Mashpee, MA 02649. 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. They're jobs are tough enough as it is and in today's climate they should be afforded protections.

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,

Carrie A. Diauto  
782-603-7228

From: Rose Foley <rose8190@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

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

Rosa Doherty

John Doherty

Doris Santorelli

Billerica, MA

From: Bob Villeneuve <bobvill12@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:08 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

Sincerely,  
Robert Villeneuve  
53 Steepleview Dr  
Hampden, MA 01036

From: Shelia <sheilavalicenti@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sheila M. Valicenti  
Sent from my iPhone  
From: Bill Gillmeister <wgillmeister@charter.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:07 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,

Bill Gillmeister

8 Kimball St.

Brookfield, MA 01506

From: Jocelyn Sullivan <sullivanjo@peabody.k12.ma.us>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: MA Bill S.2800

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to you today in regards to MA Bill S.2800. I have recently been doing a lot of research regarding the proposed Massachusetts Bill S.2800. While I can see that there are many excellent points within the bill, such as requiring additional training, a licensure requirement (which requires renewal every three years), and essentially consistently holding officers to a high standard with review boards, I take issue with removing qualified immunity from our police officers. Our officers go into this line of work to help people and make a positive difference in their communities. Removing any and all protections that they have will

ultimately hamper their ability to do their jobs, and will eventually lead to a culture in which officers cannot appropriately respond, for fear of being personally sued, for trying to help the people they swore to protect. Our officers run into situations in which people are in fear for their lives. They put their lives on the line every day to protect ours. While I do believe in increased training, oversight, and required licensure, I respectfully ask that you reconsider stripping officers of these rights. This bill certainly has some valid points, and may be heading in the right direction, however, removing qualified immunity from our officers is not the way to get there. I look forward to your response.

Regards,  
Jocelyn Sullivan  
Peabody, MA

From: Brian <bcuddy28@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
From: Joe Lutfy <joe.lutfy@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:05 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,

JoeFrom: Barbara Crockett <bdcrockett@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:05 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,

David

From: Barbara Crockett <bdcrockett@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 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,

Barbara

From: Garballey, Sean - Rep. (HOU)  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Fwd: [External]: A copy of my testimony on S. 2820

Hello, please accept the testimony below from one of my constituents.

Thank you

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "R. Eric Reuss" <ereuss@gmail.com>  
Date: Jul 16, 2020 3:55 PM  
Subject: [External]: A copy of my testimony on S. 2820  
To: "Garballey, Sean - Rep. (HOU)" <Sean.Garballey@mahouse.gov>  
Cc:

Dear Representative Garballey,

Below is a copy of my emailed testimony to the House Committee regarding the recently-passed Senate bill. Many thanks to you and your colleagues for addressing this critical issue!

No reply needed, though I'm always happy to answer questions.

--Eric Reuss; 40 Hamlet St, Arlington, MA; 617-721-8438

Dear Representatives,

Thank you for soliciting public feedback on police reform, and for taking action!

I think the just-passed Senate bill is good. While it could have gone further, I feel the most critical thing is to get a bill signed into law this legislative session addressing some key concerns:

1. Qualified immunity. While I am uncertain whether the Senate bill goes far enough, restricting qualified immunity is a critical first step.
2. Systemic and structural racism. Much more could be done, but what the Senate bill does seems good.

3. Police accreditation. We are long overdue for this. The Senate bill may put too much police power on the POSAC, but it's much better than not having it at all.

4. Limiting use of force. Both training in de-escalation and requiring it be used are excellent, as is the duty to intervene.

5. Shifting funding from policing towards community investment. This is something to explore more over time, but the Senate bill seems to make a good start.

The Senate bill also contains a number of small details I appreciate, such as a moratorium on facial recognition, school-policing issues, keeping bad cops from becoming corrections officers, and more.

If there were longer in the legislative session, there would be many things I wish could be added to this bill(1). But there isn't, so I urge the House to pass a bill that is extremely easy to reconcile with the Senate bill so that it can be signed into law in the next 2 weeks. I would rather have a good bill that we can expand upon in future legislative sessions than an excellent bill which doesn't make it.

PS: From what I read, the House has been better about soliciting feedback from minority communities than the Senate has - I applaud this! Please keep doing it! And if those communities tell you there's some provision that needs to be included that the Senate bill lacks, please listen to them, and I'll be more than happy to write my State Senator urging her support for reconciliation including it. I'm only concerned that too many differences will make it too difficult to reconcile in time.

Sincerely,  
R. Eric Reuss

781-648-1652  
Arlington, MA

(1) = Greater data-gathering on police use of force; guaranteed access to that data for the public and insurers; a requirement that police officers be covered by malpractice insurance; limiting the power of police unions (in particular their ability to block towns from firing cops); better civilian oversight of police; body cameras; changing police training to remove the indoctrination of violence / "fighting a war" mindset; and much more.

From: kbythrow@comcast.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Please maintain qualified immunity for Firefighters, we sometimes have to defend ourselves from violent individuals.

Thank You,  
Kevin Bythrow  
617-953-7481  
Quincy Firefighters Local 792

Sent from my iPhone  
From: ourpool <ourpool@juno.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 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,  
Bill Campbell Randolph Ma

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From: Stephen and Beverly Wybaillie <swybaillie@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 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,

Stephen and Beverly Wybaillie  
Hingham, MA  
From: Nina Friedman <nsfriedman@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S. 2820

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of Arlington, MA, and a constituent of Sean Garbally, I am writing to urge you to pass this legislation for police reform. As a white person in support of BLM and fair, equal, and humane treatment of all people, I see no other way to resolve the current crisis in which we find ourselves. Please act with the urgency the situation deserves, and endorse S. 2820.

Respectfully yours,  
Nina Friedman  
167 Waverly St  
Arlington, MA

From: Peggy Ayres <writeathome@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: police reform bill

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 lifesavings 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, 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.

While I understand the need for reform, please do not go overboard by punishing all police officers. They are not the enemy.

Thank you.

Margaret Ayres  
119 Chase Road  
Marlborough, MA 01752

<[From: rserino <rserino@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820](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=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=rmSqIDu5IeWDrhL2cj79yiUC6KEm0l2vHrHf0wz_ZS4&s=gldYxkEG-diWwBrpI3l5fmIOYtIfz0IqBjVWU4BTa8c&e=> Virus-free. www.avast.com<br/><<a href=)

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,

Robert Serino

From: sticka99 <sticka99@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:03 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: FW: Bill 2820

Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy S8.

----- Original message -----

From: sticka99 <sticka99@comcast.net>

Date: 7/16/20 3:39 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: HWMJudiciary@mahouse.govHWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov

Subject: Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Christopher Macomber and I live at 43 south kingman st lakeville. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center. I 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 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.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Macomber

From: Angela Kuzemczak <angela.kuzemczak@watertown.k12.ma.us>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:03 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Extremely concerned resident and law enforcement family

Dear Representative Michlewitz and Representative Cronin,

My name is Angela Kuzemczak, and I am reaching out to you as a concerned citizen, educator, mother, and wife of a law enforcement officer in the state of Massachusetts.

This year has been truly difficult for my family for so many reasons. My husband is a US Navy veteran, and also a patrol officer in Winchester, Massachusetts. He is a good man with a heart of gold. His favorite stories from work are the ones where he does something to bring a smile to a child's face, or when a resident genuinely thanks him for his help. Often he will tell me how by showing the lights on his cruiser a disabled child will light up with joy, and the parent tells him: "you've just made my son's day". That is my husband. He went into this job to help people, as he did the Navy. He did so knowing full well that it could be at the sacrifice of not coming home to our family, especially our young son, who is four years old.

I am an educator. I have been teaching for over 12 years now in the public schools. As such I know and recognize when there is a need for reform and change. I also know how reform and change take time. I am greatly concerned that the bill passed by the state Senate has been done in haste and hasn't given the adequate amount of time necessary to truly get input from all sides.

As the wife of a law enforcement officer, and an educator, I know change needs to happen. I want there to be change. I want that for both my friends and students who have suffered racial discrimination, but especially so I don't have to fear for my husband's life or the livelihood of my family. Several parts of the bill have frightened me to the point where I am literally thinking of moving out of Massachusetts, to protect my family. I have lived here my whole life. This is the first time I have ever been so scared. My main concerns are:

1. The loss of qualified immunity, which will open up the possibility of frivolous lawsuits that could cause us to lose everything. Including the home we worked so hard to get. We live paycheck to paycheck as public workers; to have that protection taken from us would bring us to our knees.
2. The bill seemingly takes away almost every option of non-lethal use of force. I beg of you and the other representatives to argue for appropriate items for non-lethal use of force to be allowed, as doing so will be beyond detrimental.
3. The elimination of no knock warrants gives potential suspects a 15 second opportunity to arm themselves, therefore putting our officers at an immediate risk of their lives. This has most recently been seen in the news following the death of two Texas police officers that were responding to a domestic disturbance call.

4. The suggestion for an online database where incidents are made public, including the particular officer, puts a direct target on the back of my family. More than my husband's life, I have to now fear for my son and my own.

I have several other concerns but these are just the four that literally keep me awake at night.

