



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives
State House, Boston, MA 02133-1054

ALYSON M. SULLIVAN
STATE REPRESENTATIVE
7th PLYMOUTH DISTRICT

STATE HOUSE, ROOM 237
TEL (617) 722- 2305
Alyson.Sullivan@MAhouse.gov

Chairman Aaron Michlewitz
House Committee on Ways & Means
State House, Room 243
Boston, MA 02133

Chairwoman Claire Cronin
Joint Committee on the Judiciary
State House, Room 136
Boston, MA 02133

Re: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

In this letter, I have included written testimony my office has received from citizens within my district and across the Commonwealth. I strongly urge the committee to consider the comments and concerns below when deliberating and debating Senate Bill 2820.

Thank you, Chairman Michlewitz, Chairwoman Cronin and the committee members for taking the time to read written testimony and I ask you all to strongly consider taking the time in establishing a strong and meaningful piece of legislation that will have a fair and long lasting change in our Commonwealth.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Alyson M. Sullivan".

Alyson M. Sullivan
State Representative
7th Plymouth District
Abington, East Bridgewater & Whitman

Good Morning Representative Sullivan,

First and foremost thank you all for allowing those who will be affected greatly by this bill and it's sweeping changes to submit our views. Massachusetts Senate Bill S2800 was introduced on a holiday weekend and then vote on during the middle of the night granted following a lengthy day of deliberations. Both of these actions coupled with the fact the senate did not take any written or verbal testimony from officers or stake holders was deeply concerning.

I currently serve the commonwealth of Massachusetts as a police officer for the town of Abington and I am my departments Union President as well. The matters being debate on the House floor now will cause far more changes then what is being considered. Simply put the ripple affect of the final bill will be far reaching and will set the stage for a very tumultuous year to come here in the commonwealth. From a union perspective there is also the sense our legislators are attempting to "Union bust" and are taking away our rights to collectively bargain some of the changes being sought. Changes we see as changes in working conditions for our union members, but I digress.

It is interesting to see that when an agenda is present how quickly something can be accomplished yet nothing is being done to prevent the hundreds of black Americans who are killed due to gang and gun violence around the country. Since police officers in this state are being vilified for the actions of others not from this state I see it only appropriate to reference national circumstances. Your actions this month could cause a mass exodus from the profession one which will create shortages across the state. How will the state fill those position because the anti police rhetoric pushed by legislators in this state and across the country is people to not want to do the job or join. Many people I have spoken to say they are glad they never became a cop after taking the exam. Why is it that a once noble profession has received all the blame for societies failures?

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

(v) the history of slavery, lynching, racist legal institutions and racism in the United States

I ask you why it is necessary to force police officers who have no history of established racial biases to be taught this subject matter. When throughout our history lessons in school we are taught about American history, which includes these topics. You want to train officers more thoroughly yet take away valuable time by teaching a subject irrelevant to modern day policing. Massachusetts has little to no instances of racially driven policing to date. Yes our state was not the best in the past, but why are modern day officers punished for actions they did not commit and presumed to have a racial bias.

Section 221. There shall be an independent police officer standards and accreditation committee within the executive office of public safety and security consisting of: 14 members appointed by the governor, 1 of whom shall be nominated by the colonel of the state police, 1 of whom shall be nominated by the commissioner of the Massachusetts bay transportation authority police

force, 1 of whom shall be nominated by the commissioner of police of the city of Boston, 1 of whom shall be a chief of police of a police department outside of the Boston metropolitan area nominated by the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association Incorporated, 1 of whom shall be a law enforcement officer nominated by the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, Inc., 1 of whom shall be a law enforcement officer below the rank of sergeant, 1 of whom shall be nominated by the American Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts, Inc., 2 of whom shall be nominated by the New England Area Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1 of whom shall be nominated by the Lawyers for Civil Rights, Inc., 1 of whom shall have been personally involved in or impacted by the criminal justice system, 1 of whom shall be a retired judge and 2 of whom may be selected from a list of not less than 5 non-law enforcement individuals nominated by the Massachusetts Black and Latino Legislative Caucus; and 1 member appointed by the attorney general who is affiliated with an organization that advocates on behalf of communities that have disproportionately high instances of police interaction; provided, however, that non-law enforcement members shall have experience with or expertise in law enforcement practice and training, criminal law, civil rights law, the criminal justice system or social science fields related to race or bias.

To an officer we accept the POST system and understand it will be a new way of certifying an officer for duty. We welcome this change, but if someone who commits a crime is judged by a jury of their peers then so should officers. These panels or certification committees should be made up of subject matter experts in the field of policing not community activists. How are we to believe there will be no bias towards our actions after all the hatred we have seen over these past months. If my certification is to be taken away and my way of providing for my family taken from me I want it done by individuals who are familiar with the day to day actions and circumstances we face. There needs to be some type of due process allowed for officers to defend themselves and appeal the findings of these committees.

Section 11I. (a) A person whose exercise or enjoyment of rights secured by the constitution or laws of the United States or the constitution or laws of the commonwealth has been interfered with, or attempted to be interfered with, as described in section 11H may institute and prosecute in their own name and on their own behalf a civil action for injunctive and other appropriate equitable relief as provided for in said section 11H, including the award of compensatory money damages. A person who prevails in an action authorized by this subsection shall be entitled to an award of the costs of the litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be determined by the court.

(b) A person whose exercise or enjoyment of rights secured by the constitution or laws of the United States or the constitution or laws of the commonwealth has been interfered with by a person or entity acting under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of the commonwealth or, or a subdivisions thereof, may institute and prosecute in their own name and on their own behalf a civil action for injunctive and other appropriate relief, including the award of compensatory monetary damages. An action under this subsection shall be instituted either in the superior court for the county in which the conduct complained of occurred or in the superior court for the county in which the person or entity whose conduct complained of resides or has a principal place of business. A person who prevails by obtaining significant relief after the filing

of an action under this subsection shall be entitled to an award of the costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be determined by the court.

(c) In an action for monetary damages under this section, qualified immunity shall not apply unless no reasonable defendant could have had reason to believe that such conduct would violate the law at the time the conduct occurred. Nothing in this section shall affect the provisions of chapter 258 with respect to indemnification of public employees.

Qualified immunity does not give us carte blanche to do whatever it is we please. We are still required to operate within the letter of the law. It protects from frivolous lawsuits for doing our duty. If we violate someone's civil rights, unfortunately have to discharge our firearms or are seen to have used excessive force we will not be protected from a lawsuit. Consequently now you are forcing officers to consider what their duty to act will mean. When we respond to the majority of our calls they come from people in the community, neighbors, family members calling seeking help. If one of these calls results in a civil lawsuit what will happen is officers will start file counter suits tying up the already overloaded court systems. When we respond to a domestic call placed by a neighbor and the residents don't answer, but there is a belief of serious harm due to what we hear or may see and we are cleared to take down a door due to exigency. We will now be liable for the ages caused to that home because nine times out of ten one of the parties doesn't want to press charges or invokes spousal privileges we will then be sued following it. Officers will now become the subjects or numerous lawsuits and there will constantly be individuals trying to bait us into situations where we have to act. The ripple effect will cause officers to become reactive and simply only respond to a call to service. Consequently as well many officers will leave the profession all together by way of retirement of eligible or simply walking away. As well this will affect all public servants and will cause monetary damages to municipalities across the commonwealth crippling them.

