

From: dj0291@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testtimony

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Daniel Hollenbach and I live at 531 Less River Ave, Somerset. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center and am a CO1. 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,

Daniel Hollenbach

From: Aaron Greiner <aaronbgreiner@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:44 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. We cannot let another day pass without meaningful and structural reform. The status quo is not working.

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. We have no time to space - we must act now.

Aaron Greiner  
Somerville  
From: Bridget Stevens <bridgetstevens@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform bill

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

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Bridget Stevens. I live at 82 Partridge St, West Roxbury MA. I am writing to urge you and the House to pass police reform that includes:

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

Thank you very much.

Bridget Stevens

bridgetstevens@gmail.com

82 partridge st West Roxbury MA 02132

From: james.adamson <james.adamson@baystate.edu>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:44 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820

Hello,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

James Adamson

From: Mike Wandell <mwandell@wilmingtonpoliceunion.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

Good Evening,

My name is Michael Wandell, I am a 22 year veteran of the Wilmington Police Department and President of our Patrol Officers Union, NEPBA Local 1. My cell number is 978-337-8551.

I am writing you with my concerns to the Police Reform Bill S.2820. This bill concerns me as it seems to be a knee-jerk reaction, written in haste to a horrible event that occurred 1300 miles away.

I believe Massachusetts policing has been and has stayed well ahead of our country's standards in policing for many years. We spend several hours training every year in several areas including deescalating techniques, CIT (Critical Incident Training) training, which includes persons that suffer from mental health issues, persons with disabilities etc. I along with my fellow officers do believe there is always room for improvement and always look for ways to improve and be better at the job we do.

I believe putting together a committee of people that are not involved in law enforcement is a disservice and an insult to all the time and effort we put into our law enforcement profession. This is the equivalent to putting police officers in charge of a medical review board for doctors. We have no business telling a doctor how to do their job.

Stripping officers of Qualified Immunity is a disservice to law enforcement. Qualified Immunity is not there to protect illegal activity

it is there to protect us who have to make split second decisions while in the performance of our duties.

Can you give me an instance, situation or case where Qualified Immunity has protected the wrongful conduct of a police officer in the state of Massachusetts? I don't believe there are any cases that apply to this doctrine as it stands.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,  
Officer Mike Wandell  
Wilmington Police Department  
President  
NEPBA Local 1

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Mecaela Rogers <m6rogers@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Mecaela Rogers and I live at New Bedford, MA. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center and am a CO I. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to 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,

Mecaela Rogers

From: Ray Pszenny <erpszenny@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN)  
Subject: POLICE REFORM BILL S2820 - Concerns with qualified immunity within this bill to be considered

To Whom It May Concern;;

My name is Elizabeth Pszenny 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 Pszenny

15R Pleasant St, Rockport, Ma 01966

erpszenny@gmail.com

From: Stacy Coleman <scolemanj@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: police reform bill S2800

Good Evening,

I am writing this email in opposition of the policing reform bill Senate S2800. I have multiple relatives and friends in law enforcement that this bill if passed would affect greatly. The police should not have to go to work and fear to do their job to the best of their ability or have their loved ones at home fear that they will get that dreaded call that they have been injured or even killed while trying to do their job and protect the citizens of this state. Police officers should not have to worry about whether or not they will be sued or worse attacked, while trying to protect their communities. My aunt and her children should not have to worry if their husband and father will be injured or sued one day because some one that he came in contact with decided they did not like the outcome of their interaction and decided to file a civil complaint against him. Our police officers should be able to use their judgement in the situation at the moment to protect themselves and the community by whatever means they feel is acceptable for that situation and not worry about if they will be sued or fired because someone questions their motives. This bill would tie the hands of the police officers that swore to protect all citizens of this state. This bill would cause more unnecessary deaths for police officers and citizens like Officer Michael Chesna and Vera Adams. Also to take police out of the schools would be a detriment to the students and communities. Taking the school officers out would result in more violence in the school system. There is already enough bullying and violence in the schools with police officers present to take them out and have no one to stop what they have been would be a big mistake. This would result in more school shootings, more children being afraid of police. For some students school is the only place they feel safe because of the school resource officers. For my 2 children they love having the school resource officers in their school, it makes them feel safe and protected while there with everything going on in this world. I live in Middleboro Massachusetts and the police in this town and all over the world have mine and my families support 100%. This bill if passed would be a smack in the face to the men and woman and their families faces. They risk their lives on a daily bases too protect my family and yours. Please DO NOT pass this bill!

Thank you for your time

Stacy Coleman  
concerned citizen of Massachusetts

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_go.onelink.me\\_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-](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=RaDcN4sqp7VNY4LmTCxf3PQsYc7ZBs9SLbpc7QiONXA&s=FCrR62W3Ro5ygOZcobWhw0NzJZAARuT8iiaFIka1910&e=>  
From: Ann Ragosta <ann.ragosta@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:42 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Fw: I oppose House Bill S2800

Good Evening,

As your constituent, Ann Ragosta from Milford, I am writing to you today to express my strong opposition to S.2800 which was passed by the Senate. I ask that you oppose this bill as constituted when it is debated in the House of Representatives. This bill 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. It will cause many good officers to leave due to the new burdens it imposes and will likely only encourage poor candidates for the job.

S2800 establishes a review committee board with overly broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations. Review boards typically review a process or an event after it has occurred for the purpose of implementing a change. Reviews should not be conducted during the course of an investigation as that would in all likelihood jeopardize the investigation. Why is this language part of the bill?

The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment right (see Carney v. Springfield) and constitutional protections against double jeopardy. Qualified immunity protections (which are really the hallmark of sound and reasonable protections against frivolous lawsuits) are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections for the police officers we send out to protect our communities and who often deal with the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no backup. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open up officers to personal liabilities the likes of which they cannot withstand. That is a standard that that makes no sense and are unnecessary as current laws today adequately address any overreach by law enforcement officers.

I am also demanding that this bill be debated in the light of day and not in the cover of darkness. If you have to resort to sneaking a debate and vote in the middle of the night, then I assert it is "prima facie" a bad bill and "prima facie" bad faith on your part as my Representative. In addition, S.2800 failed to follow the normal and appropriate legislative process of holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and experts. The glaring question is "Why"? What is the Legislature so

afraid of? It is an abrogation of your duty to your constituents not to listen to them and to consider what they want before you vote.

In summary, this bill is ill conceived, and quite frankly, it is a cornucopia of drivel. If you could set aside for one moment your partisan loyalties, perhaps you will admit to yourself that it is a bad bill and bad policy. Further, how can you or any other Representative reform something of which you know little. Until and unless you have taken substantive police training, I would again ask that you oppose this bill. While I agree that some policing reform should be addressed (good policing should always be evolving as new things are learned) but passing a poor bill for the sake of passing a bill is not in the best interest of the good people of Massachusetts.

I would also encourage you and all your colleagues in the House to perhaps live in a poor urban community with a high crime rate for one month before you decide to change something about which I am going to assume you have little to no knowledge or experience.

For all the reasons stated above, I ask that you oppose this bill.

Sincerely,  
Ann Ragosta

From: Carol Y Mallory <cmallory107@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:41 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,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[From: Goc, Jonathan <JGoc@CityofMelrose.org>](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=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=GgWxHQjz5da2nJnfOIYbaq74CO9jlmvPhbfg_Vnd8m4&s=4fLegun1tLROy-9L8OW_jrzZ3_Y4rohokhUFQ0uA4xg&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:40 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill S2820

To: Chair Aaron Michlewitz

Chair Claire Cronin

As a police officer in Massachusetts for 25 years I simply do not understand why this controversial and complex bill (S2820) is

considered to be "immediately necessary" and "declared to be an emergency law, necessary for the immediate preservation of the

public safety." At what point in time did this subject matter become a public safety emergency in the State of Massachusetts?

Please consider delaying the passage of this bill as much further discussion is needed to pass a just bill, which should protect the rights of

all mentioned within the bill.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Sgt. Jonathan Goc

Melrose Police Department

781-979-4485

Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail message is intended to be received only by persons entitled to receive the confidential information it may contain. E-mail messages may contain information that is confidential and legally privileged. Please do not read, copy, forward, or store this message unless you are an intended recipient. If you have received this message in error, please forward it to the sender and delete it completely from your computer system.

From: Brian Lenfest <user@votervoice.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:32 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,

Brian Lenfest  
18 Whittier St  
Melrose, MA 02176  
lenfestlaw@hotmail.com

From: Rebecca Zama <Rebeccanoellezama@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:35 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,

Rebecca Zama  
18 Whittier St  
Melrose, MA 02176  
Rebeccanoellezama@gmail.com

From: Rick and Joan Sawler <rjsawler@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:39 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform S2820

Please STOP this reform. We ask you vote this down immediately.

Richard and Joan Sawler

112 Fuller Street

Halifax, MA 02338

781.754.0007

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=b-Y0dMYeArPl2IVmQyL2emmsixOSukBCSPV00JY039Y&s=SYoD22puIH2oDxE0xK6TCCebPoD41YEH3ASrebRA3iE&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=b-Y0dMYeArPl2IVmQyL2emmsixOSukBCSPV00JY039Y&s=SYoD22puIH2oDxE0xK6TCCebPoD41YEH3ASrebRA3iE&e=>)> for Windows 10

From: Susan Rizzo <[susanrizzo47@gmail.com](mailto:susanrizzo47@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:39 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: Conner Davis <connermdavis1@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:39 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Written Testimony: Reforming Police Standards

Hello, my name is Conner Davis with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 21 Garland Avenue, Apartment 2, Malden, MA 02148. I am writing to urge the House to pass police reform that includes:

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

Thank you very much.

Conner Davis

connermdavis1@gmail.com

From: pchattert <pchattert@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:38 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,

Patricia Chatterton

Sent from my Sprint Samsung Galaxy S8.

From: Robert Parr <rparr3491@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony on Police Reform Bill

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

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

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

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

Robert Parr

29 Compass Circle, Boylston

From: chrislipiec <chrislipiec@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:38 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,

Christopher M. Lipiec  
245 Tom Swamp Rd  
PETERSHAM MA 01366  
chrislipiec@aol.com

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Marc Roy <proy\_99@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Marc Roy, 125 Winter Street, Clinton, proy\_99@yahoo.com

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

<[From: Katie <kdesq99@aol.com>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=aKNjdv8DKUkg11EOfXYmLH9oWuL4XIqDEyHNE8PGlKI&s=Q5hUVL0C PmWrfywtlsEWFoQapUJXEZRJOqwXtH3ldR4&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:37 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820

As a registered voter in the State of Massachusetts I would ask you to read my testimony and understand where I, as well as many others are coming from when voicing our opinions. I am a firefighter in the City of Worcester and my husband is a police officer for the same city. We currently work combined over 100 hours serving our community of underserved citizens as well as those that are abled bodies in all aspects. I am currently assigned to the Community Risk Reduction and Public Education Unit. I, on a daily basis, work with the police department as well as many other city agencies to improve the quality of life for all those citizens underserved including those referred to in this bill as the African Americans and the communities of color. Our impact on these communities as first responders often go unnoticed because we fail in commending ourselves for our own improvement and accomplishments in connecting these citizens to the needed services, since "that is our job". Resources are available for those that want help. We as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts do not need to shift funds from the police as there is an abundance of grants being worked on and many agencies and services already available to assist these underserved members of our communities that want to be helped. We work diligently everyday hand in hand with the police department to assist these members of the community to find the resources that each sole needs. Massachusetts has some of the most prestigious police departments in this country. I have been able to see this first hand on many occasions, not only in the city but on the state level as well. The actions of one officer, so egregiously horrific, in another part of the country should not be an example of all of our officers. Our country has fought for freedom and we should not be punished for the actions of others. We as first responders representing the City of Worcester and the State of Massachusetts take each call as its own, whether it's a sick elderly person, a hurt child, a victim of abuse, a drug deal gone bad, everyone is given the greatest care possible for the best outcome for life. Training academies for the police in Massachusetts have produced some of the greatest Officers in the country. Under no circumstances is there a need to review these standards. Records of such training are kept and trainings are remediated as deemed needed after investigations have been done and officers have been found to be in need of such. Police and Fire departments have extensive trainings in the areas of disabilities and mental health issues as we deal with these patients daily. The police departments have worked with great efforts to utilize the system to give access to the sick/disabled/mentally ill persons we encounter rather than placing them under arrest for criminal activity. Training officers from Massachusetts are constantly attending seminars and trainings to keep up with new methods of policing as well as dealing with the sick and criminals and adjust their academy and in service training to reflect such.

Our police officers and firefighters and other labor unions in the Commonwealth have worked so hard in reaching agreements with their respective cities and towns through collective bargaining. These contracts have proven to be fair and respected by both sides. Removing this right would flaw the system we ALL stand behind. As a civilian, we do not understand these trainings and therefore should not be predicting the methods of dealing with each situation as a civilian we would not preform surgery or tell a surgeon how to operate. Protection given to

each professional occupation should not be taken away as it has been given as a result of need and foregoing of something. I ask that you keep in place the Qualified Immunity Act, Due process and collective bargaining rights of our unions and keep a board that evaluates a member of one occupation to those in that occupation since legal standards usually state what a reasonable person in that profession would do.

Thanks you for your time and efforts in reading my testimony,

Katie Harrington, Esq.  
Worcester Fire  
Community Risk Reduction/Public Education Unit

From: Tima <akadethpaenmuan@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:36 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony on 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,

Akadeth Paenmuan

43 W. Summit St. #7

South Hadley MA

Akadethpaenmuan@yahoo.com

From: Emilia <emiroz725@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Barbara Webb <barb4134@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

Dear Sir,

I respectfully ask a delay on this bill until a public hearing can be held. The rush to get this bill passed in the wee hours of the morning, without input of the taxpayers directly effected, is appalling. To say voters are disappointed in this underhanded move is an understatement. There are are far too many concerns in this bill that need conversation and explanation. Elected officials are voted to represent ALL residents of this great state. The fact that a great number of us feel neglected and ignored is a disgraceful and troubling for the future of Massachusetts.

Respectfully,  
Barbara Barrett- Webb  
Sent from my iPad  
From: Bill Gillmeister <bylawbill@calltoorder.us>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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,

Bill Gillmeister  
Call To Order Governance Services  
8 Kimball St.  
Brookfield, MA 01506  
508-344-6325  
bylawbill@calltoorder.us  
www.calltoorder.us

From: Jessica Needham <jneedham1711@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

To whom it may concern,



My name is Jessica Gillan and I am resident of Abington. My husband is also a law enforcement officer in our town of Abington.

I write to you as the House takes up S2800, 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, today. The following amendments are incredibly important to me and my friends and family, many of whom have also written to you. I hope that you will join in adopting the following amendments:

- (1) Amendment 26: Revocation or Non-Renewal shall be by 2/3s vote (we should be advocating that this be changed to a 3/4 vote, and it is our understanding that Senator Tarr will be doing so)
- (2) Amendment 48: State Police Colonel
- (3) Amendment 77: Discipline Changes for State Police
- (4) Amendment 114: Representation on POSAC
- (5) Amendment 116: Due Process (strike out "within the appointing authority or the committee" so that our current rights to appeal including arbitration stays in place)
- (6) Amendment 126: Changing "a preponderance of the" to "clear and convincing"
- (7) Amendment 129: Definition of Accreditation
- (8) Amendments 74 and 137: Special Commission to Study Qualified Immunity

This bill would cause a mass exodus of good police officers in our state to relocate to a state that supports them, cause those officers nearing retirement to retire early and cause other officers to leave for private security jobs. The state of Massachusetts would no longer be a safe place for many to raise their families if this bill were to pass as is.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope we can count on you to support the law enforcement officers and their families of Massachusetts.

Jessica Gillan  
Abington, MA

From: ronald Hale <blackshoe@charter.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:34 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,

Ronald Hale  
6 West Colonial Rd  
Wilbraham, MA. 01095  
blackshoe@charter.net

From: Sherryfalvey <falveyssherry@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform immunity clause.

I just sent an email expressing my concern however I am including my phone number as well. (508). 234-5999  
From: Stacy Matewsky <smatewsky@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:33 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform bill!

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Stacy Matewsky and I live at 29 Ellisville Rd Plymouth MA. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center and am a CO I. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the

opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

**Qualified Immunity:** Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to 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,  
Stacy Matewsky

Sent from my iPhone From: Kyle Gosson <goose1871@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:33 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820 Opposition

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Kyle Gosson and I live at 763 Read Street, Somerset, Massachusetts. 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 floodgates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

????????? ?????????? ?????????????????? ??????????????: 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,  
Kyle Gosson

From: Marc Roy <proy\_99@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:32 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony

\* As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the

recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment

of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting,

as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive

force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections

such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many

ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and

women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage.

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

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

(2) Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers.

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Marc Roy, 125 Winter Street, Clinton, Proy\_99@yahoo.com

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

<<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https->

3A\_\_overview.mail.yahoo.com\_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIsl6rchf\_GkGDD&m=m-Y9NXcR7F9nNgIOThw-ktF9mab6oUYdIQAL0vRHN94&s=bWxykt6pwggGYNC1Q-OYRJ8xXvagOrekCF3Uvxic3rQ&e=>

From: georgejason31@yahoo.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Jason George and I live in Dracut, MA <x-apple-data-detectors://2> . I work as a police officer for Dracut Police. 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,

Jason George

Sent from my iPhone

From: theo santos <qualityautodetailing@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:31 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Attention Chair Michelwitz and Chair Cronin

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Theodore Santos and I live at 195 Kennedy Street Fall River, MA. I work at Bristol County Sheriff's Office and am a Corrections Officer of seven 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,  
Theodore Santos

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[rosiebeaudry@gmail.com](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.onelink.me_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fw1-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-3DEmailSignature&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=TfoY9HSB19uKCeSgCVoFIZlWeCItbCE4_XKeyvTXrBs&s=K386jj-i5Z_jGSowG4lkHqU0iLo_8DGjDLOSbc4EswI&e=></a><br/>From: Rosemary Beaudry-Rocker <<a href=)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:31 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800 Policing Reform Bill

If this Bill is passed into law. It will allow criminals to personally sue Officer's. Directly affecting their families. We need to protect our Officers, their jobs & families. As they risk their lives everyday protecting the community.

Law enforcement officers were hired by the Mayor who represents the City. Responsible to reinforce the law and protect the public.  
From: [jason\\_carabello@msn.com](mailto:jason_carabello@msn.com)  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:31 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Lovely, Joan B. (SEN); Speliotis, Theodore - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform concerns

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



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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Jason Carabello

36 Harrison ave Peabody MA 01960

Jason\_carabello@msn.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: Devhan Correia <dcorreia91@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:28 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Opposition to Bill 2800

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Devhan Correia and I live in Fall River, MA. I work at the Bristol County Sheriff's Office and am a Corrections Officer and graduating from the SEMPTA police academy for deputy sheriff. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2800. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed 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 Devhan Correia #811

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\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=KbJJTKzd1Wo0S2wvxhSq9M65e-QYc9o3E9SjlS0UVB0&s=qcLzUL7T-PJ1zKuEgMVWV7PS-0bHsujyZU1tckI0vPU&e=>

From: Terry Jezak <terryjezak@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Theresa Jezak. I am residing in Dracut, MA. I am a retired manager of Shamrock Liquors in Haverhill, MA. 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,

Theresa Jezak

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad  
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\_\_overview.mail.yahoo.com\_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGIinjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_ggq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=rcnbClHRTkmUOdEWtDyq3bu5todST0o-TF-eeb5spkk&s=S7D\_mdjoBVDQDg2ga9qJdzRJCncOmUQHbv5bgqc3ers&e=>

From: Karen Ryan <karenjezakryan@hotmail.com> on behalf of Karen Ryan <karenjezakryan@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:30 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Re: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Karen Ryan and I live at 25 Nevada Road, Tyngsborough, MA . I work at Ryan Automotive Service. 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,

Karen Ryan

From: Timothy Menton <tmenton@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Chairman,

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

My name is Timothy Brian Menton and I reside at 59 Newell Road, Newton MA (617) 869-9377.

I am writing to you today to express my opposition to any change in Qualified Immunity for Police, Firefighters, Nurses, etc. These essential employees have the toughest jobs in our society as displayed a few short months ago during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic. They all must act quickly and without hesitation in order to complete their professions safely.

To undercut or cause them to second guess their actions due to possible frivolous litigation while working is downright dangerous. It will cause Police Officers to be hurt/killed. To think that "ambulance chasers" will not seek out clients in order to file suits against the above mentioned Heroes is naive.

I implore you to consider how professional the Massachusetts Law Enforcement community is. We do not have the rampant problems found in other parts of the country. This bill will only further victimize lower income communities because Police will take on a more reactive approach to their jobs. Gangs and violent offenders will take over these already marginalized communities. The good residents of these communities will fear for their lives and the safety of their children. We already can see an example of this occurring in New York City. Police reform can and will happen however this bill is far over reaching and will have severely negative consequences for Law Enforcement and the communities they serve.

Schools should share whether a student is affiliated or is an active gang member with the Police. If not, recruitment in our schools and violence in schools will only increase. Schools will be a safe haven for gangs.

This knee jerk reaction bill will cause good Police to leave the profession and will further scare away potential recruits in a profession that has already seen a decline in qualified applicants due to the "war on Police".

Our Police need help and any and all training can only be beneficial to them but please do not handcuff them and prevent them from doing their job which in turn will bring about increases in crime and violence throughout this great Commonwealth.

Thank you for taking the time to hear me.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Timothy B. Menton

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Sherryfalvey <falveyssherry@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform immunity clause

This should not be taken away from the police for the simple reason that it will give criminals the upper hand making it impossible for a police officer to perform his duty to the utmost capability causing innocent citizens to be vulnerable and susceptible to the criminal element. How can justice be enforced when an officers hands are handcuffed?From:

Sargent, Steven M. <SargentS@worcesterma.gov>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:29 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Worcester Police Chief

To all

Steve Sargent here and I'm the Chief of Police for the city of Worcester.

I hope all is well! I wanted to take a quick moment about the pending legislation that will fundamentally alter policing as we know it in Massachusetts.

I am sure you are receiving a lot of commentary so I will keep my thoughts brief. As you know, I have been a police officer in Worcester for 34 years. Simply put, forcing through this legislation will, as I see it, have three fundamental unintended consequences:

1. There will be an exponential increase of violence within the more urban Massachusetts communities.
2. Poorer, inner-city neighborhoods will suffer a disproportionate level of this violence and be comprehensively and negatively effected beyond higher levels of violence.
3. A Massachusetts police officer will be seriously hurt or killed because of the inherent doubt of action that some of these amendments will result in.

While any professional police officer or administrator welcomes a thoughtful analysis of police practice, policy, and procedure, this process can not be conducted on an artificial timetable without the opportunity to understand fully the result of all proposed changes.

Remember the silent majority is still the majority.

Please feel free to contact me to discuss.

Office number

508-799-6811

Thanks

Steven M Sargent  
Chief of Police  
Worcester Ma

From: Steven Kolodziej <kskolod@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:28 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,

From: Rick Page <rickpage2004@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:28 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 iPhone  
From: Beth Hellman <bhellman2@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill S.2820

Dear House of Representatives,

My name is Beth Hellman and I live at 25 Lexington Ave. in Methuen, MA. I write to express my concern about and opposition to Bill 2820. This bill puts law enforcement and citizens in danger!

My husband, Brian Hellman, is a Methuen Police Officer. He has several awards/citations hanging on our wall. He has received "Police officer of the Year" in Methuen two times as well as life saving awards and awards for going above and beyond the call of duty. As your constituent and the wife of a police officer, I write to you today to express my 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.

Defunded police, and limiting the ability to identify and act on crime before it happens, or stop crime in progress will result in less safe environments. It is the responsibility of our state government to support police policies that ensure that we continue to have educated officers that have quality training. We need to offer our law enforcement the respect they deserve and teach our community and our children to do the

same. This bill will backfire and result in emboldened criminals, poorly staffed departments, poorly trained officers and police who may not act with conviction because they fear retaliation. This will create more problems than can be imagined. If being a police officer becomes more dangerous than it already is you will get more retirements sooner and less qualified applicants going forward. Please do not put people at risk by passing this bill as is, which limits police response by removing qualified immunity and encourages criminals to fight back knowing police response has been stifled.

Like most of my neighbors, I am dismayed at the scarcity of respect and protections extended to police officers in the 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. The disrespect they are being shown is very upsetting. As a wife of a police officer, I worry about my husband going to work more now than ever before. He is not only a police officer, he is a husband, father of three small children, brother, son, and friend. I think people are forgetting that police officers are real people with real lives and families. They go to work and put their own lives at risk to protect others. They are being portrayed negatively in the media. I don't think it is right to rush this bill just to appease a group of people that are against law enforcement. The actions of a few in another state, should not force this to be pushed through so quickly without the input of the appropriate people. This bill will have serious consequences

not only for police officers but for the citizens they protect. I again implore you to reject this bill and to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve. Our police officers do not make the laws, but they are tasked with enforcing them. If we, as citizens of Massachusetts want to be safe, we need to support the effort of our officers so they can do the best job possible.

Sincerely,

Beth Hellman

From: Henry Rush <rushh7@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800 Bill

I would like a NO vote entered on Bill S2800.

Thank You,

Henry J.Rush Jr.  
10 Walker Road  
Westwood, Ma. 02090  
rushh7@verizon.net  
781-326-0309

From: Jessica Tahiraj <jesslp44@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Do not support S2800/S2820

I do not support S2800 or S2820 that makes us frontline workers vulnerable! We will organize a walk out if this gets passed then you will not have doctors, nursing, PTs, OTs, EMTs, firefighters, police etc!!!!

Thank you!

Jessica Tahiraj

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Teaghan Souza <teaghansouza@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Teaghan Souza. I am from Swansea, MA and my father is a sergeant at the police station in our town. I am very worried about the bill that the senate is currently proposing. While there is a lot of good things within this bill that can make our state a lot safer, I believe that there are still some things within this bill as well that will put more people at risk rather than helping them. While there have been many deaths of Black Americans while they were in police custody, there have also been a large number of deaths of police officers who were killed in the line of duty. I believe that if this law is put into place that the number of those who were killed in the line of duty will rise. I already worry every day when my father leaves for work that he may not come back and that I may never get to see him again. Now with the possibility of this bill being passed, not only am I even more worried that he may never come home, but that now he could lose his job at any given point in time or he can be frivolously sued for acting in good faith while on duty. Police Officers should not have to hesitate, stop, and think "Will I be sued for doing this?" before they act. If they have to do this, there will be so many injuries and deaths caused. While I get that you all may have some good intentions when thinking about this bill, it can and will affect so many people negatively including YOU and your family. I do believe that there should be some change to our legal system, but I don't think that it should be done like this. I hope that you all will vote down this bill tomorrow and will be able to address it during a time that is not so controversial and allow public opinion into the bill. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Teaghan Souza  
Concerned Massachusetts Citizen  
978-689-5970  
From: Donna Balich <donna.balich@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Donna Balich and I live at 151 Pine Hill Road, Chelmsford, MA . I work at Smith & Nephew, Inc as a Global, Category Manager in Procurement. 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,

Donna Balich  
From: Eva G <e\_m\_g2001@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:25 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,  
Eva Gedrich

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Melissa Balich <mbalich@worchester.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Melissa Balich and I live in Brighton, MA. I work at Bear Mountain Nursing Facility in Reading MA as an Occupational Therapist. 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,

Melissa Balich  
From: Meghan Balich <meghanbalich88@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Meghan Balich and I live in Chelmsford, MA. I am a young professional and 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,  
Meghan Balich

From: etol <etol@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

Please take your time to have your family, friends and all others who support police and correction officers, to copy this post and send it to: Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Edward O'Leary and I live at 392 Belmont Street in East Bridgewater. I am a retired Randolph Police Lieutenant and am a small businessman. 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,  
Edward T. O'Leary

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

From: Mikayla George <mikaylageorge1@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Mikayla George and I live in Dracut, MA <x-apple-data-detectors://2> . I work at Bridges memory assisted living in Andover. 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,

Mikayla George

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Julie Leduc <leducjm@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:23 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,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android  
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-  
3A\_\_go.onelink.me\_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-  
5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fwl-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-  
3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-  
3DEmailSignature&d=DwMCAQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-  
fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoEvGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk  
13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=Jhz8NZ\_ZIJCSizutz0U\_7-  
jH2CSTgQv3alMnfWcpXuE&s=uSVuM82vpT5EZY9-OwnIznEpr5UxHmZ\_CJ\_9lRUXhLs&e=>  
From: Shannon Ryan <shannon.ryan@student.fairfield.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Qualified Immunity

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Shannon Ryan and I live in Tyngsboro, MA. I will be a rising senior at Fairfield University this fall. 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,

Shannon Ryan

From: beth eskenas <beskenas@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:23 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,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

<[I support the Reform, Shift and Build Act \(S.2800\) to reform the MA police and adjust resources to be equitable to POC communities.](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=fgi3gRNcvvHNdFZhqukNBMHYJjVJhGTvHZdJbhEv7nU&s=dXczKH8L5orAicIaK8hHS1kCyFeu0zydBsJEYbWqD4E&e=></a><br/>From: Bronia Bogen-Grose <bronia86@gmail.com><br/>Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:22 PM<br/>To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)<br/>Subject: reform, shift and build act s.2800</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Bronia Bogen-Grose  
From: Michael O'Donnell <mikeod021@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:22 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Action

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,

Michael O'Donnell

Resident

9 Beatty st.

Canton, MA 02021 <x-apple-data-detectors://3/1>

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mark Daly <halligan26@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:21 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

To the Honorable Massachusetts House of Representatives,

I hope my family and I will be represented in your session considering the Policing Bill.