Representatives Michlewitz and Cronin, I am a registered democrat, my concern here is personal, and not related to the politics of today. I donated to Senator Elizabeth Warren during her primary campaign. Yet in times like these, I feel abandoned by my fellow democrats. For the first time in my whole life I am considering registering as an independent. If the people in my party won't hear the voices of those literally involved in law enforcement, how can I identify with them anymore?

I assure you, the phrase; "no one hates a bad cop more than a good cop" is true. Yet, my husband, who has a heart of gold (I'm sure Tillie would attest to that, she's known us since his Navy days), has come home recently in tears. People look at him as a demon. A woman slowed her car as he was directing traffic during a medical aid and called him a "fat pig" and said, "I hope you die." How could I ever explain that to my son? The acronym "ACAB" (All cops are bastards) was painted in a church parking lot where my husband sits on duty. It was deliberate. He sees it on every shift as do his colleagues. I saw it the other week when I brought him lunch, and for the first time I couldn't get my son out of the car to say hi because I didn't want him to ask about it.

I'm not saying there is no need for reform. I am saying it is being rushed. If it passes as is, we will lose numerous amounts of good men and women who took their oath in good faith. I fear for the quality of officers who would continue the job when essentially they have no protection. If true change and reform are to be made, all parties must get together at the table and discuss.

Thank you for reading and for your attention to this matter. I'm more than happy to speak with you if you would like.

Stay safe and healthy,

Sincerely,

Angela Kuzemczak

(617) 372-6584

angela.c.bowers@gmail.com

Resident of North Andover, Massachusetts.

Public school teacher in Watertown, Massachusetts since 2008.

When writing or responding, please remember that any email sent or received by an employee of the Watertown Public Schools is subject to the Massachusetts Public Records Law, M.G.L. c.66. This email message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information covered under the Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act (FERPA) and/or other student records laws. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to read, retain, print, copy, disseminate or otherwise use this email (or any attachments) or any part thereof. If you have received this email (and any attachments) in error, please contact the sender and delete all copies from your system.

When writing or responding, please remember that any email sent or received by an employee of the Watertown Public Schools is subject to the Massachusetts Public Records Law, M.G.L. c.66. This email message (including any attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information covered under the Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act (FERPA) and/or other student records laws. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to read, retain, print, copy, disseminate or otherwise use this email (or any attachments) or any part thereof. If you have received this email (and any attachments) in error, please contact the sender and delete all copies from your system.

From: Julia Magliozzi <juliamag@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:03 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, Julia Magliozzi

From: Albano, Joseph <AlbanoJ@worcesterma.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:03 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2820

Joe Albano

Worcester Police Department

508-523-1600

I am thankful for the opportunity to to provide my testimony in regards to Bill S.2820. I have great respect for the work you do day in and out whether I agree or disagree with some decisions. I write you today with great concern for the magnitude of importance your decisions on this bill will have. I have proudly been a Police Officer for 14 years and the recent events and discord in our society has brought me great sadness and pause. The actions in Minneapolis were beyond horrible and have no place in this society or policing. Those actions brought great shame and embarrassment to all of us in the Law Enforcement Community. Those actions should not be accepted or considered the norm of how men and women who put the police uniform on everyday act. Can we do better, of course there is always a need for improvement. I have no issue with reform, but it is my opinion that we as a society are reacting to the actions of a few with a broad angry brush in a manner that is rushed way too quickly for such an important issue. To keep it short some of the issues that concern me most are:

Qualified Immunity- Police officers should be responsible for our actions but to expose us to frivolous law suits without protection would not only be wrong but careless. Police Officers risk their lives everyday they put the uniform on to protect the public leaving behind their families and children who only wish that mom or dad comes home. They shouldn't also have the added stress that their lives could be ripped apart because of a lawsuit. Egregious actions should be punished but there needs to be



protection in those circumstances where you would have to put yourself in that officers shoes.

Due Process/Collective Bargaining- It would be a stance of Anti-Labor if due process was excluded from the de-certification process. We have the right to defend ourselves, present witnesses, cross examination, and to be part of a process where so much is at stake. Proceedings of such importance most provide rights to those being accused. If defendants in the court proceedings have rights why would we not extend those rights in this process.

Make up of the Board- I applaud the goal of creating a diverse board with different sectors of society. My concern is that a majority of these members will be making decisions on Police related matters without having the training, education, or experience in Law Enforcement. Split second decisions can easily be rewinded and slowed down on a video and be "Monday morning quarterbacked" by anyone. If you have not been exposed to the situations and stress of those moments I do not feel you can accurately judge those actions. I believe these members should have to have training that will allow them to understand what goes through the mind of Law Enforcement when certain situations arise. Such trainings as defensive tactics, use of force model, and MILO (Multiple Interactive Learning Objective)

I again thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns and provide my input to such an important decision that you will have to make.

Sincerely,

Joe Albano

From: Maria Sciannameo <mls352@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:02 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,

Maria Sciannameo  
Shrewsbury, MA

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Julia Magliozzi <juliamag@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:02 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, Julia Magliozzi  
From: karen2115@verizon.net

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:00 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,  
Karen Wright

From: Melissa Gonzalez-Brenes <mgb@berkeley.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:51 PM  
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,

Melissa Gonzalez-Brenes  
37 Cameron Ave  
Cambridge, MA 02140  
mgb@berkeley.edu

From: pjpwrite@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:00 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,  
Peter Pihun

Westport

From: KENNETH PACHECO <gun007@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:00 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This

provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,  
From: phothem@verizon.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Lu, Hua A, M.D. <Lu.Hua@mgh.harvard.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Jenny lu

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at <http://www.partners.org/complianceline> . If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

From: Michael Wood <spdwoody@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform

You have all lost ur minds  
From: Richard <rpf01089@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Fwd: Sanctuary State Bill moving; Senate pushed Illegal  
Immigration in Policing Bill

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Louise Flak <laff@comcast.net>  
Date: July 16, 2020 at 3:51:48 PM EDT  
To: Richard <rpf01089@gmail.com>  
Subject: Fwd: Sanctuary State Bill moving; Senate pushed Illegal  
Immigration in Policing Bill

?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Renew Massachusetts Coalition  
<bill@renewmacoalition.com>  
Date: July 16, 2020 at 3:40:47 PM EDT  
To: Richard Flak <laff@comcast.net>  
Subject: Sanctuary State Bill moving; Senate pushed Illegal  
Immigration in Policing Bill  
Reply-To: bill@renewmacoalition.com

?

<[http://paracom.paramountcommunication.com/cimages/4933d4bd7f4135a0e31e8a7c3f3248a0/rmc\\_renewmacoalitionbanner.jpg](http://paracom.paramountcommunication.com/cimages/4933d4bd7f4135a0e31e8a7c3f3248a0/rmc_renewmacoalitionbanner.jpg)>

Open-borders Radicals  
Push Agenda in Policing Bill

Dear Richard,

The open-borders radicals are pushing to ram their agenda  
through any way they can!

The Senate Policing Bill, SB 2820

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_paracom.paramountcommunication.com\\_ct\\_55732219-3Asch2-2D3-2DJN-3Am-3A1-3A2267194721-3A10CB31B1DA7E896160C34815E9B1F6B8-3Ar&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNsJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=zRbQ6oqx336LffZmIYp29Kuy-JtYJeEFTzlnTtHQKo&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_ct_55732219-3Asch2-2D3-2DJN-3Am-3A1-3A2267194721-3A10CB31B1DA7E896160C34815E9B1F6B8-3Ar&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNsJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=zRbQ6oqx336LffZmIYp29Kuy-JtYJeEFTzlnTtHQKo&e=>), contains radical provisions that would prevent school officials (that's right, school officials!) from reporting to any law enforcement authority a student's immigration status or whether a student may be a member of a gang!

And this is only the tip of the iceberg. There are several other bad provisions of this bill.

The House of Representatives is taking testimony on this Policing Bill until 11 AM tomorrow morning.

Please take 30 seconds to email the House and tell them reject SB 2820 by clicking here.

Also, despite the fact that the legislature has yet to even consider the budget, the Committee on Public Safety and Homeland Security reported the Sanctuary State legislation, HB 3573, SB1401, favorably.

That means the legislature could take it up and pass it at any time!

If you haven't done so already, please sign our Stop Sanctuary State petition! <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_paracom.paramountcommunication.com\\_ct\\_55732220-3Asch2-2D3-2DJN-3Am-3A1-3A2267194721-3A10CB31B1DA7E896160C34815E9B1F6B8-3Ar&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNsJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=XI9XYanN4dkGWBSVsknRLcfR2of8u-Lf9pUGSpwx3iQ&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_ct_55732220-3Asch2-2D3-2DJN-3Am-3A1-3A2267194721-3A10CB31B1DA7E896160C34815E9B1F6B8-3Ar&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNsJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=XI9XYanN4dkGWBSVsknRLcfR2of8u-Lf9pUGSpwx3iQ&e=>)>

We can stop the school gag order in the Senate Policing Bill 2820 and the Sanctuary State legislation. But you need to act now!