School department personnel and school resource officers, as defined in section 37P, shall not disclose to a law enforcement officer or agency, including local, municipal, regional, county, state and federal law enforcement, through an official report or unofficial channels, including, but not limited to text, phone, email, database and in-person communication, or submit to a the Commonwealth Fusion Center, the Boston Regional Intelligence Center or any other database or system that tracks gang affiliation or involvement any information relating to a student or a student's family member from its databases or other record-keeping systems including, but not limited to: (i) immigration status; (ii) citizenship; (iii) neighborhood of residence; (iv) religion; (v) national origin; (vi) ethnicity; (vii) native or spoken language; (viii) suspected, alleged or confirmed gang affiliation, association or membership; (ix) participation in school activities, extracurricular activities both inside and outside of school, sports teams or school clubs or organizations; (x) degrees, honors or awards; and (xi) post-high school plans. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the sharing of information for the purposes of completing a report pursuant to sections 51A or 57 of chapter 119 or filing a weapon report with the local chief of police pursuant to this section.

How does this accomplish anything? Are gangs now an accepted form of culture when they promote violence and drug use. We are currently in the midst of an opioid crisis, which oddly enough has been ignored by legislators for years allowing drug companies to make billions of people. Gangs do nothing, but destroy family bonds, promote drug use, sell drugs, illegal

firearms and are the cause of a large amount of crime across the country. Why would we not want this provided to police so we can help ensure our children are safe at school to learn and prosper? How does allowing gangs to infiltrate schools and recruit children not raise concerns. We are not attempting to create a mass database of law abiding citizens, but individuals who will unfortunately be in the cross hairs of law enforcement for most of their adult life if we are not allowed to intervene. See we can provide help to this children and potentially get them into diversion programs where they find a better life.

Racial or other profiling”, differential treatment by a law enforcement officer based on actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, national origin, immigration or citizenship status, religion, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation in conducting a law enforcement action, whether intentional or evidenced by statistically-significant data showing disparate treatment; provided, however, that “racial or other profiling” shall not include the use of such characteristics, in combination with other factors, to apprehend a specific suspect based on a description that is individualized, timely and reliable.

So are we not allowed to use physical descriptions when looking for a criminal who just committed a crime? How are we supposed to describe said person? Should we discourage the public from using these characteristics as well. It seems as though you want people to be seen as people then stop describing those people you are trying to help by the color of their skin or their race.

Section 2. (a) All persons in the commonwealth shall have a right, including for purposes of sections 11H and 11I of chapter 12, against the use of force prohibited by this section. A violation of this section shall be a per se violation of said sections 11H and 11I of said chapter 12.

(b) A law enforcement officer shall not use physical force upon another person unless de-escalation tactics have been attempted and failed or are not feasible based on the totality of the circumstances and such force is necessary to: (i) effect the lawful arrest of a person; (ii) prevent the escape from custody of a person; or (iii) prevent imminent harm to a person and the amount of force used is proportional to the threat of imminent harm.

(c) A law enforcement officer shall not use deadly physical force upon a person unless de-escalation tactics have been attempted and failed or are not feasible based on the totality of the circumstances and such force is necessary to prevent imminent harm to a person and the amount of force used is proportional to the threat of imminent harm.

(d) A law enforcement officer shall not use a choke hold. A law enforcement officer shall not be trained to use a lateral vascular neck restraint, carotid restraint or other action that involves the placement of any part of law enforcement officer’s body on or around a person’s neck in a manner that limits the person’s breathing or blood flow.

Chokeholds are not taught or used by officers exempt in instances of serious bodily harm or death. If we are in the midst of a struggle with a subject we need to be allowed to use any means necessary to save our lives and will use any means necessary. This needs to be amended to adjust for the appropriate application in necessary situations. We are not always able to de-escalate a situation no matter how hard we try to and trust me we try because the last thing we want to do is to get into a physical altercation with someone. When deadly force is being used there often

times is no time for de-escalation tactics for instance when we're confronted with a manic subject wielding a knife or in a mass shooting. Yes the totality of the circumstances comes into play, but we are charged with making life altering decisions in split seconds sometimes. You cannot handcuff is further by requiring more and more de-escalation because believe it or not the criminals will push these boundaries to the edge.

Section 2D. (a) A warrant that does not require a law enforcement officer to knock and announce their presence and purpose before forcibly entering a residence shall not be issued except by a judge and only if the affidavit supporting the request for the warrant establishes probable cause that if the law enforcement officer announces their presence their life or the lives of others will be endangered.

No knock warrants are issued by a clerk or judge after an extensive investigation. Maybe the blame should be placed on them and not us. These warrants are used in highly dangerous situations where there is the belief or chance of a resistance being met.

Please consider the damage being done to this great profession and how you plan on keeping my family and yours safe when there are no more officers to do the job because you litigated us out.

Respectfully,

Officer Brady P. Thomas
Abington Police Department

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Scott Drinkwater and I live at 764 Randolph Street, Abington. 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,

Scott A. Drinkwater

Dear Representative Sullivan,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State Senate. 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 55, this bill authorizes "any person" to "intervene" if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed.

In Section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

In Section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted 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".

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

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

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO on S.2800, for the reasons stated above, and others. ALSO, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you,

Michael D. Malvesti
620 Adams Street Abington MA, 02351
mdmalvesti7@yahoo.com

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Jared Traynor and I live at 185 Centre Ave in Abington. 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,

Jared Traynor

Dear Ms Sullivan,

My name is Valerie Bartholomew and I live at 27 Street, Abington, 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,

Valerie Bartholomew

Hello,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recent filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State senate. 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 55, this bill authorizes “any person” to “intervene” if they believe an officer’s use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed. In section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

In section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted 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”.

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

Additionally, this bill re-writes sections of the 2018 Criminal Justice Reform Bill (See record expungement and corrections) as well as the Hands- Free law the legislature just adopted. Those bills were signed into law after the normal and appropriate legislative process of filing a bill, holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and thoughtful debate over a span of

many months. It is inconceivable that the Massachusetts State Senate would attempt this “sleight of hand” to re-write those laws with this rushed bill that will be lightly debated (in the COVID-19 remote sessions).

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

ALSO, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you

Jami Hajjar
14 Adley Drive
Abington MA 02351

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Carly Malvesti and I live at 620 Adams Street in Abington. 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,

Carly Elizabeth Malvesti

Concerned citizen, nurse, and wife of a hardworking, fair, and dedicated LEO

Dear Ms Sullivan

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recent filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State senate. 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 55, this bill authorizes “any person” to “intervene” if they believe an officer’s use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed. In section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

In section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted 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”.

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

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

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

ALSO, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank You
Diane Brady
571 Linwood St
Abington, Ma 02351

Dear Miss Sullivan,

My name is Timothy Brady and I live at 571 Linwood St. Abington. 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,

Timothy Brady

Hi Rep Sullivan -

I am a constituent in Whitman and wanted to reach out regarding S2800, the draft legislation relating to police reforms in the State Senate, and a similar bill that is being drafted in the House.

By way of background, I am a veteran and long-time government civilian who spent many years overseas - often in places that one doesn't vacation. But, I always came home to Mass, and specifically Whitman. I have done so because I feel safe here. I bought my childhood home because this area is the safest I have ever lived in.

Aside from the people of the South Shore being community minded and good, hardworking folk, the police are part of the community and ensure that our quiet streets remain that way. I appreciate that big and small cities around the country are facing real problems with the police-community relationship. However, that is not the situation here. Outside activists, more often than not who are not from Mass, are driving a narrative that our police forces are out of control, dangerous, and not responsive to the community. That may be true in Chicago, but it is not true in Mass.

I urge you to not bow to the false narrative and vote "no" on the House's version of S2800 and/or the S2800 itself if it makes its way to the House. Our police are part of the local communities and clearly understand that their actions impact the lives of their children, parents, and neighbors. As such, communities keep their local police officers and departments in check. Whitman's town meeting is scheduled for later this month - trust me when I say that the people here ask hard questions of the police chief to justify why funds are needed and how those funds do/don't lead to "good policing."