I am a 47 y/o male father of 3 children under 10. I have been a firefighter emt for almost 18 years now and have been active in my Union and the collective bargaining process.

Let me clearly state that in the 5 contracts I have negotiated we have heard the Towns concerns over finances and wages and as a Union have agreed to make the concessions at the table necessary to safeguard our members by adding staffing in our CBA and adding certifications. We have a cap on sick time at retirement , a very strict drug and alcohol policy, early retirement notification and employment contingent on maintaining licensing.

I am very concerned that "knee jerk reaction" legislation is being pushed through and panders to a small group "out for blood".

It's sad that in the great State of Massachusetts that Democracy is falling by the wayside.

No one condones the horrific act by the Minneapolis officer that resulted in the death of George Floyd.

I'm sure Massachusetts has had issues on certain calls in the past with "use of force".

I also have a more in depth knowledge of Regional teams like NEMLEC, who are geographic teams of Police Officers from separate communities that train with tactical equipment for unique events including armed,

barricaded individuals and the like. These teams are a necessity as an option when all other options fail. Local Departments probably do not need that level of gear.

This legislation will have a dire impact on recruitment of new police officers and potentially firefighters throughout our State. Standards are fine, egregious and negligent behavior should be disciplined up to and including termination. Unilateral changes to Policing only endangers citizens in the future. No doubt the Criminals will benefit from these changes and new requirements. We as a society have come close to the brink of Anarchy and I am concerned what will quell civil upheaval in the future.

As a taxpayer I want the best possible candidate to be hired as a police officer to protect my town and family no matter their gender, race or creed.

We need policing, we need to stop allowing civil unrest. Policing can be reformed but please keep in mind how rioting like we saw at the foot of the Statehouse needs to be prevented and stopped when it begins.

It was disheartening and disgusting to see the rioting and looting being allowed to happen. I went to high school on Tremont street, I know the area well.

This State and our Country should tread lightly before making unilateral changes through legislation in a reactionary way. Racism is unfortunately an issue in many fascists of life. I would clearly like to state that race is not an issue in my home and my children are taught to see equal human beings through their eyes.

My son has Autism so our family's a little more in tune with not judging people based on anything other than what you personally experience with that person as an individual.

Lastly, I would also like the Representatives to consider the opportunity the Mass Municipal Association is now trying to exploit by jamming their ambitions into this bill. They are jumping on the bandwagon not to support the cause but to tip the scales in their favor as far as negotiating, collectively bargaining and discipline however they see fit without recourse.

The Massachusetts House and Senate Memberships wouldn't legislate these changes for their own bodies please don't be fooled by the intentions of the MMA.

I'm a firefighter/emt, who has actively responded to numerous COVID-19 calls during the pandemic because that is my duty I have sworn to provide. (as my colleagues and I have done through Ebola, H1N1, triple E and all new challenges that come along) To now find my career under attack and my livelihood jeopardized because of a Minneapolis Police Officer is absurd, unfair and unjust.



Police and Fire jobs/careers are dynamic and individuals are expected to act to the best of their ability to mitigate the emergency even though that emergency maybe something they've never encountered or trained for.

Please tread lightly, these footprints could last generations.

Thank you for the Consideration.

Mark Daly

Bedford 01730From: estelle0009@googlemail.com

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:21 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S2820

To the members of the Legislature,

My name is Estelle D'Amico and I am the wife of a Massachusetts State Police Trooper. Thank you for taking the time to read this and for having a public forum to discuss the topic of police reform unlike the Senate. I urge you not to accept the Senate bill, which was done without public input, and rushed. Member of the State Police are not against police reform and believe like any profession there is always room for improvement. Most concerning from the bill from the Senate is the eroding of qualified immunity. Every government official in Massachusetts is covered by qualified or absolute immunity. To take this away from those in policing would be cruel. They are forced to make split second decisions to protect themselves and others from violent criminals. They should not have to worry about their financial livelihood every time they go to work. Qualified immunity does not shield them from illegal acts. When someone in police breaks the law, they are held accountable. It does protect them from frivolous lawsuits and provides peace of mind when performing a dangerous job. Those of you in the Legislature are protected by absolute immunity, a higher level of protection then police, for actions you take over the course of weeks and months. To strip protection from police for actions they are forced to make in seconds is wrong.

Furthermore, the State Police Association of Massachusetts put forward a request for several common-sense amendments to the Senate Bill that would give law enforcement a voice in reforming policing. To reform policing you must include those doing the job. They only ask for a voice in this process so that the final product benefits everyone. I have included the State Police Associates recommendations below for you and urge you to consider them.

Again, thank you for taking the time to hear my voice and I trust that the Legislature will provide a more balanced and thoughtful bill then the one passed through the Senate.

Respectfully,

Estelle D'Amico

617-901-2105

48 - State Police Colonel - Filed by Senator Rush

This amendment seeks to retain the rank of Colonel coming from within the ranks of the MSP. It states that the Colonel could also fill the dual role as a Superintendent (as is the case today), and if a civilian Superintendent was to be appointed, it greatly increases the requirements of a Superintendent, and retains the position of Colonel from within the ranks of the MSP. Further, if such an outside appointment was to be made, this amendment would ensure that the appointee would have the basic elements required to command and operate a diverse organization such as ours and would double the minimum years' experience required from 10 to 20 years.

74 - Qualified Immunity - Filed by Senator Tran

This amendment seeks to amend the bill in SECTION 10 by striking subsection (c) of section 11I. The following would be struck - "In an action under this section, qualified immunity shall not apply to claims for 431 monetary damages except upon a finding that, at the time the conduct complained of occurred, 432 no reasonable defendant could have had reason to believe that such conduct would violate the 433 law."

Complimentary to this amendment is #137 (filed by Senator Velis), which also strikes the Qualified Immunity section and adds a special commission to study Qualified Immunity.

"Qualified immunity balances two important interests—the need to hold public officials accountable when they exercise power irresponsibly and the need to shield officials from harassment, distraction, and liability when they perform their duties reasonably." Pearson v. Callahan.

77 - Discipline Changes - Filed by Senator Tarr

This amendment moves to amend the bill in SECTION 18 by striking in line 621 the words "1 year" and replacing therewith- "45 days". This would allow for our officers to seek an appeal of an administrative suspension without pay within 45 days, not the 1 year as drafted. This is an important Due Process piece for our officers and grants the Department of State Police more than the required 30 days to complete their investigation.

114 - Representation on POSAC - Filed by Senator Rush

This Amendment move to amend the bill in SECTION 6, by striking lines 164-192 in Section 221 and inserting in place thereof:-

"Section 221. There shall be an independent police officer standards and accreditation committee within the executive office of public safety and

security consisting of: 13 members appointed by the governor, 1 of whom shall be the Attorney General or her nominee, 1 of whom shall be the Colonel the Massachusetts State Police (or a sworn Officer designated by the Colonel), 1 of whom shall be the Commissioner of the Boston Police Department (or a sworn Officer designated by the Commissioner), 1 of whom shall be a chief of police of a mid-sized municipality who is a person of color to be nominated by the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association Incorporated, 1 of whom shall be the President of the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, Inc., 1 of whom shall be the President of the State Police Association of Massachusetts, 1 of whom shall be the President of the Boston Police Patrolmen's Association, 1 of whom shall be a sworn Police Officer nominated by the Massachusetts Law Enforcement Policy Group, 1 of whom shall be a retired judge, 1 of whom shall be a Professor of Criminal Justice from a Massachusetts College or University; 1 of whom shall be an expert in the field of use of force, 1 of whom shall be an expert in the investigation of firearms discharge; and 1 other member; provided, however, that non-law enforcement members shall have experience with or expertise in law enforcement practice and training, criminal law, or the criminal justice system. Appointments to the police officer standards and accreditation committee shall be for terms of 3 years and until their successors are appointed. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall be filled by the original appointing authority for the balance of the unexpired term. Members of the police officer standards and accreditation committee shall be compensated for work performed for the police officer standards and accreditation committee at such rate as the secretary of administration and finance shall determine and shall be reimbursed for their expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties."

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Levine, Susan <SusanLe@lchealth.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:19 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony for expungement

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 I 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 I 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.

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. 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. 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 I write you to champion these clarifications. 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 for a variety of circumstances, and since the overwhelming number of those young people grow up and move on with their lives, I am hoping to make clarifying changes to the law. Expungement for youth also may influence better mental health outcomes due to the decrease in negative police interactions, reduced perception of discrimination, and improved employment opportunities. (MIT. Health Impact Assessment July 2016)

I 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; 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,

Susan West Levine, MPH

Chief Executive Officer

Lowell Community Health Center

161 Jackson Street

Lowell, MA 01852

978.746.7870

A Community Caring for a Community

Visit [www.lchealth.org](http://www.lchealth.org) for events, stories, and more, celebrating 50 years of cultivating health in Greater Lowell.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE This message and any included attachments are intended only for the use of the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and protected from disclosure under applicable law. Any review, disclosure, transmission, dissemination, copying or other use of this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete the related message. Thank you.

From: Lucas Rich <rucas.lich@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform, Shift, and Build Act thoughts

Hello, my name is Lucas Rich. I have lived in Boston for 7 years now

I am sending this email to send all the support I possibly can for the Reform, Shift, and Build Act (S.2800)

The state of the country is no mystery right now, and positive change is long overdue. This will be a move in the right direction, it will help ALL people and ALL residents of our state.

Please support this Act and make it a reality, it is necessary for the well being of our communities.

Lucas

From: Jeffrey White <jwhitenpd@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: To House Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

To House Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I am writing to you to express my concerns and absolute frustration with the police reform bills 2820 and 2800 that have been circulating around the House of Representatives as well as the Senate. First let me say that I am appalled to say the least on how Police Officers are being treated regarding this matter. Look at the numbers and you tell me if Massachusetts has a problem! Massachusetts officers are some of the best in the country and do their job to a high standard.

Let me start by saying Police officers are some of the most under appreciated men and women in this country and these two proposed bills prove it! How do you expect someone to do the job as a police officer which is already hard enough with no qualified immunity. How could law makers, leaders, and everyone else for that matter expect someone that already puts everything on the line to do so without protection from being sued. This bill will have so many unexpected consequences! We are not talking complete immunity rather just qualified immunity which means you must be acting in good faith. Being racist is not good faith That's plain

and simple. So why is there such a push to remove a protection for our police officers? You can have accountability without taking away something that's a protective measure to these men and women.

We live in a society that puts athletes and musicians on a pedestal paying them millions while the men and woman of law enforcement, firemen and the military are risking their lives only to get shit on (lack of a better term). Why are we attacking the very men and women that protect us day in and day out? When is America going to wake up ? When are we going to learn that knee jerk reactions don't solve problems it makes them worse?

Lastly the unintended consequences of this bill will be ever lasting. We will lose not only great men and women in the profession, we will lose protection which should be afforded to them so that they can do their jobs and keep these streets safe! Where is the rush? This happened with the juvenile reform bill which tied the hands of law enforcement and still does to this day. Let's think before we act and get a real solution! Training officers is the real solution!

Respectfully,  
Jeff White

Sent from my iPhone  
From: D BRIAN MCDONALD <donkay3@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:17 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: Paige Watson <paigenwatson@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:15 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Written testimony

Dear Senator,

My name is Paige Watson and I live at 111 Grove Street Randolph, 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,

Paige Watson

From: thomas duffy <tduffypats12@gmail.com>



Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Fwd: Police reform S 2820

My name is Thomas B Duffy II and I am a proud lifelong resident of Worcester, MA. I have been a police officer in the city of Worcester for 23 years. I also served in the United States Marine Corps prior to being a police officer. I am deeply troubled by the manner in which this process has been conducted. I also take great issue with the complete disrespect this profession has been subjected to. We take great pride everyday to go out there and do our job and make the city the safest best place to live it can be. We deeply care about our city and its residents. I would like to go in greater detail, but I will focus on this bill.

I have several issues with this bill to include the fact that it is an anti labor bill. Many of these working conditions we collectively bargained for in good faith. The fact that there is no due process. Every American is granted due process and you want to take that away from police officers. The issue of doing away with qualified immunity, and that we as a profession will not help make up the POSAC board. These issues are completely unacceptable.

I believe this bill is a very dangerous piece of legislation. I would also like you to think about the severe negative consequences this bill would have on the citizens of this Commonwealth. If you think that this bill would make our State safer or be in the best interest of its residents, I strongly suggest you think of all the negative impact it would have and vote No!

Thomas B Duffy II

Worcester Police Dept

508 868-9300

From: Nelson Curral <nelsoncurral@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:14 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Nelson Curral and I live in New Bedford MA. I work at Bristol County Sheriffs Office 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,  
Nelson Curral

Sent from my iPhone  
From: JEAN BURNAND <jeanburnand21@msn.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800 needs editing

Please consider re-evaluating this Bill. I agree with the ban of use of violence, but as a senior citizen living on my own I fear that my safety is in jeopardy. Hold officers and first responders accountable for their actions via choke holds, etc. but do not put my life in jeopardy because an officer won't give me CPR for fear of reprisal. Or a first responder

who won't start an IV in an emergency if needed. If this passes, I will carry in my person and in my vehicle permission to use life saving treatment without fear of reprisal from me or my family.

My son is a firefighter/paramedic and a nurse. Please don't tie his hands. Respectfully,

Jean Burnand

From: Josh Spitaleri <joshspit42@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:14 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Testimony

? Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Joshua Spitaleri and I live in Beverly Ma. I work for the City of Beverly and am a Police Officer & Union Vice President. I also worked at the Suffolk County Sheriffs Department for 4 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,  
Joshua Spitaleri

Vice President BPBA (Patrolmans Union)

Beverly Police Department

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tia Thomson <tiasthomson@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:13 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: I support the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800)

Hi,

I am a resident of Boston, MA and I unequivocally support the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800). The movement that has taken hold of our country (and the world) in the past couple of months has proven that the time for change is now. More than ever before, people are hungry to see real and meaningful action taken by people in power. Simply put, it is 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. Massachusetts needs to be at the forefront of passing progressive legislation to lead the way for the rest of the country.

Thank you,

Tia Thomson

37 Cunard St #2  
Boston, MA 02120  
From: Megan Anderson <meggre32@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:13 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Good Evening

My name is Megan Anderson and I live at 111 Hillside Circle in Hanover. I write to you today with regards to S.2820. This is a bill that has the attention of many in our Commonwealth. Most particularly, it has the attention of Police/Law Enforcement officers, those that love them and those that support them.

I write to you as the wife of an active Weymouth Police Officer and the daughter of a retired Weymouth Police Officer. Growing up as the daughter

of a Police Officer I don't really remember being worried about my father going off to work. It was a different world then. Police Officers were respected and appreciated for the job they did. As the wife of a Police Officer in today's world things are different. Like all police wives, I watch my husband leave and hope and pray that he comes home safely every day. My last words to him every time he leaves are "be careful". The last words our children say to their dad when he leaves are "be safe". In our world this "normal" but not everyone lives in the same world we do, not all wives need to say "be careful" and not all kids have to say "be safe" when their loved one leaves for work.

I also write to you as a member of a larger family - the Blue Family. This week, Wednesday July 15 to be specific, my Blue Family and I remembered one of our own, Sergeant Michael Chesna. On July 15, 2018 this husband, father, son, brother and uncle who just also happened to be a Police Officer was murdered. I will never forget where I was when my husband got the initial call about Mike. I will never forget where I was when I learned that news that Mike had died. I will never forget attending Mike's wake and funeral with my husband, my Blue Family and the Chesna Family. Sitting in St. Mary of the Sacred Heart Church in Hanover with my fellow police wives is something none of us will never forget. A police wake and funeral are things NONE of us ever want to attend again.

As I noted above, S.2820 has caught our attention. There are pieces of S.2820 that are acceptable and appropriate when we think of a bill with a goal of constructive Police/Law Enforcement reform.

Like many, I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards that apply to individual officers. I also support accreditation of police departments. Certification and accreditation both serve as a commitment to excellence in training and promote each individual's and department's maintenance of the highest professional standards. Certification and accreditation also serve to enhance public confidence. Public confidence, and I might offer respect, is critical to police officers being able to do their job on a daily basis. I also support the ban of the use of excessive force by police officers as well as the proposal that every individual officer has the duty to intervene if they witness excessive force. These parts of S.2820 all make sense when we focus on the idea that this bill is about constructive police/law enforcement reform.

S.2820 has also caught our attention because there are pieces of it that do not allow for the fair and unbiased treatment of Police Officers. Most importantly, the removal of Qualified Immunity for Police Officers is unfair and potentially dangerous. Qualified Immunity, as I understand it, does not excuse criminal conduct. It is, instead, a legal protection offered to all public employees and serves as a protection against losing one's home or life savings in a civil suit. As many people know, Police Officers need to make in the moment decisions every day when they put on their uniform. If they don't make those decisions quickly enough they face the very real chance of death or injury. Police Officers CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried

about liability. They CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried about losing the home their family lives in. They CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried about how they will support their loved ones. Is there a chance that Sergeant Michael Chesna chose not to use his weapon on the morning of July 15, 2018 because he was worried that such use would have been viewed as use of excessive force? Was he worried that if he used his weapon he could potentially lose his family's home? The answers to those questions we will never know. It does seem reasonable to assume, however, that had Sergeant Michael Chesna chosen to use his weapon to shoot Emanuel Lopes he would still be here today. He would still be here with his family who miss him every single day. Police Officers need to be able to make quick decisions and act in good faith without fearing that each and every decision they make could lead to a lawsuit against them. Police Officers who are forced to stop, pause and think about potential liability before they act are Police officers whose lives are at risk. The removal of Qualified Immunity should NOT be part of the final police/law enforcement reform package.

As I stated, there are parts of S.2820 that are acceptable and appropriate when we think of a bill with a goal of constructive Police/Law Enforcement reform. The bill as it currently stands before you is NOT acceptable as a total package. If Legislation such as that tied to S.2820 is to be effective, appropriate and just for all citizens of our Commonwealth it takes time along with careful thought and consideration. Reactive and rash decision making do not serve the citizens of our Commonwealth. The early acts in the Senate to rush a vote on this bill and to not study pieces like Qualified Immunity further have been extremely disheartening. I appreciated those Senators who called for more time and for a closer look at the bill in order to produce a product that was fair and just for all citizens of our Commonwealth. I also appreciate the willingness of the House to hear from the citizens of the Commonwealth. Legislation such as S.2820 impacts all citizens so all of those citizens should be allowed to share their thoughts.

In closing, I urge you to take the time that is necessary to make the best decision for ALL citizens of our Commonwealth. We have the some of the most well trained Police/Law Enforcement Officers in the country. They need to be able to do the job they were trained to do in a safe and effective way. I urge you to correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in Law Enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,

Megan Anderson

111 Hillside Circle

Hanover 02339

(781)829-6924

From: laberley@massmed.org  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:12 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Ann Webb; Pam Barra; Joe Golemme  
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: Patricia Schmid <paschmid8@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:12 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,  
Patricia Schmid

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Mary Kathryn Flaherty <marykflaherty@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:12 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Naughton, Harold - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony

Dear Representative Naughton,  
I hope this email finds you well.

First, I would like to thank you for your many years of service to the community. Your thoughtfulness and dedication is much appreciated and respected.

In the past several months the United States has dealt with tremendous upheaval. Every aspect of every citizens life has been impacted. We are facing challenging times socially, educationally, economically, and with access to healthcare. I feel this has brought to the surface many structural problems. One area of concern is the importance of recognizing the value of the disenfranchised; those who lack access to education, healthcare, housing and jobs. It is our job to recognize and address the structural problems that are leading to a collapse in society.

In order to create meaningful change we must take a critical look at ALL the forces that shape society and address each one. While police reform and standards should be examined, it is my belief the police reform presented is not the answer. There exists several fundamental flaws that would prohibit police officers from carrying out their duty safely and effectively. Specifically the loss of qualified immunity. This along with other recommendations, i.e no K9, no rubber bullets, no tear gas or pepper spray, and allowing people to interfere with police officers doing their duties if they see fit, will create a form of "defensive policing" that will undermine the ability of officers to make split second decisions. This is dangerous for all.

We ask men and women who serve across the state to risk their lives daily yet legislation is being presented that puts them at risk.

At no point has any elected official, that I am aware, stood up and recognized that Massachusetts has an educated, well trained police force. At no time, that I'm aware, has an elected official commended the professionalism, compassion, and dedication of the police throughout Massachusetts. It's been too easy to make police the enemy. Law enforcement officers deal with the most tragic, violent, gut wrenching events that affect many vulnerable people. We need to be supportive of the police and not target them with legislature that is based on a visceral



reaction to a public tragedy. I strongly urge you to reject the proposal as presented.

Thanks you for your time,  
Mary K. DeCesare Flaherty, MS  
Resident Clinton MA

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Eric Anderson <elanderson5@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:12 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,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Joe S <jstmartinjr@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2820. This bill 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 this bill:

This bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

This bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted it's own investigation. The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination (see Carney vs Springfield) and constitutional protections against "double-jeopardy".

Qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for the police officers we send out on patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card, or other things for the benefit of them and their families. Good luck with police recruitment.

Thank you,

Joseph St. Martin Jr.

Quincy, MA

jstmartinjr@yahoo.com

From: Nunotte Zama <user@voterveice.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:05 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,

Nunotte Zama  
18 Whittier St  
Melrose, MA 02176  
nzama@aol.com

From: ELLEN JOHNSON <ineson@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

To whom it may concern: I am strongly opposed to the passing of bill S2820. We need to protect our law enforcement officers so that they can do their jobs! All lives matter; which includes our law enforcement officers. Do not tie their hands. Nobody wants a job that offers no support from the people they are suppose to protect. Also, I believe that there will be less interest in our youth aspiring to pursue a career in law enforcement with the passing of this bill and it will hurt our society beyond repair. Please consider this when voting on this bill.

Thank you,

Ellen Johnson, mother and sister of police officers,

22 Cottage Street  
Wilmington, MA 01887

From: Yahoo <carla.orta@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

To whom it may concern,

My name is Carla Orta I live in Weston, Ma with my husband and daughter. I would like the opportunity to speak on S2820.

I have been an EMT in the city of Waltham for just over 20 years. My husband is not only a decorated officer in Waltham but he is a minority. My husband is Hispanic and speaks both English and Spanish. We have devoted our lives and careers to public service. We have both worked extremely hard, my husband even more as english was not his first language. We were both born into extreme poverty and worked tirelessly to Become educated and make a better life for ourselves and our daughter. Can you imagine a Cuban and a girl born onto a farm without a bathroom is now living on Weston, ma. However if you vote to take qualified immunity away from public service employees you will be taking away from all we have worked hard for. Imagine an EMT does CPR on a patient. The patient lives but subsequently a rib was broken in the process of CPR. That patient can now sue that EMT such as myself in civil court.

Im asking you to chose me to speak as to why taking qualified immunity from us puts the public in harms way.

How could you not want to hear from someone that is an EMT with a 25 year veteran police officer husband that is a minority

It's so important for people to understand how this will affect us all.

Sincerely  
Carla Orta  
597 south ave  
Weston, ma  
781-507-1899  
From: Natalie Loureiro <natalieeloureiro@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800)

To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to express my support for the Reform, Shift + Build Act. I support police reform and a more equitable commonwealth for communities of color.

Thank you,

Natalie Loureiro  
Dorchester, MA

--

Natalie Loureiro

From: Susan Thornton <smnthorn@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:08 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,

Reverend Susan Thornton  
From: Laura <lauramurphy79@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:07 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

My wife and I urge you to vote NO. Keep QI for LEO.  
Sent from my iPhone  
From: toothy410@gmail.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820 Testimony

To Whom It May Concern,

I am strongly opposed to many of the components of this bill. Qualified Immunity exists so that Officers who are acting in accordance with their agency's policies and procedures and using the appropriate actions/force based on the situation they are presented with are protected from civil liability. Qualified Immunity doesn't exist to protect officers violating their agency's P&P or using excessive force. I am also opposed to public databases regarding officer complaints.

Should Qualified Immunity disappear officers will no longer be proactive or try to apprehend suspects or violent persons for the very real risk of being sued personally. I honestly believe criminals will be emboldened with the knowledge an officer won't try to apprehend them or put their hands on them. Crime will rise and the innocent public will suffer. Results are already evident in many major cities where officers are taking a hands off approach like the public has called for. Now in those communities leaders are coming forward asking for anti-crime units to be put back in place and more law enforcement.

In law enforcement, unlike many other professions, people can often be left unhappy when an officer is doing "good work". Good work means writing tickets to speeders hoping they slowdown in the future and prevent major crashes resulting in injuries or death. Good work is arresting the spouse who just beat their significant other- even though neither want the police to make an arrest. An Officer does it knowing the next beating could be their last one if they are killed. Good work might mean using lethal force to save someone else's life or your own. Does any officer want to be put in these situations? The answer is no. Sadly, until every citizen abides by the law, police officers need to respond accordingly.

By taking away Qualified Immunity speeders won't be stopped for fear of accusations of bias or profiling. Batterers won't be arrested for fear the couple will accuse the police of using excessive force, even if the appropriate amount was used. A lawsuit could be filed against the officer even if it was found the police acted accordingly. Officers and innocent citizens will die at higher rates when an Officer hesitates to use the appropriate amount of force in a lethal situation (or perceived lethal situation- the police are not psychics) for fear of their family losing their home and savings... or even just being portrayed in the media as a murderer. I believe Sgt. Michael Chesna lost his life and an innocent woman in 2018 because of the fear of using excessive force as the perpetrator was "only" armed with a rock.

Good officers doing good work and being proactive will generate complaints. I have been a police officer for 12 years in the community I grew up in. Every day I try to serve and protect those in my community to the best of my abilities. I truly care about people and often I am kept up at night wondering if the victims I work with will be okay upon my next shift in. In my career I have generated complaints because people were not happy they were pulled over, placed into protective custody for their own safety when they were highly impaired, and felt discriminated against due to their mental health when I assisted an elderly couple get restraining orders against their abusive adult child struggling with their mental health. Having a database available to the public will place a target on officers more than there already is. It is very easy to find addresses available to the public online. Showing and Officer has a certain amount of complaints will give the false perception the officer is a bad one.

In closing, I respectfully request you do not remove Qualified Immunity and do not have a public database regarding officer complaints as this will jeopardize Officers and their family's safety more than it already is. Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony.

Amy Rando

From: blennon1@verizon.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:06 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Vieira, David - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

To Committee Members;

I am a Retired State Trooper, VERY PROUD OF MY SERVICE, and live in East Falmouth. The Senate passed S2800, 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 with 7 members not voting for the bill as it was passed.

These national incidents of Police aggression did NOT occur in Massachusetts, and this legislation hastily drafted and introduced in several weeks (not months or years), does not reflect the good work that law enforcement does here in Massachusetts.

I'm reaching out to express my dismay, disappointment and strong opposition to Senate bill.2800.

It is now in the House and as a past public servant, please do NOT PASS this Bill. This bill 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 this bill:

In Section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted its own investigation. The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination (see *Carney vs Springfield*) and constitutional protections against "double-jeopardy".

In Section 10, qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for the police officers we send out on patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card, or other things for the benefit of them and their families. Good luck with police recruitment.