Thank you,

<<http://paracom.paramountcommunication.com/cimages/4933d4bd7f4135a0e31e8a7c3f3248a0/sigbillblue20191008.jpg>>

Bill Gillmeister  
Executive Director

P.S. The radical leftists in the Massachusetts State Senate are attempting to ram their agenda through the Senate Policy bill SB 2820. It gags school officials from reporting immigration status and whether a



student is a member of a gang as dangerous as MS-13. Tell the House of Representatives to reject this legislation by clicking here. You need to do this before 11 AM tomorrow morning!

P.P.S. They've favorably reported the Sanctuary State legislation, so it could pass at any time! Please sign the Stop Sanctuary State petition now! <[This message was intended for: laff@comcast.net](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_ct_55732221-3Asch2-2D3-2DJN-3Am-3A1-3A2267194721-3A10CB31B1DA7E896160C34815E9B1F6B8-3Ar&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=v0-gRB6zpm9dEVxEeybylS1lbvrgjSEvGjTTao3lB3o&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

You were added to the system June 17, 2020.

For more information click here

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_paracom.paramountcommunication.com\\_p\\_isch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=Y2sR\\_26fDnjEH4qf1GZnVADo1IF1lswXVhPwCvJ0kno&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_p_isch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=Y2sR_26fDnjEH4qf1GZnVADo1IF1lswXVhPwCvJ0kno&e=>)

> . Update your preferences  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_paracom.paramountcommunication.com\\_p\\_osch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=bCWQUPA36KiV1UR-79k0\\_ENiDO62peeMG9d3AbSsnPE&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_p_osch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=bCWQUPA36KiV1UR-79k0_ENiDO62peeMG9d3AbSsnPE&e=>)

Unsubscribe <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_paracom.paramountcommunication.com\\_p\\_osch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=bCWQUPA36KiV1UR-79k0\\_ENiDO62peeMG9d3AbSsnPE&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__paracom.paramountcommunication.com_p_osch2-2D3-2DJN&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=bCWQUPA36KiV1UR-79k0_ENiDO62peeMG9d3AbSsnPE&e=>) | Unsubscribe via email <<mailto:unsubscribe61419458634-echo3-3C049358D73F6B7B3C522D89EBD60EDE@emailsendr.net?Subject=Unsubscribe&body=Please%20remove%20me%20from%20further%20mailings>>

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.paramountcommunication.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=WzvT2n3-Ts9BnQCf0UQV3-nJ3deGWBS8yEU16Dfai9o&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.paramountcommunication.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nDppuBqGMLcDGYdHs-pstWNSJwOHYQfUmjjpkwmcfw4&s=WzvT2n3-Ts9BnQCf0UQV3-nJ3deGWBS8yEU16Dfai9o&e=>)

<<http://paracom.paramountcommunication.com/imagelibrary/N-sch2!3!JN-F279810BC76800E6E7A12EF030FA7497.jpg>>

From: anthony wood <aw\_woodinc@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:58 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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

From: Marlene Hobel <marlenehobel@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:58 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Abolish Qualified Immunity

I am in favor of removing qualified immunity for public employees, including police officers. I do not believe that anybody should be above or immune to the law. If we maintain rigorous standards, train our police and other employees well, clearly define appropriate response and actions— as the new bill does, then I see no reason to grant immunity. I know this was a contentious issue in the MA Senate debate, and will likely meet the same in the House debate. I do hope the House will vote to retain the language of the Senate bill and dissolve qualified immunity.

Marlene Hobel  
88 Rose Hill Way  
Waltham, MA 02453  
marlenehobel@gmail.com  
From: dfarleyii@juno.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:57 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Please reject Senate Policing Bill SB 2820

Dear Sirs:

The Senate Policing Bill, SB 2820, contains radical provisions that would prevent even school officials from reporting to any law enforcement authority a student's immigration status or whether a student may be a member of a gang! This is outrageous and I encourage you strongly to reject this misguided bill. Thank you, and may God give you the grace to do what's right.

- Donald L Farley II  
Woburn, MA

"For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish but have eternal life." - John 3:16

From: Scott Winer <scottwiner@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:56 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN)  
Subject: RE: S.2820

Good afternoon,

We are living in some crazy times. It is wild to think that over the course of three months we, as a nation, can go from praising civil servants ( ie. police officers, fire fighters, EMT's and nurses, etc...) as heroes, to then go on to attack police officers. I have police officers in my family and many friends that have also taken on the noble and sometimes scrutinized calling. My father, whom is a member of a municipal police department, has told me policing is no longer the job that it used to be 10-15 years ago. He has said he is happy I became a nurse instead of waiting for my name to appear on the civil service list. He, along with many other veteran members of police departments, are just riding the wave until retirement. My friends in Law Enforcement, that have only worn the badge for a few years, are actively contemplating and looking at other career fields due to the recent climate in society.

I have recently relocated to North Andover from the South Shore. It disappoints me that this bill was passed the way it was without public input. Especially as it was passed within hours of the two year anniversary of Sgt. Michael Chesna's end of watch. This is a situation that has been theorized to have happened because he hesitated shooting a man armed with "just a rock". As you know this unfortunately cost him his life and the life of Vera Adams.

It is my fear that repealling qualified immunity will put officers and civilian lives at danger. We, as a people, need police that are willing to act and not worry about being sued and losing everything they have worked for. Unfortunately, police upset people daily, whether it's handing out a speeding ticket or arresting the aggressor of domestic violence. Removing qualified immunity, to my understanding, would give anyone with a grievance towards a police officer the ability to sue that individual officer for whatever they can claim happened. It is my fear, as a concerned citizen, that that possibility will make more officers hesitate to act. Most occasions with a police officer happen because they were

called there by someone. They have to show up, no matter the nature of the call.

Over the last few years we have seen countless cell phone videos of incidences with police that appear to show police brutality. While this has been the case in cases such as George Floyd, many are debunked. These videos show a moment in a larger situation. Videos can be persuasive of one argument or another. Many cases can show police are justified when body cameras, video surveillance, eye witness testimony and forensic analysis are introduced into the equation. Take for example the Michael Brown situation. Public outcry said he was shot in the back running away from Officer Darren Wilson. Forensic analysis proved that was not the case and that Officer Wilson was in a struggle with Mr. Brown inside his police vehicle when the shooting occurred. If the type of legislation that is currently proposed was in place in Missouri at that time, Officer Wilson would have been exonerated of criminal charges, but he would have been open to a civil suite.

I believe this one part of the bill sets a dangerous precedence for other occupations that fall under the civil service umbrella. It could one day lead to teachers being sued because a parent feels that their child was not graded properly. A highway department employee could be sued for damages incurred to a vehicle because a pot hole was not filled in in a timely manner. A fire fighter could be brought to court because they had to knock out the windows of a vehicle illegally parked in front of a fire hydrant during a house fire.

I also have a grievance with the oversight committee that would be formed if this bill progresses through the process. Why do we need another committee, group, agency for anything? Where does that money come from? Don't police officers, in this state, have to meet training requirements and hours to become a police officer as it is? I pay enough in taxes to fund border line incompetent and arguably corrupt agencies such as the RMV, OEMS, Mass Board of Nursing and the UMass system. I have had dealings with agencies like these that take months because people are unable to do their jobs properly or fluidly. If this new committee has hiccups in the beginning, like all other agencies, will there be police officers off the job because they cannot get their license approved in a timely manner?

The issue for all of this comes from a disgusting act that happened 1,000 miles away. Society is the problem. Rocks are being thrown at the men and women that ran into the World Trade Centers and Pentagon. Let that sink in. The NYPD has seen significant increases in retirement from officers that were on the job on that horrendous day. No police officer wakes up, goes to work and is determined to get into a life and death situation. These are men and women that put on the uniform and want to make a positive impact on their communities, just like you wanting to be State Representatives and Senators. These men and women need the backing of their communities now more than ever. As a country, we are on the brink of change. While change is good and hard to do, we should not be making it harder to make this a safer town, city, commonwealth and country.

I believe that if your committee is willing to pass Bill S.2820 you need to rethink the stance on gun control and the Attorney Generals law in the commonwealth. As we are seeing increased numbers of shooting in other states/cities that have "defunded" the police, I believe it is of the utmost importance that we, as private citizens, can protect ourselves. The rules governing how to obtain a license to carry change from town to town and can change when there is a new police chief. The argument in the past was only the police should have guns. Unfortunately if there are less police, they are more hesitant and the number of violent crime increases; we need to be able to protect ourselves.