I welcome further discussion on this matter. My email address is jenncounter@gmail.com and my cell number is 781.608.4458.

I appreciate your consideration.

Best,
Jennifer Counter
32 Indian Trail
Whitman, MA 02382

Dear Senator,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State Senate. 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 55, this bill authorizes "any person" to "intervene" if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed.

In Section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

In Section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted 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".

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

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

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO on S.2800, for the reasons stated above, and others. ALSO, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you,

Kelly Halpin
159 Linwood St
khalpin29@gmail.com

Dear Representative Sullivan,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State Senate. ALSO, I ask that

you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill. This bill is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more so for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. More importantly, it will directly impact the safety of our community. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of this bill:

In Section 55, this bill authorizes "any person" to "intervene" if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more police officers being injured or killed in the line of duty while trying to serve their cities, and most importantly, this language will work in direct opposition to the intent of the bill, which is to save lives. Allowing citizens to intervene in police interactions is a quick way to create more confusion and violence in already tense situations, and it will undoubtedly result in unnecessary harm to both police officers and citizens.

In Section 6 of 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 currently offered to ALL government employees who serve the public. Furthermore, it shifts the burden of proof onto the public servant in a move that will make police officers the only American citizens who will be, by law, guilty until proven innocent. Our law enforcement officers who we send onto our streets every day to protect our communities at substantial costs to their own well-being will be unable to purchase a home, buy a car, or obtain credit cards or loans. If you are not aware, there is already a shortage of police officers in America. Many departments across the country, and here in Massachusetts, are understaffed due to the inability to hire new officers. The direct, personal attack on the lives and livelihood of police officers outlined in this bill will result in fewer qualified, educated, and well-intentioned police officers in our cities and towns – and ultimately the inability to ensure public safety in our communities.

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

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO on S.2800, for the reasons stated above, among many others. ALSO as previously stated, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you,
Melissa Petta
54 Linden Street, Whitman MA 02382
Email: malp1234@gmail.com

Dear Ms. Sullivan - I am writing to you as a voter, neighbor (I live on VanBuren) & sister to 4 police officers. Please vote against ending qualifying immunity. We can not have police officers wanting to retire because we won't protect them while they're risking their lives to protect us.

This can not pass it will be the death of our life as we know it and our safety in this great community.

Please do not let this pass!

Sincerely,
Jeanie Barrett

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Nancy Emery and I live at 10 Kendrick St Whitman Ma 02382. 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,

Nancy Emery

Dear Representative,

My name is Peter Emery and I live at 10 Kendrick St. Whitman Ma 02382. 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,

Peter Emery

Dear Representative Sullivan ,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129,and137 to 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,

*William Cormier
29 Orange st #2
Abington, Ma*

Dear Senator,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2800 and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated in the State Senate. 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 55, this bill authorizes "any person" to "intervene" if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed.

In Section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this.

In Section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations- even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted 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".

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

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

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO on S.2800, for the reasons stated above, and others. ALSO, I ask that you respond to this e-mail to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you,

Martin E. Prendergast |

Dear Senator Brady and Representative Sullivan

My name is Eileen Needham and I live at 9 Marian Lane, East Bridgewater. 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,

Eileen Needham

Hon. Alyson Sullivan ,

I am an active member of the Randolph Police Dept. and have been for the past 30 years. I am also living in East Bridgewater where you are my Senator. I am very concerned with the bill to reform Police standards. I understand that in this new climate, standards need to be looked at and reforms should be made, but to have 71 pages of changes without any public hearings and without any town or union input is unacceptable.

In the town of Randolph, we have had 0 deaths at the hands of a Police Officer in my entire career. To paint all towns and cities with the same brush is not fair. I am very concerned that not only putting myself and my fellow officers at more risk from the public than we have now, also allowing no protection from frivolous lawsuits for every move we make will make our jobs that much more difficult to do successfully. Though I am close to retirement, there may be a mass exodus of well qualified and experienced members of all Police Departments. It will be very difficult to find new members willing to join the Department. I have noticed a trend of less and less people applying and accepting jobs on the Police Depts. throughout the Commonwealth. When I was hired, there were in excess of 20,000 people taking the test, now, I learned that in the town of Randolph, there were 43 people from within a town of 35,000 who were on the list. This trend will continue.

I would hope that you would spend time reading and understanding the bill and understand what the members of all Police Dept's have to go through for their cities and towns day in and day out. Thank you Steven Elman

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Nicholas Pak and I live in East Bridgewater . 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.

NICHOLAS PAK
45 SACHEM ROCK AVE
EAST BRIDGEWATER

Nicholas.r.pak@gmail.com

781-534-0739

Dear Alyson M. Sullivan,

My name is Marisa Falvey and I live in Whitman, 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.

Marisa Falvey

436 Plymouth St, Whitman MA 02382

marisafalv@gmail.com

Dear State Representatives

The Massachusetts Senate has recently proposed a massive police reform bill that it intends to pass without a public hearing. This bill was largely authored by people who consistently oppose police services. As a constituent, I request that you take the following action before voting on any such bill:

1. READ THE BILL.
2. ASK HOW POLICE DEPARTMENTS IN YOUR DISTRICT ARE ACTUALLY PERFORMING; AND
3. AT A MINIMUM, HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE BILL.

THESE ARE VERY MINIMAL REQUESTS BEFORE PASSING SUCH MASSIVE LEGISLATION THAT HAS SUCH A HUGE IMPACT.

DO YOUR OWN RESEARCH BEFORE YOU VOTE! You have been presented with a 71-page Bill that:

- changes dozens of laws, creates and funds many new agencies and Commissions
- eliminates collective bargaining rights of police officers
- removes authority from Cities and Towns to control their own employees
- removes the rights of police to monitor gang activity in schools
- removes the due process rights of public safety officers
- exposes police officers and their families to personal liability even when acting in good faith
- will open the floodgates for frivolous lawsuits against Municipalities and increase the cost to taxpayers to defend those cases
- puts the lives of police officers in danger unnecessarily
- creates a police licensing board that is staffed by organizations who sue our communities and advocate for the elimination of police services

Why are you considering passing such sweeping changes without a public hearing - what happened to transparency in Government? What happened to the voice of the citizens?

DO NOT OVERLOOK THE SUCCESS OF MASSACHUSETTS POLICING

Don't believe the misinformation about the alleged need for emergency police reform here in Massachusetts – in reality, Massachusetts is a success story on Police Training and use of force results – even according to those groups advocating national police reform. Our educated police force, competitive wages and mandatory training have produced excellent results.

For example, Massachusetts is among the absolute best in the nation when it comes to police use of deadly force:

- Massachusetts has one of the lowest annual rates for deadly use of force incidents in the Nation - at only 1.2 incidents per million people.

- Massachusetts Cities have excellent records when it comes to deadly force – In Worcester, there have been ZERO deaths caused by police since 2013 (excluding a taser related incident which was ruled a drug overdose) – in fact, Worcester has an annual citizen complaint rate of only .0002% out of 140,000 calls for service. In Lowell, there has been only one police related death (justified) in that same time period.
- During this span, the 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.
- When anti-police groups present data of people killed by police, they include people like the Boston Marathon Bomber, and others who murdered police officers during incidents.

Before passing a bill, creating new state agencies and destroying the morale and success of our public safety officers – is it too much to ask that you first take a look at how police in Massachusetts are performing? Have you looked at your own constituencies – the Towns in your district to see what needs changing, and what is working?

WHAT DOES THE PROPOSED POLICE REFORM BILL DO?

The proposed massive Police Reform Bill IS NOT BASED ON MASSACHUSETTS performance history and NOT BASED ON MASSACHUSETTS DATA.

The proposed bill will destroy the morale of our police departments, will put our officers' safety at great risk, and will expose them and their families to personal liability, will generate thousands of frivolous lawsuits to be paid for with taxpayer money, and even has provisions to pay the lawyer's fees for people who sue our communities.