Additionally, this bill re-writes sections of the 2018 Criminal Justice Reform Bill (see record expungement and corrections) as well as the Hands-Free law the legislature just adopted. Those bills were signed into law after the normal and appropriate legislative process of filing a bill, holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens, and thoughtful debate over a span of many months. It is inconceivable that the Massachusetts State Senate would attempt this "sleight of hand" trick to re-write those laws with this rushed, bill that will be lightly debated (in the COVID-19 remote sessions) and done behind a smoke-screen of hurried "exigency".

I am a proud voter on Cape Cod, severed over 20 years dedicated to the people of Massachusetts and I ask that you reconsider what the Senate passed and PLEASE, PLEASE DO NOT VOTE HASTILY on these measures for the reasons stated above, and others.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

William P. Lennon

Retired Captain, Massachusetts State Police

25 Longshank Circle, East Falmouth, MA 02536

Cell - 508-922-5139

From: Eric DeCouto <edecouto@comcast.net>







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,

Joanne George

From: harvey tiomkin <lefttyharv@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: jeffreynroy@gmail.com  
Subject: Senate bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Harvey Tiomkin and I live at 43 Wampanoag DR, Franklin, MA, 02038, 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,  
Harvey Tiomkin

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Kathy Lahiff <kklahiff@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:05 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,  
Kathleen K. Lahiff  
From: Scott McAdoo <mcadoo.scott@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Scott McAdoo and I live at 278 Waverly Road, North Andover Massachusetts 01845. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a Correction Officer

with 12 years on the job. 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,

Correction Officer Scott McAdoo  
MCI-Norfolk  
12 years

From: Ryan Caneen <rcaneen@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Ferguson, Kimberly - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

To Whom It May Concern,

As a citizen of the Commonwealth, I would like to voice my displeasure with the Bill that the Senate recently passed in regards to police reform. My hope is that the House of Representatives will take a more thorough look at the current state of policing in Massachusetts. I believe that if this is done, it will reveal that police officers in this state are highly educated and trained, use appropriate levels of force, and are far from being racist. The Bill passed by the Senate creates unnecessary burdens on police officers that could result in hesitation on the part of the officer in the performance of their duties. Hesitation can be the difference between life and death to an officer.

Respectfully,

Ryan Caneen

1174 Wachusett Street

Jefferson, MA 01522

(978) 337-7073 From: Francine Hayes <fhayes@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:02 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: Dana Toland <dana.toland@itexgroup.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 7:00 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Kearney, Patrick - Rep. (HOU);

constituent.services@massmail.state.ma.us

Subject: Police Reform 52820

Dear Representative Michlewitz, Representative Cronin, all members of the house and Governor Baker:

As I single mother, I am terrified of the direction our country is going. The death of George Floyd was evil, and all of the individuals need to be held accountable. However, this atrocity happened in Minneapolis, not in Massachusetts.

Massachusetts has an excellent record in terms of our police officers. Boston's own commissioner is Black. We should be a model for other states to imitate. Could there be more training, probably. I think all organizations, both in the public and private sectors benefit from ongoing training.

I am especially nervous about the immunity clause and our limiting their ability to use certain tools to keep them and the public safe. If they are deprived of immunity, and there are protests or riots in the future, will a politician, who I understand will still be protected by immunity, be at the front of the police line to determine what tactics and force may be used? If not, will officers be willing to work a protest/riot? Looking at the initial riots in Boston, from the comfort of my couch, was terrifying to watch. I was shocked. My son (13) and I were afraid for the police and Boston. We live in Marshfield, and still don't feel safe going to Boston.

In the past month, I know 20 people, who initially were against guns, take a gun safety class to allow them to get a license to carry. Now, I wonder if I need to to get a license. Never in a million years would I think that would ever be seen as a necessity to keep my son and I safe.

Prior to rushing to appease a segment of society, I beg you To find the strength to be true leaders. Gather all key stakeholders to sit down and evaluate and analyze the data and come up with a solution. I believe too the racial issue is systemic. Therefore instead of just looking at police reform, look at the entire issue and find real solutions.

It seems like so many politicians have lost their way, and are afraid to lead. Wouldn't it be wonderful if not just the Massachusetts police, but the leadership of the Mass House could show our country and the world how to make meaningful change that will bring desired results, rather than a placing a bandaid on a much larger problem?

Please be the voice of reason!

Regards,

Dana TOLAND

A terrified Mother of a teenager

617.270.6054

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tara Wilson <wilsonlara9@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:52 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,

Tara Wilson  
32 Grove St  
Boston, MA 02114  
wilsonlara9@gmail.com

From: Sandra Simon <sfx6@msn.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: policing standards bill

Police officers deserve the right to the appeal process.  
Police officers deserve qualified immunity.  
The Police Officers Standard Accreditation Committee must include rank and file police officers.  
Please support our police officers.  
Thank you,  
Sandra Simon  
73 Furnace Lane  
Pembroke, MA

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.avg.com\\_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.avg.com_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk)>



13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=gVnEQlqPGrso8adQuz4H2GI6aHCKKvvl\_fZwdoklnpA&s=0CjhE-Ts5uRB\_BkzXZGWkxbxlEVOMT4-ylTvRlQBt0ec&e=> Virus-free. www.avg.com  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.avg.com\\_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=gVnEQlqPGrso8adQuz4H2GI6aHCKKvvl\\_fZwdoklnpA&s=0CjhE-Ts5uRB\\_BkzXZGWkxbxlEVOMT4-ylTvRlQBt0ec&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.avg.com_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=gVnEQlqPGrso8adQuz4H2GI6aHCKKvvl_fZwdoklnpA&s=0CjhE-Ts5uRB_BkzXZGWkxbxlEVOMT4-ylTvRlQBt0ec&e=>)>  
From: Nick Marino <nick.marino1617@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:58 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

As a life long resident of this state it upsets me to no end to see how horrible our government is treating the only ppl that stand between anarchist and law and order. If this bill passes I will do everything in my power to make sure everyone that votes yea doesn't get reelected. Yes I may be one vote by I'm part of the silent majority.

PS

Charlie Baker do your job and Veto this bill if it makes it to your desk or you can kiss your political future down the drain as well.  
From: stitcherwiz <stitcherwiz@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:57 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,

Debra Powell

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Larry Lewis <llewis215@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:56 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Larry Lewis and I live at 44 Wilcox St, Fall River, MA. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center and am a Correction Officer I. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

**Qualified Immunity:** Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to 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,

Larry Lewis

From: Bill Rock <bill.rock@live.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:53 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800

As your constituent, William T. Rock, Walpole, MA, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to S.2800 which was passed by the Senate. I ask that you oppose this bill as constituted when it is debated in the House of Representatives.

I also ask that it be debated in the light day and not voted on in the dark of night.

The bill is ill conceived and politically driven. We agree that police reform is important and needs to be addressed but passing a poor bill for the sake of passing a bill based is not in the best interest of the Commonwealth.

This bill 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. It will cause many good officers to leave due to the new burdens and make it harder to recruit individuals into law enforcement.

S 2800 establishes a review committee with overly broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations. The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination (see Carney vs Springfield) and constitutional protections against "double-jeopardy."

Qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for the police officers we send out on patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card, or other things for the benefit of them and their families. Good luck with police recruitment.

In addition S 2800 failed to follow the normal and appropriate legislative process of holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and experts. I ask that you vote NO when S.2800 comes to the House of Representatives for the reasons stated above, and others.

"We cannot support a measure which takes handcuffs off drug dealers and gang bangers and puts them on police, allows criminal records to disappear while tearing open police personnel files and allows criminals to appeal for monetary damages while denying police due process to appeal for their job," said James Machado, executive director of the Massachusetts Police Association.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

William T. Rock  
6 Lakeview Drive  
Walpole, MA 02081  
(339) 364-4829

From: Henrietta Cosentino <hcosentino@me.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:52 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Mathew Muratore; Henrietta Cosentino; Lois Post; Lyle Lawrence; Deanna Nealey; Judy Savage; Mary LeSueur; Martha Vautrain; Vedna Heywood; Deb Etzel; Yaxsarie Velázquez; Alexandra Godfrey; Heidi Mayo  
Subject: Support of the Senate police reform bill, S.2800

Dear Members of the HWM Judiciary Committee,  
I urge your support for the inclusion of the following measures, despite any predictable pushback from police unions and the like.  
We need our police and we appreciate that the majority of officers are full of good intention and the desire to be peacekeepers. These these proposed reforms are fundamental to the restoration of trust, particularly in communities of color and immigrant communities. Incorporating these measures will result in more effective, as well as more humane, policing practices:

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

sgvpuxFJPhOGSVlEGDdi-8TK5zMvvS7iKlk&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.

Many thanks,

Henrietta & Donald Cosentino  
43 Gallows Pond Road, Plymouth, MA 02360  
Mailing:  
Box 3906, Plymouth, MA 02361  
From: Robert Joannette <robert\_joannette@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:50 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Robert Joannette. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a CO1. 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,  
Robert Joannette

From: Laura Windmuller <laura.windmuller@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:50 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800 Comments

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you regarding the S.2800 bill being considered for vote in the House. I believe it is critical that this bill be brought to the House floor for debate and voting. I also believe the legislation captured in this bill are critical to the health and safety of both police and community members alike. For far too long we have asked law enforcement to deal with those who have been failed by the system. They have been asked to walk into situations they are wildly unprepared nor ill-equipped to deal with on a daily basis. Additionally, our community members have been deeply harmed and even killed as a result of an organization being given too much power and too little oversight and accountability. It is unimaginable to say that the status quo is working for anybody. With the huge body of research and years of work to bring the changes we see included in S.2800 available, I believe it is acceptable for our government to work quickly to finally make changes. I do not believe any delay is warranted nor do I believe that this will be the last time we must revise our approach to community safety and law enforcement. This is only the beginning. But just like anything, we will have opportunities to revise it and refine it as we need. But we know the changes to things like use of force standards, police certification, use of faulty facial recognition technology, and refinement to qualified immunity are critical to preventing further harm to all. Additionally, by allocating funding to programs that are trained and equipped to address so many of the cases that police officers are asked to address, we can alleviate the uncertainty and room for error our offices encounter. Let's set everyone up for success.

We are watching and observing who responds with action during this time. Never doubt it.

Sincerely,

Laura Windmuller

258 Chestnut Ave, Jamaica Plain, MA

From: Peg Foley <peg723ne@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:49 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,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Lyle Core <LyleC@brandfuel.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:49 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Written Testimony for House Hearing on Senate Bill S.2800

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 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, policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and will have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights. 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.

Best regards,

Lyle Core

Resident

5 Short Street

Medway, MA 02053

508-488-6464

From: Kamaron Washburn <kameronw@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:49 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Kamaron Washburn and I live at 141 Elm st. Blackstone MA 01504. 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,  
Officer Kameron Washburn

From: Karah Piscitelli <karahpiscitelli@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

To the Massachusetts House of Representatives,

My name is Karah Piscitelli and I have been a lifetime resident of Millbury. My husband of 4 1/2 years has been a police officer for the city of Worcester for the past 7 years and for the town of Oakham for 3 years before that.

I have personally seen the impact this "war against police" has had on him. He no longer feels the support from not only the political leaders in this country, but even from many people in his life. Lifelong friendships of his have ended simply because he is a police officer. He and the rest of the good, honest police officers are seen as the enemy in these people's eyes and this is taking a toll on them.

Bill S2820 will not make these police officers feel any more supported if passed. Not only will some of what's included in this bill affect the police officers, but it will be affecting their families. I believe eliminating qualified immunity will only discourage police officers even more than they already are. What police officer will want to risk everything they have in life to make an arrest that could potentially lead to a civil lawsuit? Police officers will respond to any call they need to respond to and simply leave it at that. Any kind of proactive policing will be thrown out the window in fear of getting caught up in something that could have been avoided.

I think we can all agree that some reform is necessary in law enforcement and the judicial system alike. There are some good points included in Bill S2820, but there are too many included that will have a lasting negative impact on police officers like my husband.

This is why I'm asking that you reject Bill S2820 that the Senate passed. There is a better way to hold police officers responsible for their actions and I believe that a revised reform bill can be agreed on without having to take the protection of qualified immunity away from law enforcement.

Thank you for your time,  
Karah Piscitelli  
From: Joan Poulin <jjntpoulin@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:47 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform

My name is Joan Poulin and I live in Raynham. 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 considers legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well 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 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.

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 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.

I for one support law enforcement and hope you have the courage to do the same, unlike your counterparts in the Senate.

Thank you for your consideration  
Joan Poulin  
10 Martin Dr  
Raynham Ma 02767  
jjntpoulin@yahoo.com

From: Roger Downing <hpd14@msn.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill 2820

Chair Aaron Michelewitz, Chair Claire Cronin,

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed bill S2820. This bill has serious implications that will negatively affect Massachusetts Police Officers and their families. I have been a Police Officer for 24 years, and duties include department use of force instructor, firearms instructor and less lethal weapons (taser, OC, baton and Pepperball OC launcher).

My concerns with the bill are;

#1 . Qualified Immunity - This bill makes 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 you 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.

#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.

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 - 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 our 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.

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. 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 complain 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 this bill be taking this protection away from other municipal workers? from teachers? from lawmakers?

Policing is a difficult and challenging career at the best of times. Police are called to fix problems in minutes that took years to create. We are judged from the moment we put the uniform on. Someone is always unhappy with the outcome, but we do our best to handle problems and keep people safe.?

This bill shows every Police Officer that the law makers do not know what we do, how we do it and they do not support us. My fellow Officers and I wear body armor, and must carry blood stopping agents and tourniquets in the very real chance that we are shot or stabbed. In the last five year, 6 Massachusetts Police Officers have been killed in the line of duty. In 2020 alone, 65 Police Officers have been killed in the line of duty nationwide. That's a 14 % increase over last year.

No other profession has to deal with the hate and rage that Police Officers have to deal with on a daily basis. Bill 2800 and 2820 show that the elected officials are caving to mob and not listening to the quiet majority and the professional Police Officers.

Police reform is needed. Police Officers are tasked with handling many issues that we are not equipped to deal with. As a commonwealth, we must move forward together.

If this bill is passed crime will increase. Officers will leave the force and the candidate pool for new officers will be drastically diminished. Anyone who decides to stay will not be proactive. Why would anyone join a career where the pay is minimal, with more calls to defund Police, they could die in the line of duty, be sued by the suspects they arrest and the elected officials on Beacon Hill do not support them.? I can't answer that and being a Police Officer is a job that I love.

All Police Officers are in support of having a POST system. Training is always needed and welcomed. Certifying Officers is long overdue in Massachusetts. But the bill is misguided in its intention and it needs serious work.

I ask that you table this bill and bring career, professional Police Officers to the discussion to have reasonable and long-lasting reform.

Sincerely,

Roger Downing  
Hudson Police Department  
978-567-9446

From: Claire Verlicco <cverlicco@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:46 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,  
Claire Verlicco

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: THERESA SCATTERDAY <tscatterday@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: POLICE REFORM BILL S2820 - Concerns with qualified immunity within this bill to be considered

To Whom It May Concern;;

My name is Theresa Scatterday 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,

Theresa Scatterday

76 High St, Rockport MA

tscatterday@verizon.net



From: Ann Cumming <cumminga@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. % 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,  
Ann M Cumming  
Cumminga@comcast.net

Sent from iPhone From: Alex Elias <alex.s.elias@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Alex Elias and I am a constituent of yours and a Dennis Police Officer. I am writing to you today to pass on my thoughts regarding police reform which is currently in debate. I began my career in 2005 as a summer police officer on Martha's Vineyard and wanted nothing more than to become a full time officer in Massachusetts. Through hard work and determination, I fulfilled that dream. Throughout my career, I have worked with some of

the most caring, thoughtful and professional men and women you could ever meet. These officers go to work every day to help the community they serve and they do it proudly.

Since the horrific death of George Floyd, the country has taken a turn for the worse. While we have seen patriotism through protests and marches, we have also witnessed destruction, riots, and increases in violent crime nationwide. This is heart breaking to watch as I truly do my best to help our community here on Cape Cod and want the best for my country.

Looking over the proposed bill regarding police reform, I have many concerns that I wish to share with you. My biggest fear is this bill, if passed, will be the final straw in ceasing all effective police recruitment. The national media has been overly critical of all police actions as of late, leaving officers with the feeling that we are under attack. There is very little vocal support for our profession as a whole, regardless of the selfless and heroic work performed every day that garners no attention. This undoubtedly leaves potential police candidates second guessing their career choice. I know of at least one town in my area that received no applicants with a job posting from this past Fall. These recent events, and bills such as this one, will do nothing to help that. My agency and all others on Cape Cod have struggled to attract candidates and seen test applications plummet, leaving potential candidate pools smaller than ever in my career. While I attempted to get hired as a full time officer, I waited in lines with hundreds or even thousands of others who paid over \$100 just for the opportunity to take a test knowing only one or two positions would be available. Unfortunately, those days are over. We no longer have the interest of young men and woman who want to serve their communities as police officers. Current events are only making this worse.

Passing this bill will do nothing to improve policing. In fact, it will only make policing worse. With fewer qualified candidates, cities and towns will be forced to hire second, third and fourth tier candidates to fill vacancies. This will only hurt the community we serve, accelerate the retirement of veteran officers and lead to experienced officers seeking new career paths. I personally know several good police officers who already have an exit plan. They no longer wish to do a job that is as dangerous and heartbreaking as ours. These are good men and women who will be missed by their cities and towns when they leave. These are not the police officers to drive away. These are officers who we should be pointing to and using as positive examples. Unfortunately, with little support from the public and elected officials alike, they are unwilling to risk their lives, their family's safety and their mental wellbeing any longer. Locally, two officers from my agency recently resigned and left policing all together. These are issues that are not just in the cities, but right here on Cape Cod.

I can assure you that a combination of good experienced police officers leaving the job and fewer qualified candidates taking the job will create severe issues throughout the Commonwealth. Like all officers, I do not want to work with bad cops. I do not want to work with cops who are racist, homophobic, or sexist. Nobody hates a bad cop more than a good cop. That is not something I will tolerate. As a Field Training Officer

who is entrusted to train and evaluate new hires, I do not accept attitudes like this. I instill only the best in new officers and expect them to enforce the laws justly and without bias. Furthermore, I do not want to be training anything but the best. These new officers will be working side by side with me and eventually take over for me some day. I do not want to see the hard work of good police officers wasted if lesser recruits are all we have to choose from.

I do not want the good cops who do not fall into that category throw their hands in the air and say, "I'm done. No one supports us." Unfortunately, that is what is happening. As a society, we are in the process of weakening our police departments and ultimately our communities. All we have to do is look at the increase in violent crime in Boston, Atlanta, New York and Chicago, just to name a few.

I am not against police reform. I support reform in the right way and not in a kneejerk reaction to current events. We must all meet to discuss what is appropriate, reasonable and realistic in reform. We must identify tangible issues within our profession and find a solution. A bill that simply lists politically motivated changes and paints the hundreds of police agencies across this state with one broad stroke, in an election year, will not truly make any difference. I think most people who think about that for a minute would agree.

I support better training for police officers. However, the reality is, the Municipal Police Training Committee has requested additional funding for years with almost no support from Beacon Hill. A surcharge was added onto citations issued to motorists, however this failed to be adequate. The police are simply not given enough funding for training. Demands for new training to be added to police curriculum cannot happen under the current funding model. Important classes are already cut short and most officers do not receive any hands on training for years at a time. How can you stay proficient when you are not provided with the necessary training by the state? Perhaps if more hands on training was provided, fewer use of force incidents would be necessary in the first place. Officers would be more confident in their abilities and not be forced to resort to higher levels of force in some cases

People are demanding that we receive training regarding the mentally ill and de-escalation. We do. What we do not receive is the necessary support in the field when we interact with the mentally ill who often times need to be talked down. We do our best, but the state has failed in providing us with the resources and support necessary 24/7. All police officers would agree we need help. We need mental health professionals with us in the field. What we do not need is the current system where we are expected to solve a crisis when a number of other agencies specializing in that issue have not solved it themselves.

I would ask that you please reconsider changes to qualified immunity as this has added immense stress upon officers. We are fearful that our families will be unduly attacked with frivolous lawsuits. Our families already go through enough and do not deserve added stress and fear. The fact is, qualified immunity did nothing to stop the killing of George Floyd. The officers involved were arrested and charged even though

qualified immunity was still in place. That proves the current system works. There is no need to change it just for change sake.

I would also ask that you reconsider the makeup of the proposed POSAC board. With the immense responsibility this board would have, we need law enforcement professionals making up the bulk of the membership. Please do not misunderstand what I am asking. I do not say this because I want bad cops to the protected. I say this because no one knows what police officers face every day besides other police officers. We must be judged reasonably and not by those who are biased against us from the beginning. I ask that more law enforcement officers be included in the board to work with the civilians named to the board for more effective and fair results.

Finally, please strongly consider all parts of this bill which change how we can do our job. We can already look at other areas in the country which has changed what police are allowed to do. Crime is rising. Police officers either cannot or are fearful of intervening before crime occurs. This is sure to help drive crime rates up and eventually fear of crime by citizens. Please understand there is a difference between proactive policing based on statistics and facts and poor policing that we are trying to eliminate. We should not end the use of proven police tactics. We should push bad cops out of the job so they cannot use these good tactics for bad reasons.

I realize this has been a long email and thank you for your time. I understand you are busy and have a number of other emails and phone calls regarding countless issues. I just ask that you honestly consider the effectiveness of this bill and the unintended consequences if it passes before you and your colleagues vote. I would be more than happy to speak further to you regarding the current state of law enforcement at any time if you wanted.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Respectfully,

Alex Elias

Dennis Police Department  
413-519-2555 (cell phone)  
From: Ellen Finn <finn.ellen@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform bill

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,  
Ellen Finn  
Resident  
Braintree, MA

From: Joshua Tierney <JTierney@newburyportpolice.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820 Testimony

Rep. Michlewitz and Rep. Cronin,

My name is Joshua Tierney, and I am a sixteen year law enforcement veteran, currently employed by the Newburyport Police Department, and a resident of the 1st Essex District. I am writing in opposition to bill S2820 being brought before the General Court.

While I concede that all aspects of our governmental functions should regularly be examined and improved, I fear that many aspects of this bill are shortsighted, motivated by political expediency, inequitably punish frontline police officers who serve our communities and put their personal safety at risk, and in turn, hinder our ability to help those who cannot help themselves.

While there have been, and will continue to be protests in my community, I have received many messages of "thank you" and "it's not fair what they are doing to you," while on duty, from individuals who want to live their day-to-day lives and feel safe in their community. While these individuals may not be the loudest voices, they are constituents as well. They vote too.

I implore the committee members in their consideration of this bill to consider the long term effects on both the police officers in the field, and the safety of the public at large. Please detach from the expedient emotional response and consider the totality of the circumstances of this

bill and its effects that, in many ways, will reverse decades of professional policing improvements in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Joshua R. Tierney

Newburyport Police Department

(508)527-3179

From: jebw2003 <jebw2003@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:44 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 Sprint Samsung Galaxy Note8.

From: Ellen Connors <ekconnors@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:42 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: !!!!

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 Immunityis 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,

Kelly Connors  
2417 Centre Street  
West Roxbury, MA

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Patrick Browning <patrick.browning@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:41 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Written Testimony

Dear Representative Committee Members,

My name is Patrick Browning and I live in Boston. 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 officers 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 laborrelations - 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,

Pat Browning

From: Ellen Gunning <egunn275@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:40 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Kearney, Patrick - 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,

Ellen M. Gunning

Retired Public School Principal

From: Linda Coville <lulujean61154@verizon.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:38 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 Yahoo Mail on Android

<[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,  
Charlene Harrison](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=NSTNmqtqYCxXeIMk-DErH2qTwPoTGP8Av-rpA9qQUt8&s=QMu-k5xIUQgvACymSVkYJPynNVQ20BZjChDdiaNviJw&e=></a>><br/>From: WAYNE P HARRISON <harri2020@comcast.net><br/>Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:38 PM<br/>To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)<br/>Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820</p></div><div data-bbox=)

From: Linda Coville <lulujean61154@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:37 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 Yahoo Mail on Android

<[From: Keith DeStone <\[keithdestone@gmail.com\]\(mailto:keithdestone@gmail.com\)>](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=PGcyhIbetfWmAvzmBtD2poQWL6yYEAvmlyE9C511bBU&s=Yn4Re_jz3hlMhjHifCYSnrO-3tWGPUTWsKQT7VrOO20&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:37 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: testimony in re S.2820

Dear Rep. Cronin and Rep. Michlewitz-

I am writing in support of S.2820, the police reform bill recently passed by the Senate. While I believe reforms ultimately need to be taken further, I would support the House passing this bill as-is in order to make some progress on the issue as soon as possible. I am sure there will need to be several rounds of police reform instituted, and this is only the first.

I am in favor of many aspects of the bill, the most important of which, to me, are these three:

- limits on qualified immunity
- prohibition on nondisclosure agreements in misconduct settlements
- moving funding from policing and prisons to communities

I'm also in favor of the following:

- duty to intervene when witnessing misconduct
- limits on use of force

- de-escalation training (and requirement to de-escalate)
- requirement to track racial information for police interactions
- requirement of civilian approval for purchase of military equipment
- moratorium on the use of facial surveillance technology
- appointment of a state police colonel from outside the state police
- state-wide training standards
- jail "diversion" programs
- local control over the use of school "resource officers"
- expanded possibilities for clearing juveniles' records
- prohibition on decertified officers working in corrections

Sincerely yours,  
Keith DeStone  
617-230-5539  
Arlington

From: Joslyn Allen <joslyn.allen@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

To the House Judiciary Committee,  
My name is Hallie Joslyn Strupp Allen. I am a resident of Andover (30 Rutgers Road). I am writing today to urge you to preserve the essential reforms that are being proposed in Senate bill S2820, including:

- \* creating an independent and primarily civilian body to oversee police certification and training standards, which provides an important checks and balances system on a body that is currently imbued with too much power, authority, and immunity;
- \* setting limits on qualified immunity so that victims of police brutality can sue for civil damages (though this measure needs to go farther and completely eliminate qualified immunity);
- \* taking steps to reduce the school-to-prison pipeline, which threatens the very fabric of our community by criminalizing youth behavior and forcing individuals into lifelong interactions with an unjust and inequitable system;
- \* establishing a Justice Reinvestment Fund to begin to realign the inordinately disproportionate funding of the police and prisons and to reinvest in our communities.

I also strongly urge you to look closely at where the Senate bill falls short. You, the honorable members of the House, have an opportunity and an obligation to strengthen this bill and to enact real and lasting reform. Please take this opportunity to ABOLISH qualified immunity. As the notable practitioner of restorative justice Danielle Sered has written, "Impunity guts legitimacy, and so any effort to bolster the legitimacy of law enforcement will require that its members be held to at least as high a standard of behavior as that of the people they are authorized to police." Similarly, I beg of you to pass an outright ban on chokeholds and the use of tear gas; the current language does not go far enough to protect Massachusetts citizens from unwarranted police brutality. Finally, please

strongly consider lifting the cap on the Justice Reinvestment Fund. Let's allow for substantial, neither nominal, temporary, nor limited reinvestment in our communities. For far too long, we have spent millions of dollars to militarize the police against our own people. It's time we do better.

Thank you for your consideration and for the work you continue to do to help our Commonwealth enact real, just, and lasting change.

Hallie Joslyn Strupp Allen

--

Pronouns: she/her/hers

When injustice becomes law, resistance becomes duty.

From: Daniel Fitzgerald <daniel.fitzgerald@pd.boston.gov>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:36 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN); Biele, David - Rep. (HOU)

Subject: S2820

Representatives of the Commonwealth,

You have a great task in front of you regarding Bill S2820. I corresponded with a number of senators and thanked them for their efforts, both before and after the bill was passed. I would ask the House of Representatives to do more. You already are, by listening to members of the public voice their concerns. I am asking you to take a closer look at S2820, because in it's current form, is no friend to first responders. I can say that, because I have been a Boston Police officer for more than 34 years. The bill is going to affect many people across the state and I can't speak for them, but what I can say, is the current uptick in crime recently in Boston, unfortunately may be the new normal if S2820 passes in the House of Representatives in its current form. No one is against improving law enforcement with new and better tools and training. But my experience tells me that S2820 was pushed through the Senate for political reasons with direct correlation to the current state of the nation. Again no one is against reform - good reform, S2820 in its current form does not hit that benchmark. I urge you to look beyond the current climate and promote a bill that works for all.