Thank you for your time,

Scott Winer  
781-901-0522

From: Alan Bergeron <alanbergeron513@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:56 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,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,](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=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=Q2k3e-dix-XkjjzDawRXKqzSjbcCUE0M0FGgGHP3yG-8&s=701FUS3A9MsqvgAt_2Ay8lBBvrigCrs0keWsfmzB7I&e=></a>><br/>From: Ana Curral <ana_curral@comcast.net><br/>Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:06 PM<br/>To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)<br/>Subject: Fwd: Bill 2820</p></div><div data-bbox=)

My name is Ana Curral and I live at 16 Peach Blossom Rd, Acushnet, Ma. <x-apple-data-detectors://0> I work at in Healthcare and am a Human Resources Manager. 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,

Ana Curral

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kate Hannigan <khannigan@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:06 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill S2820

Dear Chairs,

As a parent of a law enforcement officer, I feel offended All Lives Matter is never considered in your proposals. We are all made in the image and likeness of God. By putting one life over another, you are degrading all others simply by your choice of words. Words matter. Qualified Immunity needs to stay. If it is removed from the men and women who protect all of us, then it should be removed from all of you who benefit from it. As a parent of someone in law enforcement, you are telling me that my child and his family mean nothing except to protect and serve you with no help from you in return. In these times in which we live, everyone is law suit happy and wants to take aim at the police. I am disgusted by the fact the Senate Bill was rushed through the way in which it was. I hope The House has more integrity, common sense and values than the Senate. Reform of any kind must be a two way street. I hope and pray you keep in mind that every law enforcement officer has a wife, children, mother, father, siblings to come home safely to at the end of each shift. It is difficult, but try to put yourself in their shoes. Every stop they encounter is of the unknown. Every stop they encounter could be their last.

Thank you for your time.

You are deliberately punishing every law enforcement officer because of the bad acts of one individual in MN. Would you punish all the children in a neighborhood if 1 child misbehaved and was punished? I think not.

The Senate Bill was passed in haste. Please do not do the same.

Thank you for your time,

Kathryn Hannigan

James Hannigan

Khannigan@verizon.net

Jmhannigan@verizon.net

218 Vernon St. Rockland MA 02370

<[From: Leo Haskell <leohaskell193@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:06 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)](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-3Demailclient-26utm-5Fterm-3Dicon&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nApyRsb0dQBY4EmvDIwwuGMKuNUg8yYY2by830Ls0qs&s=pzKsHSHHChnS_8DXpPrqeb0NbHBvGlJw0nQa9xKlnAk&e=> Virus-free. www.avast.com<br/><<a href=)

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,

Leo Haskell IV

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Wanda Craig <wcraig709.wc@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

I am very concerned after reading this proposed bill and the speed at which this bill is being forced upon police officers, voters and taxpayers. No discussion, and no input from the public or the police who are both greatly impacted by this legislation.  
\*Taking away qualified immunity will open up officers to frivolous litigation.

\*Without collective bargaining rights Officers will be subjected to unfair working conditions with no way to remedy the situation.

\*Subjecting police officers to having thier disciplinary records open to the public, when criminal board of probation records and sex offender registries are not open or accessible to the public

\*Violating an officers 14th amendment rights to due process. Subjecting them to a board which is made up of members of certain groups who abhor the police and support anti police sentiment.

\* As a citizen, voter and taxpayer where is all the money coming from to fund all these committees, training, and initiatives????

Police reform is needed, we can all agree on that, but more time and discussion is needed to do this right. There is no emergency situation in the State of Massachusetts that warrants immediate action. No other occupation in the United States or Massachusetts is being forced to adhere to such stringent policies that affect their life and liberty as well as their family's lives. No other occupation in the United States is being judged so harshly as a whole by the actions of few. Please stop this bill, we need to do better for all involved.

Thank you  
Wanda Corbin,  
Milton Police  
617 216 8147

From: Steve OConnell <steveoconnell1@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the 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,

Steve OConnell

Resident

64 Sunnyplain ave

Weymouth MA

781 331 9455

From: Jonathan Mills <jrmills2468@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Jonathan Mills  
7812520160  
I represent the public

When you gross politicians remove qualified immunity for our first responders, because why wouldn't you. You guys rarely pass any bills that's actually benefit lower class people. I want the money you would've spent on the lawyers and court costs, back in my pocket. You slick ass politicians will 100% spend that budget on something else or put it right into your pension fund. All I want to say is that I want the money back in my tax return, this state is incredibly expensive to live in and you guys just keep raising taxes and implementing new tolls. So help me God if you ever pass traffic cam tickets into law I'll leave this state. Anyhow you guys will 100% fuck this up somehow, all I want is my tax money back if you get rid of qualified immunity.

From: nicole callahan <ncallahan824@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: opposition to Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Nicole Callahan and I live at 32 Pierce Avenue in Dorchester. I work at Suffolk County House of Corrections 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,  
Nicole Callahan

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Devin Paul <oneblade123@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Devin Paul and I live at 42 East Briggs Rd in Westport, Ma. I work at the Bristol County Sheriff's Office 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 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,  
Officer Devin Paul  
From: Alexander Berry <aberry2072@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:05 PM  
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,

Alexander Berry

46 H. Putnam Rd. Ext.

Charlton, MA 01507  
Email: ABerry2072@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Randy Tyler <roscot207@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:03 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,

Randall Tyler  
From: Jordyn Noonan <noonan\_jt@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:03 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2820

?

To the House of 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 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,

Jordyn T. Noonan

530 Lyon Street, Ludlow, MA 01056 <x-apple-data-detectors://1/1>

noonan\_jt@yahoo.com

From: Chris Donahue <trooper3423@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:03 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820 Testimony

Good evening,

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

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

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

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

Christopher Donahue

Saugus, MA

From: Dave Oxner <doxner5@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:02 PM  
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,

David M. Oxner

10 Marlymac Way

Pembroke, Ma. 02359

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sean Crowley <stc012@icloud.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:02 PM

To: Crighton, Brendan (SEN); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Wong, Donald - Rep. (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform bill 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,

Sean T Crowley

19 Allston St, Lynn MA, 01904

From: Jacqueline Kung <jacqueline.kung@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:02 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Support S.2820 police reform bill

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

Just last week I had to file a complaint against the Cambridge police department for handcuffing a 21-year-old black man for crying loudly and trying to get into our apartment building, where his mother had just suddenly died. I am a doctor and I have never treated a grieving family member like that.

<https://boston.cbslocal.com/2020/07/10/i-team-cambridge-police-man-handcuffed-video-investigation/>  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_boston.cbslocal.com\\_2020\\_07\\_10\\_i-2Dteam-2Dcambridge-2Dpolice-2Dman-2Dhandcuffed-2Dvideo-2Dinvestigation\\_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=MKZE81rR88bn0oGr6RlwdraSBBBrBTisfUTtthROaz50&s=CBF91JXfE6v6ml0RveetI7enFxfrDAzTvtm3sMm9W1U&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__boston.cbslocal.com_2020_07_10_i-2Dteam-2Dcambridge-2Dpolice-2Dman-2Dhandcuffed-2Dvideo-2Dinvestigation_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=MKZE81rR88bn0oGr6RlwdraSBBBrBTisfUTtthROaz50&s=CBF91JXfE6v6ml0RveetI7enFxfrDAzTvtm3sMm9W1U&e=>)>

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

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

The problem is here, I have witnessed it myself. Please help.

Thank you for your time and all the work you do,  
Jacqueline Kung, MD  
129 Franklin St, Apt 305  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
From: Joel Martin <joelco27@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:01 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Joel Martin and I live at 37 Easthill rd Brimfield MA. <x-apple-data-detectors://1> I work at MCI-Concord 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,  
Joel Martin

From: Santiago Flores <usmcsf2013@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:01 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: House Bill

To the Chair of the House Committee:

First and foremost I would like to thank you for the opportunity to listen to the public and allow us to contribute our opinions regarding this bill which is something that the Senate members failed to do. My name is Santiago Flores and I am currently employed at the Everett Police Department. I want to simply begin by saying that I have spent my entire life fighting for this country from my days in the Marine Corps and now as a Police Officer. I strongly believe that in order to become better individuals and a better state as a whole we need to adapt and change the way we do things. Although change is needed, some of the points that were touched upon by the Senate I believe will not only destroy the job of policing, causing crime to sky rocket, but will also severely and negatively affect the job of all public workers such as nurses, teachers, and firefighters. Below I will list several points that I believe should be included in the bill as well as items that I believe should be left out.

As you probably already know the topic of Qualified Immunity is probably the most important topic that is being discussed. Qualified Immunity is in place in order to protect public employees and allow us to perform our jobs to the best of our ability without having to worry about being sued for doing the right thing. In a world where everyone is quick to sue for everything, I believe that if Qualified Immunity is taken away, it will lead to ridiculous lawsuits from individuals simply looking to make a quick buck. In addition, why would public workers do their jobs to the best of their abilities knowing that they may lose everything even if they do the right thing? I believe in due process and if ANY public employee does something such as the disgusting act that occurred in Minneapolis he/she should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. However people will still continue to be held accountable for their actions with Qualified Immunity in place and I believe this is where the general public is getting confused about this topic.

Next I will discuss certain Use of Force situations that was covered in the Senate bill. As we all know the use of "chokeholds" is being banned all around the country. Throughout my time on the job, a chokehold is something that I have never used and never seen used. In addition, it is something that was never taught in the police academy. I have trained in different martial arts for years such as brazilian jiu jitsu and kickboxing and have performed and experienced many techniques like this and can say that it is a very dangerous technique that many people do not know how to perform properly and can cause serious injury. I agree with the Senate, and a chokehold should not be allowed in policing in 99% of circumstances. What the Senate bill did not cover is what should be done in a deadly force situation. In any deadly force situation, we must use any force necessary to simply survive and this SHOULD include using a chokehold. To be put simply, a chokehold should be banned from being used unless an officer is faced with a deadly force situation. The second item that was mentioned in the Senate bill was that officers would not be allowed to fire at a vehicle attempting to run them down and that a vehicle will not be labeled a deadly weapon. I will not even waste your time speaking about this topic because it is just absolutely ridiculous. I have responded to many calls for service involving a pedestrian struck where the pedestrian has sustained life threatening injuries or has died. Although in these situations there was no ill intentions by the operators of the these vehicles, they had no control of what sort of damage their vehicle would cause. Now imagine someone deliberately trying to use their car to run someone down. What kind of damage would this cause? I urge you please dismiss this from being on your bill.

