

My name is Mark Chasse. I am from Portland, and I am testifying in favor of LC 49.

My brother, James Chasse, Jr., was beaten to death by Portland Police and, through their lies and misdirections, they ensured that he was denied medical treatment and died. Our family sought sought justice for years for what happened to him, and I suppose that is also what I am doing here.

We and others submitted many complaints regarding the officers in Jim's case. In brief, I believe it would have been possible—for a properly motivated and conflict-free prosecutor-- to obtain a guilty verdict of some type of criminal homicide for the death of my brother. The level of criminality increased as they continued to lie and cover up what they had done, and a jury would have probably hated them. That did not happen, and I address that more in my testimony for LC 79.

We waited for almost four years for the Portland Police's byzantine and secretive disciplinary process to consider the disciplinary cases against the officers. When they were eventually decided, the most severe discipline was for not "disclosing" to medical personnel that Jim had gone unconscious and they had beaten and tased him—but instead lead the medical team to believe that it was a drug-related issue and he would recover. This was not addressed as the obvious lie it was, or that it was an obvious cover-up of their own actions. It was just a simple procedural error, as it was processed by the police's disciplinary review. And, for that oh-so-technical-sounding oversight, my brother died.

Even at this, the arbitrator overturned this pathetically underwhelming discipline.

I'd like to point out that the logic driving the police arbitration "ace in the hole" this bill seeks to end is similar to the embattled "qualified immunity:" if no prior case has found discipline for the same acts, then none shall ever be found for these acts. Like qualified immunity, this allows police impunity.

The scales of analyzing officer discipline have tipped way too heavily toward the officers' job security. It is extremely difficult to bring a complaint, it is secretive, and it is unquestioningly and jealously guarded by the police as a job that only they can handle. While the police have a job, their job involves the monopoly in the use of deadly force—as entrusted to them by the people. The citizens not only have the right to oversee their police, they have *the duty* to oversee the police. As the citizens' representatives, it is your job to help ensure this duty is fulfilled.

Treating the job security of police officers on the level of a national security matter with death penalty implications is ridiculous. This is analogous to the job security they now enjoy. It's a job, paid for by the citizens for the citizens' own safety. The disciplinary process is a large part of why the public has lost trust of its police, and now fears its police more than those the police are supposed to be protecting the public from. This needs to change drastically. A lot of that change will need to come from how the localities themselves are handling police oversight, but this bill is a step in the right direction for police reform.