Regards,

Dan Fitzgerald

Boston Police Department

--

P.O. Dan Fitzgerald

SORI Unit

617-343-4965

From: tricia greene <triciamgreene@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:35 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

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





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,

Anthony Mastrapasqua

From: Errick Davis <errickjersey@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:35 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Please pass S.2820

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

My name is Errick Jersey of Medford, MA and I am writing to request that you pass S.2820, An Act To Reform Police Standards and Shift Resources to Build a More Equitable, Fair, and Just Commonwealth that Values Black Lives and Communities of Color.

I am a white man, and I have enjoyed extraordinary privilege in my interactions with the Boston Police Department over the 16 years I have lived and worked in the greater Boston area. I know that my experience is a reflection of my skin color and apparent class, which means that even though I can be loud and physically intimidating due to my height and strength, I have never had to be concerned that I would be treated with anything other than the utmost respect for my life and rights by the Boston Police Department.

I also know from first-hand accounts from friends and loved ones that people of color in the Boston community do not receive that same respect.

Boston loves to celebrate itself as a liberal bastion, but we have some of the most segregated schools and neighborhoods in the country. Our racism is cloaked in pity and condescension. We do not provide equal opportunities or access to people of color in this city, but congratulate ourselves for not showing the overt racism of the Deep South that I moved here from so long ago.

A massive part of that is the practices of the Boston Police Department. We have poured resources into the BPD, giving them the kinds of armor and weapons we should only see in the frontlines of war, not on our streets. We have given them tear gas, which isn't even legal in war! And they've used it on unarmed, peaceful protesters! All this while crime has declined overall over the decades. There is no excuse.

The least we can do is pass S.2820, and work towards a Boston we can be proud of, where people of color are truly welcome, and given the opportunities to be lifted by this wealthy, liberal city, where we have held them down in the past.

Sincerely and with utmost respect,  
Errick Jersey  
Medford, MA  
From: Julie burgess <jabburgess@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2800

Dear Committee,  
I strongly oppose the police reform bill (2800). This bill makes it very difficult for police to do their job. It makes police very vulnerable to frivolous lawsuits.  
It creates too much red tape, waste and oversight. It will cost too much and the taxpayers will be ultimately on the hook.  
The de-escalation restraints are troublesome. The police need to be able to control crowds more than ever given that many cities were on fire one month ago.

It's a shame that this bill was "rammed" through the process. The committee did not even take into account Mr. Crispin and his arguments against the bill.

Please do not let this bill go any further. Give the taxpayers who are also VOTERS some say in the process.  
Boston Police have been paramount in coming to the rescue of the city residents time and time again. Who was running toward the bombs on Boylston Street? Who found the terrorists that planted those bombs?  
Please get rid of this bill.  
Boston is not Minneapolis and never has been.

Julie and Frank Burgess  
18 Tanglewood Drive  
Scituate, Massachusetts

From: Anthony Karasinski <tonykphoto@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:34 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: Andie Elaine <apackdesigns@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:33 PM  
Subject: Free Logo and Branding with Website

Hi all!

I am running a summer special! [www.andreapackdesigns.com/webdesign](http://www.andreapackdesigns.com/webdesign)  
<[\[andreapackdesigns.com/webdesign\]\(http://www.andreapackdesigns.com/webdesign\)  
<\[--\]\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\_\_andreapackdesigns.com\_webdesign&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=cMdG2TI1751CqH57S6DUzRfPS8m63vY89Ze2IxF01QE&s=8KDYHZj3E37Nv8ueFnE9rTuqWgxvwZYwMencxUh4mew&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=\)](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.andreapackdesigns.com_webdesign&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=cMdG2TI1751CqH57S6DUzRfPS8m63vY89Ze2IxF01QE&s=pZZq_EShk7SplZGwx_HrsGE6JnG-n7H8K3IVMe-bSa0&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

<<http://static1.squarespace.com/static/52e55c95e4b0b788a31121d0/t/58ac9f9e4efcb53233fb95fe/1497907583029/>>

Andrea Pack, ASID  
Interior Designer/Marketing Strategist  
<http://andreapackdesigns.com>  
<[Ph: 206.707.5847](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__andreapackdesigns.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=cMdG2TI1751CqH57S6DUzRfPS8m63vY89Ze2IxF01QE&s=1zY1DQsy8Ir4eSWoqpYZIjDJfvHCL5z8E8anwU0xM9U&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

From: Jacqueline Thibault <hoop1385@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:33 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820



Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Emily Crowley  
6 Loves Lane  
Woburn, MA

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Shirley Santiago <shirleysantiago625@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:32 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill S.2820

Good evening,

My name is Edward Santiago, I live in Worcester, MA. I normally don't get involved in politics but this bill S.2820 affects my family in a personal way. My son is a law enforcement officer and I'm asking for your support in defeating this piece of legislation. I'm not sure if I'm too late to ask for your support in this endeavor but I figure that if I didn't at least try I would not be protecting my son's right to preform his duties without the fear of being prosecuted because he made a millisecond life or death decision that may change his life forever.

My son is a good man who chose to be a law enforcement officer and I'm extremely proud of his decision to put on the badge and represent the men and woman in blue to protect his community. Every time he puts on his uniform he doesn't know if it will be the last time he does. I am a registered democratic who has voted with the best intentions to help put the best representatives that I feel will best represent my views. At this time I ask that you find it in your heart to vote this bill down in it's current state and help rewrite it so that it not only protects the men and women who represent our law enforcement community but the public as a whole.

Please let me know if there is something I can do to help you reach your support for defeating this piece of legislation.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to starting a dialogue with you on this matter..

Sincerely;

Edward Santiago

From: Sue Moore <suemoore43@outlook.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:32 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,

Helen s Moore, vote against this sb2820 bill, thank you  
Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Angela Bowers <angela.c.bowers@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:28 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.

--

Un maestro è come una piscina in cui si può imparare a nuotare. Una volta imparato, l'intero oceano è vostro. -Hasan Di Basra  
From: Gloria Christian <glomaec@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:27 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, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,  
From: Kylie Hogan <kylie9479@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony for Police Reform Bill

Dear Representative,

My name is Kylie Byrne and I live in South Boston. 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 laborrelations - 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, Kylie Byrne

617-803-6754

Sent from my iPhone  
From: phoebe <phoebe@copper.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:25 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,

Helena Starke

Sent from my Tmobile email address 4G LTE Device  
From: Ms Mary <maryann121484@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform

I am a resident of the city of Brockton and I am terrified to even think about what defunding the police will do for my city and the safety of its

residents. Illegally obtained Guns are found on our streets weekly, arrests are made daily of people who simply cannot follow the rules of our society. If something major and dangerous were to happen here, I want a trained officer to use his department issued AR15 IF NEED BE. Civilian workers should not be called on to respond to mental health issues, these situations can be so dangerous! Having someone hired for an agency with little to no experience and taking on potentially disastrous emergency calls regarding mental health? It should be a no. Police are always trained here and always held accountable. Keep going massachusetts! We don't have the issues other states have. Our criminals are already not being judged by (what many would call) lenient judges. Why does MA need to go further? 99% of Massachusetts law enforcement officers do the right thing everyday, every time. Let's use certain parts of the bill yet cut out others. No chokeholds, no knee to necks and let's have our officers intervene when a fellow officer is out of line. I'm not a resident of a low crime community. We need our officers to feel 100% supported. Inmates also return to cities. Shootings happen daily. The crime isn't going away, so why change what funding our LE gets?

- Brockton resident

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Stacey Shea <stacey@woofaboutit.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

?

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Stacey Shea

Resident

24 Ward Well Road

Canton, MA 02021

617-372-5994

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Laura Lang <laura.lang@pd.boston.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill

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,

Laura Thomas

<[8 Old Meadow Lane <\[Canton, MA 02021 <\\[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\\\_\\\\_www.google.com\\\\_maps\\\\_search\\\\_8-2B0ld-250D-250A-2BMeadow-2BLane-2B-250D-250A-2B-250D-250A-2BCanton-2C-250D-250A-2BMA-2B02021-3Fentry-3Dgmail-26source-3Dg&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-\\]\\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.google.com\\_maps\\_search\\_8-2B0ld-250D-250A-2BMeadow-2BLane-2B-250D-250A-2B-250D-250A-2BCanton-2C-250D-250A-2BMA-2B02021-3Fentry-3Dgmail-26source-3Dg&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-\\)\]\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\_\_www.google.com\_maps\_search\_8-2B0ld-250D-250A-2BMeadow-2BLane-2B-250D-250A-2B-250D-250A-2BCanton-2C-250D-250A-2BMA-2B02021-3Fentry-3Dgmail-26source-3Dg&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=SEbB0FIik0hX2fwOlmfr3Sn47TOxS521Aq65T30jzfk&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=\)](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.google.com_maps_search_8-2B0ld-250D-250A-2BMeadow-2BLane-2B-250D-250A-2B-250D-250A-2BCanton-2C-250D-250A-2BMA-2B02021-3Fentry-3Dgmail-26source-3Dg&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=SEbB0FIik0hX2fwOlmfr3Sn47TOxS521Aq65T30jzfk&e=> Resident</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk  
13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-  
qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=SEbB0FIik0hX2fwOlmfr3Sn47TOxS521Aq6  
5T30jzfk&e=>

617 699-2914 <tel:617%20699-2914>

--

P.O. Laura Lang  
District C11  
617-343-4337

<<https://www.google.com/s2/u/0/photos/public/AIbEiAIAAABDCKDw28nFicejWCILd mNhcmRfcGhvdG8qKGQzYTFkZDUxZWVjNjFmNTk0Y2MwOTIxMDNlY2JjZWVjMzg2MwY4MDgwAYx6rubgsb2Rn-4JX3eIVJzy7umN?sz=40>> ReplyForward

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_drive.google.com\\_u\\_0\\_settings\\_storage-3Fhl-3Den-26utm-5Fmedium-3Dweb-26utm-5Fsource-3Dgmail-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dmanage-5Fstorage&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=ZbIpI38kcH1E6IYxbIzT5rPdopvHiLgXFkkwSI-icCk&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__drive.google.com_u_0_settings_storage-3Fhl-3Den-26utm-5Fmedium-3Dweb-26utm-5Fsource-3Dgmail-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dmanage-5Fstorage&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=ZbIpI38kcH1E6IYxbIzT5rPdopvHiLgXFkkwSI-icCk&e=>)> <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.google.com\\_intl\\_en\\_policies\\_terms\\_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=T1A91MMS-ililBD56-OJ-Abadt9E94Utp2Tkn5BK6rg&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.google.com_intl_en_policies_terms_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=T1A91MMS-ililBD56-OJ-Abadt9E94Utp2Tkn5BK6rg&e=>)>

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.google.com\\_intl\\_en\\_policies\\_privacy\\_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=D5UsT98i-322vF1zx0XArn-\\_G6og1Z4hXJCgtc-taAQ&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.google.com_intl_en_policies_privacy_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=D5UsT98i-322vF1zx0XArn-_G6og1Z4hXJCgtc-taAQ&e=>)> <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.google.com\\_gmail\\_about\\_policy\\_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=99M3hmLJy4p9Mks\\_68fgqJnsNuSIEXgFmYPk5xbwW4&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.google.com_gmail_about_policy_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=C4090b-qwTAG8FaMjz5vniSkpnIIUIHA93KicXFL2Ao&s=99M3hmLJy4p9Mks_68fgqJnsNuSIEXgFmYPk5xbwW4&e=>)>

--

P.O. Laura Lang  
District C11  
617-343-4337  
From: Ron Ayotte <ronayotte@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820

Dear members of the House Ways and Means Judiciary Committee...disappointed and confused by the Massachusetts State Senate's recent passing of Bill S.2800 (now bill S.2820). The Firefighters of Local 1713 praise diversity within the fire service, and expect Firefighters to provide the VERY best efforts as it relates to protecting people, and property. Race, color, creed or religion doesn't factor when saving lives of the people within our community, or our brother/sister Firefighters when called upon. These truths are self evident. Although well intended, Bill S.2800 was passed on 7/14/2020 at 4:11am and was denied a public hearing process. Bill S.2800 seemed to be rushed, includes amendments that attack ALL public employees, including Teachers, Firefighters, Public Nurses, Police, City and Town employee, etc., etc. These are the same essential workers who were called upon a few months prior to help keep society functioning, while putting themselves and their families at risk by exposing themselves to Covid19, repeatedly. Attacking qualified immunity, due process, and collective bargaining is a direct attack on hard working public employees of Massachusetts, and puts liability of good employees in jeopardy, who do their job in good faith. Furthermore the attack on "due process" and

From: Anne Fernandes <phoruorme2@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:24 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,

Anne Fernandes  
515 Snipatuit Road  
Rochester, MA 02770

From: Sara Taetle <sarataetle84@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony in support of Bill S.2820

Dear Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

I am writing to express my strong support for Bill S.2820. I support this bill because it will place some independent accountability around policing in the Commonwealth and will make it safer for citizens to exercise their right of free speech and peaceful assembly. I am frankly astounded that some of these elements still haven't been passed into law, for example a stipulation that a person in custody cannot consent to sex with an officer.

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing about the progress of this bill.

Sara Schwindt  
North Andover, MA  
(978) 305-4159  
From: reingham <reingham@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:24 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,

Richard & Frances Ingham

From: Luis Maldonado <eddie@lemald.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

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

Luis Maldonado  
Somerville  
From: EMC <ecallahan01@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:22 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.



????????????????? ??????????????????: 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,  
Sean Guilbeault

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android  
<[I am totally against stripping qualified immunity from police, fire or nurses. None deserve this. How can we expect them to do their job, which many are extremely dedicated to when financial ruin faces them personally. None will take that extra step when some crazy is out there ready to sue. I can't believe any of you could dream this nonsense up.](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=z4ha4eocFpeJNAWBWQRXrIc9aW7eZ-Y5bmATM7o7eVs&s=1qQrAb8uteZhPbYfnw7FPbuEgQiwAHNe1qp6f5aEv4&e=></a>><br/>From: Len Dzengelewski <lennyd729@gmail.com><br/>Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:34 PM<br/>To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)</p></div><div data-bbox=)

Len Dzengelewski  
16 Allen Circle  
Milton Ma  
From: Raine Ferrin <raineferrin@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:22 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony Regarding 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.

Raine Ferrin, Malden

From: John Davin <davinmedway@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:22 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Written Testimony

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,

John J. Davin

Resident

15 Jasmine Road

Medway, MA. 02053

From: Liliane Spatafora <lilymont@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:21 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.



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,

Zachary Presto  
860-539-8300From:Tori Gabriele <vgabriele18@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:19 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S. 2800

To whom this may concern,

As a resident of Millbury, I am writing to you today to share my disgust regarding the defunding police bill S. 2800. I have many reasons why I disapprove this bill, here are some examples. 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. I bought my home in a safe neighborhood in Millbury for a reason and 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. I do not want a police officer to have to hesitate or think twice about saving my life in a dangerous situation because they are afraid they could get sued or lose their job. Criminals will not support them

regardless so giving them the power to do that will ruin how police officers do their job. I think that police should be covered by qualified immunity because they are already putting their life at risk by helping the people.

Lastly, I come from a family of many police officers in different cities and towns here in MA. These are good men and women who wanted to become a police officer to help people and keep people safe. I have a brother who has been a police officer for 4 years and an uncle who has been a police officer for 26 years. Both of them love their job and pick up many shifts during the week. Both of them volunteer to do kind and meaningful things in their community to give back. However, they are both nervous how this bill would impact their job. And good police officers are sadly the ones who will be too scared to do their job without feeling they could get sued. Law enforcement officers risk their life every single day to protect people in a selfless way. We need to protect them in this time because they protect us ALL of the time. I think police officers actually deserve much more respect than what they are shown. I am sure that many people who are in favor of this bill would never want to do their job and respond to the horrible, unfortunate calls they go to every single day. I ask that you stand with THE PEOPLE and vote against this bill. The safety of THE PEOPLE you represent are in danger.

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Victoria Gabriele

From: Elena Ansara <eansara@utecinc.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:19 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Support expungement

7/16/20

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 or 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,

Elena Ansara

UTECH, Inc.

978-856-3902

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Charlie Keller <charlierkeller@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Please Pass & Strengthen Police Justice Bill

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.

Charles Keller, Medford, MA

From: Joanne Dorsky <joannedorsky@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear House Ways & Means Committee,

I am writing to you today out of concern and extreme frustration over Bill S.2800 that was passed by the State Senate today. 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,

Joanne Dorsky  
8 Alder Rd  
Westwood MA 02090

Joanne Dorsky  
Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage, Premier Office  
692 High Street  
Westwood, MA 02090  
joanne.dorsky@nemoves.com <mailto:jdorsky@hammondRE.com>  
Call or Text: 617-335-8991

From: M Rothman Ahern <mmrothman@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: OPPOSITION TO S.2800

My name is Michelle Ahern, and I live in Watertown. 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 and can reasonably be expected to have devastating unintended consequences.

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





????????? ?????????? ?????????????????? ??????????????: The 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,  
Zachary Dunne

From: Christina <drful00@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony Regarding 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.

Christina Ferrin, Tewksbury  
From: Calla Crafts <calla53@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:17 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform build and shift act

We support this bill. It addresses needed changes in the regulations.  
Please pass this  
Calla m. Crafts  
103 Montague rd

Leverett  
Ma 01054  
Sent from my iPhone  
From: COLLEEN M SALMON <colleensalmon29@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:16 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

To:  
Rep. Aaron Michlewitz  
Rep. Claire D. Cronin  
Chair, House Committee on Ways and Means  
Chair, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Re:  
Bill No. Title S2820

I am opposed to this bill. You are making it impossible for the police to do their jobs effectively. It was rushed through without public input and makes no sense. Pandering to a limited number of protesters is not representing the people who elected you.

Sincerely,

Colleen Salmon  
Boston, MA  
Private Citizen - No Organization  
617-777-5787  
From: Terry Barden <tbarden49@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:16 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800

To whom this may concern,  
My name is Theresa Barden. I live in West Roxbury, MA. I am a registered nurse and work along side EMTs and police officers. I do NOT support this bill. Civil lawsuits is not the route that should be taken and defunding the police and holding them accountable for ridiculous claims does not benefit anyone. I find it interesting that this bill was passed at 4:15am. Obviously, the idea was to slip this under the rug, similar to sending a memo to staff late on a Friday afternoon. I am 100% against this bill and implore you to include Article 10 with immunity. And to those who were present but did not vote, please do not take the coward's way out and vote for what is right.  
#backtheblue  
Sincerely,  
Theresa

From: Terry Thomas <Tsquared09@msn.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:16 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Terry Thomas

Subject: Bill S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

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

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

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

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

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

sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

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

Sincerely,

Terry J. Thomas

Resident

8 Old Meadow Lane

Canton, MA 02021

617 699-2914

From: Robert Shubert <shubert59@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:15 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill 2820

Mr. Robert N. Shubert

698 Rockdale Avenue

New Bedford, MA 02740

RE: Bill2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Robert N. Shubert and I live at 698 Rockdale Avenue New Bedford MA. I am a Sergeant at The Bristol County Sheriff's Office.



July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Erica Pimentel and I live in North Billerica, MA. As a constituent and a law enforcement spouse, 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,

Erica Pimentel

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Mary Memmott <memmottm@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: support for Senate Bill S2820

As a resident of Framingham, MA, I support the police reform bill S2820. It should not be watered down -- each aspect is important to true police reform, including clarifying "qualified immunity."

No one should live in fear of their police force -- these reforms are necessary so police can truly "protect and serve" all citizens of the Commonwealth.

Sincerely,  
Mary Memmott  
24 Terri Rd.  
Framingham, MA 01701

From: D JH <dhuyghel@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:13 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, Debbie Huyghe

From: john Routhier <paulrouthier2@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:12 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Good evening,  
I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of North Andover, Massachusetts and extremely concerned about the S.2820 bill passed by the senate.  
Growing up police officers were respected, admired, trusted and to many heroes.



Now all of that has been replaced with hatred, distrust and verbal and physical abuse.

The real question is WHY and why is it allowed?

Politicians have been bullied into making rash decisions by those that are making the most noise.

Certainly there has been some tragic and needless tragedies, along with the Covid 19, that has brought protests and started the "Black Lives Matter" movement.

Bad cops need to be removed and punished when they cause unnecessary death or injury.

However the truth is most police officers are good people trying to do a good job for all of our citizens and they more than anyone want the bad ones removed.

I don't know of any profession that doesn't have a few bad apples and they too should be removed.

When police officers are shot or killed I don't see the public protesting and marching against criminals. Why is that?

If more training and proper guidelines help. Let's do it. However removing "qualified immunity" is a major mistake!

Police officers put their lives on the line every day. They deal with the good, bad and ugly. Disrespected, spit at, abused, hit with many different objects, kicked, punched, shot at, injured and sometimes killed. Why do we want to punish those that put up with this every single day? Why don't we back them up and go after the criminals and why don't we keep them in jail?

Those that want to force this bill through should be required to spend 6 months as a police officer and then put together a bill that supports law enforcement as well as citizens.

If this bill passes removing qualified immunity I expect many police officers will retire or resign and others will no longer pursue law enforcement as a career.

Who will respond to accidents, shootings, robberies, rapes and murder?

Crime will escalate and those that remain will be reluctant to do their job fearing they will be sued and possibly lose their homes and savings.

I must admit I am biased by the generation I grew up in where respect and love thy neighbor was prevalent. I've never been prejudice to anyone for any reason but I feel supporting Black Life's Matter means I don't support All Life's Matter. Instead of making the world a better place it's tearing it apart.

I'm also biased because my youngest son is a State Trooper. The day he graduated from the academy and received his badge was one of the proudest days of my life. He always wanted to be a police officer and after 6 months of training at the academy his dream was achieved and I'll always remember that look of accomplishment and happiness on his face.

Now I worry for his safety every day. When my phone rings I hold my breath if it is his number as some of those calls are to tell me he was involved in a dangerous situation and he's ok. One of those calls was to meet him in the hospital after a vehicle hit his cruiser. Eventually he required surgery to repair his neck.

I'm still proud of him but if he was going to college I would discourage him from pursuing his dream

My message is please vote AGAINST bill S2820 if it includes removing "qualified immunity" for police officers.

Let's support, respect and help those that protect us.



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,  
Christin A. Peets

Sent from my iPhone  
From: William Gallant <wpdgallant@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Gregoire, Danielle - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: E-testimony bill S. 2820

Dear representatives,

There is a reason Massachusetts police have one of the lowest complaint rates in the country. There is also a reason we are one of the safest states and have some of the safest major cities in the nation. That reason is we have some of the best trained and best qualified officers in the country. In years past we had dozens of applicants per vacant position. Now we are lucky to get one or two applicants for a single job. Now, think about the press the police are getting (remember that none of these issues occurred within our borders). There will come a time where we can not fill vacant positions. Down south and out west they have been having this issue for many years. They can't fill positions and when they do it's usually with people who could not get a job elsewhere (many times from around here). They have to advertise to get qualified applicants and still can't fill them all. Now take this information and then make the job even less desirable. Make it so no one with an education would want this job. People with skills and life experience might take a job doing something else that would be less dangerous, more respected, and way less controversial. How many parents out there will ever encourage their child to go into a career in law enforcement? You like what you have here? You like living in a safe location? You like the fact that your police are usually nice to you? You like the fact that minority complaints against police are the lowest in the nation (per capita)? Well don't get comfortable it's coming to an end. Policing as you know it will end in the next decade or so if the state bill in its current form (S.2800 or 2820) goes through. All because you want to fix police here for things that happen elsewhere. please listen to police leaders and fix it for Massachusetts not for Minnesota or Kansas. Your kids will thank you.

Thank you,

Respectfully submitted,

William Gallant  
71 Farmington Cir  
Marlborough, MA 01752  
774-245-0126  
From: Katryna Hadley <hadley.kat@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Dear members of House leadership;

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

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

This bill should have been written hand in hand with community input , truly asking the community what is important to them - this feels like a bill that is being pushed through so that leadership can say it had done police reform.

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,  
Katryna Hadley,  
Somerville, MA

From: Robert Kieran <robert.kieran@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Bob Kieran  
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 F. Kieran

Salem, Mass.

From: Ms Mary <maryann121484@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform

Hello!!

My name is MaryAnn. I am a black female, currently working in law enforcement. I reside in the commonwealth of Massachusetts and I am against the police reform bill. The images of the past decade where I have seen unarmed black men who look like my brother or father being killed by police officers have sickened me. As have the riots/looting. However I don't believe change in regards to law enforcement needs to occur in Massachusetts. Massachusetts is on top of training their officers of all agencies and most importantly Massachusetts is all about holding officers accountable for their actions. We don't have the problems other states have. Would I like to see the hiring process and diversity training changed/implemented? YES! Massachusetts does not need to put forth a copycat bill just to quell BLM. I'm Black and I have confidence in our Massachusetts law enforcement officers. Please, let's not defund our

police, let's take a look at other avenues to ensure that what happened in so many other states doesn't happen here. Please do not defund the police.

-MaryAnn  
Mass. Resident

Sent from my iPhone From: Cheryl Goggin <cag2236@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Cheryl Goggin and I live at 40 Benefit St, Attleboro MA 02703. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a Correction Officer I. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

**Qualified Immunity:** Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to 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,

Cheryl Goggin

From: Dana <danatberry@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:09 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: will recos <wjrp8@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:09 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

Dear elected officials,

My name is William Recos and I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth

every single day. As the House and Senate consider legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity - legal safeguards that have been established over decades and refined by 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.  
William Recos (registered voter)

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: kv.fettig@verizon.net  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

I urge passage of the Senate police reform bill, S2800. Please include the provisions in the House bill below:

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



<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\_\_www.facebook.com\_voteliz\_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3DK-2DR-26eid-3DARAoqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-255B0-255D-3D68.ARCpDWxSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPotPwTxxZ2JtqfZoMTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlWOGxpWGCMb-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab8lGKdWQqCJl6NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZZdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYTnFPi6&d=DwMFAQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=byr-rSGFMGKy1FJwnpkhRnXF7FHWVHHbmWFbyIUzGW0&s=-N1QAdGEqgWmnd-knj4j0Q-Enpf2dpfP7Cqkq8x6tnA&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.

Virginia Fetting  
234 Baker St.  
Walpole, MA 02081  
508-641-9673

From: Dale Gunn <dcgunn@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:09 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.





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,  
David A. Peets

From: Nancy Minucci <nancyminucci@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:55 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: BILL S.2800

Dear All Massachusetts Elected Senators & Representatives,

My name is Nancy Minucci and I live at 894 East Broadway, South Boston, Massachusetts. <x-apple-data-detectors://0> As a Massachusetts 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,

Nancy Minucci

From: Alan Bergeron <alanbergeron513@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:55 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 Yahoo Mail on Android

<[From: austin correia <austinjohncorreia@gmail.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=OrAztde2psbrvAEnjIye5wmDA1ScjbcjlqaX0mCkREo&s=gmDlvKCA C35gy8ZhJ5wl_pxyLDsyCqXS47NdiL9hw90&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:55 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

????????????? July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Austin Correia and I live at 13 railroad ave ,Taunton,Ma. I work at Old Colony Correctional Center 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: 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,

Austin Correia

From: Elizabeth Bernstein <liz@drlizbernstein.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:54 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Advocacy for Bill S. 2820

As a Massachusetts voter, I am very concerned about police reform and that the Mass house preserve key parts of the Senate bill and build on them.

It is vital to preserve these features of the Senate bill:

- \* 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

It is vital to add these additions to the Senate bill:

\* 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

Thank you for your consideration on this very important issue.  
Elizabeth Bernstein

--

Elizabeth Bernstein, Ph.D.  
49 Hancock Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
617-943-2529  
liz@drlizbernstein.com

--

Elizabeth Bernstein, Ph.D.  
49 Hancock Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
617-943-2529  
liz@drlizbernstein.com  
From: Lisel Sipes <freyal947@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:54 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,

From: Matthew Carmack <matthew.carmack@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:54 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.% 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,

Matt Carmack

Ashby, MA From: Patrick Harrinton <pathwpd@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police reform bill S2820

My name is Pat Harrington and I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth every single day. As the House consider legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform (S2820). 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.