Although the Senate bill that was approved had many issues it did bring up some good points. It stressed the fact that officers should go through de-escalation training in order help reduce the amount of use of force situations that occur. I fully agree with this and as an officer that treats every situation that I encounter as respectful as I can I strive to be the best that I can be and go to as many training events that I can go to. This however brings up the question that if police departments begin to get defunded, how will we have the money to further the training of officers? If anything we require more money for training and not less. At the very least, funds should be re allocated in order to



be able to properly train officers in de-escalation. I personally believe that this is where we as officers can make the biggest difference and help prevent a bad situation from happening. Some officers are not very good in this part of the job, not because they don't care or because they want to end every call in arrest but because they simply are not trained properly in dealing with an emotionally disturbed person. We need to work hand in hand with social workers so we can understand fully what they do and vice versa. Something else to consider is when we receive calls for service it is very difficult for us to be able to devote all of our time on one call helping a single individual. Often times we are traveling from call to call and as much as I would like to talk to someone that needs help for an extended amount of time it is not always feasible. I do not know what can be done to alleviate this problem but that once again touches on the fact that if police continue to get defunded it will only make this problem worse than it already is.

I could sit here all day writing to you with my thoughts on the Senate bill as well as ideas to help make your bill improve the field of policing but I know that you simply do not have the time to listen to the thoughts of one person. What I have touched upon in this email I believe are some of the key points that should be brought up. Before I conclude I simply wish to ask one favor. I urge you to look around at cities around our country. As police have been defunded in cities like NYC and LA, crimes have skyrocketed and innocent people have paid the price. I believe that here in the state of MASS, officers have always been held to a higher standard and are better trained and qualified than in other areas in the country. Let's continue make officers better and well trained, helping the communities that we serve. This is not done by taking away qualified immunity or defunding the police, but by working together and improving upon what we have been doing for years. Is our system here truly broken? Or do we simply need to tweak and adjust certain things. Like a car needing an oil change or a tune up, I believe that is what we need. I urge you to listen to the people and not pass a bill on a knee jerk reaction to please a small group of people that know nothing about what we do as officers. I thank you for time, and appreciate you listening to what I have to say. Stay safe and God Bless America.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Officer Santiago Flores  
Everett Police Department

From: Jeremiah Donovan <miah21e@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:01 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Cutler, Josh - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: My Opposition to Parts of Bill S.2820

?Good Evening,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and

reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Jeremiah Donovan

286 Keene St, Duxbury, MA 02332

781-727-6067

Jeremiah Donovan

From: Mike Smallwood <irishbomber66@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:00 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Testimony

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Michael Smallwood and I live at 44 Braley Hill road Rochester ma. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center and I am a CO 1. 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.

Sincerely,

Michael SmallwoodFrom: Dawn Davis <dawnd5180@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:00 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Dawn Davis and I live at 472 Springfield St, Wilbraham MA. I work at Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co and am a Treaauey Consultant. 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,

Dawn Davis

From: Jackie Esielionis <jackie@keystoneproperties.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:00 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

I cannot believe that you would tie the hands of the police with this kind of legislation. There are much better ways to get equitability and I believe you should all put your thinking caps on and lead with creative ideas rather than bowing to the loudest folks. Find a better way to keep us ALL safe and prevent abuse of power. Let's use some common sense.

--

Thank you,

Jackie Esielionis  
"Your Realtor for a Lifetime"  
Keystone Team, LAER Realty Partners  
Cell: 978-257-0123  
Office: 978-692-9292  
FAX: 978-540-2112  
www.keystoneproperties.com  
<[Download my new app which to get information on homes you are driving by:  
<https://app.laerrealty.com/jesielionis>  
<\[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\\_\\\_app.laerrealty.com\\\_jesielionis&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\\_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=KrIqG1SC43\\\_AqeUTn1kqRg\\\_fmKSNQwr7fUicL-vgOVY&e=>\]\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\_\_app.laerrealty.com\_jesielionis&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=KrIqG1SC43\_AqeUTn1kqRg\_fmKSNQwr7fUicL-vgOVY&e=>\)](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.keystoneproperties.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=tCJc1n3Jr4hIPoob6L5Wpxe7FUnrgopWLuFvTNzWXT0&e=>jackie@keystoneproperties.com</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Here what my clients have said about working with me...

<http://www.zillow.com/profile/Jackie-Esielionis/#reviews>  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.zillow.com\\_profile\\_Jackie-2DEsielionis\\_-23reviews&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=PMvkyPRTTJCA dgIakSZ9xfPxSAi-L-UsrKYwuRaT8Ls&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.zillow.com_profile_Jackie-2DEsielionis_-23reviews&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=PMvkyPRTTJCA dgIakSZ9xfPxSAi-L-UsrKYwuRaT8Ls&e=>)

Visit and LIKE my Facebook Business Page for Local Real Estate Updates:

<[From: Bruce Gabriel <jbgabriel@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:00 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820 \(corrected for typographical error\)](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_keystonepropertiesrealestate_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=voMA4fZSDuai7hW68hRCQvw1OjCHv1WBvvyX7u4YzMY&s=fpXcT3guE7KiTrWBXFrMdfy3Ea7ZCFxQMir9e_lRaac&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

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.

With S 2800, the police defunding bill having been passed in the Senate, Massachusetts is getting a newfound but undesirable reputation for lawlessness. In response, I will quote the highly competent and vastly underrated President Calvin Coolidge, who so pithily noted the following when he was Massachusetts Governor and much clearer and more reasoned thought prevailed in the Massachusetts Senate and in the Governor's Office:

"It is my purpose to maintain the Government of Massachusetts as it was founded by her people, the protector of the rights of all but subservient

to none. It is my purpose to maintain unimpaired the authority of her laws, her jurisdiction, her peace, her security. This ancient faith of Massachusetts which became the great faith of America, she reestablished in her Constitution before the army of Washington had gained our independence, declaring for 'a government of laws and not of men.' In that faith she still abides. Let him challenge it who dares. All who love Massachusetts, who believe in America, are bound to defend it. The choice lies between living under coercion and intimidation, the forces of evil, or under the laws of the people, orderly, speaking with their settled convictions, the revelation of a divine authority."

— Governor Calvin Coolidge, excerpts from an Address at the Tremont Temple in Boston, October 4, 1919.

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,

J. Bruce Gabriel  
18 Saint Mary's Way  
Marlborough, MA 01752  
From: Bill Cameron <cameron2832@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 8:00 PM  
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,

Bill Cameron

42 Millbrook Dr

Rockland, Ma 02370

Cameron2832@gmail.com

781-844-7466

From: Comcast <jmalonson13@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Joshua Malonson and I live at Carver 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 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Josh Malonson

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Michael Parr <parr.mike@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Naughton, Harold - Rep. (HOU);  
Chandler, Harriette (SEN)  
Subject: S2820

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently passed S.2820.

This scapegoating is an appalling abuse of power by the legislature. Blaming the entire establishment for the sins of a single bad apple is the most unjust action this nation has seen in decades. This is discrimination under the shade of political correctness.

Just as you are considering blaming all police and public employees for individual failings, I will blame each and every current legislator if this bill becomes law. I promise you that I will work to unseat every incumbent present during this disgusting action until they are all removed.

Stop following the mob and start creating legislation that properly handles long standing abuses of power like term limits on corrupt politicians.

Thank you,

Michael Parr

63 Shadylane Ave Northborough

From: Heather H <heatheraavaldez@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:58 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Heather Valdez and I live at 324 Prospect Hill Street Taunton, Ma. I work at the Department of Correction and am a Correctional 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,

Heather Valdez

From: Bobby <rjberrena@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:53 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill S.2800

?

?Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Robert Berrena. I am a former UMass-Amherst police officer of 9 years and am presently a Trooper with Massachusetts Department of State Police. I understand the above mentioned bill is is an extremely lively topic that could change many things, including me and my family's future well-being. I agree with change. I agree with the public feeling safe. I especially agree with accountability. I assure you when I signed to be a police officer I vowed to do the right thing and treat all as equals. I speak and interact with people in a manner in which I would want to be treated. So do my coworkers. I see the good in this bill....I truly do.

My concern is this; by taking away and/or adjusting the "Qualified Immunity" for police officers the Commonwealth will lower it's quality in policing, tenfold. I wanted to stay in Massachusetts. I opted to seek a job that protected the citizens here. I love raising my two daughters here In Western Massachusetts. This is our home. I was promised a great career that included honor, integrity, self achievement, and promise of a pension. A safe and achievable retirement is/was very comforting, especially doing something I love and putting 110% effort in each day I go to work. These things were assured as long as I got up everyday and "Did the right thing". I have lived by this for the past 16 years of full time law enforcement. I will continue to as well.

