

My name is Mark Chasse. I am from Portland, and I am providing testimony in support of LC 80, with amendment.

My brother, James Chasse, Jr., was beaten to death by the Portland Police and denied medical treatment after officers lied and misdirected medical personnel at the scene of the beating. One of the most shocking things about this, from a citizens' standpoint, should be how quickly and flawlessly other officers who appeared on scene assisted in the cover-up. Within minutes, there were approximately a dozen officers surrounding the scene. One of the officers involved announced for the many civilian witnesses to hear, after picking up a sandwich bag containing bread crumbs, that he'd found crack cocaine. That officer was specially trained in identifying narcotics. (Notably, that sandwich bag could not later be found in the Portland Police evidence locker). Another officer on scene told civilian witnesses that there was no reason for their concern—my brother had 14 crack cocaine convictions. Not only did none of them know my brother, but his record was clean.

What sort of public "safety" system has been so heavily corrupted that officers can so spontaneously and immediately play-act an imaginary set of facts that will make the police look better? This is the result of decades of unchecked police misconduct and a complete lack of real independent oversight. I think this an indication of how deeply imbued the "blue wall" against police oversight is.

In this policing environment, it is clearly a good idea to require officers to intervene if they believe another officer is committing a wrongdoing. However, I am concerned this could play into the existing culture. If officers are *unwilling* to "see" something wrong happening, how would they report it? I think that, if this bill is to have any meaning in the current police environment, the subjectivity of the officer needs to be eliminated and an independent body needs to address whether this occurred. This seems to rely too heavily on the existing system, where officers' word is taken at face value—within the blue wall—and then adjudged by their peers within the blue wall.

I would propose that the Attorney General's Office have jurisdiction (like the other aspects of investigation as proposed in LC 79). Also, the subjectivity of the officer should be irrelevant. This is a job, not a criminal matter assessing criminal intent. They should know what's wrong and have a duty to do their job. This would seem to nudge officers to err on the side of complying, if they can't claim they didn't see something, didn't know, etc. Until there is a truly independent local oversight body for police, leaving it to the local oversight will seem to leave this where it is currently. Perhaps there is some other way to have an outside body review these matters.

Otherwise, I am in support of this bill.