For example – the legislation:

- Creates and funds at least 6 new Agencies, Commissions or Committees
- Eliminates Civil Service Protection only for Law Enforcement Officers; (Sections 41-43)
- Prohibits School Department Personnel from Providing Information to Law Enforcement regarding gang activity and affiliation; (Section 49)
- Expands the rights of individuals convicted of multiple crimes to expunge records of those crimes
- Requires that a lengthy record (receipt) be generated related to virtually any interaction between a police officer and a member of the public; (Section 52)

- Creates - but does not fund – mandates upon municipalities to gather, track, organize and report data, as well as unfunded training mandates; (Section 52)
- Creates a Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee to govern the conduct of police and judge police officer conduct but – unlike every other professional licensing board – is made up of individuals nominated by groups which openly advocate against law enforcement. It would be similar to staffing the Board of Pharmacy with anti-vaccine advocates or staffing a medical board with lawyers who sue doctors. The Board of Plumbers is made up by a majority of plumbers. The Board of Accountancy is made up of by a majority of Accountants. Same goes for nurses, electricians, etc. Law Enforcement should be no different and the committee that can take away our careers should not be populated with nominees that include law firms who claim to have made millions suing cities and towns and their police departments (Lawyers for Civil Rights, Inc.) or the ACLU. (Section 6).
- This 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. (Section 6)
- This bill creates a cottage industry for lawyers and another unfunded mandate upon Cities and Towns by greatly expanding liability on municipalities and officers. Under this Bill, every time a Court grants a motion to suppress evidence - because of any technical violation of the Fourth Amendment for instance – a per se violation of the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act will be created. The proposed Bill even provides for attorney fees to prosecute these actions. (Section 9). Even officers acting in good faith will be liable.
- This bill purports to regulate the Use of Force by Law Enforcement Officers without any recognition that police officers often must make split second decisions, often under extreme stress. Good faith actions will result in lawsuits and can result in the loss of a career. Even if those actions were deemed appropriate by an internal or District Attorney’s review, the new committee can decide on their own to end a career. Nowhere in the bill is there acknowledgement that the reasonableness or necessity of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene and not from the perspective afforded by 20/20 hindsight. (Section 55). It is easy to make decisions in the comfort of a lawyer’s office with the benefit of video, hindsight and knowledge of the actual outcome of an event. The law has recognized for years that hindsight judgment is unfair and not practical for the officer who may be faced with life or death situations in the heat of the moment.

These are only a few items of concern. Passing this bill without a public hearing, without considering how we are doing here in Massachusetts, without considering the impact of this massive legislation, without even a thought of how it will impact that thousands of police officers and their families, is not only negligent, but will have a residual negative impact that our state and our families cannot afford.

As your constituent, I request and expect that you will represent me, and that you will do your due diligence. Please read and understand the bill. Please research how your own district's police officers are actually doing. Please hold a hearing.

We intend to hold ourselves accountable, and we trust that you will do the same.

On a personal note, this deeply concerns me. If you take away Qualified Immunity and my collective bargaining rights, then how do I defend myself against false accusations and attacks when I am doing my job according to the law and my department policies? Where is my protection, because you will not have anyone willing to do this job, (at least qualified individuals), if you pass this bill? I have done this job for close to twenty years and now as a sergeant I am thinking of leaving, because I feel unwanted. I would challenge each lawmaker to take a moment and go for a ride along with your local law enforcement officer and see what they encounter during their shift, and then ask yourself if you are doing the right thing for the public and law enforcement. Please think about both sides before acting on this bill, all I am asking is for a fair reform bill that protects me and the citizens who we serve.

Sincerely,

Douglas Morgan
42 Morningside Drive
Rockland, Ma
NEPBA Local 34 President
Randolph Police Superior Officers Union
781-838-1889

I am writing in opposition to S. 2800 not only as a constituent, but, as a Police Officer. I have been a full time Officer for over 12 years. During that time I have received no legitimate complaints against my conduct. Now I find myself vilified and treated as if I am deserving of drastic changes to my working conditions. I do not consider myself an exceptional Officer. I am merely a typical example of the professional men and women that instinctively put the needs of others above our own, only to be targeted by politicians feeling a need to appease the mobs. These calls for change are more based on emotion and misunderstandings than they are based on fact. Law Enforcement here in the Commonwealth has always been of a better quality than many other states, please represent us as such and do not pass S. 2800. I can give specific issues with the bill if needed. Thank you.

Lawrence R. Clark Jr
132 Union Street
East Bridgewater, MA 02333
(774) 291-6516

Hello Ms. Sullivan, PLEASE do NOT vote to put through bill S.2800. Not only will it hurt GOOD police officers, which make up the majority of police officers and will affect Fire fighters and teachers!!

Best,

Susan Bunker

Hi Alyson,

I'm writing in regards to your Facebook post on the MA senate passing a police reform bill. As a citizen of the Commonwealth, I'm very concerned with any legislative action that would limit our law enforcement officers ability to protect themselves and the public. The measures discussed in the bill put our officers and all law abiding citizens at greater risk. Criminals who resist arrest should not be catered to at the expense of the safety of the rest of us who abide by the law and are respectful of the police. In addition, the notion that our law enforcement officers are inherently racist and that measures need to be put into place to specifically protect black and other minority citizens is insulting.

Everyone agrees that what happened to George Floyd was wrong and his family deserves justice. But we also remember what happened to Officer Michael Chesna, and we know the dangers that exist for our officers if they are not able to use every measure available to control suspects who will not comply. We also know that the national organization leading the charge for police reform - BLM - is a radical political organization steeped in Marxism and anti Semitism. It's an organization that has regularly marched the streets demanding dead cops, has had a supporter in Dallas carry out a massacre on their officers, and is leading the mayhem and rioting we are seeing across the country. No one should cater to their demands.

Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention.

Gregg Occhipinti

I am a resident of Whitman , a nurse, mom, and and Republican. I am writing to implore you to vote no on 2800. Thank you. Lynda Connell RN. 3 Patriot lane Whitman MA

Dear Representative Alyson Sullivan

My name is Daniel Francis and I live at 25 East Battery Street Abington, 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,

Daniel Francis

Representative Sullivan,

My name is Nicholas Smith and I live at 3 Helen Way in East Bridgewater. I grew up in Abington and played sports/went to school with your brother Joe.

I am writing to ask that you please do not accept the awful piece of legislation that your colleagues in the senate passed this morning. I am a Sergeant with the Hingham Police Department, and I am very concerned of the consequences that are going to come from this bill. I already see hesitation in officers as it is when they act, due to fear of being second guessed and Monday morning quarterbacked. This legislation is going to cause officers to get hurt and it will absolutely make policing a purely reactive profession.

Reform is not something that police officers are afraid of. We welcome proper change, but what is happening here is we are getting our legs cut out from under us and we haven't been represented in discussions. I am not opposed to a police certification process. What I am opposed to is not having police represented on the board that oversees police certification/suspensions/decertification.

I am also deeply concerned about the loss of qualified immunity. It seems like the state senate is openly trying to set up frivolous lawsuits on police. The loss of qualified immunity will result in policing becoming reactive rather than proactive.

The fact that the senate purposely did not include language allowing officers to use choke holds if their life is in jeopardy, is incredibly disturbing. Police in Massachusetts don't use chokeholds. I've been in law enforcement for 15 years and I've never seen a chokehold used, but

if we are fighting for our lives, there are no rules.

Massachusetts has the most highly educated officers in the country, thanks to the Quinn Bill. I firmly believe that is why we do not see the use of force/racial issues that are elsewhere throughout the country. The fact that the senate used a murder that happened 1400 miles away to come after police in this state is pathetic and disheartening.