Pat Harrington (registered voter)  
Phone #1-508-304-2524

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone  
<[From: kvgoodfellow@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 PM](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=0sEWTZVJDen_8ZplMdWbgK1uf0_yHWkOnsROL2vMPLE&s=OSFN2_3z xikhEqJKcC7dNdA2c0BW6EFfe5lBng9eNBeQ&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

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,

Kathy Goodfellow  
From: MARK TRETTEL <mtrettel@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Mark Trettel  
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,  
Maureen and Mark Trettel

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Debbie Black-Komendecki <dblackkomo@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 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,

Deborah Black Komendecki

From: AMY FEMINO <amj1178@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Regarding Police Reform Bill

To whom it may concern:

Stripping Law Enforcement of qualified immunity takes away their protection and due process. This state is in for some tough times if that happens. It would be safer for police and fire to do the bare minimum if this bill is passed and the public deserves more!!

Thank you,  
Amy FeminoFrom: Mary Haley <maryg30@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:53 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,  
Mary Haley, Hingham, MA

From: R. Eric Reuss <ereuss@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:52 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony on S. 2820 (Reform, Shift + Build Act)

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: Jane Leung <jleung@bostonasians.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:52 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Public Testimony on S.2800 to the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees

July 16, 2020

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,

Jane Leung  
Executive Director

[jleung@bostonasianyees.org](mailto:jleung@bostonasianyees.org)

Boston Asian: Youth Essential Service, Inc.

199 Harrison Avenue, Boston MA 02111

617 482-4243



From: PFB <pbiggins@wfbiggins.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:52 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 F. Biggins

--

From: John Umina <johnu@umina.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:51 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,

--

John Umina  
978-397-2939

From: RR <suhag21@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:52 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 Jordan, Medford MA 02155

From: Deanna Castro <deannacastro@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:51 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: John Larivee <jlarivee@crj.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:51 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Criminal record expungement expansion

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, Vice Chair Day, and Vice Chair Garlick:

Community Resources for Justice (CRJ) supports expansion of the expungement law (MGL Ch 276, Section 100E) as proposed in S.2820, the Racial Justice and Police Accountability bill.

As you know, the overwhelming number of young people who become involved with the criminal justice system grow up and move on with their lives. With that consideration, CRJ respectfully asks the law be amended 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.
- Distinguishing 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.
- Removing certain restrictions from the 150+ list of charges.

Expanding the expungement law will advance the goals of the Legislature's 2018 criminal justice reforms: reduce recidivism, and remove barriers to employment, education, and housing. Moreover, it will allow young 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.

Thank you for your consideration.

John

John J. Larivee

Community Resources for Justice

President & Chief Executive Officer

355 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116

(617) 482-2520 x2112 (voice)

(617) 262-8054 (fax)

[www.crj.org](http://www.crj.org) <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.crjustice.org\\_&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=zu0C041w3hhmSAIJEdg6F4h6oxVkMY2Knk2ZiucE-iY&s=-1Jti5VOA-N-FtksMaA8t0pH7VUet\\_LoWiQGLHGzG\\_4&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.crjustice.org_&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=zu0C041w3hhmSAIJEdg6F4h6oxVkMY2Knk2ZiucE-iY&s=-1Jti5VOA-N-FtksMaA8t0pH7VUet_LoWiQGLHGzG_4&e=>)>

\*\*\*\*\*

Statement of Confidentiality:

The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me at 617-482-2520 x2112 or reply to [jlarivee@crj.org](mailto:jlarivee@crj.org) <<mailto:amitrovic@crjustice.org>> and destroy all copies of this message and attachments.

From: Michael Anderson <[mikea523@yahoo.com](mailto:mikea523@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:51 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

Good Afternoon,

Please accept this correspondence as a plea to reconsider ending the qualified immunity as described in S.2820 for public servants including those of us who work in public safety and education.

I agree there needs to be constructive reforms that work for all people. By ending qualified immunity, many will suffer the unforeseen consequences of this radical agenda.

Sincerely,

Michael Anderson  
Rockport resident & taxpayer  
Police Officer in Essex County  
From: Louise Flak <laff@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:50 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,

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Trish R <trishregan1966@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:50 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,

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Trish

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: patcl35 <patcl35@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:49 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,

Pat Chessa, taxpayer & VOTER  
Westford MA

Sent from my smartphone

From: Kecia McCaffrey <kecia@hphcllc.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: RE: S.2820

Dear Senator Brown,

My name is Kecia McCaffrey and I live at 8 Nautical Way, South Dennis . 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,

Kecia McCaffrey

From: Lorraine Botts <vze3cnd2@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:48 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, Lorraine A. Botts, Rehoboth, MA  
From: Smc39 <smc39@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); mcgovern.press@mail.house.gov  
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,  
Sue Clerk  
Westborough, MA  
From: vaacpa@yahoo.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:47 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,

Vin Armstrong

Plymouth, MA

From: sallyb1057@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:47 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,

From: MIke Delsoldato <mdelsoldato@scarafoniassociates.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:47 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

Thank you for giving us a chance to voice our frustrations. I believe this bill was written in haste and rushed through very improperly for one.

Police are not the problem in society. Taking away their qualified immunity is such a disgrace and slap in the face to our officers and troopers that serve the commonwealth and our local municipalities. These men and women are out there dealing with the lowest of the low scum our society has to offer. Most all of them will have an axe to grind with an officer or trooper arrest them, so you make it easier for them to sue said law enforcement officer that does this. I have heard from many friends in the State Police that when this thing goes thru they plan a mass exodus. Also local law enforcement officers many have said the same. Why would they want to do a job that each day they go to could loose everything they have worked for protecting the citizens of this state. Seems a little backwards to me. Also you are doing this to Nurses, Firefighters, any municipal employee! What do you think is going to happen when all these people say" you know what? This isn't worth it". You are going to have anarchy in this state and no town will be safe. Your beautiful Berkshire's will become a cesspool. Second home owners will be gone and towns will suffer as local businesses shutter. Citizens will have to do the job of your law enforcement officers. That's not something anyone wishes for. Please reconsider this bill for the safety of our front line first responders and municipal employees. As a retired volunteer firefighter with 22 years experience I have seen some very sad things, but this should not be one of them. Let's keep our state safe and let the law enforcement officers do their jobs as they do everyday to make each and everyone of us safe.

Mike Delsoldato

Lee Massachusetts From: Alyssa Gonzalez <alyssangonzalez@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Concerns on S2820

Dear Committee,

I send this email today to oppose S.2820. I ask you to consider a commission to really look into our weakness and our strengths to better our communities together. I fear that removing qualified immunity for first responders is not wise.

If you are choking in a restaurant and there is a Doctor, a Nurse or a First Responder trained to save your life, they may pause. They hesitate because they are terrified at the reality they may very well break your ribs. This would open them up for civil lawsuits, and litigation just to do their life's work to save lives.

That is why I ask you to table this and study it rather than a knee jerk reaction that may very well hurt our communities in the end. Massachusetts is not Minnesota, New York, or any other state. Let's be different in how we approach our community safety and public safety.

Thank you.

Alyssa Gonzalez  
AlyssaNGonzalez@yahoo.com  
9788682233

186 Waterford Street  
Gardner, MA 01440

From: Janet Nolan <j2006nolan@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

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

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Janet Nolan  
978-377-0515

From: Elizabeth Molle <e.m.mourad.95@cantab.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: constituent.services@massmail.state.ma.us  
Subject: S.2800 Bill Testimony

Dear Committee Member,

I am writing to provide you with testimony regarding your policing Bill as both a citizen of the Commonwealth, a student of urban economics and a professional for more than three decades. Having worked in the lower Roxbury area and affordable housing policy as a national housing consult for several years, the one constant that rang true nationwide was the need

and desire from the local communities for additional policing. I was very distressed to hear that Bill 2800 was proposing personal liability for police officers. In my view, this is simply another way of defending the police. Massachusetts has always been a pillar of excellence and innovation. I have to believe that we can reimagine the police and better support our communities in more creative ways that don't necessarily call for reducing police officers.

I sincerely hope that the Committee will reconsider this aspect of the bill and once again lead the nation with an innovative and thoughtful approach to both policing and keeping our communities safe.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Molle,  
617-803-6035

From: Louise Parker <parkerlouise@earthlink.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Jehlen, Patricia (SEN)  
Subject: S.2820

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

I am writing to express my strong support for S.2820. I believe this bill will bring crucial reform to our criminal justice system. I am therefore calling on you to work swiftly to pass and strengthen this bill. Specifically, it is essential that the final bill eliminates qualified immunity; if we do not eliminate this loophole we cannot hold police accountable for excessive force and overreach. It is also essential that bill introduces strong standards for decertifying problem officers and completely bans tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids such as the one that killed Breonna Taylor. I believe that the Commonwealth can be a leader in criminal justice reform. S.2820 provides a much needed and powerful step towards this goal.

Sincerely,

Louise Parker

1 Warwick Park

Cambridge, MA 02140



From: Emily Ronald <ekronald@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S. 2820 Support

Dear Representative Stanley and Members of the House Ways and Means Committee,

I'm a Waltham resident writing to express support for S. 2820, the Senate's police reform bill. I urge the House to enact a similar bill quickly.

I'm especially in favor of the bill's positions on limiting use of force, the duty of an officer to intervene in misconduct, restrictions on purchasing military equipment, and its modifications to qualified immunity.

I also support leaving the decision about police in schools to local superintendents. As much as I love the police officer in my sons' elementary school - she's kind, friendly, and a welcome face to them - police officers in schools by and large do not make schools safer enough to outweigh the increase in arrests and profiling of minority students. This decision ought to be up to each community.

Most of all, I hope that a good police reform bill will be enacted and signed into law by the end of July.

Thank you for your attention to this priority, and thank you for soliciting opinions on the bill (I saw Rep. Stanley's tweet and remembered I hadn't called or emailed!). Please stay well in these COVID days, and thank you for your hard work.

Regards,  
Emily Ronald

--

Emily Ronald

Researcher  
she / her  
cell: 617-803-0584  
From: Sallye Bleiberg <sallyefbleiberg@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Ciccolo, Michelle - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform

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.

Sallye Bleiberg

Lexington

From: Michael Wetherbee <wetherdad@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Written testimony regarding S2820

Please take your time to have your family, friends and all others who support police and correction officers, to copy this post and send it to: Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Michael Wetherbee and I live at 26 Red Fox Xing Gardner, MA 01440. I work at the Souza Baranowski Correctional Center and am a Lieutenant and a Disciplinary 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 Wetherbee

From: Chief William G. Brooks III <wbrooks@norwoodma.gov>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Testimony re: Senate 2820

I am the Chief of Police in the Town of Norwood. I have been a police officer for 43 years, served as president of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association in 2016, and am a member of the Board of Directors of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

To say that the morale of police officers is sagging these days is an understatement. We are all disgusted by what we saw happen to Mr. Floyd, but we also worry that the good people we serve will associate us with those who killed him, or at some level believe that any of us would do such a thing. And now, a bill is before you that promises to "reform" us, while missing the point on so many levels. So we are left with the narrowest of windows within which to try to explain how we feel, or why we believe Senate 2820 misses the mark in so many places.

First, please understand that Massachusetts has some of the best trained, most highly educated police officers in the U.S. (in spite of low state funding in these areas), with remarkably low levels of use of force. Our citizens enjoy relatively low rates of crime and violent crime, and our Commonwealth has the lowest incarceration rate of any state in the country. Our police departments lead the way nationally in training and policy related to serving people with mental illness and we embraced community policing long before it became universally accepted. We implemented and authored a white paper on the pillars of 21st century policing as outlined by the DOJ and President Obama's task force, and followed up with training on restorative justice, implicit bias, and procedural justice.

Our officers risk their lives daily, but just as importantly they provide service to their communities in a dignified and respectful manner.

As for the bill, the issue causing the most angst among officers is the threat to qualified immunity. Our officers accept that they must make split-second judgments in highly charged situations, but they expect some measure of protection from personal liability when a citizen believes they should have handled an incident differently. The change to qualified immunity in the Senate bill would affect all public employees (except legislators, judges and prosecutors who enjoy absolute immunity). It strikes me that the bill confers the lowest level of immunity on those public employees with the least time to make decisions. I fear that such a change will make it even more difficult for us to attract qualified candidates to policing.

I am troubled by the proposal to create a "police officer standards and accreditation committee." First, the name of POSAC should be changed. There are currently many police departments, including mine, that are accredited through Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission (and re-accredited every three years) and so the similarity in titles will be confusing. If an entity is created to certify officers, it should be called the Massachusetts Police Certification Board.

The bill as written would empower the board/agency to conduct misconduct investigations with subpoena power, but we note that law enforcement officers are in the minority on the board. If medical boards are staffed with medical professionals and bar overseer boards by attorneys, why would a board overseeing the certification of police officers not be staffed primarily by law enforcement officers? And police departments must report all complaints of officer misconduct to this board? Misconduct at all levels? That is absurd.

As for the creation of a POST system of standards and training, you may already know that the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association proposed a POST system (as it is called in 46 other states) in the 2013 and 2015 legislative sessions. So I support the concept, but it should be accomplished properly.

(As an aside, Massachusetts already has two MPTCs, one of which is actually a committee, but other the state training agency. The name of the

agency should be changed to "agency" or something similar. This is a constant point of confusion.)

The bill contains a requirement that an officer report every stop and frisk, even if consensual. This requirement poses a risk that the authors of the bill did not likely understand. An officer who encounters a person behind a building late at night might ask him if he's carrying a weapon and if the answer is no, ask if he can check for for weapons for his own safety. I did this many times when I was on patrol or as a detective. A law requiring the reporting of all such encounters will cause officers to hesitate to ask a person for consent out of concern that they will have to report it. And the notion that an officer would have to give every person a "receipt" is off the mark. What does a receipt do? I have never fielded a complaint from a citizen and been unable to discern which officer he or she was talking about. A receipt?

It strikes me that the data reporting in this bill looks like the provisions struck by the legislature from the hands-free bill just a few months ago. But if the legislature wants data on stops, the state should fund an interface connecting police departments to the state (we STILL don't have an interface for the eCitation system the state asked us to adopt) and the state can pull whatever information it wants.

One section of the bill deals with use of force and force reporting, and requires a police department to report to the state the use of any "chemical weapon." We suspect that this provision is aimed at the use of tear gas, but as written it would require an agency to report every time an officer uses oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray, and report "all measures that were taken in advance of the event to reduce probability of disorder." Really?

There needs to be a clarification regarding the potential use of a chokehold. Massachusetts police officers neither use nor are trained to use chokeholds. However, if an officer is involved in a deadly force situation, it is nonsensical to make an officer subject to criminal prosecution and decertification for using a chokehold, when he/she would have been otherwise authorized to use deadly force and shoot someone. This is easily accomplished by adding language like, "unless authorized to use deadly force to protect the life of the officer or another" after the language prohibiting the use of chokeholds. My Department policy already contains this language.

There are many other segments of the bill that are troubling, and the better course would be to either defer passage of the bill, or to pass a version creating a POST and take up the many related issues in the next session when we all have time to think and talk about it.

I appreciate that the members of these two committees will read this testimony and consider it in their deliberations. But I ask that you take a moment to think about the good work police officers do, often under dangerous conditions, and our commitment to community service.

William G. Brooks III  
Chief of Police  
Norwood Police Department  
137 Nahatan Street  
Norwood, MA 02062  
781-440-5150  
IACP Board of Directors  
@ChiefBrooksNPD <<http://ozil-conseil.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Twitter-logo.jpg>>

From: Jen Holtcamp <jenholtcamp@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 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,

Jennifer Holtcamp  
From: jcsmyrle@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 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,

Mr. Myrle Francis

JCSmyrle@aol.com

From: Lisa Ouellet <leelaj22@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 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: Jesse Crafts-Finch <jcfinch@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Public Comment on S.2800

Members of the Committee,

TLDR: I support the changes presented in S.2800.

As a citizen of the Commonwealth, it is important to me that we recognize that in the last several decades Police and Police Unions have seen an enormous growth in influence, power, and a massive decline in accountability. At this point in time, I believe it is essential that we make a substantial push in the other direction. When our laws and judicial findings prevent public servants from being held accountable for their actions, and when laws and policies provide incentive structures for Police gain at the expense of the public (such as Civil Forfeiture) steps need to be taken to address the issue.

I'm aware that our State has a relatively good record when it comes to both policing and incarceration compared to the rest of the country. It is important to note that this in itself does not mean we are doing a good job, just that we are doing better. We should continue to strive to improve ourselves as a commonwealth.

The Police need to be more accountable for their actions. Their members and unions will cry foul and tell stories about how if the status-quo is changed, chaos will reign, all officers will quit their jobs, and those that remain will continuously be charged for crimes when they were simply doing their jobs. It makes sense for them to make these appeals, because they have nothing to gain in the short term by giving up such protections.

It is up to you in the committee, the larger Senate and House, and the citizens of this state to step back and take a more clear eyed view of the situation to understand that even with some of the significant change this bill would produce, our police will still be among some of the best protected - legally and otherwise - in the world.

At the end of the day we need to strike a good balance between providing officers the ability to do their job effectively, and providing the public with the protections, oversight, and ability to hold the police accountable that a healthy community requires.

In closing, I want to note that trivial changes or changes which some might categorize as tweaks will just continue to perpetuate the problem. It would punt it down the road, to use a sports analogy. The body politic



at this time clearly sees a need to make a significant change, and if our legislatures do not do so the problem will only continue to worsen. We need to take the top off the pot before it boils over.

Sincerely and with Best Regards,

Jesse Crafts-Finch  
18 Nutting Ave.  
Apt 2  
Amherst MA, 01002

From: Noreen McDonagh <nmcdonagh99@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

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 hastily passed by the State Senate. This bill has been is an attack on all public employees. People who are public employees work within the community to ensure the vital growth of the community. As you know, Massachusetts is the first in education and to take away rights from teachers is just ludicrous. For years, studies have shown that the number of people staying in the teaching profession is dwindling with the average new teacher lasting roughly 5 years. Additionally, across the Nation, there is a dire need for teachers who are people of color. This Bill sets yet another reason why young people would stay out of the profession. You know as well as I do that anyone can say what they want about anyone whether true or false and there just needs to be a modicum of doubt ruin a person's life.

Additionally, this attack on law enforcement is going to lead to a lack of law and order. It is happening every day and people just ignore it. This lack of law and order will flow through every community and school system in the state and what does that leave us?

Please do not do this to public employees and to the future of this state.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,  
Noreen McDonagh  
153 Aldrich Street  
Roslindale, MA 02131

From: Jeanne Marrasso <marrassoward3@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:42 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill S.2820 An Act to reform police standards and shift resources to build a more equitable, fair and just commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of color

I am writing to voice my opposition to Bill S.2820. I strongly urge the Governor to veto this and any similar bill that would come across his desk, that would establish a committee or laws for the benefit of any person or persons based strictly on the color of their skin! Any one who does support such a Bill I believe is a racist and therefore has no place in the Massachusetts government. And I will work to have those lawmakers and representatives voted out of office. This is no longer 1965 and we have moved way beyond segregation. At this time in our history we have a well respected police force that does not require these extreme measures. If there are a few who do not abide by reasonable current guidelines, they should be provided the proper training or removed from law enforcement. Let me reiterate once again, I will make it my mission to do everything in my power, to see that any racist occupying a seat on Beacon Hill is promptly voted out of office.

Respectfully yours,  
Citizen, Jeanne Marrasso  
617-224-2031

Ward 3, Newton, MA

From: Daniel Craven <craven.daniel.t@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:41 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S2820

The Honorable Rep. Aaron Michlewitz

Chair, House Committee on Ways and Means

The Honorable Rep. Claire Cronin

House Chair, Joint Committee on Judiciary

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

I am writing to ask you to oppose S2820, An Act to reform police standards. The bill as written has dangerous changes to qualified immunity, due process and collective bargaining. I can agree that police and criminal justice reform is needed, but this bill reaches far beyond that.

The proposed changes to qualified immunity would result in the flooding of the state court with lawsuits. Those lawsuits would cause a financial strain on the municipalities that are forced to defend these cases. The increase in costs may cause municipalities to settle meritless claims that would have been protected under qualified immunity prior. The state courts will have to interpret the new qualified immunity language. That will force the courts to develop a whole body of case law and will lead to

uncertainty for public employees and plaintiffs for years to come. Lastly, qualified immunity does not just apply to police officers, but all public officials. This will put all government officials at a greater risk for individual personal liability based off of their official actions.

Given the concerns surrounding these changes, S2820 should not be passed at this time. As a proud member of the Professional Firefighters of Massachusetts Local 1032 I ask you to oppose this bill and to stand with public employees to ensure that much needed criminal justice reform is done so thoughtfully.

Sincerely,

Daniel Craven

8 Silverbirch Rd

Billerica, MA 01821

From: william murphy <8murfs@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:41 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,  
William Murphy

Sent from my iPhone From: Lisa Bradley <lisabradley618@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:36 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,

Lisa Bradley  
15 Sleeper St Apt 506  
Boston, MA 02210  
lisabradley618@gmail.com

From: Jay Morgan <jaymorgan69@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:39 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform

Greetings,

I support police reform to get rid of bad police officers and police brutality but I do not support a removal of qualified immunity for police officers. If an officer has done anything criminal in performance of their duties, that person can be criminally prosecuted. It is however not fair to bankrupt a police officer by civil proceedings since by definition he is acting as an agent of the state in performance of his duties. He would not otherwise be arresting people. The same logic is applied to politicians who have complete immunity from personal civil prosecution for their legislative actions. Thank you for reading my input to the current proposed legislation.

Respectfully,  
Joseph G Morgan  
6 Bright St, Apt 1  
Waltham, MA 02453

781-642-7379

From: Iris <iristoner@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: SB 2820 (policing reform)

Iris Toner  
(508)386-1241  
134 Whippoorwill Dr  
Raynham, MA

Hello,

My name is Iris Toner. I'm from Raynham and am a Taunton Public School teacher. I am writing to you to please not move forward with the Police Reform Bill. I feel that the citizens from the Commonwealth of MA need transparency about this new Police Reform Bill. Politicians that passed this bill in the Senate did not hear their constituents nor did they present this bill to their community that they represent. My State Rep-Mark Pacheco who voted for this bill did not take any consideration that the majority of his constituents are NOT in favor of this bill. We need more transparency, more dialogue from all points of views, and more time. This shouldn't be rushed. Police Reform should be a thoughtful and methodical process, not rushed for to appease a political climate.

As a citizen of this great state and as a public school teacher, this not only effects adults from all walks of life, but also our children especially those who rely on School Resource Officers for their safety. For example, at our high school, our school resource officers are involved with the at risk students' lives more than a teacher could reach. SRO are an unusual hybrid of a counselor, educator, and a cop. Our SROs are important to our school community, but VITAL to our low income community with mainly single parent households. SRO provide guardians and parents with guidance/counseling, education, mentoring, a friend to lean on for help, and role model to the youth in the community.

If you ask many students in the Taunton Public School System, they would tell you not to pass this bill that could jeopardize losing their SRO who are the fabric of our school community, but also their friend and role model.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter,

Iris Toner

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Stanley Sayer <sayer207@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: reform

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  
stanley sayer  
76 elm at boston ma 02130  
sayer207@yahoo.com

From: Virginia Vaughan <vvaughan80@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:37 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill No. S2820

Dear Rep. Aaron Michlewitz and Rep. Claire Cronin,

My name is Virginia Cassidy. I live in Billerica, MA. My husband, Patrick Cassidy, is a Police Officer in Everett, MA. He is also a father to our two little boys, a son, brother, friend, and role model. He works in Youth Violence and as a School Resource Officer. He builds positive relationships with ALL MEMBERS of the community. He has kept many kids from going down a dark road of drugs and crime. He is considered a role model to so many. He gets invited to be a part of these kids' lives far past when they graduate from school. He has EARNED their trust and their respect. He has run into burning buildings to rescue people he doesn't know. He has stopped known criminals from running from a crime scene and

directly into innocent civilians homes. He HAS SAVED LIVES and KEPT EVERYONE SAFE.

He is part of the 99%. He teaches kindness and patience to all those around him. He is fair. He is just. He is proactive. He goes to work everyday, kisses his family goodbye, and prays he will come home. He sees that the power to not use force is the best power of them all. Our kids and I see him as a HERO and you will not find a soul who will dispute that.

Our friends and family? About 90% of them wear the badge. They also find it a privilege and calling to protect and serve the Commonwealth . They are also part of the 99%. They also have children, spouses, mothers, fathers, and other family who are proud of the way they protect the public, collaborate with their communities, and earn the respect and trust of the citizens they serve.

As a wife of a an exceptional law enforcement officer, I find the NON-TRANSPARENT, NON-COLLABORATIVE, LATE NIGHT, REACTIONARY acts of our State Senate to be a slap in the face of all law enforcement, law enforcement families and, quite frankly, anyone in the Commonwealth who values their safety and quality of life. The idea that the livelihood of my family could be in jeopardy because of an ignorant few is downright despicable. No officer wants to have to wonder if they are going to lose their home or retirement for doing a job that they feel is their calling in this life.

This bill does not just impact law enforcement. It also impacts nurses, firefighters, and other public servants. I have worked in Healthcare in Massachusetts for over 15 years. I have seen first-hand the impact of the quick actions taken by qualified first responders to save people's lives, minimize injury, and protect the quality of life of so many citizens of the Commonwealth. I am concerned this bill will negatively impact this valuable, critical decision-making and will INCREASE mortality, and injury, and be detrimental to the quality of life of the citizens of Massachusetts.

No good decision is ever made at 4AM. Never mind one that is RUSHED, NON-COLLABORATIVE, POORLY EVALUATED for LONG TERM CONSEQUENCES, and PUNISHES those who are QUALIFIED to serve and protect the Commonwealth.

We have the opportunity to stop a very harmful piece of legislation from passing. As a wife of a law enforcement officer, a member of the Massachusetts Healthcare Team, a Mom, a Daughter, and a Proud Citizen of the Commonwealth, I BEG you to reconsider this Bill and Vote a Strong "No."

I am sure you are getting lots of emails about his topic and I thank you for taking the time to read this one.

Please don't hesitate to reach out. I can be contacted via email or at 6179183360.

Regards,  
Virginia Cassidy

Billerica, MA

From: Glenn Mulno <glennmulno@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:36 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Garlick, Denise - Rep. (HOU); Rausch, Becca (SEN)

Subject: Feedback for police reform and racial equity legislation

To Members of the MA Legislature

I write to offer the humble opinion of a concerned citizen regarding police reform and racial equality. This is simply my opinion on these topics and the scope of my opinion may go beyond what you are currently considering for active bills to date. But I feel compelled to ask that you work to bring about a more just and equal system for every human in this state.

Regarding police reform:

If Massachusetts were a private/public corporation, a school, small business, restaurant, etc - we would have a set of rules and expectations about what behaviors are acceptable and not acceptable for our employees. Should one of these employees violate those standards the employee would be subject to discipline up to and including termination. This is how it works in every place of business and that is a good thing. Accountability to one's actions is critical to a properly functioning and just society. Why should we expect anything less for our hired employees of the police force?

If anything, because these employees were hired to enforce the laws of our great state and represent all of us, we should expect more from them and at a higher standard. These are public employees whose employers are the citizens of this great state of Massachusetts. They are not a power or entity unto themselves. We the people of Massachusetts should have a say in what behavior is acceptable and not acceptable for our employees. These employees should not be protected and shielded from their own actions and behaviors when those actions and behaviors violate the trust and integrity we expect and demand from our employees.

It is time we decide what behaviors are acceptable and not acceptable. There is no reason to choke someone. There is no reason to put your knee on someone's neck. There is no reason to attack protesters. Employees that perform unnecessary acts of violence on another human are terminated and must face the consequences of their actions. It is time these employees be given proper guidelines that if crossed, they are terminated and face the consequences of their actions.

Think too about what the police force has grown into. We expect the police to handle every grievance, every complaint, every accident and everything we don't want to deal with ourselves. We ask them to show up at accident scenes to handle traffic, to handle traffic for construction crews and to babysit our roads to handle the high crime of forgetting to use your blinker. We ask them to show up in millions of situations, where a person with a gun is probably not in the top 10 of people who could best handle that situation.



It is time we step back and rethink our policing and ask them to do only what they do best and where the presence of a weapon may reasonably be expected. We must redirect funds from a runaway police force to resources that are better equipped to handle much of what the police face on a daily basis.

Regarding racial equality:

We are long long past when we should do everything, everything, in our power to bring about racial equality in our communities, our state, our nation, and the world. For far too long people of color have had to live with a system of "justice" that is racist, unjust and has treated them as if they don't matter, or at least that they don't matter as much as white people. Thank God for cameras that have exposed near daily instances of police brutality and abuse of power around the country. Without those cameras many of us would be ignorant and blind to the longstanding and continued injustices faced by people of color every day.