I read the blanket response from Senator Hinds explaining the breakdown of our qualified immunity and that it will still exist. I read his personal interpretation of same. I understand changes were made to protect us. I am familiar with the bill's breakdown but am fearful of the questionable language written in. I saw the 4:15 <x-apple-data-detectors://1> in the morning vote that pushed the bill through the Senate. Police officers will be reluctant to act and/or be proactive. Men and women in blue will take up a reactive type of policing each day in their respective jurisdictions. We will be wondering if we will lose our jobs, or if our kids will eat and be sheltered. Or if someone is suing us

for everything we have...We have seconds to make life altering decisions. Everyone else has days, months, or even years to pull it apart, while sharing the same unaltered qualified immunity. So please entertain my concern and the concern of many. I am one of thousands. The concern here is not just of police officers but for the citizens who currently enjoy their quality of life. They will be deprived of that safe feeling knowing blue lights are coming with confidence to help them in crisis or emergency. There will be hesitant and nervous police officers responding there, trust me. New York City is a prime example of failure and police officers reluctant to act. I personally would like to be alive for my daughters and wife. Is that too selfish Of me? People actually like the police within the Commonwealth. It is shown to me everyday I put the boots on and go to work.

Before this bill is slid into law under the cover of darkness or in the early morning hours, please reconsider and make an amendment guaranteeing our qualified immunity's original protections. Why can everyone else hold this comfort and security but the police? Our job is at most risk of scrutiny at all times. Many of us are too vested to start over. I do not know how to build a house or design a building. Nor do I want to abandon this job because I feel it is being abandoned by many. I have been a police officer since I was 20. This is all I have and will continue to my best....If allowed. Nobody I know including me, condoned the awful tragedy that happened 1,000 plus miles away in another state with George Floyd. It was horrible. I feel awful for his loved ones and family. We have very few of these types of situations within Massachusetts because of the existing demand of qualified and trained police officers. It is one of the highest standards in the nation. This is why our academies are laterally accepted in most other states as a transfer. The Commonwealth's recruitment of qualified and sound police officers will diminish with the stripping or "adjusting" of our qualified immunity.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,  
Robert Berrena  
(413)896-6345

From: Bobby <rjberrena@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:57 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

??  
?

?Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Robert Berrena. I am a former UMass-Amherst police officer of 9 years and am presently a Trooper with Massachusetts Department of State Police. I understand the above mentioned bill is is an extremely lively topic that could change many things, including me and my family's future well-being. I agree with change. I agree with the public feeling

safe. I especially agree with accountability. I assure you when I signed to be a police officer I vowed to do the right thing and treat all as equals. I speak and interact with people in a manner in which I would want to be treated. So do my coworkers. I see the good in this bill....I truly do.

My concern is this; by taking away and/or adjusting the "Qualified Immunity" for police officers the Commonwealth will lower it's quality in policing, tenfold. I wanted to stay in Massachusetts. I opted to seek a job that protected the citizens here. I love raising my two daughters here in Western Massachusetts. This is our home. I was promised a great career that included honor, integrity, self achievement, and promise of a pension. A safe and achievable retirement is/was very comforting, especially doing something I love and putting 110% effort in each day I go to work. These things were assured as long as I got up everyday and "Did the right thing". I have lived by this for the past 16 years of full time law enforcement. I will continue to as well.

I read the blanket response from Senator Hinds explaining the breakdown of our qualified immunity and that it will still exist. I read his personal interpretation of same. I understand changes were made to protect us. I am familiar with the bill's breakdown but am fearful of the questionable language written in. I saw the 4:15 <x-apple-data-detectors://1> in the morning vote that pushed the bill through the Senate. Police officers will be reluctant to act and/or be proactive. Men and women in blue will take up a reactive type of policing each day in their respective jurisdictions. We will be wondering if we will lose our jobs, or if our kids will eat and be sheltered. Or if someone is suing us for everything we have...We have seconds to make life altering decisions. Everyone else has days, months, or even years to pull it apart, while sharing the same unaltered qualified immunity. So please entertain my concern and the concern of many. I am one of thousands. The concern here is not just of police officers but for the citizens who currently enjoy their quality of life. They will be deprived of that safe feeling knowing blue lights are coming with confidence to help them in crisis or emergency. There will be hesitant and nervous police officers responding there, trust me. New York City is a prime example of failure and police officers reluctant to act. I personally would like to be alive for my daughters and wife. Is that too selfish of me? People actually like the police within the Commonwealth. It is shown to me everyday I put the boots on and go to work.

Before this bill is slid into law under the cover of darkness or in the early morning hours, please reconsider and make an amendment guaranteeing our qualified immunity's original protections. Why can everyone else hold this comfort and security but the police? Our job is at most risk of scrutiny at all times. Many of us are too vested to start over. I do not know how to build a house or design a building. Nor do I want to abandon this job because I feel it is being abandoned by many. I have been a police officer since I was 20. This is all I have and will continue to my best....If allowed. Nobody I know including me, condoned the awful tragedy that happened 1,000 plus miles away in another state with George Floyd. It was horrible. I feel awful for his loved ones and family. We have very few of these types of situations within

Massachusetts because of the existing demand of qualified and trained police officers. It is one of the highest standards in the nation. This is why our academies are laterally accepted in most other states as a transfer. The Commonwealth's recruitment of qualified and sound police officers will diminish with the stripping or "adjusting" of our qualified immunity.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,  
Robert Berrena  
(413)896-6345

From: Krystal Day <kmday333@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:57 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov

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,

Cathy Docos  
32 Fieldstone Drive Goffstown, NH 03102  
Cathy.docos@gmail.com

From: Caden Tibert <cjtibert@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:56 PM  
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,

Caden Tibert

131 Granite St Unit 2 Rockport, MA

cjtibert@yahoo.com

From: mb murphy <elizabethmurphy1987@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:56 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

To Whom It May Concern:;

My name is Elizabeth Murphy 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,

Elizabeth Murphy

21 R Pleasant Street

Rockport, MA 01966

(978) 8797926

Elizabethmurphy1987@gmail.com

From: Comcast <jenmareg@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:55 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800 Bill

My name is Jennifer Regan and I live at 855 Front Street Weymouth, MA 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,

Jennifer Regan

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Aaron Richardson <aaronrichardson9393@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:55 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Review of 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,

Aaron L. Richardson  
137B Pleasant Street  
Attleboro, Ma 02703  
aaronrichardson9393@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone From: Megan Murphy <megmurphyanimate@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:55 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: In Support of Bill No. S2820

To Whom it May Concern,

This email is a show of support for the Reform, Shift, Build act. I want the state of MA to eliminate qualified immunity and put a limit on the use of force.

I also support the movements within the bill to:

Certify officers and investigate misconduct complaints, and decertify officers who act improperly

Redirect funding away from policing and corrections into communities affected by mass-incarceration

Demilitarize the police force by requiring a public process for any military equipment acquisitions

Thank you for taking the time to read,

Megan Murphy  
From: Krystal Goodno-day <k.goodno.day@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:54 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: 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 include...

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,

Krystal Day  
137 Pleasant st Attleboro, Massachusetts 02703  
K.goondo.day@gmail.com

From: Linda White <ljjwhite@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:54 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,  
Linda White  
Carlisle, MA

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Elena Korniyenko <ykons777@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:54 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,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Sean O'Rourke <orourke sean14@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:54 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Refom

Good Evening,

I am writing this email in regards to the Police Reform Bill. I am writing in support to all of the great law enforcement officers in Massachusetts.

On May 25, 2020. The murder of George Floyd occurred several states away. The actions of the police were disgusting, and It makes me very angry that

an individual would abuse his badge like this. I truthfully believe that this is not what policing is about, and that individual is isolated. Prior to this event in Massachusetts, there was no extreme concern with Law Enforcement here in Massachusetts. There was no reason to rush a bill through legislation in less than a month. One incident that happened several states away is now effecting all law enforcement officers in Massachusetts and country wide, all of whom do not agree with the actions of those police officers in Minneapolis.

In Massachusetts, all officers are trained by the Massachusetts Police Training Council. All officers have the highest training in the country. We have strict use of force policies, none of which include a choke hold. We have a system of checks and balances with internal affairs investigations. We have the best officers in the country. Well trained and well respected.

As a police officer in Massachusetts I go  
To work everyday and take great respect and pride in what I do.

Police Officers go to work every day, leave their families at home and put their lives on the line. They are our first line of defense against terrorist attacks, like the Boston Marathon Bombings. They respond to murders, shootings, stabbings, home invasions, armed robberies, suicidal individuals, intoxicated individuals and mentally ill people. All of these calls could go wrong at any one second. With all this in mind I ask that you look at numbers of complaints and use of force problems. That number is almost too good to be true here in MA. So few complaints and even fewer use of force issues. Why? Because of the great training we go through. Police officers go to work defend the great people of this state. I ask that you defend the police.

In order for the police to successfully and effectively do their jobs. Qualified immunity is a must. Police must know that their actions, good faith and reasonable actions are protected. That if they act in good faith that they won't lose their house, that their family won't lose their house. If police start second guessing themselves and walking on eggshells in fear that at anytime they could be personally sued, more people will get hurt and the effectiveness of policing will go down. The rate of violence will undoubtedly go up.