I ask that you please use your influence to fight for the rights of Police Officers, which will in turn enhance the safety of the entire commonwealth.

Thank you for your time and service,
Nick Smith

Dear member of the house,

I respectfully ask that you Carefully examine and consider one but not all aspects of this bill. In its entirety, this bill is dangerous to the public. It allows the Small percentage of criminals to become increasingly Comfortable with furthering crime as police will have to question all actions with fear of lawsuits, placing police at a increased risk for their safety, lives, and families well being. If your job was to curb criminal acts however be placed at a great risk for a lawsuit, by a stranger to be able to possibly take away your livelihood that you and your family have worked hard for, would you? Furthermore, it's very disappointing to see the lack of support for officers who place their lives on the line, each and every day. If this bill passes, many will shy away from becoming officers, many will retire, crimes will increase. Who will protect us then? Please consider no chokeholds but qualified immunity should continue to exist.

Thank you,
Sonia Pereira
Sonia0090@aol.com

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Paul Arnstein and I live at 5 Wild Turkey Ln. in Whitman. 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.

Furthermore, as a Lieutenant with the UMass Boston Police Department I fear that this bill will force Police Officers out of the profession all together. Those that can retire will, and those that just began will reconsider, leaving a vacuum of departments that are understaffed and now operating without support from the communities they serve. If this happens the trickle down effect will be dramatic. Proactive policing will take a back seat to strictly reactive policing, placing both the communities and the officers in harms way at a far greater rate. "Quality of Life" crimes such as disorderly conduct, loitering, graffiti, public drinking etc. will just continue to rise as departments struggle to properly staff each shift day to day. These are just a few of the concerns that I can think of, but I'm sure it will be far worse.

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.2800 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,

Paul Arnstein

Hello,

I wanted to touch base on the recent senate bill that was passed and is now into the house regarding police reform. I would like you to consider voting No on the version of this bill that is currently being presented.

This bill was passed with no input from the very persons it seeks to manage...the police departments.

In my opinion this bill was a rush to condemn the actions of a large group of public servants who for the most part perform their high risk jobs with the utmost professionalism. The actions of one recent "bad apple " should not condemn an entire group or hard working men and women in blue.

Surely there are many more pressing issues that are better served to be discussed that are not reactionary to a recent singular event that has gained national attention for all the wrong reasons.

There may be changes needed to some of the powers and procedures but the senate and house are not qualified to make those decisions as they do not have the training and experience that comes with the job to make changes.

Thank you
Dan Sheedy

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Carly Malvesti and I live at 620 Adams Street in Abington. I write to you tonight as a concerned citizen and the wife of a dedicated and hardworking law enforcement officer. I am asking for your support in making sure that Senate Bill S2800 does NOT pass. I am asking that you vote NO!

While this bill aims to solve some of the troubling issues within law enforcement throughout the country, it was thrown together with extreme haste and received little to no input from Massachusetts' law enforcement officers. It also failed to include any input from minority law enforcement officers and those who attempted to reach out and have their voices heard were silenced and ignored. The bill was pushed through the senate without a public hearing, leaving the concerned voices of law enforcement, their loved ones, and residents of the Commonwealth unheard and powerless. This bill takes a profession that requires experience and knowledge and makes sweeping changes that will negatively affect all law enforcement officers in the Commonwealth.

The calls for increased training in de-escalation tactics, mental health, and racial justice are warranted and most, if not all officers, agree that more education and knowledge help them to do their jobs effectively. Massachusetts is currently ranked 48th out of 50 on amount spent on police training. This is one of the few positive parts of the bill. Our good officers are open to change and reform but are asking for a seat at the table when these discussions are taking place.

Senate Bill S2800, as it stands, is a danger to our law enforcement officers and will significantly affect their ability to do their job effectively. The calls to end Qualified Immunity are concerning for our law enforcement officers and their families, as well as for all public municipal workers affected by this bill. In doing my own research and speaking with those whose understanding of law is far greater than I, I have come to the understanding that Qualified Immunity protects a government official from lawsuits alleging that the official violated a plaintiff's rights, only allowing suits where officials violated a "clearly established" statutory or constitutional right. As it stands, Qualified Immunity does not aim to protect officers like Derek Chauvin or those who act egregiously. It is to protect law enforcement officers and other public workers (firefighters, nurses, teachers, DPW workers, etc.) from frivolous lawsuits that can destroy their livelihoods and the lives of their families. Removal of Qualified Immunity will surely affect the decision making of officers, as they will now fear about the legal consequences of every choice they make. Removal of Qualified Immunity will unfortunately lead to more officers being injured or killed in the line of duty.

As I write to you tonight, it is with a heavy heart, as I remember my husband's late co-worker Sgt. Michael Chesna. Tomorrow, July 15th, is the two-year anniversary of his death while on duty in Weymouth, Massachusetts. Sgt. Chesna was responding to a call for an erratic operator

when he was attacked by an "unarmed" man, who then shot him with his own service weapon. Two years ago this week, I attended the wake and funeral of a dedicated and hardworking law enforcement officer and military veteran. I will never forget the sound of his shrieking widow as she lay over his casket or the end of watch call at the gravesite. I sincerely hope that I never have to attend the funeral of another law enforcement officer, but I fear that if S2800 passes, it will likely happen again.

Representative Sullivan, I ask that you please vote no on S2800. This bill is an insult to all of the hardworking, dedicated, and selfless officers that work to protect Massachusetts. This bill is dangerous for those who risk their lives to protect the residents of this state every single day. Please vote no in support of our officers.

Sincerely,

Carly E. Malvesti

Representatives,

My name is Richard Vitale and I have been a police officer for nearly 30 years, half of which I have been a trainer in force related issues including, firearms, defensive tactics, TASER and use of force. I am asking you to take a moment and consider this legislation and ask, have we done our due diligence or are we making an emotional decision.

While there are many areas of concern that need our attention to ensure racial inequality and abuse of power are not tolerated in our society the focus is on law enforcement. This bill contains many positive aspects including the adoption of POST strategies and uniformity of training as well as oversight and development committees designed to broaden training and understanding of these issues. However, many aspects of the bill appear to have been put together without input from law enforcement professionals and without regard to the stresses that are inherent to police work and the decision making process.

The implementation of the POSAC as listed in this bill has several concerns. While we are looking to address the abuse of power it appears that this committee has absolute power to permanently revoke certification with no avenue to an independent appeal process. This is like the judicial system doing away with the appellate section and the appeal process being heard by the Judge that decided the conviction. As a legislator, I am sure you understand the absolute need for the checks and balance system that our government has been utilizing since its inception. This section eliminates the due process as it does not allow for an independent appeal process.

The section which addresses "Qualified Immunity" is of the utmost concern when it comes to the decision making process during times of extreme stress. The current concept of qualified immunity supplies officers with the confidence that decisions made in good faith will be supported. Not unlike medical malpractice insurance allows a doctor to make life and death decisions instantly knowing that if they are acting in good faith they have an umbrella of personal liability protection. The current concept has an avenue for damages through the municipality or overseeing entity and also holds the individual officer accountable for actions involving gross negligence or violations of the law. This proposed language is extremely vague

stating, "...qualified immunity shall not apply to claims for monetary damages except upon a finding that, at the time the conduct complained of occurred, no reasonable defendant could have had reason to believe that such conduct would violate the law". The current qualified immunity statutes cover these areas and are more clearly developed. This language appears to have been worded in a particularly vague manner and included in the bill as a pacifying section instead of a thoughtful planned attempt at crafting logical and practical legislation.

Please take the time to consider this important legislation and to objectively look at the sections so that you may make an informed and logical decision. Reach out to those who perform these functions and ask if these are viable solutions or are they the result of an emotional outreach by the legislature during this time of civil unrest.