We must work to educate and retrain our police to eliminate racial biases, profiling, discriminating policies and hiring practices. We must change laws that were written to punish people of color and are enforced against people of color in far higher percentages than whites. We must change our criminal justice systems and enact prison reforms that incarcerate people of color at far higher percentages than white people. We must release people from prisons that are serving time for nonviolent crimes and reduce or eliminate prison times for nonviolent crimes, again, that impact people of color at far higher rates. We must overhaul our bail systems that put people in jail for the crime of being poor.

We must also change the foundations within communities to provide economic and educational equality throughout the state. Far too many schools receive far too little funds because they are not as affluent as another community. The foundations of future financial success are rooted in a full and enriching education from preschool through college, but we let the rich perpetuate inequality at these most basic levels and tell poor communities they just need to self fund like the rich do to be on equal footing. This is a lie that perpetuates a racist and unjust system. All too often the poorer communities are primarily people of color, all too often the affluent communities are primarily white. We should direct funds to communities that need more so they can be truly equal.

You have the power to stop perpetuating racial and economic injustice. You have the power to reimagine our communities in a truly equal way. You have the power to reimagine our policing in a more just way. You have the power to bring the State of Massachusetts closer to the ideals of what this great nation was founded on.

Act

Perhaps no one will read this. I am just a citizen. I am just one person. One voice. One vote. But I hope that we can all work together for a better community for all.

Best regards in these difficult times. Stay safe. Stay healthy.

Glenn Mulno  
40 Morton Street  
Needham, MA  
02494

From: Elizabeth Egan <eliegan@bu.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:32 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony in Support of Police Accountability -- Use of Force Standards, Qualified Immunity Reform, and Prohibitions on Face Surveillance

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, Qualified Immunity Reform, and Prohibitions on Face Surveillance

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

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

1. Adopt strict limits on police use of force,
2. End qualified immunity, because it shields police from accountability and denies victims of police violence their day in court, and
3. Prohibit government use of face surveillance technology, which threatens core civil liberties and racial justice.

The Fraternal Order of Police acknowledges that the "enormous responsibility that comes with a badge" and that officers should be "held to a much higher standard of personal and professional conduct."

Unfortunately, this rhetoric does not carry over to the practice or structure in which law enforcement officers practice. Many professions have standardized education requirements, testing, continuing education, and licensing boards which uphold the shared values and standards of a profession. I support the creation of a Police Officers Standards and Accreditation Committee to provide independent oversight of the profession and uphold the standards of the profession. It is time for qualified immunity to be revoked and for law enforcement officers to be held to the same standard as other professionals who are accused of wrongdoing. In medicine, providers are held liable for mistakes that lead to death or injury and can be the subject of civil lawsuits, they are held to high standards of education, licensing, peer and societal review and must complete continuing education to ensure their practice is based on evidence. It should not be controversial to apply the same professional framework to that of law enforcement. S.2820 applies a reasonable person standard, and if brought to trial, the accused would be able to present evidence to a judge or jury, who would apply the reasonable standard to the case. Again, this is not a controversial process, it is not new and it is not remarkable in any way, it is the standard by which the residents of the Commonwealth can seek damages.

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

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

Of critical and urgent importance: Massachusetts must abolish the dangerous doctrine of qualified immunity because it shields police from being held accountable to their victims. Limits on use of force are meaningless unless they are enforceable. Yet today, qualified immunity protects police even when they blatantly and seriously violate people's civil rights, including by excessive use of force resulting in permanent injury or even death. It denies victims of police violence their day in court. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820. Maintaining Qualified Immunity ensures that Black Lives Don't Matter. We urge you to end immunity in order to end impunity.

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

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

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Egan, MPH, LICSW

From: Chris Westfall <ctw46@law.georgetown.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:26 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,

Chris Westfall  
1 Emerson Pl Apt 10E  
Boston, MA 02114  
ctw46@law.georgetown.edu

From: Abraham, Tobin (HOU)  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: FW: [External]: Police and Juvenile Justice Reform Legislation

Good afternoon!

I am forwarding the below testimony on S.2820.

Best,

Tobin

Tobin G. Abraham, Esq.  
Legislative Aide | Office of Representative Tram T. Nguyen, Esq. - 18th  
Essex District  
State House, Room 33 | Boston, MA 02133  
617-722-2060 ext. 5 | Tobin.Abraham@MAhouse.gov

---

From: mona Igram [monaigram@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:17 PM  
To: Abraham, Tobin (HOU)  
Subject: [External]: Police and Juvenile Justice Reform Legislation

Dear Representative Nguyen (Tram),

Thank you for committing to confront racial injustice in our communities. I am writing asking you to urge the Speaker to include these youth-focused policies in the House race equity bill. These proposals will address racial disparities in our justice system and hold law enforcement accountable when interacting with young people in our communities and in our schools:

\* Require transparency and accountability by reporting race/ethnicity data at each major decision point of the juvenile justice system, as filed by Rep. Tyler (H.2141). Require law enforcement and other juvenile justice agencies to report data on young people at major decision points with the juvenile justice system to improve the state's policy and planning. It is really difficult to look at systemic change without access to data.

\* End the automatic prosecution of older teens as adults, as filed by Rep. O'Day and Rep. Khan (H.3420): Massachusetts' youth of color bear the harshest brunt of our legal system with their over-representation in the adult criminal justice system. By raising the age at which a teenager can be automatically tried as an adult, we can hold young people accountable in a more developmentally appropriate setting, giving them a better chance to succeed and turn away from offending and reduce the harms of legal system involvement all while reducing crime in our communities. Raising the age of majority to 19 is the first step in increasing the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, where young people are treated in developmentally appropriate ways.

\* Expand eligibility for expungement to rectify the collateral consequences of the over-policing and criminalization of communities of color, as filed by Rep. Decker and Rep. Khan (H1386) and as passed in S.2800: There is overwhelming evidence <[Expungement as passed was a hollow promise. Please make it a priority to give young people a clean slate.](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.washingtonpost.com_graphics_2020_opinions_systemic-2Dracism-2Dpolice-2Devidence-2Dcriminal-2Djustice-2Dsystem_-23School&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=FFzuTF14HHJEtOOWc-awL8LiFjtFfdoQgT3yGtkZXXK8&m=BW0aLTTdDSKOcKq0Wla0khWzkNFTcNu57A_OZ4BKUVg&s=vEXvBeKf2dnGHJnaWdb5hhYNMGjJpc6Nv-1mIeDqwGM&e=> that racial disparities against Black individuals at every stage of the legal system - from policing and profiling, court proceedings to sentencing and every stage in between. Expungement is an important tool to rectify the over-policing and disparate treatment of people of color by expanding. The current law limits does not distinguish if a case ended in a conviction or a dismissal. We ask that eligibility is modified so that (1) all non-convictions are eligible for expungement; (2) change the limitation on the number of cases on a record, to length of time since last conviction (3 years for misdemeanors and years for felonies); and (3) limit the list of offenses ineligible for expungement to only those resulting a felony conviction.</p></div><div data-bbox=)

\* End the surveillance and profiling of students in schools as amended in S.2800 Section 49 by prohibiting school police from sharing student information they gather through their interactions with students with the Boston Regional Intelligence Center (BRIC) and the Commonwealth Fusion Centers that are accessed by local, state and federal law enforcement.

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

\* National and local studies have overwhelmingly shown that Black and Latinx students are significantly more likely to be suspended, expelled,

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

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

Mona Igram  
5 Heritage Lane  
Andover, MA 01810  
(603) 401-7146

From: D. McKeown <dougmckeownmst@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:30 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: End qualified immunity!

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.

MA State and municipal police are notoriously corrupt. A full quarter of the officers at my local police department can't be called to testify during court cases due to being on the Brady List. This means they've lied in an official capacity, and are not reliable witnesses! Yet somehow they still have their jobs? Completely unacceptable.

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.

If you could take a full and committed step toward ending police brutality in our Commonwealth, that would be wonderful.

Cheers,  
- Douglas J. McKeown, resident of Medford MA  
From: Mark Obrien <markob65@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:30 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

My name is Mark O'Brien and my family and I are Lynnfield residents. I am a State Trooper and have a combination of 16 years of law enforcement experience. I am writing on behalf of my family, specifically my two sons.

I consider us very fortunate to reside in Massachusetts. The Commonwealth is a wonderful place to live; however, the safety of our communities is at risk. If our public safety employees are no longer protected under the well established civil protection now afforded to us, there will be a stark drop in safety provided to our cities and towns. To no one's surprise, the fear of a civil suit will influence one's job performance; whether that job a police officer or a teacher, the fear is real. As police officers our number one priority is to ensure the safety of the communities and to hopefully act before someone is victimized. The fear of a civil lawsuit will drastically hinder the performance of those job duties.

There is potential for a drastic trickle effect caused by the recent bill passed by the Senate that would effect our future generations. The idea of my two sons growing up in an unsafe community is scary. In such an advanced society, why would the following generation suffer such mistakes made by the previous generation. I truly believe the Senate acted in accordance with an agenda; to wit a dangerous agenda.

As I grew up as a child in the lower middle class in an urban community, I knew if I worked hard I could become a civil servant and provide for a small family. Police and fire careers were a modest, worthwhile goal. I served in Operation Iraqi Freedom to become a police officer. If the senate bill were to pass, how will we replace the volume of police that will retire with new qualified candidates? We are striving to recruit candidates of every race, ethnicity and gender to work with. This will be near impossible. Representatives I assure you the quality of candidates will not be what they are today if the Qualified Immunity we are afforded now is changed. This in turn affects the quality of life my children will grow up in. I assure you, family is the reason we oppose any changes to qualified immunity. Massachusetts is a wonderful place to live. We should not suffer from tragic, wrong actions in the Midwest. Commonsense must prevail.

Respectfully,

Mark O'Brien  
Lynnfield, MA

From: Patricia Brouillard <patSYMAY521@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill S2820

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: Julio Quiles <JQuiles@wpd.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:29 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Urgent

Dear Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Representative Claire Cronin, and to all the other elected officials.

My name is Julio Jose Quiles and I live at 24 Lawrence Street, Haverhill, MA 01830. As your constituent, I write to you today to express my staunch opposition to S.2800, a piece of hastily-thrown-together legislation that will hamper law enforcement efforts across the Commonwealth. It robs police officers of the same Constitutional Rights extended to citizens across the nation. It is misguided and wrong.

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

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

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

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

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2800 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Respectfully submitted,

Ofc. Julio J. Quiles  
Patrolman, Badge 197  
Patrol Division  
Wilmington Police Department  
1 Adelaide Street  
Wilmington, MA. 01887  
978-658-5071 Ext. 5197

From: Robtirrell <robtirrell@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Madame and Mister Chairman,

As a Constable I am against any language that effects qualified immunity. It would open the door to frivolous lawsuits for all public employee in pursuit of their duties.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Robert Tirrell  
From: donna semel <donna10707@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Please don't put children in jail

Please consider raising the age of placing offenders in adult prisons to at least 21. Could YOU be held responsible for your behavior at that age? Children need to be provided with care to make them into functioning adults. A juvenile facility could be their last chance at that.  
Thank you,  
Donna Semel

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Jessica Pero <jessiepero@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:28 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Good afternoon,

My name is Jessica Pero and I'm writing to you today about the police reform bill that has been brought before you.

My husband has been a Boston Police Officer for about 15 years. I have lived and worked in the city of Boston my whole life and I feel that the Boston Police do a great a job. I do not feel that Boston faces the same problems that face other states across the country and to blanket all police departments as one just isn't fair.

However, like most people, I do believe that some change is needed but this bill is NOT that change. This bill threatens to harm the neighborhoods throughout the state, as well as the well being of its police force. It's a large bill that needs to be broken down to the public so that everyone knows and understands what's in it, and how it will affect them and their safety. It seems as this was thrown together rather quickly to make a statement.

So I'm asking you to veto this bill so that we can affect the real change that is needed, for everyone, and not just a few.

Thank you,  
Jessica Pero

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Barbara Keefe <jessejam@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

Please veto the S2800 police reform bill. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts needs its wonderful police force at State and local level. Across this country police are being attacked and demoralized, please don't let it happen in Massachusetts

Get BlueMail for Android <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.bluemail.me\\_r-3Fb-3D15894&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=ZNzDgbr8tx5irsWM2-xjCoz7j4T5rCGpyMBjanrNZA&s=ZHPTbhdKAJ7jGmW82krCaHyk4nq6mu66DS\\_g3JMLef4&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.bluemail.me_r-3Fb-3D15894&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ZNzDgbr8tx5irsWM2-xjCoz7j4T5rCGpyMBjanrNZA&s=ZHPTbhdKAJ7jGmW82krCaHyk4nq6mu66DS_g3JMLef4&e=)>

From: Lynette Culverhouse <lculverhouse@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:25 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. It is imperative that we address the bullying culture that has been allowed to exist in our police force for way too long. The precedents have been set that allow white male police officers to bully and harass people from marginalized communities, some of our most vulnerable people, including women. It is time to watch out for them and give them some cover. This bill would be a start. Please make it happen before any further damage to our state's integrity is done by rogue police officers.

Thank you.  
Lynette Culverhouse  
Arlington Fights Racism  
concerned citizen  
From: Tyler Estrella <tylerestrella22@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Tyler Estrella and I live at 120 Hood ST, Fall River MA 02720. I work at the Bristol County Sheriffs 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,

Tyler Estrella

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Bonnie Bain <bonnie@bonniebain.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:25 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Support for 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 am alarmed by the amount of pushback we are seeing for the bare minimum required for a safer criminal justice system.

The final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for certifying all officers and decertifying problem officers (I have learned that the time it takes to become an officer and the amount of training they get is minimum and the methods by which we remove problem officers hardly exist), and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Bonnie Bain Massie, Salem

From: Julie Murphy <murfcota@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2820

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to you after reading the bill S2800, which is now bill S2820. I am shocked that our elected officials would even allow to pass this bill on after reading the full details. I am a nurse and an educator and not only am I upset about how this will impact our police, but all other professions that have vowed to care for the public. I know you are in a tough situation, but I plead that you reconsider this bill and perhaps start over and focus on funding and training.

Sincerely,

Julie Norton of Quincy, MA  
From: Parks, David <dep3@williams.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:22 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: MA Police Reform Bill

I definitely support the MA Police Reform Bill!

Thanks,  
David Parks  
34 Glass Works Rd  
Berkshire, MA 01224  
From: mcana7@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:19 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

July 16, 2020  
Good afternoon,

I write to support the bill in front of the House to begin reform of police practice in Massachusetts. It is a good step in the right direction. All of good hearts and fair minds will agree we are in dangerous and unhealthy times. We have an opportunity to reach a little higher, to do better, to strive for peaceful settlements of disputes by strengthening the good that is being done already and requiring more thoughtful approaches to crime and punishment. Determent is best. Punishment was never meant to be meted out in the street by officers of the law.

Those who profess to protect and serve must be accountable to those people they protect and serve. It is those people calling for reform. We are all a community here, and all subject to the law, not above it, especially those who enforce it. In these days of rabid abuse of power and negligent disregard of human life, we in Massachusetts take the step toward peace, toward a better union.

We can do better. We can go forward. We can lead this crippled nation toward peace. In God We Trust.

Mary Canavan M.Ed  
617-744-5259  
From: Margaret Ryding <margaretryding@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:18 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony re S.2820

Subject line: Testimony re S.2820

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.

Thank you,

Margaret Ryding

781-641-2195

--

-

Margaret Ryding, M.Ac.  
Traditional Acupuncture,  
393 Massachusetts Avenue,  
Arlington, MA 02474

[www.margaretryding.com](http://www.margaretryding.com) <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.margaretryding.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.margaretryding.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-)

fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk  
13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=gfAAPtLZBOS2oKx8SR6x1x2UloFd9OkzmipgrWwNcPQ&s=-  
w8uTMdkHlgRzH4Y-YPEkXRw7IkT47NaMG1IVSdoDeM&e=>

{office} 781 641 2195

From: tom rock <tomfrock95@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:18 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2800

As your constituent, Tom Rock, from Mendon, I write to you again today to express my strong opposition to S.2800 which was passed by the Senate. I ask that you oppose this bill as constituted when it is debated in the House of Representatives.

I also ask that it be debated in the light of day and not voted on in the dark of night.

The bill is ill conceived and politically driven. I think that we all agree that police reform is important and needs to be addressed but passing a hastily thought-out bill just for the sake of passing a bill is not in the best interest of the Commonwealth.

This bill 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. It will cause many good officers to leave due to the new burdens and make it harder to recruit individuals into law enforcement.

S 2800 establishes a review committee with overly broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations. The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination (see Carney vs Springfield) and constitutional protections against "double-jeopardy."

Qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for the police officers we send out on patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities, or maybe more importantly the constant fear of personal liability, so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card, or other things for the benefit of them and their families. It will also expose LEOs to unlimited frivolous lawsuits and person legal costs associated with defending themselves in court. Good luck with police recruitment.



In addition S 2800 failed to follow the normal and appropriate legislative process of holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and experts. I ask that you vote NO when S.2800 comes to the House of Representatives for the reasons stated above, and others.

"We cannot support a measure which takes handcuffs off drug dealers and gang bangers and puts them on police, allows criminal records to disappear while tearing open police personnel files and allows criminals to appeal for monetary damages while denying police due process to appeal for their job," said James Machado, executive director of the Massachusetts Police Association.

Please have the courage to challenge the popular narrative and vote NO on S.2800

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Your Name and address and phone #

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Dino Rossi <dino@realestateman.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:16 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820

We need our local policemen and I do not support this proposed bill. Governor Baker please VETO this bill. If this passes we will have a mass exodus of policemen/women.

Dino Rossi, Owner  
Everything We Touch Turns To SOLD!!!!  
362 Watertown Street  
Newton, MA 02458  
617-312-3910 Cell  
617-969-0676 Office

Do you want to know what your home would sell for in today's HOT Real Estate market? Find your homes value by clicking here  
<

Please donate <[From: Cooper Gould <coopgould@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:16 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \(HOU\)  
Subject: Please Pass the Reform, Shift, Build Act!](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.newtonbgc.com_copy-2Dof-2Ddonate&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=DxHPE3Fy2fQbAx_B7rCPZNaH0QoQVdsVbq5XVRtyfZg&s=1C4cjAJE vTIGteS4ZmNMjzMYvzBWWDYgyxuMbV74qBY&e=> to the Newton Boys & Girls Club whenever you are able!!</p></div><div data-bbox=)

To whom it may concern,

Massachusetts must pass S2820.

I have been deeply disheartened by recent events across this country and in my city of Boston. As someone who has been in the streets demanding justice for the Black lives that have been murdered by police and white supremacists across the country, I have been disgusted by the response of state and local officials and law enforcement to the demands and the needs of the people. Time and time again, when communities rise up to make their voices heard and their demands clear, they have been met with a wall of police officers, armed and armored as if for war, with clearly visible detention and torture implements hanging from their belts and vests. The whole reason that people have been in the streets week after week is to show that the welfare of communities of color in our city and our state are more important than the semiautomatic weaponry, white supremacist indoctrination, and internationally criminal instruments of torture with which police forces are readily supplied. We are still in the streets because we have yet to see evidence that our representatives agree with this assessment. S2820 is the step we need to start to make this claim, that black lives matter a truth in our state and not simply a fantastical regulatory ideal. If the money spent on policing were spent on enriching communities, redistributing wealth, and providing health care and other essential social services, communities would be safer, happier, healthier, and better. I think we can all agree that empirical evidence shows the militarized, overpaid, unaccountable and improperly trained police forces of the state achieve none of these goals. S2820 is absolutely necessary if we are even to begin to consider Massachusetts a safe place for our communities and residents of color. I would be ashamed of my representative government if they were to reach an alternative conclusion.

Thank you for doing your jobs well, making Massachusetts a better place, and passing S2820.

Cooper Gould  
From: Ashley Barber <ashleybarber@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:14 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Re: S2800

Good Afternoon

I am writing to you in regards to the recent police reform bill (S.2800) that was carelessly rushed through the senate. I ask that you do not support this bill. This bill is nothing short of detrimental to law enforcement and the way that they serve and protect their communities. It is very clear that little research was done by the individuals who wrote this bill, not one has experience in law enforcement. Many black and Latino officers have stepped forward to challenge this irresponsible bill. They are frustrated that they, commonwealth chiefs and other law enforcement professionals were not consulted at all whatsoever. The boards, policies and the removal of all protections that this bill proposes is disheartening to myself, most Massachusetts residents, municipal and public employees and the men and women of law enforcement. We should all have had a voice on this matter and the senate effectively removed what rights we had to voice our opinions by sneaking this hastily written and irresponsible bill through to vote. This is not okay. This is not what they were elected to do.

If any reform is passed, let it be for more training and better equipment. If something is to be done, let us give police what is needed to keep everyone safe, from the residents of the commonwealth to the men and women who swore to protect it. Police departments in the state of Massachusetts are for the most part very progressive and extremely well run. Disrupting the way they are run with this bill is going to destroy policing in the state and could be catastrophic for all of us. Officers now are in fear for their future and reconsidering doing the job they love. What has happened in Massachusetts in recent years that we have to punish every officer in the state for? The terrible actions of one man in Minneapolis do not reflect a single officer at any level in the state of Massachusetts. They should not be subject to punishment for something they simply did not do or condone.

In closing, I ask that you do not support this bill. What the men and women in Law Enforcement is our support, not to be made out to look like animals and be stripped of any and all protections. They are not the enemy that S.2800 makes them out to be. We should all be most concerned about the senators who pushed this bill through.

I thank you for your time  
Ashley M Barber  
781-588-5502

From: Cynthia Tavilla <cstavilla@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:13 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony re S.2820

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.

Cynthia S. Tavilla  
781-572-5554

--

Cindy Tavilla  
107 Webster St.  
Arlington, MA 02474  
Hm/Cell: 781.572.5554  
Wk: 781.863.5570  
FAX: 781.316.0374

"The question is not whether Lincoln truly meant "government of the people" but what our country has, throughout its history, taken the political term "people" to actually mean."  
? Ta-Nehisi Coates

From: michael carey <michael.carey@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:13 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: RE S 2820, Police reform

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.

Michael Carey  
617 599 5817

Community Reentry Program Inc.  
Prison Fellowship at Friends Meeting (Quaker), Cambridge  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
From: John Bonczek <jbonczek@charter.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:12 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill

As a Massachusetts retired citizen I respectfully disagree with the police reform bill. It puts police and citizens in danger. We the people need to be protective from the criminals that are taking over this country. We need more protection not less. Please do not approve this bill.

Thanks

John j Bonczek

Sent from my iPhone  
From: Michael Ricci <mikeric@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Testimony

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Michael Ricci and I live in Middleboro. 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 floodgates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

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

From: George Sousa <gsousa123@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:11 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Subject: Police Reform Bill

Honorable members of the House Judiciary Committee,

Please accept this email as testimony regarding the police reform bill you are considering with regard to the issue of "qualified immunity". As the father of a Swansea police officer, it is concerning that my son could potentially be sued for just trying to do his job. Being a police officer in today's society is hard enough (many think it is the toughest job in the country). These men and woman choose a tough profession and the majority perform their duties admirably every day. They take an oath to protect and serve us. Massachusetts Police Officers are among the best - trained and most professional officers in the Nation. This measure of weakening or eliminating the protections granted to Police Officers under "qualified immunity" seems to me will only make the job even more difficult and has the very real possibility of making them and the citizens they serve less safe. I fear 2 things: Hard - working, honest police will be forced to "reason" or second guess themselves if they should help in certain situations (as noted in a recent Boston Herald article) or we will see many of these officers (especially the younger officers) leave the profession and create huge gaps in manpower. I think you will agree that most police officers are good people who want serve their community and are now living in the shadow of what the few bad cops do.

I ask that when the House reviews police reform that you consider the issue of "qualified immunity" and how this will have a negative impact on police officers. The law - abiding citizens of the Commonwealth need our elected officials to support our police officers rather than enacting legislation that has the potential to put their futures in jeopardy.

I hope that you agree that weakening or eliminating "qualified immunity" with regard to police reform is not a good thing and should not be part of any police reform bill. This is how this is affecting my son: He has been an officer for 6 years, has taken the Sergeant exam and scored second within his department, has multiple commendations in his jacket and wants to remain on the force. If this passes, he will have to shift gears and start a new career out of frustration leaving his Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice and past 6 years of his life feeling wasted.

Please do the right thing and support our officers.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

George Sousa

209 Bushee Road, Swansea, MA 02777

508 207 5612

From: amcbig <amcbig@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:10 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform bill s2800

Good Afternoon,

We need to back our Police not harass them! We should be hiring more police on our streets instead of trying to find ways to destroy morale and put our officers in harms way! We were just fine in Boston but this is creating hatred that I've never seen before directed at our police officers! You are all more concerned about criminals than the law abiding citizens of the Comth. Stop pandering for votes and protect our Police and citizens! At the rate we are going you won't have to worry about police anymore because they will all quit then you will have regular citizens armed to protect themselves and their families and property. Stop this hatred and violence against our men in blue! They deserve respect and protection for putting their lives on the line every day!!!

Anne Biggins  
617-875-8334

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Jimmy Elsenbeck <jelsenbeck@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:09 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.

James Elsenbeck, Medford, MA  
From: Josh <joshcolbs@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:08 PM



To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Opposed to bill S2820, especially the qualified immunity section

To the honorable representatives of Massachusetts,  
I am opposed to bill S2820 for Police reform and mainly to the qualified immunity section. Jobs that serve and help the communities need the up most protection we can legally give them. We cannot tell law enforcement officers or first responders to rush towards danger when help is needed. But not have their backs when they need help. We dont live in a perfect world, and these men and women do their best to protect is from the criminals and people who try to do us harm. Taking away the qualified immunity will only hurt the community further. Responding agencies with lower number of employees will now take longer to get to emergency calls. If you've never been involved with a medical call, seconds can be life saving. The first responders answering the call will now drive slower in fear of potentially getting into a fender bender or clipping another vehicle and being sued over it. Or detain someone who fits a suspect description, and be sued because it wasnt the right suspect.

This is a link to a PDF file that explains the hazards of messing with qualified immunity:

<https://files.constantcontact.com/132a544f001/feed66f3-e896-43ad-b0a2-e90e4a45070e.pdf>

Some changes are needed. But not this, and not in this way.

Thank you for your time.

From: Bill Burke <wjb1776@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:08 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2820 Police Reform

Chairs Michelewitz & Cronin

House Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary

I am emailing you my concerns for any hastily written or rushed police reform legislation. As a former municipal and state police officer I hope the Senate and House can agree on a police reform bill that is based on facts and not emotions.

Any bill being proposed deserves proper process including vetting, hearings, debate and input from all groups including law enforcement.

A Certification/De-Certification Process for law enforcement in Massachusetts is well overdue but must include a Due Process/Right of Appeal.

The elimination of Qualified Immunity will be a morale killer for the hard working members of law enforcement that go to work everyday trying to do the best job they can for the community they serve. The

Qualified Immunity elimination will also keep the most qualified and educated candidate from applying for positions in law enforcement due to the possibility of being sued individually for "acting in good faith" in performing the duties of law enforcement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Burke  
MSP-Retired  
508- <tel:508-385-5388> 922-7619 (c)  
wjb1776@yahoo.com

Sent from my iPad  
From: Diana Starke <djstarke@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:05 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

I respectfully request that the Massachusetts House preserve the vital reforms in the Senate bill and 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

Diana Starke  
Boston, MA  
From: Elizabeth Maglio <elizabethmaglio@icloud.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:04 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Need Transparency on SB 2820

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

Transparency is critically important, particularly when it comes to fighting abuse issues and the work of special state police officers. Specifically, there needs to be transparency around number of investigations, arrests, and arraignments to avoid selective and unjust policing practices. Special state police officers who work to fight animal abuse must be required to follow public record laws if they are empowered with some of the rights of policing. In essence, they must be held accountable to the public and/or marginalized populations, just like any other police officer.

We ask that you adopt a provision ensuring that special police officers are NOT exempt from public record laws, as follows:

An Act relative to transparency for special state police officers

SECTION 1. Chapter 66 of the General Laws, as appearing in the 2016 Official Edition, is hereby amended by inserting after section 21 the following section:-

Section 22. A document made or received by special state police officers as defined in Chapter 22C, including but not limited to, special state police officers as defined in sections 51, 56, 57, 58, and 63 shall be considered a public record under this chapter and under clause twenty-sixth of section 7 of chapter 4 and subject to all applicable exemptions.