I ask that you look at good faith and policing especially when related to use of force. Think of a suicidal individual threatening to jump off a building or jump into traffic. Will an Officer be covered if they physically remove them from the ledge or street. Saving a life and getting that individual to the hospital. Or an intoxicated individual who needs medical help, but is physically refusing. Can a police officer assist in keeping medics safe by helping restrain a patient. All good faith efforts where an arrest would make matters worse. Police are here to help people. The goal is to get these people to a safe environment so they can receive help. If reasonable force is necessary in good faith then so be it. An arrest would in no way help that individual.

Due process and collective bargaining are very important. In the United States we give murderers, terrorists, and violent felons due process

rights. Why would we take them away from police officers? Officers reserve the right To appeals and collectively bargain. They deserve this because they are all US citizens who signed up for a job to help people while putting their life on the line Unions and civil service were started in this state/ country for a reason. Why would we take those away from the police. This sounds like an anti labor bill. I ask that you look at why civil service was started and why the protections of civil service and unions were given. Police deserve these protections like all the other hard working people in this state. Again police officers go to work everyday to help people. Every call we answer there is a Person in need of assistance.

Lastly I ask that the licensing committee Is created with members who have backgrounds and experience in law enforcement. No one understands and sees what police officers see and do on a daily basis. We see things that no one else sees. We deal with things no one else deals with. We wouldn't put a dentist on the board for plumbers. I ask that we fill the board with well respected members of the law enforcement community. Nobody hates a bad cop more Then a good cop.

I ask that you remember the Police officers are there to help. Help the victims of domestic violence, victims of child abuse, victims of sex trafficking, victims of violence, families of victims of violence etc. Help protect the police. You never need the police until you really need the police.

I lastly ask about the repercussions of this bill. Will violence escalate. Will we be able to recruit the best candidates for policing in the future. Will great officers retire and or resign I ask you to step in the boots of a police officer. Would you want a job with no qualified immunity or due process? Would you put your family through that?

Thank You,  
Sean ORourke  
774-696-9231

From: Paul Gibbons <pgibbons@wickedlocal.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:54 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,  
Pam Gibbons

Sent from my iPhone

--

This message may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or authorized to receive this for the intended recipient, you must not use, copy, disclose or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender immediately by sending a reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Paul Gibbons <pgibbons@wickedlocal.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:53 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,

Paul Gibbons  
Sent from my iPhone

--

This message may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or authorized to receive this for the intended recipient, you must not use, copy, disclose or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender immediately by sending a reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: Kevin Bell <KevinBell14@outlook.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:53 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Kevin Bell and I live at 1 Kimberly Lane, Blackstone, MA. I work at MCI-Norfolk 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: 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 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 and ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kevin Bell

Get Outlook for iOS <[To whom it may concern,](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_o0ukef&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=07ufMgm9B5KiqeQpGLnWbYH5_jDcKR1SYZRAlRLtDIQ&s=4vd2ahsJPfNmJ2OGuYqokW7M0HN7KYztdBqzjMNUjzQ&e=></a>><br/>From: crystal patsavos <cpatsavos1@yahoo.com><br/>Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:53 PM<br/>To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)<br/>Subject: attn Chairs Aaron Michlewitz/Claire Cronin - Police Reform Bill S 2820</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Below is a letter I sent to the senators regarding the hastily put together Bill S.2800, now S2820. I, as well as many others are disappointed to say the least, with our elected officials who are trying to rush a bill into law for political reasons with blatant disregard for the safety of the majority of citizens in the state of Massachusetts. Just over a month ago law enforcement officers were regarded as heroes during the surge of Covid-19 here in Mass., many participating in birthday car parades for children unable to celebrate in normal fashion. They are still heroes, that hasn't changed. We should be doing MORE to protect not only law enforcement, but all of our municipal workers. We are watching the detrimental effects of giving more rights to lawbreakers and criminals than to those brave enough to uphold the law. Crime and violence is rapidly increasing throughout the country and especially in our major cities. Crime has been at multi - decade lows but that is now reversing at record pace. Boston will no doubt experience this extreme spike in crime if this bill is passed as is. What I know is that 5 other officers were shot in the past few years in the Southshore/Cape area alone; two of which paid the ultimate sacrifice with their lives; Officer Gannon and Officer Chesna and the latter because he hesitated taking necessary actions to stop the assailant who stole his gun and shot him. This bill will only lead to more of these dangerous situations. Cops will no longer be willing to take the risks necessary to do their jobs in fear of being persecuted for doing so. Policing will be reactive, not proactive as it has been. To my knowledge only one department- Springfield in a total of 357, has been investigated for any wrongdoing. This is not systemic. Please protect the rights of our public servants. This bill should not be passed without more careful consideration just to meet an unrealistic deadline or to satisfy a political agenda. It would be irresponsible and dangerous.

Respectfully,

Crystal Patsavos

14 Madison Drive <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>

East Sandwich, Ma. <x-apple-data-detectors://0/1>

978-697-1266

Dear Legislator,

I'm writing in regards to the S.2800 Police Reform Bill currently being discussed. I am the wife of Dennis, Ma. police sergeant Nicholas Patsavos who was a recipient of the George L. Hanna Award for saving the life of a complete stranger while risking his own without hesitation. He has been an officer for over 20 years serving the community with compassion and the utmost respect for all citizens regardless of who they are. The VAST majority of police officers are kind, decent people who enter the profession to SAVE lives, NOT take them. For these brave men and women it is a calling and a job few are able to do as most of us are incapable of the sacrifices they make, and the risks they face daily. I have never been more disturbed by the vilification and demoralization of these heroes today. All should not be punished for the poor actions of very few. For the many "hats" they wear on any given shift - a variety of emergencies and tragedies they witness daily, we ask and expect a lot from them. They too are only human. Perfection at all times for any human being is not attainable yet some expect this from our officers. They deserve the respect and same constitutional rights that every citizen in the nation is entitled to. Though some form of police reform may be necessary - regardless of what any of you claim , this bill is being rushed and the

consequences are not being fully thought through. Particularly, in regards to Qualified Immunity, which protects them from frivolous lawsuits when it is clear they are doing their jobs properly and in good faith acting reasonably in the eyes of the law. This does not protect those problem officers who don't act appropriately. Officers are in harms way at any given time and sometimes have to make life altering decisions that most of us can't even fathom in a matter of seconds. If they truly feel their life is in danger they should certainly have the right to protect it. They didn't sign up for the job to not have that right. Their loved ones constantly live in fear that one of these days they won't return home safely. I have two children and their dad is their hero. The choice they are left with in the event of a legitimate threat to their well being is either be killed or defend yourself and risk losing everything/possibly go to jail- just for doing the job we ask of them. Without qualified immunity officers are more at risk as well as every citizen because they won't risk taking the necessary measures to do their job effectively for fear of persecution for doing so. This is just wrong. I do not feel the majority of the public supports this, and far too many aren't even aware of this being pushed along by legislators at all. Laws and Bills need to protect EVERY citizen, police included. Most officers go way above and beyond the call of duty. They help citizens with so many different acts of kindness, Ive seen them do so- whether it's a meal for the homeless, shoveling a driveway for an elderly individual, giving a ride to someone in need, or emotional support to someone suffering loss and tragedy; not to mention rushing to aid anyone in need anywhere when off duty. My own husband has done so many times over the years because that's just what they do. They are our first line of protection always running towards the dangers the rest of us run away from. How quickly we forget the collapse of the Twin Towers/9-11, the marathon bombing, and countless other tragedies they've dealt with across this nation. Always in harms way rushing in to defend all of us- strangers of all colors. They deserve the same- to be protected and defended by every one of us. It is not fair for those who don't walk in their shoes to make decisions they are not experts on which will make it difficult for them to do their job. And that's if they even stick around long enough as many won't and are walking away across the country. Can't say I blame them. It will no longer be worth the risk for many of them. Please consider all of this to make the best possible informed decisions for ALL. I don't want to live in a world without police and one none of us are safe in. The treatment of police in general has been shameful and disgraceful. Those who decide to break the law should be held accountable on BOTH sides- law enforcement as well as the law breaker. Respectfully,  
Crystal Patsavos, concerned citizen and police wife

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Brendan Forestell <btff1213@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:52 PM  
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 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.

Brendan Forestell  
84 Morrison Ave  
Somerville Ma  
From: Ana Curral <ana\_curral@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:52 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill 2800

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Ana Curral and I live at 16 Peach Blossom Rd, Acushnet, Ma. <x-apple-data-detectors://0> I work at in Healthcare and am a Human Resources Manager. 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,

Ana Curral

Sent from my iPhone

From: Josh Monfreda <josh.monfreda@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:51 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: LeBoeuf, David - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony S.2820

Dear Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and Judiciary members,

I hope this message finds you all well. My name is Joshua Monfreda, I am a registered voter who was born and raised in the City of Worcester and have recently moved to the town of Leicester. I would first like to thank you all for slowing the process down and giving your constituents an opportunity to weigh in on such an important matter. The bill pushed forward by the Senate, is in no way something that the general public/tax payers would wish to impose upon the very people who protect our communities.

