

Submitter: Marc Poris  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary  
Measure: SB808

Chair Prozanski and members of the Committee,

Based on my experience observing and attempting to participate in the LESC over the past months, I am pleasantly surprised that SB 808 appears before you now and I have no objections to what is currently proposed.

Public input in the LESC's work thus far has been tolerated, not encouraged or, in my opinion, appreciated.

I support the addition of "two members who represent community-based organizations to represent the interests of the public" in exchange for one of the Chief law enforcement officers and one of the law enforcement labor union representatives.

Regarding the dash-one amendment: the public would be better served by adding new members to the Commission, rather than replacing one of the desperately needed new community members that I just mentioned.

To echo what Barbara Kenny, Maria Rossi Cahill and others stated during the public hearing, the Commission should also add at least one member of the public who is a representative of people who have been affected by police brutality and/or other police misconduct.

Another adjustment that would give the Commission more balance would be to specify that the "member who represents a federally recognized Indian tribe or association of tribes within this state" NOT also be a Chief Law Enforcement officer. I have no objection to Chief Addleman's presence on the Commission, but since he is a Chief Law Enforcement officer there are actually 3 Chief Law Enforcement officers currently on the Commission.

This is the time to fix the balance of membership on the commission, so I do hope that you will consider increasing the size of the commission at this time.

For an example of a Commission with more than 13 members that is doing important and necessary work in the Police Accountability space, you can take a look at the Police Accountability Commission in Portland which has a 20 person membership. One of the strengths of a larger commission is that members are better able to share leadership positions and rotate responsibilities as sub-committees are formed and dissolved. This commission is expected to last for a long time, so setting up the

members for success is important.

Regarding quorum requirements, the language must account for the fact that the Commission will have turnover and may not be completely filled at any given time, so it should specify that quorum is based on the number of active and/or seated voting members.

Thank you.