Thank you,  
Elizabeth Maglio on behalf of  
Mass Coalition to End Puppy Mills

From: Debbie Lang <deborahannlang27@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:02 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S-2800

To Whom it May Concern,

I know you believe that the Police needs reform, but I'll tell you this, I have been working for the City of Boston for almost 6 years and Boston Police is my family. They are there when we need them and who else will go into communities to kill each other. On another note, you think that Health Care workers are the solution to Domestic Violence, well that won't help, the victim will continue to be the victim when the suspect, continues the abuse of them and those of the Health Care, they should also be infear for their lives because the suspect will beat on them as well. This Commonwealth needs to have Police and I know as an employee that Commissioner Gross, keeps a tight house and that is all that matters. So with these words I oppose this bill as should all the public.

Regards  
Deborah A Lang  
540 Hyde Park Ave #3  
Roslindale, MA 02131  
From: Nathaniel Harrison <harrysson@aol.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:01 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Ban all use of chokeholds

Dear HWM committee members,

I am writing to urge you in the strongest possible terms to approve a justice reform measure that would ban the use of chokeholds in ALL circumstances. The relevant language approved in Senate Bill 2800 is far too narrow and is unlikely to prevent practices that violate standards of basic decency and humanity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nathaniel Harrison  
106 A Franklin Street  
Watertown, Massachusetts 02472  
617-852-2919

From: Rich and Lisa Barthelmess <landrbart3@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 3:00 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800 (Police Reform)

Please accept my brief thoughts on S.2800.

I am a police officer with just over 29 years experience. Although some version of police reform is needed, I feel that the current attempt to rapidly change is a knee jerk reaction. Did something terrible happen in the Commonwealth during the pandemic? The answer is NO. I, along with the overwhelming (I would venture to say over 99%) of police officers continue to do the right thing every day. During the pandemic I went to work everyday. As always leaving my family not knowing what the day would bring. We went from hero's to being unwanted. I feel there are people that want nothing more than to see our mission fail. That mission is to care for and protect the citizens of this fine Commonwealth.

Please refer to the opinions of such professional groups as the Mass Police Association, MACOPS and the Mass Chiefs to name a few. Obviously we are not against well thought out and fair change. One area I personally take issue with is Qualified Immunity. Removing that puts all police officers (and others like Firefighters, Nurses and EMTs) in an unsafe position. QI protects the good police officer who act in good faith. It protects us from frivolous lawsuits that will be common if this becomes law. Please do the right thing and protect us who protect the Commonwealth.

Other issues again I ask you listen to the requests of our professional groups. Let us have a seat at the table.

I previously sent an email to Rep. Spiliotis. So if this is considered duplicate, I apologize.

Thank you for your time.

Richard Barthelmess  
Danvers PD (this is however a private request)  
Danvers MA  
978-739-8424

From: Dave Cooper <hnia.coop@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:59 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform Bill S.2820

To whom it may concern :

This is a copy of a letter I sent to State Representative Joseph Mckenna voicing my Opinion on this reform bill. and what my thoughts are about why it is being pushed through the process so fast , I ask of this Committee to think strongly about the true reasons that you are doing this . As a Citizen of the Commonwealth my entire 49 + years 15 of which I was a 1st responder covered by the Qualified Immunity system that you are trying to remove from our 1st responders . This will affect all citizens in the Commonwealth in a negative way. not to mention put an additional burden on the Court system that already has a hard time keep up on cases as it is now. again please see attached email that I sent to my State Representative.

Mr, Mckenna,

I am taking this time to express to you my disapproval of the Police Reform Bill and especially the section pertaining to the removal of the Qualified Immunity for this States 1st Responders .

Especially the Police , Fire & EMS parts . This will give the criminal the upper hand in a State that already is more stringent on Police and Law Abiding Citizens whom defend themselves .

We need Representation that will not be afraid of going against the main stream and Black Lives Matter . Please do not allow this bill to pass for the Citizens of the Commonwealth depend on our 1st responders a great deal. If this bill passes it will leave the common citizen protected by the good Samaritan Act more then our Police , Fire and EMS . Again please do not Pander to the Left and stand your ground for all of the Citizens in the Commonwealth.

Thank You

David Cooper

Webster, Ma.

470-359-1476

--

From: Daniel Paluzzi <daniel.paluzzi@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:58 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is D. Paluzzi and I live at 28 May Street Braintree, MA. 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,  
D. Paluzzi

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Julie Campbell  
<campbell.julie.info@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:57 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill # Title S2820

We can have police reform without making our cops feels vulnerable.

Julie a Campbell 7814549914  
From: Lisa Morton <lmorton@laplumeprinting.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:56 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill Police Reform

Good afternoon Rep. Michlewitz and Rep. Cronin,

I'm writing to you regarding the senate police reform bill, and specifically about qualified immunity, which has now been extended to nurses and firefighters. I'm beyond disgusted. Our police departments in MA are envied by other states for their general professional conduct. We've have not had an incident like Minneapolis for that reason, so why is this being applied to our police forces? Our public servants were called "heroes" throughout the pandemic by the public, and all on Beacon Hill. Are police, firefighters and nurses now villains? This bill is the ultimate non thank you and slap to the face. As a licensed nurse, why would I ever return to the profession when I could be exposed to unjustified lawsuits? Same for the police and firefighters - expect a mass exodus of experienced professionals. Yes, police reforms are needed for incompetent officers, but not to this extreme where we punish all. I am very upset by the growing civic ignorance of Beacon Hill, and how our elected officials are sending more support to those with extreme views, rather than the majority of citizens. We pay taxes for our laws to be enforced, and for a peaceful existence. I worry for the future of the state. Also, I have one more thought about the bill in general, in regards to limits on police tactics to subdue a suspect. I believe some of their present methods should remain intact, such as mace, pepper spray or a taser, if other physical methods are eliminated. Did you hear what happened to the two NY officers who just recently made an arrest of a known drug dealer and gang member? On the arrest, the suspect was resisting after being cuffed. A mob then descended on the police, and one of the officer's bodycams was purposely knocked off, which led to a physical scuffle. The officer in the scuffle was placed in a choke hold with maximum pressure and was rendered unconscious and defenseless. What if his gun was taken? What if the officer had another means to stop this? These men and women in uniform need our support. The criminals in NY were cheering that the policeman was placed in a choke hold, instead of the neighborhood cheering that a criminal was taken off their street. This is so backwards and so very wrong.

Thank you for letting me speak as a concerned citizen, and I hope for greater transparency with future bills in the house and senate.

Respectfully,

Lisa Morton

978-807-7782

1 Farley Street

Lawrence, MA 01843

978-683-1009

Visit us at [www.laplumeprinting.com](http://www.laplumeprinting.com)  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.laplumeprinting.com\\_&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=I2sMcf48M8xRjOSinE1ty-1G4G8hpQ88eXa6OTG6c7U&s=7Q6a0pJbfffjNODMnyClkhB4DKW5nQxFz4WMETHXtuMo&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.laplumeprinting.com_&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=I2sMcf48M8xRjOSinE1ty-1G4G8hpQ88eXa6OTG6c7U&s=7Q6a0pJbfffjNODMnyClkhB4DKW5nQxFz4WMETHXtuMo&e=>)>

From: Vera Pavel <[vera.pavel@gmail.com](mailto:vera.pavel@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:54 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Support police reform bill

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Vera Pavel, Medford MA resident  
From: Maria Minichello <[mariarminichello@gmail.com](mailto:mariarminichello@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:51 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2800



Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

My name is Maria Minichello and I live at 52 Wordsworth Street, East Boston 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,

Maria Minichello

From: Miriam Riad <miriam.riad222@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:50 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800)

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz & Chair Claire Cronin,

I am writing about the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800). I am writing to express my support of this bill. I am grateful to the police officers who risk their lives to keep our communities in Massachusetts safe, but I also firmly believe that there needs to be greater accountability for our law enforcement, as the tragic and unlawful deaths of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd have demonstrated.

I support this bill to restrict qualified immunity, as well as ban chokeholds and tear gas, and I hope our House of Representatives will support it as well. We must put stronger accountability measures in place to preserve justice in our law enforcement system. Taking measure such as the ones outlined in the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800) hold us all to a desperately needed higher standard, a standard which our communities deserve and need.

Best,  
Miriam Riad

From: Jennifer Yanco <jjyanco@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:47 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: testimony: S.2820

Dear Rep. Cronin and Rep. Michlewitz,  
I am writing in support of S.2820, and urge the House to enact a similar bill as soon as possible, get it through a conference committee, and have it signed by Governor Baker by the end of July. This is of critical importance to me.

I am glad to see a number of features of this bill, which I believe will go a long ways towards reforming police in ways that reflect community standards and the quest for justice. A state-wide certification board and state-wide training standards and limiting use of force are important, as is specifying officers' duty to intervene when witnessing misconduct by another officer. In the interest of diminishing racial bias in policing, banning racial profiling and mandating the collection of racial data for police stops will be a solid start. As for demilitarizing the police, requiring civilian approval required for the purchase of military equipment is a step forward. I am also in support of 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 have also been concerned about growing police presence in our schools and support leaving the decision of whether or not to have SROs to local Superintendents of 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.

Above all, I am eager to see a good police reform bill enacted by the end of July. Thank you for attending to this historic bill and giving it priority. important priority.

Sincerely,

Jennifer J. Yanco, PhD  
Author of Misremembering Dr. King  
16 Monument Street  
Medford, MA 02155  
jjyanco@gmail.com

Justice is indivisible. If it is accorded to some and not others it is not justice but privilege. Gary Younge

<[http://www.bu.edu/africa/files/2014/01/559500\\_193158577550464\\_493171804\\_n.jpg](http://www.bu.edu/africa/files/2014/01/559500_193158577550464_493171804_n.jpg)>

Order your copy here <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.iupress.indiana.edu\\_product-5Finfo.php-3Fproducts-5Fid-3D807305&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=\\_a3He3dx3QdqLExHy4f0CUNw6qleLzK-V45gBl7PkQo&s=AT1zVeXuCJB87jbtvwmMFuCVkHAzLuti9mpPYOdQC-M&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.iupress.indiana.edu_product-5Finfo.php-3Fproducts-5Fid-3D807305&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=_a3He3dx3QdqLExHy4f0CUNw6qleLzK-V45gBl7PkQo&s=AT1zVeXuCJB87jbtvwmMFuCVkHAzLuti9mpPYOdQC-M&e=>)>

Listen to a podcast <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_iupress.typepad.com\\_blog\\_2014\\_01\\_podcast-2Djennifer-2Dyanco-2Ddiscusses-2Dmisremembering-2Ddr-2Dking.html&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=\\_a3He3dx3QdqLExHy4f0CUNw6qleLzK-V45gBl7PkQo&s=v5PcPeqSfkPeCQJZFEXc5YDy9mbmwIPQY3gQ2LxL0qg&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__iupress.typepad.com_blog_2014_01_podcast-2Djennifer-2Dyanco-2Ddiscusses-2Dmisremembering-2Ddr-2Dking.html&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=_a3He3dx3QdqLExHy4f0CUNw6qleLzK-V45gBl7PkQo&s=v5PcPeqSfkPeCQJZFEXc5YDy9mbmwIPQY3gQ2LxL0qg&e=>)> with the author

From: Bill K <billkett1@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:48 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police reform Bill number S2820

Dear Representatives,

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

I am strongly opposed to at least 3 aspects of the bill, and I therefore emphatically urge you to not support this bill as it is currently written. It is my opinion that these 3 below- mentioned aspects of the proposal are deeply flawed, fundamentally short-sighted, misguided and dangerous. They do nothing to facilitate the just and right cause of true racial and social equality and justice, (which I strongly support), and they will only serve to radically hinder our law enforcement in their ability to protect and serve the citizens of the Commonwealth. I think it's pretty obvious that the practical outplay of these 3 aspects of the bill, and their subsequent hindrance of Law enforcement, will simply be emboldened and increased criminal behavior. This is completely unacceptable.

The 3 aspects I am adamantly opposed to are as follows:

- 1) Any changes to Qualified immunity for state and city/town Police, Firefighters, EMT's, Paramedics.
- 2) A complete ban on chokeholds, even in legitimate cases of self defense. (A police officer should be allowed to utilize a choke hold in legitimate situations of self defense and/or protection of an innocent crime victim).
- 3) Restrictions on the use of tear gas. (I am also opposed to any further restrictions of other chemical agents such as mace or pepper spray, any further restrictions of the use of rubber bullets or pellets, and any further restrictions of the use of Tasers and any other electronic equipment).

That being said, some of the things i am in favor of are: increased training for police, a certification program, body cameras, a comprehensive database to keep up to date info on legitimate Police offences.

I would have liked to have had further time to review the bill for positive aspects and point them out, but because of the unreasonable submission deadline of 11am on 7/17, I am unable to do so.

As a long time Mass resident, law-abiding citizen and registered independent voter, I am very upset at the attempt to push this bill through so quickly and the borderline sneaky way in which the 30 senators passed it. That is unacceptable for a bill of this importance.

Finally, i am also very upset that the bill is such a "mixed bag" of some obviously good ideas, with some obviously horrible and destructive ideas sandwiched in.

To reiterate, my emphatic request as a constituent is: Do not pass this bill as it is currently written.

Sincerely,  
C William Kettinger Jr

19 Hall Ave  
Andover, Ma 01810  
(978) 749-0983  
From: barbsullw@aim.com  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:47 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Barrows, F. Jay - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

The House Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary,

I would like to share my opinion on the bill that just passed regarding police reform.

I feel it is a poorly written bill and although some reforms may be necessary this bill which takes away qualified immunity from first responders and teachers goes too far. I am all for education, extensive training and forbidding choke holds, however this bill goes too far.

I hope as my representatives you understand how strongly I oppose this legislation.

Thank you for your time.

Barbara Wainwright  
From: Matthew Tupe <matthew.tupe@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:46 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Matthew Tupe and I live at 85 Holly Rd, Marshfield, MA, work at Marble and Granite, Inc. and am a Sales Representative. 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,

Matthew Tupe  
P: (617) 653-1203  
From: lindy stowe <lindy28882@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800)

Hello,

I am a resident of Boston, MA and I unequivocally support the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800).

Massachusetts has always been on the forefront of states passing legislation to support the people that live here and I have taken pride in the fact that we never shied away from decisions that seemed radical at the time.

Since moving here I have always been proud of Mass being the first state to legalize gay marriage, and I hope to see us continue to make the right choices ahead of the curve and set the standard for the rest of the country to follow. I, like many others, believe it's time to eliminate qualified immunity, ban chokeholds, reallocate state funds to communities disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system, and allow the Mass AG to file lawsuits against discriminatory police departments. I hope to see this legislation pass so I can continue to be a proud resident.

Thank you for your time.

Lindy Stowe  
From: christine defelice <yeep107@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:45 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S2800

Dear Mr. Chairman/Madam Speaker,

I ask that you support amendments 114, 116 ,126 ,134, 129, and 137 to the Senate Bill S2800. 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.

Respectfully,

Christine B. DeFelice

Swampscott, Ma 01907

From: Colleen <caivens@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:44 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2800

Good afternoon,

As a concerned citizen I am asking that qualified immunity for police officers remain in effect. I think it is a disgrace that the lawmakers of Massachusetts would even consider this. Police officers need to do their jobs, which is protecting ALL OF US, without having their hands tied worryingly about a frivolous lawsuit which could cost their family their home and livelihood. Have we forgotten the Marathon Bombing already? As far as the argument made by Cindy Friedman stating that qualified immunity closes a loophole that enables cities and towns to deal with a bad cop I find that incredibly naive. The thought that she would want to punish the thousands of good police officers in Massachusetts to weed out a few bad officers is beyond outrageous.

I want the police officers in all cities and towns in Massachusetts to be able to do their jobs completely.

Thank you for reading this and I hope you will kill this bill.

Colleen Ivens

781-718-1450

Concerned Citizen

From: Jane Hearn <jhearn417@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Fwd: S.2820 (policing reform package)

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jane Hearn <jhearn417@verizon.net>  
Date: July 16, 2020 at 2:33:49 PM EDT  
To: HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov  
Subject: S.2820 (policing reform package)

?

My name is Jane Hearn, 508-612-2988, and as a lifelong resident of the City of Worcester and the mother of a Worcester Police Officer the the grandmother of a Shrewsbury Police Officer, I want to express my strong opposition to S.2820 the policing reform package. The bill 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 with honor and courage. Massachusetts has already undertaken many police reform bills and our officers continue to be trained and retrained throughout every year. As yourselves how you think the police departments in your area are performing in this very difficult time.

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



Who wouldn't want police officers in schools when needed to keep track of the gangs in our areas.

Qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for police officers sent 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. Imagine you are having a heart attack and the officer who arrives is afraid to perform CPR to save your life for fear of breaking a rib and being sued. This is not the community I want to live in. We do not want officers afraid of doing what they are trained to do for fear of opening those personal liabilities so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card or other things for the benefit of their families. GOOD LUCK WITH POLICE RECRUITMENT.

I ask you to look at and reconsider the make-up of the POSAC committee which will govern the conduct of police and judge police officer conduct, but unlike every other professional licensing board, does not have any law enforcement members. The Board of Plumbers is made up by a majority of plumbers, WHY NOT the Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee. At the very least it should be made up of individuals who have been on the streets, walked the walk, in police officers shoes. Just do a ride along for a few shifts. This bill will handcuff police officers, and God help the rest of us.

This Anti-Labor bill effectively eliminates collective bargaining rights for police officers - the employees that need it most given the difficulty of their job. This anti-labor, anti employee bill essentially removes (only for police) the right to be disciplined only where there is just cause - a right enjoyed by virtually every other public employee in our state.

Massachusetts has one of the lowest annual rates for deadly use of force incidents in the nation.

Massachusetts Cities have excellent records with it comes to deadly force - look at Worcester - not one since 2013

During this time span police have successfully handled many millions of calls for help, often involving volatile and violent individuals, without incident

Most Massachusetts Towns have had no law enforcement related deaths during the tracked time period

Before you, our state legislators create a huge new State Agency or Agencies and destroy the morale and success of our public safety officers - PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT HOW POLICE IN MASSACHUSETTS ARE PERFORMING. Please take a look at your own constituencies and see what needs changing and what is working....

I am not a member of any organization, just a proud constituent, proud to call my family members Police Officers.

Jane Hearn, 417 Hamilton Street, Worcester, MA 01604  
508-612-2988

From: Jennifer Valenzuela <jennvalenzuela@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:43 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: oamarasingham@aclum.org  
Subject: Testimony in Support of Police Accountability -- Use of Force Standards, Qualified Immunity Reform, and Prohibitions on Face Surveillance

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

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

1. Adopt strict limits on police use of force,
2. End qualified immunity, because it shields police from accountability and denies victims of police violence their day in court, and
3. Prohibit government use of face surveillance technology, which threatens core civil liberties and racial justice.

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

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

Of critical and urgent importance: Massachusetts must abolish the dangerous doctrine of qualified immunity because it shields police from being held accountable to their victims. Limits on use of force are meaningless unless they are enforceable. Yet today, qualified immunity protects police even when they blatantly and seriously violate people's civil rights, including by excessive use of force resulting in permanent injury or even death. It denies victims of police violence their day in court. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820. Maintaining Qualified Immunity ensures that Black Lives Don't Matter. We urge you to end immunity in order to end impunity.

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

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

Sincerely,

Jennifer Valenzuela, LICSW, MPH 72 Halliday St.  
Roslindale, MA

From: Sam Carihfield <scrihfield@bbns.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:42 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Public Comment in support of police accountability bill

Dear Chairs,

I write in support of the measures before you to increase police accountability, including adopting limits on police use of force, ending qualified immunity, and prohibiting facial surveillance technology.

I believe these and the many other provisions in the bill are important ones to create a proper balance of trust between the community and the state. As an educator, I am particularly concerned with youth being criminalized, and I particularly support efforts to move away from the youth prison pipeline.

Thank you,  
Sam Crihfield  
Boston resident

--

Sam Crihfield

Upper School English Teacher  
Buckingham Browne & Nichols School  
80 Gerry's Landing Road  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
he/him/his  
From: Noreen McDonagh <nmcdonagh99@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:41 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2800

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 hastily passed by the State Senate. This bill has been is an attack on all public employees. People who are public employees work within the community to ensure the vital growth of the community. As you know, Massachusetts is the first in education and to take away rights from teachers is just ludicrous. For years, studies have shown that the number of people staying in the teaching profession is dwindling with the average new teacher lasting roughly 5 years. Additionally, across the Nation, there is a dire need for teachers who are people of color. This Bill sets yet another reason why young people would stay out of the profession. You know as well as I do that anyone can say what they want about anyone whether true or false and there just needs to be a modicum of doubt ruin a person's life.

Additionally, this attack on law enforcement is going to lead to a lack of law and order. It is happening every day and people just ignore it. This lack of law and order will flow through every community and school system in the state and what does that leave us?

Please do not do this to public employees and to the future of this state.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,  
Noreen McDonagh  
153 Aldrich Street  
Roslindale, MA 02131

From: Rick Bravoco <rickbravoco@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:41 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820, (please read)

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,  
My name is Richard Bravoco and I live at 37 Rosemont St, Haverhill MA. 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,  
Richard Bravoco

From: Karen Cooper <kcooper65@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:40 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: AGAINST S2820 policy immunity

Please do not pass S2820 and take QUALIFIED IMMUNITY from police officers/ firefighters/nurses. My grandfather was a Cambridge police officer: my brother-in-law was a Burlington Police officer and my sister is a nurse. She worked within a Covid unit at Lahey Clinic recently. to take away the protection of immunity of such first responders will put ALL of us at risk. I do not know anyone who would work such a job without qualified immunity. If you take away their qualified immunity, then take it away from all politicians to be fair.

if I have a car accident and my car is on fire, and a police officer or firefighter pulls me from my car and it leaves me paralyzed I should not be able to sue him for his actions and take his home and assets that he has worked hard for. I would not want to burn in my car because the police or firefighter are afraid he will be sued. this bill contains a double edge sword that is against public service. REASONABLENESS IS THE KEY and this bill is currently not reasonable.

it appears to me that because one police officer killed Mr. Floyd that all are labeled bad. From the Michael Jackson's song, "ONE BAD APPLE DON'T SPOIL THE WHOLE BUNCH".

PLEASE DO NOT PASS THIS BILL.

Karen Cooper 69 Francis Wyman RD Burlington,ma 781-272-2510

From: Sue Gladstone <sgladstone@utecinc.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Public Testimony on S.2800 to the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees

7/16/20

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,

Susan Gladstone

UTEC, Inc., Lowell, MA

Cell - 978-496-6110

--

Sue Gladstone | Major Gifts Officer

UTEC | [sgladstone@utecinc.org](mailto:sgladstone@utecinc.org)

Work: 978-233-1359

Cell: 978-496-6110

Programs: 35 Warren St. | Café UTEC: 41 Warren St.

Mailing: P.O. Box 7066, Lowell, MA 01852



Join our enews <[www.UTECinc.org/donate](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__tinyurl.com_UTEC-2DENEWSsignup&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=IZtFQk01U2m0NhTkpeWx90KCvU5isZLcdDv6HyWdpuQ&s=apqmkb-YybwcehvqyJNnA8XDwVKerx0QkN7st0iOUA8&e=></a><br/>Give today to break barriers in 2020! <a href=)  
<[< \[<\\[From: Gina Hughes <\\\[delcil3@aol.com\\\]\\\(mailto:delcil3@aol.com\\\)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:39 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary \\\(HOU\\\)  
Subject: S2820\\]\\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_www.linkedin.com\\_company\\_utecinc&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=IZtFQk01U2m0NhTkpeWx90KCvU5isZLcdDv6HyWdpuQ&s=2us0\\_uzJ\\_NLbmcDzS3Rud3OWsH4oFcDT2kxqn5rj8QM&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=\\)\]\(https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\_\_www.facebook.com\_UTECinc\_&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\_GkGDD&m=IZtFQk01U2m0NhTkpeWx90KCvU5isZLcdDv6HyWdpuQ&s=Iu3Aw0PqA8-djjMB0ptyX1pBdx-ibB8eaw\_WGMTilDk&e=></a><br/><<a href=\)](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.utec-2Dlowell.org_donate&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=IZtFQk01U2m0NhTkpeWx90KCvU5isZLcdDv6HyWdpuQ&s=jPY1P_m5a0ZAzTp1q3hQb41kMhjWxf3JH5JwYtYSVSKQ&e=></a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

To Whom It May Concern,  
As a lifelong Massachusetts citizen, I am appalled and frankly frightened by what has been written in this bill. How dare you take away our rights to protection and elevate criminals at the expense of our brave men and women in blue. You have been elected to represent your constituents and this does not represent the will of the taxpayers and citizens of the Commonwealth. Our police should have more funding not defunding. Holding them personally liable for actions that may be out of their control or caused while trying to apprehend a criminal who most likely is exhibiting violence towards them is absolutely unfair and criminal within itself. There will be no police force or protection for us citizens, your constituents, if you pass this bill. I implore you to vote NO!!!

Sincerely,  
Gina Hughes  
110 Sheridan Ave  
Medford, Ma  
781-396-8670

Sent from my iPhone

From: Paula Bennett <pbennett2001@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:39 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); oamarasingham@aclum.org

Subject: Police Accountability

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

On behalf of The Episcopalian Immigration Partnership of the Diocese of Eastern Massachussets, 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, because it shields police from accountability and denies victims of police violence their day in court, and
3. Prohibit government use of face surveillance technology, which threatens core civil liberties and racial justice.

As someone who has attended presentations of Lorrie Mills-Curran on understanding your rights, I recognize that being confronted by police can be most intimidating, especially for recent immigrants to our community.

This historic moment is not about one police killing or about one police department. Massachusetts is not immune to incidences of police brutality. Indeed, Bill Barr's Department of Justice recently reported that a unit of the Springfield Police Department routinely uses brutal, excessive violence against residents of that city. We must address police violence and abuses, stop the disparate policing of and brutality against communities of color and Black people in particular, and hold police accountable for civil rights violations. These changes are essential for the health and safety of our communities here in the Commonwealth.

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

Of critical and urgent importance: Massachusetts must abolish the dangerous doctrine of qualified immunity because it shields police from

being held accountable to their victims. Limits on use of force are meaningless unless they are enforceable. Yet today, qualified immunity protects police even when they blatantly and seriously violate people's civil rights, including by excessive use of force resulting in permanent injury or even death. It denies victims of police violence their day in court. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820. Maintaining Qualified Immunity ensures that Black Lives Don't Matter. We urge you to end immunity in order to end impunity.

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

Having listened to a number of DACA recipients, I have learned of so many members of our Latina community who have had unfortunate encounters with our police force.

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

Sincerely,

Paula Bennett- 02116

From: Robert Gariepy <robert\_gariepy123@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:38 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S2800

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Robert Gariepy and I live at 113 W Shore Drive Ashburnham, MA 01430. I work at North Central Correction Institution at Gardner Ma and am a Correctional 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 doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Robert Gariepy

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Robert Ayres <ayresall@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:37 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

To Whom It may Concern,

I understand that the House is deliberating S.2820 which was hurriedly passed by the senate. I understand it eliminates "Qualified Immunity" for police, fire and nurses.

This is an enormous mistake. In the current political environment, police departments are already having difficulty recruiting replacements for retirements.

This will boost retirements/resignations and kill recruiting. No one will want to serve their community.

When you need help, when something goes bump in the night, you call 911 (police, fire) because you trust them to come and help you. All my life, that is what I have seen.

This legislation seeks to destroy that group of first responders. Anyone who votes to destroy that important government function will never get my vote again. Shame on anyone who votes for it.

With no law enforcement, we can disband the legislature because we would have no need of legislators to write laws which will not be enforced.

I always vote and my memory is long.

--

Robert Ayres  
Citizen of Bolton, MA  
508-983-4929  
From: Kimberly Bress <kimbress@bu.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony re: S.2820

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.

Kimberly Bress

410-491-1222

Boston University

--

Kimberly Bress

410-491-1222 | [kimbress@bu.edu](mailto:kimbress@bu.edu)

From: Nicholas A. Vettese <[nvettese@juno.com](mailto:nvettese@juno.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:36 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Nicholas Vettese and I live at 132 Milk st Westborough. 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,

Nicholas Vettese  
From: Alex Kolodney <alex.kolodney01@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:36 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

I am a Massachusetts resident who is excited and grateful by the progress being made by passing this police reform bill. However, Massachusetts can do better. I am writing to ask you to preserve the vital reforms which have been passed, including

- \* 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

As well as adding additional reforms to improve the lives of those in our state, 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

Lets end the violent policing that targets our most vulnerable communities and make a stronger, safer Massachusetts for all.