Take the time that the Senate refused to take and do your research so that you can make an informed decision. You should seek clarity where it is needed and input from stakeholders. You have an obligation to the people of Massachusetts to make objective decisions and to put forward bills developed by logic and debate not by an emotional response.

Thank you,
Richard Vitale
Bedford MA

Dear Representative Sullivan,

My name is Matthew Rodman and I live at 80 Warren Avenue, Whitman. 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,

Matthew Rodman

Patrolman Randolph Police Department

Ma'am, I am a veteran and police officer. I have literally dedicated my life to serving my community and country. You know in your heart this bill, as currently written, is not the right right way to address the issues that plague our Commonwealth. I ask you if this bill reaches your desk, to reject it without hesitation. I will gladly sit with you and any of your colleagues willing to have a real discussion. We will talk about the right way to make change and progress and continue the proud traditions of Law Enforcement, rather than destroy my it's foundations. Thank you for your time.

Governor Baker approved a Police Reform Bill (PRB) consisting of 11 pages. The Massachusetts State passed a PRB that had an additional 60 PAGES. For legislation of this magnitude, we are OUTRAGED, that this was not presented to the voters of MA. This story has been on the news and we are not the only ones who are upset with what has happened. As registered voters, we are asking you to NOT pass this bill as written. One example is the Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee. This board should be made up of individuals who are Law Enforcement. I am not aware of any licensing boards that are not made up of professionals in their respective fields. i.e, Real Estate, Medical, Teachers etc.

As stated above, please to not accept this bill as written.

Nancy and Joe Petras
10 Dorset Lane
Plymouth MA
nancypetras2@gmail.com

Good Morning,

I am a Independent Plymouth voter. I am watching to see how all of you vote on bill S.2800. I saw how the Senate voted (AT 4 IN THE MORNING)... very transparent. I will be letting every person I know about this bill and again we will see how the rest of you vote.

This bill is targeting the people who protect us, Police, Firefighters and Nurses. We can all see what's happening with this new movement and if our Congress is going to be scared and/or bought off by this group we will remember come voting time.

Keep your own family in mind when voting. You know what's right, support our public servants. Don't remove from them what you sit and enjoy, "Qualified Immunity".

The people who pay the taxes are waking up and we are angry and watching.

Vote with your conscience not your wallet.

Cindy Reed

Please don't remove Qualified Immunity! Police will hesitate, firman will hesitate and nurses will hesitate! Nothing good will come of this. Thank you

Brian Johnson (Ret)
Duxbury PD

Good afternoon,

I was saddened to wake up yesterday morning and be kicked in the throat by the thought of the MA state senate voting to end qualified immunity for cops, overnight nonetheless- this is cowardly- the MA Senate has betrayed MA law enforcement, and good policing. I can support the core principles contained in the legislation, but am saddened by the rest. How reckless?To hold a public hearing process and not inviting all stakeholders to the discussion is an attack on public employees and their rights to protection. Every single one of you owes LEO families an explanation. My husband, a 14 year veteran with the Waltham Police Department is passionate about keeping our state, and streets clean. His biggest passion is getting drugs off our streets. He risks his life daily to go into the homes of dangerous criminals who are selling drugs, in order to keep our streets safer. Why would he continue to do this if this law is passed? It's maddening that people think this acceptable. He's worked his tail off for this city/state for 14 long years. That's 14 Christmas', 14 Easters, 14 Mother's Days, 14 Birthday, countless, missed holidays with his family, not even knowing if that would be the last. When my daughter was 5 weeks old he came home, and told me he had to shower before he held her because he had urine and spit on him, with this bill, it's possible that could happen, and he would have to shake it off and walk away. Before you vote, please please please consider what this will do to our state. Firemen and women, nurses and ETM's will have to make decisions and choices based on their livelihood and their family, not on what they've known to do, first hand for years. THIS IS BAD, and it's SCARY. It's scary for families, but it's more scary for civilians who will not receive help and who will not feel safe. It's scary for my family; we have a home, and belongings, that could all be taken away from us in a lawsuit. I have a child, who has a father who has put his life on the line for 14 years, in a state that has always protected him, to build a life to make sure her future

is the best it can be. Be like the commendable 7 souls who voted NO, even if it means going against your own party. Be BRAVE, stand up, DO WHAT'S RIGHT. Don't vote because you're scared, because you're bowing down. Massachusetts has always stood out, always been a state to be proud of, now I'm sickened. This is no longer about race, and what's going on around our country. This will give dangerous criminals an open door. It's about keeping our state and its residents safe. Let the men and women who have dedicated years of hard work to continue to do what they love, respectfully, and not live in fear. This will do nothing but divide out State faster and further. The chaos that this bill will bring is unfathomable. I.AM.TERRIFIED.

Be well,

Nicole Cadman

Dear House Members,

My name is Jill Cimildoro and I live at 36 Pleasant Garden Rd, Canton MA. As your constituent, and a wife of a MA LEO, I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and 137 to Senate Bill S.2800. 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. I ask you to not bow down to these BLM radicals. You took an oath and it includes morality and justice. Enough is enough.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Jill Cimildoro

Hi I am emailing you regarding
Bill S.2800 <<https://malegislature.gov/Bills/191/S2800>>

As it is currently written, this bill puts ALL public servants (police officers, firefighters, teachers, etc) in an unfair and vulnerable position that will tug on their moral compass and compromise the integrity and ability to perform their jobs as they currently do.

I am disappointed in the Senate, but now it's on the House to do the right thing. Please stop this Bill.

Thank you
Beth and Yashin Cerritos
Whitman, Ma.

I am writing to request your assistance with the S.2800 Act to Reform Police Standards. I am a Worcester Police Officer and 15 year veteran of the United States Air Force. Since I was 18 years old, I made a decision to put on a uniform and serve my country. After I served my country, again I put on a uniform in order to serve my community. As a country we are facing unprecedented times in light of recent events, specifically in Minneapolis that has sparked controversy across the entire world. We are being fed a misleading national narrative by news media outlets across the country about this idea of “systematic racism” that seems to only exist within law enforcement agencies. I am not denying the fact that racism doesn’t exist nor that it is acceptable. What we must examine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is (1) does systematic racism exist, and (2) are the police within the Commonwealth engaged in it? I have heard this term being thrown around during the Senate hearings for this bill, but what I did not hear is one example or fact laid on the table from this state. Although what happened in Minneapolis is a tragedy, the good men and women who protect and serve the communities within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts should not be punished because of it. Massachusetts police and training standards are already far above that of the rest of the country, which is why we don’t gain national attention. The police reforms sweeping the nation is what Massachusetts has had in place for years. Anything further is simply dismantling the police.

The Senate Bill S.2800 is a toxic bill that effectively ties the hands of police officers across the state, which will result in an unjustified negative impact on the very communities we serve and protect. If this Bill passes, GOOD police officers will retire, GOOD police officers will walk off the job, GOOD police candidates will not take this job and we will be left with the very people this Bill is trying to prevent because there will be no choice but to hire anyone willing to work. This Bill was hastily thrown together without even consulting the community and aims to remove qualified immunity and Due Process from police officers who may make a mistake while acting in Good Faith. The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States grants all people the right to be judged by a jury of their peers. Bill S.2800 calls for police to be judged by a committee who have no experience in policing. If you needed emergency heart surgery, would you want it performed by a doctor who refuses and lets you die because he knows if he makes a mistake he will lose his house, retirement, savings, livelihood, or the doctor who knows even if he makes a mistake he will be covered and tries his hardest to save your life? Well the same holds true for police, why would we want to arrest any criminals when we know at any moment we can lose everything because of a split-second decision? Bill S.2800 is completely erasing United States Supreme Court case law such as *Tennessee v. Garner* and *Graham v. Connor*. Both cases are surrounding use of force by police and state that force shall be justified based on what a reasonable officer would do. How is a person that has never been a police officer, never made a split-second decision, never put their life on the line for another human being, supposed to know what a reasonable officer would do?