I would like to start by saying that the murder of George Floyd was downright disgusting, unacceptable and a display of pure evil. I agree whole heartedly that the discussions raised since have been fruitful and offer an opportunity to reform policing across this great nation. That being said, I feel that the worst thing we can do is rush this bill, just to be a "first." In todays society, it seems to be the common theme, with news outlets rushing to be first to break news, even though they do not have the facts and often completely make a mockery of the situation at hand. Now this bill, which I feel if rushed will do the exact same thing. Difference being, this bill cannot just be re-read on a later broadcast with corrections. This bill will have a lasting impact on our communities. Look at New York City, who rushed into decisions and have seen a disturbing spike in violent crimes. It has become so bad that now there are Black leaders in the community who are begging for the Anti-Violence Unit to be placed back into patrol. I am in 100% agreement that there is need for discussion and reform, but it should be on a state by state basis and the conversations should without question involve the men and women of the police departments and other stake-holders.

There are numerous parts of S.2820 as currently written that I find unacceptable and hope that you will agree with, at a minimum, the few that I will discuss in the following text:

I find this bill disturbing in the sense that it is without a question an Anti-labor bill. The thought that a majority Democrat Senate, who has forever been the party for Unions and Labor and would look to take the rights afforded to Unions away from Police is mind-boggling. The removal of Collective Bargaining is a slap in the face to Unions across the entire country.

Secondly, the idea that elected officials are looking into taking Due Process from the hard-working men and women of the police departments is appalling. Allowing a committee to be the say all be all is quite frankly dangerous. Having this POSAC committee have final say in decertifying a police officer and not allowing an appeals process is against everything



we know as citizens of the USA. This will give murders and rapists more rights to appeal than the very heroes who so diligently put their lives on the line to protect you and I.

Third is the issue surrounding Qualified Immunity. There seems to be an extreme disconnect in regards to what Qualified Immunity offers to civil servants. Removing this little bit of protection from the Police and other civil servants is dangerous and opens up pandoras box in unsubstantiated civil suits. By removing this sliver of protection, Officers will have more legal binding to stan-by, rather than assist in a major incident.

Lastly, I would like to bring up the breakdown of the Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee. There is not a single profession that has such a large number of civilians (people who do not practice/have never practiced) the job at hand. It is quite easy to "Monday morning quarterback" a police officers actions by watching a slowed down, or single sided video, but an entirely different story to individuals who have been in a dangerous or life threatening situation. Imagine having a board of over 50% civilians overseeing a Doctors licensure. Neither you nor I could look at a malpractice situation and be able to determine if a Doctor acted improperly. The same should be offered to Police, who see the worst of the worst in live action and full speed and do not always have the opportunity to "slow it down" to analyze what the action should be. In addition, coming from the City of Worcester (the 2nd largest city in New England) I see their department and Chief as being missing from a seat on this committee. I think that there needs to be some serious discussion about this committee and who is going to have a seat at the table.

I again thank you all for taking the time to listen and hear our requests. As mentioned before, I do think that this bill needs to be slowed to let the dust settle and make sure that we get it RIGHT here in the Commonwealth. If this gets rushed through, we are going to have a mass exodus of Police Officers and be hard pressed to get qualified candidates to fill the vacancies. Nobody is going to risk their families livelihood and finances for such a thankless profession. The time is now to turn this around and back the men and women who risk their lives for perfect strangers on a daily basis. These issues do not plague the state of MA. We have had more Police Officers murdered in this state in the last few years than the other way around. I beg of you all to hear the deafening sound of the silent majority who vote every election, respect, love and admire the men and women in blue.

Respectfully,

Joshua A. Monfreda

774-239-3025

From: Vincent Noe <vinnienoe@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:51 PM

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,

Vincent F. Noe

9 Alyssa Drive

Wakefield, MA

781-858-3708

From: Kreig Martinek <kreig.s.martinek@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:51 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill 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,

Kreig S. Martinek

56 Spruce Street, Westfield, MA 01085

413-250-0901

From: Bruce Gabriel <jbgabriel@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:50 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.

With S 2800, the police defunding and bill having been passed in the Senate, Massachusetts is getting a newfound but undesirable reputation for lawlessness. In response, I will quote the highly competent and vastly underrated President Calvin Coolidge, who so pithily noted the following when he was Massachusetts Governor and much clearer and more reasoned thought prevailed in the Massachusetts Senate and in the Governor's Office:

"It is my purpose to maintain the Government of Massachusetts as it was founded by her people, the protector of the rights of all but subservient to none. It is my purpose to maintain unimpaired the authority of her laws, her jurisdiction, her peace, her security. This ancient faith of Massachusetts which became the great faith of America, she reestablished in her Constitution before the army of Washington had gained our independence, declaring for 'a government of laws and not of men.' In that faith she still abides. Let him challenge it who dares. All who love Massachusetts, who believe in America, are bound to defend it. The choice lies between living under coercion and intimidation, the forces of evil, or under the laws of the people, orderly, speaking with their settled convictions, the revelation of a divine authority."

— Governor Calvin Coolidge, excerpts from an Address at the Tremont Temple in Boston, October 4, 1919.

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,

J. Bruce Gabriel  
18 Saint Mary's Way  
Marlborough, MA 01752  
From: Sean Noonan <noonansean122@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:49 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

To The House of 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 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 T. Noonan

530 Lyon Street, Ludlow, MA 01056

noonansean122@gmail.com

From: Elaine <iblany@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:49 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Veto bill S2820

Back the Blue by vetoing the police reform bill S2620. It's hastily written & is unsafe. I support our LW Enforcement Officers in the Commonwealth and do not support this bill.

Thank you,  
Elaine Lanza

From: emlrn12@comcast.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:49 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,

Anthony J. Luzzetti

<[From: darcie25@gmail.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: S2820](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-3Demailclient-26utm-5Fterm-3Dicon&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=X623jf4kNh0-ZhSPcsLyhMycrBZMNS0meUSnXcVbDPw&s=wZqw-nTFqhqd1WzjnAyeh7DL_84dqW0uqhzhmWrQ3Zk&e=> Virus-free. www.avast.com<br/><<a href=)

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,

Darcie Rayner

Resident

17 Wildewood Drive

Canton MA

From: Kyle Reilly <ksreilly@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Support for S2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Cronin,

I am writing to you to voice my support for S2820. Its imperative that we make this first step toward racial justice. We've seen to many times abuses of our neighbors at the hands of law enforcement. Its time we gave the commonwealth the protections it needs, and the legal backing for good police officers to be able to stand up against fellow officers. I ask that you preserve the language creating an independent and civilian majority police body, limit qualified immunity, and reduce the school to prison pipeline by removing barriers to expunge juvenile records.

I also ask that you strengthen the use of force standard, fully prohibit facial surveillance technology and lift the cap of the justice reinvestment fund.

Thank you for taking the time to review my input

Kyle Reilly  
Hopkinton MA  
From: emlrrn12@comcast.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:47 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,

Prof. Elaine M. Luzzetti, MSN, RN

<[From: Ata, Sahar <atas@merrimack.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill](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-3Demailclient-26utm-5Fterm-3Dicon&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=jSr_L_qdd5IJEllpOpa_wIXcVvEKCGsDhUIqoxs0hX4&s=jV1G1TQjAEoc74L3NVWEoQpEZrhZ49b47ejvVwE0sf0&e=> Virus-free. www.avast.com<br/><<a href=)

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,

Sahar Ata

6 Mockingbird Ln, Dracut, MA 01826

Atas@merrimack.edu

From: Angela Topham <atopham66@netscape.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony to Bill S.2820

Dear Rep. Michlewitz and Rep. Cronin;

Please accept the following written testimony as it relates to a Bill (S.2820) in front of the House.

I am a concerned Massachusetts Citizen residing at 66 Crossbow Lane, North Andover, I am a parent and grandparent.

I write 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 this nation. It is misguided and wrong. I shudder to think of the repercussions the passage of this Bill will inflict upon the law abiding citizens that depend on our law enforcement to assure our safety in society. I worry for my grandchildren growing up in a non law and order environment and how it will impact their lives. I fear for their safety. All of you should be worried about this also and I cannot understand how ANYONE would think this Bill is the right thing to do for the citizens of this Commonwealth.

Like most of my neighbors, I am dismayed at the lack 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.



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,  
( Lieutenant Brian Pratt)

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

From: Keith Edmeade <kedmeadester@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police issue

The police, Boston police in particular have worked tirelessly for years, drawing double shifts almost every day. Running into danger, not even considering their own safety to maintain peace. It was only a few years ago when they were on the cover of sports illustrated, determined to not only help people hurt during the bombing at the marathon but also went out and got those guys. The police didn't stop until they were caught and now, they are being scapegoated. After they were met with an organized mob that tried to hurt them with bricks and the like. Working , not knowing if they will see their family. They bowed to the mob and gave them their due; and now defunding?

How will anyone be encourage to take up this once great profession once these things are in place?

Thank you for your time.

From: Derrek Deranian <derrekderanian@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800

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.

Very Respectfully,

Trooper Derrek G. Deranian



Massachusetts State Police