Alex Kolodney  
Newton, 02460

From: annie weiss <anniecweiss@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

To whom it may concern,

I was born and raised in Massachusetts and raised my own children here. I am writing now to support the police reform bill. Though we need more dramatic measures to direct funding away from police departments statewide and towards community-based stability, safety, clean energy, and justice services, the reform measures in the bill, including reducing qualified immunity, are necessary for making our communities (especially Black and Brown ones) safer and more just. Please pass this bill and continue making MA a leader in our country for just legislation.

Thank you,



Annie

From: Marianne Jenkins <mjenkins@alliancesecurityservice.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Cc: Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN); Nguyen, Tram - Rep. (HOU)  
Subject: Written Testimony/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 78 Equestrian Drive, North Andover, as well as the Owner and President/CEO of small security business (WBE/WOSB) based in Everett. I employ approximately 150 people providing security services throughout the region. As the industry serves a security and public safety function, I am cognizant of the repercussions this Bill will have on not only policing, but the security industry and private businesses, which protect people in the communities we serve, along with millions of dollars of assets.

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 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.

Please confirm timely receipt of this e-mail to be included in the written testimony on S.2820.

Marianne Jenkins

President/C.E.O.

Alliance Detective & Security Service, Inc.

930 Broadway

Everett, MA 02149

Phone: 617-387-1261

Cell: 617-974-0002

Fax: 617-389-0022

E-mail: [mjenkins@alliancesecurityservice.com](mailto:mjenkins@alliancesecurityservice.com)  
<<mailto:mjenkins@alliancesecurityservice.com>>

Web: [www.alliancesecurityservice.com](http://www.alliancesecurityservice.com)  
<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.alliancesecurityservice.com\\_&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=NL1vFjh-fuZQxS-vmcrVKWq-pPghcAUWbOXV69wIYIg&s=aWrnWHNTAH2TgRi\\_4a-rTL4qK9SVzgt5-p5IXmJAdvY&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.alliancesecurityservice.com_&d=DwMFAg&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=NL1vFjh-fuZQxS-vmcrVKWq-pPghcAUWbOXV69wIYIg&s=aWrnWHNTAH2TgRi_4a-rTL4qK9SVzgt5-p5IXmJAdvY&e=>)>

"Life is not measured by the number of breaths we take but by the places and moments that take our breath away." ~Anonymous

From: Kathleen Rush <kmmrush@verizon.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:35 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

I want you to vote NO on the entire bill.

Kathleen M. Rush  
781-326-0309  
From: Evelyn Ophir <evelynlouisephir@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Testimony re: S.2820

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.

Thank you very much for your serious consideration of the so very timely issues raised in this email.

Sincerely,  
Evelyn Ophir  
Brookline, MA  
Tel: 857-919-3859  
Organizational affiliation: Temple Sinai of Brookline

From: Ashley Goldstein <ashley.goldstein30@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Ashley Goldstein and I live at 51 South Street Apt 202 in Hingham, MA. I work at Boston Children's Hospital and am a registered nurse. 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,

Ashley Goldstein  
From: Joe Brooks <brooksjoel477@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:34 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Bill S.2820

Mr. Michlewitz and Ms. Cronin,

My name is Joseph Brooks, and my purpose in writing to you today is to oppose bill S.2820 as currently constructed. Some background on me, I have been working in law enforcement for the last ten years, beginning with campus law enforcement at Bentley University in Waltham, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, and for the past 7 years the Newton MA Police department. My father spent over 32 years serving the Waltham Community as a police officer, and two of his brothers served or are currently serving as police officers in the city of Boston. My mother has been a nurse for over 30 years serving the greater Boston community. My family is deeply rooted in public service, and are proud to serve our communities.

The death of George Floyd has brought a call for reform to law enforcement across the country. Every police officer is suddenly being judged by the actions of Officer Derek Chauvin, which departments around the country have vehemently condemned. Policing has been vilified in the media and activists are pushing for the defunding and abolishment of police departments.

Massachusetts has some of the most well trained and highly educated officers in the country. Our police academies do not train in the use of choke holds, and our use of force policies are designed around a sliding escalation scale. Many departments have social workers working alongside officers and offering jail diversion and counseling options for those suffering from mental health or addiction crisis. We received crisis intervention and de escalation training. Departments have created critical incident stress management units to offer peer support to officers, to prevent burn out and PTSD trauma from the calls officers respond to. Our law enforcement in this state is very progressive, and President Obama specifically mentioned Boston as a model for the rest of the country when talking about police reform. It's disheartening that the Senate passed this bill, and continued the narrative that policing in Massachusetts is broken.

I want to address a few sections of the bill that I hope you will take under consideration. The amendments regarding qualified immunity are going to have drastic and far reaching consequences if passed. I've attached a link highlighting some of these issues.

<https://files.constantcontact.com/132a544f001/feed66f3-e896-43ad-b0a2-e90e4a45070e.pdf> <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_files.constantcontact.com\\_132a544f001\\_feed66f3-2De896-2D43ad-2Db0a2-2De90e4a45070e.pdf&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=a\\_qawGHDMpMhAVAnYQ4CRMcdliRC1fb8vQ8GvvPTGBc&s=xfyPZHhXxoySKIWq\\_Xe4woBmqelqshkKmt3rF8Onz2A&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_files.constantcontact.com_132a544f001_feed66f3-2De896-2D43ad-2Db0a2-2De90e4a45070e.pdf&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=a_qawGHDMpMhAVAnYQ4CRMcdliRC1fb8vQ8GvvPTGBc&s=xfyPZHhXxoySKIWq_Xe4woBmqelqshkKmt3rF8Onz2A&e=>)>

The section in regards to "military equipment" also should be left to the departments discretion, and not public scrutiny. How quickly the community forgets the Boston Marathon bombing, the murder of Sean Collier, and the ensuing shootout in Watertown. It's an unfortunate reality that police departments need to be prepared for extraordinary situations to protect the communities we swore an oath to serve. The North Hollywood shootout was a major eye opener for policing, when you have a bank robbery and the suspects are better equipped than your police officers. School shootings across the country have also brought to light the need for Officers to be prepared which brings me into the next portion of the bill that I feel needs to be addressed.

The lack of communication and information sharing between schools and the police is going to have very real consequences. School resource officers not only are a deterrent to immediate violence, but are able to intervene when the schools have concerns regarding their students behaviors. Looking at school shooting history, teachers, administrators, and other students often saw the signs that something was "off" with the shooter, whether that was mental health related or bullying. The current bill reads more towards gang affiliations but I would argue that the response from police would be the same in regards to early intervention. If the police are able to identify these problems early on, it may be possible to prevent future tragedies.

I would ask that you take the time to speak with law enforcement professionals and hear the realities of the job, before rushing to pass legislature based on an incident that happened half way across the country. Hastily moving through the legislative process without input from ALL community stake holders, and thinking about the long term impacts of the laws you are passing, will greatly diminish the public safety in the state.

Thank you for your consideration on the matter,

Joseph Brooks  
2 winch park road, Framingham Ma 01701

From: Joey Shelley <joeytrshelley@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:31 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2820

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

Ending qualified immunity, and banning life-threatening techniques like tear gas, chokehold, and no-knock raids should be a priority for this judiciary period. Move swiftly to protect all lives in Massachusetts and specifically Black lives.

Thank you,  
Joey Shelley  
Somerville, Ward 3  
From: David Markham <dmarkham18@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:31 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Senate Police Reform Bill S.2820

Hi,

I would like to voice my support for the following parts of the Senate Police Reform Bill:

- \* 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

I would also like to ask that the following areas be expanded upon in the house bill:

- \* 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

Thank you for taking time to read my email. I hope you consider the aforementioned when amending the bill.

Regards,

David

From: Kung, Sunny, M.D. <SKUNG@BWH.HARVARD.EDU>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: SUPPORT of police accountability reforms in S.2820

July 16, 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, Qualified Immunity Reform, and Prohibitions on Face  
Surveillance

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

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

1. Adopt strict limits on police use of force,
2. End qualified immunity, because it shields police from  
accountability and denies victims of police violence their day in court,  
and
3. Prohibit government use of face surveillance technology, which  
threatens core civil liberties and racial justice.

I am part of a group of Brigham residents investigating the movement of  
"Defunding the Police". After literature search and discussion, we have  
found that police brutality as a consequence of systemic racism is a  
public health crisis leading to the death of our Black patients. Use of  
force must be stopped and police must be accountable for their actions.

George Floyd's murder by Minneapolis police brought hundreds of thousands  
of people into the streets all around the country to demand fundamental  
changes to policing and concrete steps to address systemic racism. This



historic moment is not about one police killing or about one police department. Massachusetts is not immune. Indeed, Bill Barr's Department of Justice recently reported that a unit of the Springfield Police Department routinely uses brutal, excessive violence against residents of that city. We must address police violence and abuses, stop the disparate policing and brutality against communities of color and Black people in particular, and hold police accountable for civil rights violations. These changes are essential for the health and safety of our communities here in the Commonwealth.

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

Of critical and urgent importance: Massachusetts must abolish the dangerous doctrine of qualified immunity because it shields police from being held accountable to their victims. Limits on use of force are meaningless unless they are enforceable. Yet today, qualified immunity protects police even when they blatantly and seriously violate people's civil rights, including by excessive use of force resulting in permanent injury or even death. It denies victims of police violence their day in court. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820. Maintaining Qualified Immunity ensures that Black Lives Don't Matter. We urge you to end immunity in order to end impunity.

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

Our group also advocates for divesting from policing and investing in mental health first response teams, such as CAHOOTS which has effectively minimized the use of police and saved money for the city of Eugene, Oregon.

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

Sincerely,

Sunny Kung, MD  
Internal Medicine-HVMA Residency Program, PGY-3  
Brigham & Women's Hospital  
Pager: 33710 | Cell: (408) 705-8714

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: PAUL LANDRY <bard6@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: S.2800 Police Reform Bill

To Whom it May Concern;

I want to thank you in advance for your willingness to seek public input.

I have had the honor to serve my city and the commonwealth for 26 years as a sworn law enforcement officer. The following quote from Sir Robert Peel in 1829 still resonates with me today - "The police are the public and the public are the police."

We are the community because we are part of it, and we like many others are concerned about the murder of George Floyd. Since June an incident occurred more the 1,500 miles away, police officers have been vilified, threatened, killed or injured in the line of duty and labelled as racist killers.

However the narrative cannot be farther from the truth. Just look at the data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics In 2018 African-Americans made up 53% of known homicide offenders in the US and commit about 6-% of robberies, though they are 13% of the population.

Or look at the Washington Posts database - that in 2019 police fatally shot 9 unarmed blacks and 19 unarmed whites. In 2018 there were 7,407 black homicide victims, assuming that a comparable number of victims in 2019 the nine unarmed black victims represent 0.1% of all African-Americans killed in 2019. A police officer is 18 ½ times more likely to be killed by a black male than an unarmed black male is to be killed by a police officer.

While every life is precious and we should be concerned anytime a person regardless of race, creed, religion or color is killed - the charge of systemic police bias and racism does not hold up - unless you just want to perpetuate the also narrative.

Do I believe police reform is necessary, Yes I do, we always need to continue to change and adapt our policies and procedures to reflect the norms of society and to continue to uphold the rule of law.

Of most concern is the issue of qualified immunity. Qualified Immunity does not mean absolute immunity. In Malley v. Briggs, 475U.S. 335 (1986) it "As a matter of public policy, qualified immunity provides ample protection to all but the plainly incompetent or those who knowingly violate the law." What it does do is protect good police officers from frivolous lawsuits, just for doing their job.

Prior to this current environment my department already met the policy and training recommendations of the "8 Can't Wait." Chokeholds aren't part of the training curriculum of the MPTC, we require de-escalation training, and require Use of Force Reporting for any force that officers use. Massachusetts has some of the best trained officers in the country. Officers are screened (medically and psychologically) before being hired, are trained and attend between 60 to 80 hrs of in-service training, which includes Use of Force as well as Biased Base Policing Training and Mental Health Training. My department also has a social worker on staff as part of our Jail Diversion Program.

This is a challenging time, but we can move forward and be successful if we collaborate and developed police reforms that are part of a non-partisan, apolitical and well informed effort. We all must denounce racism and excessive force - that's a given. But at the same time Law Enforcement must be supported. They are not mutually exclusive.

I'd like to suggest you ensure you get input from the police unions, the chiefs of police as well the minority police officer groups.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Paul Landry  
Everett Police Department  
617-201-1942

From: Lee Constantine <lconstantine@massbar.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:29 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: testimony of the Mass Bar Association

Testimony before House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees

July 16, 2020

via email

The Massachusetts Bar Association (MBA) urges your Committees to include the expansion of expungement when considering Racial Justice and Police Accountability legislation. Senate Bill No. 2820 contains this expansion.

The criminal justice reform legislation recently enacted contained special provisions to permit expungement of juvenile court records and adult offenses committed before the age of 21 if a judge finds that such expungement is in the interests of justice. G.L. c. 276, §§ 100F-100J. These provisions, however, are unworkable because an individual seeking to expunge an offense is not eligible unless he or she only has a single charge on his or her record. In practice, a case often includes more than one offense. Police also may overcharge a person with more than one offense related to a single incident. In addition, more than 150 common offenses are excluded from eligibility for expungement under the current law. As a result, attorneys are rarely able to obtain relief for clients under the present statutory scheme.

Expanding current expungement law would promote access to jobs and opportunities for professional success by permitting expungement even if a person has more than one charge and allowing expungement of all juvenile offenses except for never sealable sex offenses.[1] The right to expunge a record is of great importance because criminal record sealing only limits who has access to the record. Expungement, however, is "the permanent erasure or destruction of a record so that the record is no longer accessible to, or maintained by, the court, any criminal justice agencies or any other state agency, municipal agency or county agency." [2] As the Supreme Judicial Court has acknowledged, a "cloud of prosecution" remains even if a case ends favorably if law enforcement, employers or others can gain access to information about the case.[3]

Thank for your consideration of our views.

[1] "Steady gainful employment is a leading factor in preventing recidivism." OFF. OF THE ATT' GEN., U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT ON CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS, 2 (2006). See also Christy A. Visher, Laura Winterfield, & Mark B. Coggeshall, Ex-Offender Employment Programs and Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis, 1 J. OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 295 (2005); John H. Laub & R. J. Sampson, Understanding Desistance from Crime, 28 CRIME & JUST. 1, 18 (2001).

2 MASS. GEN. LAWS c. 276, § 100E, added by St.2018, c. 69, § 195, eff. Oct. 13, 2018 <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_1.next.westlaw.com\\_Link\\_Document\\_FullText-3FfindType-3D1-26pubNum-3D1077005-26cite-3DUUID-28I0C1F990044-2D2B11E8994DF-2DA89B0D54A4C-29-26originatingDoc-3DNEC8132F04EFE11E8BA478209A3F344DF-26refType-3DSL-26originationContext-3Ddocument-26transitionType-3DDocumentItem-26contextData-3D-28sc.UserEnteredCitation-29&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=2PpOn\\_sAfIIbT6jWnPyDh9FsGqDnVAKbpax6M-HbCBA&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__1.next.westlaw.com_Link_Document_FullText-3FfindType-3D1-26pubNum-3D1077005-26cite-3DUUID-28I0C1F990044-2D2B11E8994DF-2DA89B0D54A4C-29-26originatingDoc-3DNEC8132F04EFE11E8BA478209A3F344DF-26refType-3DSL-26originationContext-3Ddocument-26transitionType-3DDocumentItem-26contextData-3D-28sc.UserEnteredCitation-29&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=2PpOn_sAfIIbT6jWnPyDh9FsGqDnVAKbpax6M-HbCBA&e=>) .

3 Police Com'r of Boston v. Mun. Court of Dorchester Dist., 374 Mass. 640, 659, (1978).

Lee Ann Constantine

Director of Policy and Operations

Massachusetts Bar Association

<[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_\\_www.massbar.org\\_&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=AFL\\_cXkc tV\\_vftq4F49-0jxX2gVRk-ULPg8jKZv5VRk&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.massbar.org_&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=AFL_cXkc tV_vftq4F49-0jxX2gVRk-ULPg8jKZv5VRk&e=>)

20 West St., Boston

(617) 338-0692

[lconstantine@massbar.org](mailto:lconstantine@massbar.org)

---

[1] "Steady gainful employment is a leading factor in preventing recidivism." OFF. OF THE ATT' GEN., U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT ON CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS, 2 (2006). See also Christy A. Visher, Laura Winterfield, & Mark B. Coggeshall, Ex-Offender Employment Programs and Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis, 1 J. OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 295 (2005); John H. Laub & R. J. Sampson, Understanding Desistance from Crime, 28 CRIME & JUST. 1, 18 (2001).

[2] MASS. GEN. LAWS c. 276, § 100E, added by St.2018, c. 69, § 195, eff. Oct. 13, 2018 <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_1.next.westlaw.com\\_Link\\_Document\\_FullText-3FfindType-3D1-26pubNum-3D1077005-26cite-3DUUID-28I0C1F990044-2D2B11E8994DF-2DA89B0D54A4C-29-26originatingDoc-3DNEC8132F04EFE11E8BA478209A3F344DF-26refType-3DSL-26originationContext-3Ddocument-26transitionType-3DDocumentItem-26contextData-3D-28sc.UserEnteredCitation-29&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0Sck2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=2PpOn\\_sAfIIbT6jWnPyDh9FsGqDnVAKbpax6M-HbCBA&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__1.next.westlaw.com_Link_Document_FullText-3FfindType-3D1-26pubNum-3D1077005-26cite-3DUUID-28I0C1F990044-2D2B11E8994DF-2DA89B0D54A4C-29-26originatingDoc-3DNEC8132F04EFE11E8BA478209A3F344DF-26refType-3DSL-26originationContext-3Ddocument-26transitionType-3DDocumentItem-26contextData-3D-28sc.UserEnteredCitation-29&d=DwMFAw&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0Sck2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=nqZ4nwtSa8zzwhTnEvuSSKdFfyul18lXHhsD9e5AJxA&s=2PpOn_sAfIIbT6jWnPyDh9FsGqDnVAKbpax6M-HbCBA&e=>)

[3] Police Com'r of Boston v. Mun. Court of Dorchester Dist., 374 Mass. 640, 659, (1978).

From: Deborah Paisner <debpaisner@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: The MA Senate's Police Reform Bill

It's a start but it's so important to strengthen the senate bill by widening the definition of "chokeholds", allow for no loopholes in the teargas and no knock raids, limit the interactions with police in mental health or traffic issues and the doctrine of qualified immunity should be ABOLISHED.

Now is the time to make a real difference!!

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Kecia Ali <kecia.ali@protonmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Ensuring police accountability

Dear HWM Judiciary members,

I write to urge you to pass a bill similar to S.2820, the Senate's police reform bill, and to get both through conference committee and signed by the governor this month.

While I wish the Senate bill had gone further in some of its reforms, I suggest that the House bill should retain its provisions for limiting the use of force, requiring officers to intervene when colleagues engage in misconduct, for banning racial profiling and mandating the collection of racial data for police stops. I want the House bill to require civilian approval for the purchase of military equipment; I want it to prohibit nondisclosure agreements in police misconduct cases--these encourage a problematic culture of silence. I also support 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 dislike the Senate modifications to the proposed restrictions on qualified immunity for police officers. Under their 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. I want an end to qualified immunity. In the interests of getting legislation passed, however, it might be necessary to keep the current version in. However you modify the bill, police officers should not 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.

Thank you,

Kecia Ali

Arlington

781-475-0536

From: Manoach Paul <mhpaul@live.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Madaro, Adrian - Rep. (HOU); Gingras, Steven (HOU); Rivas, Gloribel (HOU)  
Subject: Strong Support for the Reform-Shift-Build Act

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to voice my strong support for the Reform-Shift-Build Act. As a resident of Stoughton, 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 Stoughton 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 reimaged 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 Stoughton, 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,

Manoach Paul

From: Phyllis Geany <marina815@me.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:27 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Do NOT Pass This Bill

To whom it may concern:

Stripping Law Enforcement of qualified immunity takes away their protection and due process. This state is in for some tough times if that happens. It would be safer for police and fire to do the bare minimum if this bill is passed and the public deserves more!!

Do NOT pass this bill!!!

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Diego Paredes <dparedes971@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:26 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Diego Paredes and I live at 46 Lakewood St, Worcester, MA. I work at the Souza Baronowski Correctional Center and am a CO 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,

Diego Paredes

From: Peter Wise <peter@squarecandy.net>

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:24 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Farley-Bouvier, Tricia - Rep. (HOU); Hinds, Adam (SEN)

Subject: S.2820 Public Testimony

Hello -

My name is Peter Wise and I'm a resident of Pittsfield. (52 Thomson Pl, Pittsfield, MA 01201) Please include my statement in the official public testimony on S.2820.

I'm writing today in support of strengthening some specific measures in the Police Standards Reform bill.

The Senate bill had stronger and clearer language on the creation of a truly independent and civilian-majority police certification board. The creation of such a body without giving it any real authority or power is lip service in place of the real systemic change the people of the

Commonwealth are asking for. I ask that the House consider adopting the original Senate bill language.

Likewise, the language on limiting qualified immunity and making real efforts to reduce the school-to-prison pipeline have been watered down and I ask that the House restore the original Senate bill language on these topics. Without real reform to qualified immunity, not many other police reforms make much of a difference. The message our current system sends to officers is "please don't do bad stuff... but if you do, there's pretty much no accountability or consequences at all... but please, seriously, don't do bad stuff." How can we be surprised by the constant stream of video evidence of blatant abuse of power when this is our official public stance towards the police? Let's end qualified immunity for real in Massachusetts.

I also believe that we can and must go further than either existing bill in a number of areas. The outcry in this country after the deaths of George Floyd, Eric Garner, and many others choked to death by police has been loud and is righteous. And yet the current bill only dips its toe into the waters of strengthening use of force standards. The current language in the bill would allow what happened to George Floyd to be completely legal right up until the seconds before his death. Let's actually ban choke holds here in Massachusetts. This should be a really easy one.

Another issue that deserves attention is facial recognition technology. The uses of this technology by law enforcement are so troubling that even big tech companies like IBM are pulling out of the sector and calling for a national discussion about the potential abuses and consequences of using such technology. Let's fully ban facial surveillance tech instead of just vaguely implying that it's bad.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Peter Wise

Peter Wise

Owner  
Web Design and Development Lead

Square Candy Design

pronouns: he/him  
(413) 591-8401 <tel:4135918401>

squarecandydesign.com <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_squarecandydesign.com&d=DwMF-g&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=zYd\\_-0M4TFj-32yrlbYWSrx28o5lh0RX2ORe\\_a95VwQ&s=nuNGAdrtYuHlecx4hxGoSVaCX8AQVz8MP\\_FKmmOR85I&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__squarecandydesign.com&d=DwMF-g&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=zYd_-0M4TFj-32yrlbYWSrx28o5lh0RX2ORe_a95VwQ&s=nuNGAdrtYuHlecx4hxGoSVaCX8AQVz8MP_FKmmOR85I&e=>)>

From: Tanya Gorlin <tanya.gorlin@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:24 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

My name is Tatyana Gorlin, I live in Brookline, MA. It came to my attention that last night the MA Senate passed the bill to end qualified immunity for police officers. I am appalled that the legislature of such importance was passed without public hearing.

The very idea that such a thing as removing qualified immunity from police can be seriously proposed, let alone voted for 30 to 7, seemed totally absurd just a few months ago. Qualified immunity of elected officials and members of the law enforcement community is the bedrock principle of any government. Without it, no government institution would be able to function. And policemen, due to the very nature of their work, are the most vulnerable group.

This shameful legislation is unfair, immoral, and harmful to the extreme, especially to the people of color, whom it's supposedly designed to help - this group needs strong law enforcement and police protection more than anybody. By taking away qualified immunity from police the Commonwealth of Massachusetts essentially declares itself non-governable territory. Scores of policemen will retire, which is already happening. And nobody will be

interested in joining the police force - the group that not only is unjustly vilified, but now even deprived of any legislative protection.

A horrible death happened in Minnesota and everybody condemned it. But why the whole profession of policemen is punished for that? I talked to Brookline police and there has been not a single incident of police brutality for the years of existence of Brookline police. Massachusetts police in general is an exemplary organization. Why are you in such a hurry of changing the law? This new law will harm not only police but the whole population of Massachusetts.

In the strongest possible terms, I urge you to keep qualified immunity for MA police officers intact.

Tatyana Gorlin  
28 Marshal street  
Brookline  
tanya.gorlin@comcast.net

From: Scott Haskell <shaskell@18degreesma.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:23 PM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Expungement

7/16/20

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 or 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,

Scott Haskell

Program Director

18 Degrees, West Main Connections SSYI program, North Adams, MA

413-672-4242

Sent from Mail <[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_\\_go.microsoft.com\\_fwlink\\_-3FLinkId-3D550986&d=DwMF-g&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns\\_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db\\_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf\\_GkGDD&m=xVaaxAaQyv0ozuTtdSA-SCOPwldbQiE8Y\\_3agD6ikA&s=uDNgEzAK9O-gdtZxIGLxyFvkApQ6G1JxlOxrggMKwmk&e=>](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.microsoft.com_fwlink_-3FLinkId-3D550986&d=DwMF-g&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xVaaxAaQyv0ozuTtdSA-SCOPwldbQiE8Y_3agD6ikA&s=uDNgEzAK9O-gdtZxIGLxyFvkApQ6G1JxlOxrggMKwmk&e=>)>  
for Windows 10

From: Raymond Hawkins <[rayoflight97@gmail.com](mailto:rayoflight97@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:23 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.

Raymond Hawkins, of Waltham, MA  
From: Peter Wood` <pwoodlicsw@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 9:59 AM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Community policing

Hello,

As a private citizen of western mass, I am grateful to live in a town where no firearm has been discharged by police in over 40 years.

Yet, I am dismayed by the omnipresence of guns and weaponry carried by police at all times. Police officers are required less training than licensed hair stylists, and yet are given graver responsibilities to intervene in a multitude of matters beyond their skill, resorting to brute force often resulting in catastrophic consequences related to incarceration even prior to any conviction.

Police require oversight and community resources with alternatives to force in order to help them provide safety and security to the communities they serve. They do not need more weapons, or to carry them at all times, or drug arrest incentives, or military surplus.

In addition, the prosecutorial process must be overhauled to ensure people who are arrested, particularly for non-violent crimes (Which are too broadly defined), do not lose their housing, public assistance, voting rights, children and freedom in general regardless of their suspected offense.

Police are the first point of contact for American citizens, the majority of whom are people of color, for entry into the unjust, destructive and racist judicial system that exists today. Let's ensure that these gate keepers are not alone and ill equipped to exercise good judgement, compassion and discretion when facing the challenges of being human. Money and weapons are crude and clearly ineffective in keeping our communities safe and our neighbors out of jail.

Sincerely,  
Peter Wood, LICSW  
AmherstFrom: Tina Collins <teemarie\_collins@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 9:57 AM  
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)  
Subject: Police Reform Bill

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. 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: Thomas Wycislak <tomw2318@icloud.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=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=51Ert2dgurPXSKikyoxUx6E9902v0euxSGmS9HFI2Yo&s=9S7bgzroFDFkePoZEQvMfrHHXswGDnDm_WLF1E-_9rs&e=></a>></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 9:57 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: BILL S2800

Hello,

I am a Law Enforcement Supporter and am sending this email in opposition of the proposed bill. 99% police officers go to work daily and do the right thing and should not be in fear of being sued civilly. In the case of Chauvin, he is in jail... charged with murder... what did qualified immunity get him? He got exactly what he deserved.

Police need to be allowed to do their jobs and go hands on and keep us safe. If we are going to pass this bill why not take the reigns off and give the criminals the keys to the state. How come we are not watching NY as they are doing just that and seeing crime spike through the roof.

Taking immunity away from police will ruin the profession and 100% force police to not intervene as they used too. It won't matter to the rich cause they will hire private security but what about the middle class lady at the ATM who will get robbed and the police will not be in any rush to get there. Not that they don't want to help but that they don't want to get sued by the CRIMINAL.