I have never heard of an unarmed person in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts being killed by police, but when I read this reform bill the names **Michael Chesna**, **Sean Gannon**, and **Ronald Tarentino** come to mind. These are all police officers in Massachusetts that were shot and killed by violent criminals. If this Bill passes not only will the list of fallen police officers in the Commonwealth grow, but so will the list of citizens that die at the hands of violent

criminals. If we look at the number of murders across the nation and more specifically the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over the last month, they are up tenfold. The reason for this is because of Reform Bills like S.2800 that have handcuffed police. Police officers cannot and should not do anything other than the bare minimum because of the unnecessary dangers this Bill places them in. All of these Bills have been put together without consulting the community, specifically the minority community. Recently in New York City a Bill was passed that removed 1 Billion dollars from the budget, reduced the police force by 1,400 officers, canceled a police academy of 1,000 officers, and dismantled their Anti-Crime Unit (a unit designed to stop violent crimes and gun violence). All of this was done without consulting the community. Approximately, two weeks after getting rid of the Anti-Crime Unit murders and gun violence in the City is up 45% in just a matter of days. Leaders of the Black Community are now calling for Politicians to bring back the Anti-Crime Unit and stating they never asked for them to be dismantled to begin with. We have already had over 10 murders across the Commonwealth in the last two weeks so let's stop this before it's too late.

We as police are not resistant to change and are open to make things safer for the communities we protect, but let's do it in a way that protects both the citizens and police in the Commonwealth. I am urging you to delay this Bill until we can work together as an entire community to come up with a plan that protects us all. We need to consult our communities and ask for their opinions, we need to consult our police and ask for their opinions, and most importantly we need to come up with a Bill that is reasonable for all. Please delay Bill S.2800 before crime in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts spirals out of control and cannot be stopped.

Please feel free to reach out to me and discuss this matter further. Again, I thank you for time, dedication, and commitment to resolve the challenges we are facing in this extraordinary time.

Respectfully,

Stephen Germain
Worcester Police Department
(508) 612-9756
Sg07248@gmail.com

I do not support this bill and have a lot of concern about it. First why so quick with no public forums? Also why was the vote done at 4AM. Something is not right here. Just want to let my elected representatives know I am a concerned voter and if you support this bill I will not support you.

Dawn Kelly
East Bridgewater

Dear Representative,

While I understand the events that have occurred in different parts of the nation are disgraceful, categorizing all law enforcement officers as the problem is not the solution. Frankly, it is a lazy way to deal with a larger issue. I cannot help but wonder why Massachusetts is never in the spotlight for these tragedies. I know it is due to the fact that the training in Massachusetts is significantly superior than those in most of the other states. In Massachusetts you have Officer's that attend a 26 week academy. Academies in other parts of the country can be only 14 weeks.

Does racism play a role in law enforcement? You bet it does, but I am here to tell you that it is not with the patrol officer. It is with the Massachusetts General Law. Changing the minimum mandatory sentencing or statues is difficult. So it is certainly easier to blame it on the cop who gets called to the scene of a crime, makes an arrest, files the appropriate charges then hands it off to the court house. A police department receives a report of a suspicious person. The officer is dispatched and responds to find a minority person. The officer has an interaction with this person and clears it out as unfounded. Now people hear about this and automatically blame the officer accusing him of being a racist. Is the cop a racist, or was he doing his job? What if the officer never responded, do you think the reporting party would have stopped calling?

You see, the officer is not racist, society is. The law is. The patrol officer is not. Yet the patrol officer is the easiest target to blame. There is always room for additional training for officers. I am not naive to the fact that not every police officer serves with integrity. But to take away basic protections and rights for the officers is absurd. Officers are willing to sacrifice their lives, but now they are being asked to sacrifice their family's wellbeing, all in the name of political pressure?

If you take away qualified immunity, you know what you are going to get? Less qualified police officers. Police departments nationwide are already scraping the bottom of the barrel to hire because the benefits of the job don't outweigh the risk. When good, honest officers walk off the job because they are not willing to risk their family's livelihood, you are only going to get less qualified people to do the job. Does that sound like the solution?

How about putting money back into the police departments for training. Police Officers have become social workers, marriage counselors, psychologists, teachers, parents and the list goes on. You will not find a police officer in the commonwealth who would be upset about having social workers respond to non-police related calls instead of them. But leave the police officer's protection with qualified immunity alone. The police officers rely on qualified immunity for the same reasons clerk magistrates, prosecutors and judges do; mistakes happen. Not due to maliciousness but due to the facts at hand. I strongly urge you to consider your position and ask yourself, if the majority of good and honest police officers walk off the job, who will you be left with?

This in combination with the portion of the bill encouraging private citizens to interfere in police business if they feel it is excessive is reckless. Have you ever been in a fight? If you have, then you know it never looks good. Ever. Now you are giving private citizens who have no knowledge of the use of force continuum officers abide by and courts rule on, the authority to assist the arrestee? You want officers to accept this? How do you think this will end? This is going to get people hurt and or killed. We ask too much of our officers and frankly, I could not

blame them for wanting to walk away from their profession and show these extremists and reactionaries just how lawless society will be. I will again reiterate, if this passes, we will become a lawless society. Maybe that is what some people want, I do not. I do not want it for my young family, and I know the silent majority does not.

Many politicians believe if they do not support this, it will be political suicide. I am here to tell you the silent majority is disgusted by the events that have transpired since the Minneapolis tragedy. If you do support this, this will be political suicide. Once lawlessness takes over, people will remember who supported these bills and it will affect their voting. I urge you to consult with experts in this matter, and not just give into political pressure.

Respectfully,

John Annunziata

Ms. Sullivan,
I am sharing the email I have sent to Speaker DeLeo.

Mr. Speaker,

I am begging you to BE EVER SO THOUGHTFUL as you lead the house in a debate about the Police Reform Bill the Senate, I believe foolishly, passed in its current form. **AND...I might add....STUCK IT TO FIREFIGHTERS AND NURSES by taking away their Qualified Immunity! OUR NURSES...?? REALLY...?? THE NURSES WHO SELFLESSLY MANNED HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ROOMS, ICUs and COVID FLOORS during the COVID Pandemic.?? AND UNDER THE GUISE OF A POLICE REFORM BILL?**

THIS IS A CLEAR MESSAGE THAT OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS TRULY HATE THEIR CONSTITUENTS!

Then why not take away Qualified Immunity from ALL who hold public office....senators, representatives, governors, mayors....?

One of the main reasons our country is unique and free is that at the very base of our freedoms is our Law and Order. **IF WE LOSE OUR POLICE, WHICH WE WILL IF THIS BILL PASSES - POLICE OFFICERS WILL WALK OFF OF THE JOB** (many have verbalized they will and many already have left). **WE WILL HAVE NO LAW AND ORDER....WE WILL LIVE UNDER MOB RULE** (criminals will be empowered)....**WE WILL NOT HAVE A STATE or COUNTRY....**

IS THIS WHAT YOU WANT FOR MASSACHUSETTS? IS THIS WHAT YOU WANT FOR OUR COUNTRY?

As I expressed to all Senate members before their final imposition of their overwhelming support of **LAWLESSNESS** onto the hard working, tax paying, law abiding Massachusetts citizens, my main concerns are as follows:

****DO NOT TAKE AWAY QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FROM POLICE, FIREFIGHTERS AND NURSES!** DOING SO WILL DIMINISH THEIR ABILITY TO DO THEIR JOB TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY.

****THIS BILL SUPPORTS ABOLISHING THE POLICE!** IT WILL FORCE POLICE OFFICERS TO LEAVE; YOUNG PEOPLE WILL BE DETERRED FROM SEEKING THIS PROFESSION.

****CRIMINALS WILL BE EMPOWERED!** THE PUBLIC WILL NOT BE SAFE! (especially the most vulnerable in low income communities)

****WE NEED A PUBLIC HEARING!** THERE ARE MANY STAKEHOLDERS WHO HAVE NOT BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS!

Supporting this Bill IS A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF LAWLESSNESS IN MASS AND IN THE UNITED STATES. Supporting this BILL TELLS THE hard working, tax paying, law abiding Massachusetts citizens OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS DO NOT CARE ABOUT US/OUR SAFETY AND SECURITY....SAFETY..Hmmm....Isn't this ONE REASON WHY WE PAY TAXES??

WE WILL NOT HAVE A STATE OR COUNTRY UNLESS WE HAVE LAW AND ORDER.

I AM BEGGING YOU....PLEASE DO NOT PASS THIS BILL....

EXTREMELY CONCERNED,
Massachusetts Voter

Good afternoon, I would like to let you know that I am against the above bill and would like you to vote against it. Our Police, fire, EMTs and everyone else affected by it deserve more. They put their lives on the line every day and should not have to worry about being sued trying to do the right thing. I am asking you to vote against this, this is nothing but political BS put in place by the liberal mindset of this state. We need conservative lawmakers who know how hard our police etc work for the people of MA.

Thank you, Lynne Brown
41 Morton St.
Abington, MA 02351

Good afternoon,

I am writing this email to you in regards to the new bill that would get rid of protection against law suits for civil service workers. I am currently an EMT, I work closely with police officers as well as the fire department. This bill is a huge mistake. Not only are people going to be afraid to

do their job, to put it bluntly, people are going to die. That will be at the hands of politicians voting to pass this bill. This bill is a band aid. I can tell you from first hand experience a lot of civil service workers are going to leave their jobs, putting a lot of lives at risk that are already being put at risk because of this bill. We need a permanent solution that will help, this is not that. I beg you to reconsider this bill in place of an actual solution. I hope this gets through in time. I hope you will think about the big picture and the devastating effects this will have on our communities.

Thank you,
Erin Bussey

Good afternoon Ms. Sullivan,

I am writing you today asking you to please not vote for this bill.

This will only put our officers lives in more danger and now they can be sued personally for anything and everything.

There are over 800,000 officers in this country who proudly serve everyday to keep us safe, yet they are being judged on the actions of a few.

Not long ago they were being hailed as heroes for being on the front lines and now because of the radicals who have waged war on them and have left them to fend for themselves.

They are not even been given the chance to be on the board but rather have people who know nothing of what they face everyday.

They should go on a ride along some Friday or Saturday night to see what they deal with daily.

I respectfully ask you to stand up and do the right thing.

We families see our loved ones leaving for their shift and pray they come home safe from the bad guys, now we have to worry about their future and the future of every good citizen from those who should be standing with them.

Respectfully
Diane Bourisk

Dear Alyson,

As you know my husband and I live in Abington, my husband is an Abington Police Officer. This bill would directly effect us and if it were to pass as is, it would cause us to leave the state.

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.

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

Jessica Gillan
Abington, Ma

To who it may concern,

My name is Alix, I am a student at a Boston university. I am studying to be a nurse. I have grown up with police in my family, police as friends, and have even found many I find rude and offensive.

I still find it unacceptable to reform the police as may happen with the bill that is coming into the house. I REJECT DISARMING POLICE OFFICERS! Police officers are some of the first responders on scene to ensure safety to the greater public, they cannot do this is illegal firearms are being used by people with bad intents, and they cannot do this even with good people who have firearms that may have a bad day and decide to go postal. DO NOT TAKE AWAY THE SAFETY MECHANISMS IN PLACE FOR POLICE TO SAFELY DO THEIR JOB AND RETURN HOME AT THE END OF THEIR DAY. I EXTREMELY OPPOSE THIS BILL!

I hear the arguments of friends and acquaintances of mine. They say "police being killed is the price of racism ending".

Reread that until you see the lack of humanity occurring in our world right now.

Reforming the police will not only remove a safety mechanism for police officers, but it will implore those who were waiting for this moment to strike. More men and women in blue will have their lives at risk of this bill is passed.

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,
Tim O'Connor
10 Strathmore Rd
East Bridgewater

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,
Emily O'Connor
10 Strathmore Rd
East Bridgewater
508-456-1247

To Rep. Sullivan,

I am a registered voter in the state of Massachusetts and want you to know how disappointing I found that the senate's bill was rushed quietly through at 4 in the morning without any discussion from their constituents. I hope you don't do the same.

The Senate bill is an anti-labor bill who are supporting to eliminate Collective Bargaining and the right to due process. It is against their platform as being labor/union supporters.

They blanketed all law enforcement with a broad brush. That is unfair to them and the community. They risk their lives everyday for people like me to stay safe, go to work and live in peace. They should have the same opportunities as other professions do. Nurses and teachers have collective bargaining, are protected from being sued and have a board made up of their peers. How is law enforcement any different?

I support Qualified Immunity, Due Process/Collective Bargaining and a POSAC Board made up of their peers and other law enforcement professionals.

Thank you for listening to me and know I and many others will be watching this closely to how this is handled and addressed since it's an election year.

Thank you,

Danielle Fahey

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,

Kara Chapman

17 Strathmore Road

East Bridgewater MA 02333

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,

Mark Chapman

17 Strathmore Rd.
East Bridgewater ma 02333

Good Evening,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you,

Nicholas R Pak
45 Sachem Rock Ave
East Bridgewater
781-534-0739

Dear Alyson,

below is a template email that you can send to your state repDear Representative (your MA State rep that represents your voting district)

As your constituent, (Your Name) from (city/town) I write to you today to express my strong opposition to S.2800 which was passed in the dark of night by the Senate. I ask that you oppose this bill as constituted when it is debated in the House of Representatives.

We 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.

The Bill will put restrictions on police tactics of non lethal crowd by limiting use of tear gas. In addition S 2800 failed to follow the normal and appropriate legislative process of holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and experts.

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO when S.2800 comes to the House of representatives for the reasons stated above, and others.

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.

I ask that you respond to this email to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill.

Thank you,

Pat Borden

31 Indian Trail Whitman Ma. 02382

nstarpatty51@aol.com

I am a Police Officer and I am writing to you regarding bill S2820, which I do not support. These opinions are of my own and do not reflect on my employer. I work for a Community College in Boston. There I can interact with people in positive ways. I can help people make the right choices and direct them away from the criminal justice system. However, my hands will be tied if bill S2820 is passed. Most importantly if qualified immunity is removed.

If qualified immunity is removed law enforcement in Massachusetts will struggle to move forward. Police Officers will leave the profession in such massive numbers it will take years to recover. I fear that Officers that do stay will be under qualified, overwhelmed and only looking for a paycheck. This will lead to long wait times for calls of service. Qualified immunity does not protect that bad Officers out there, it protects good Officers who are doing the right thing and acting in good faith.

If qualified immunity is removed what worries me for example is a scenario like this. I go to a call for a car accident, upon arrival I notice a person trapped in the car that is on its side and its on fire. I pull the person out and they break their arm in the process. The insurance company sues me for their medical bills to reduce their payout to this person.

In conclusion I do not support this bill as it stands and there must be changes done before I can support it. I know if it passes as it stands, I will have to consider and think deep about looking for a new career that won't have these same negative impacts on my family.

Respectfully,

Andrew Rezendes

Police Officer: Bunker Hill Community College

Cell: 401-662-7021

41 Captain Standish Drive

Abington, MA 02351