

CITY OF FALCON HEIGHTS
 Falcon Heights Inclusion and Policing Task Force
 City Hall
 2077 West Larpenteur Avenue

MINUTES
 April 11, 2017 at 7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

ANDREWS	X		JOHNSON-POWERS	X
BALLENTINE	X		LEEHY-CO CHAIR	X
COLOND	X		THOMPSON	X
DEMERATH	X		WADE	X
JOHNSON	X			

STAFF PRESENT:

MAYOR LINDSTROM	X
CO-CHAIR/COUNCIL MEMBER GUSTAFSON	X
CO-FACILITATOR QUICK	X
CO-FACILITATOR MORRIS	
ADMINISTRATOR THONGVANH	X

I. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 7:26pm.

II. Review Agenda

Agenda was changed to the following:

III. Review of March 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes

IV. Discussion with Subject Matter Experts

A. Video

B. Citizen Review Board

C. Joint Power Authority

V. Review of March 30, 2017 Police Panel

VI. Break

VII. Review of April 3, 2017 Community Conversation #3

VIII. Fine Tune Recommendations for Policing Policies and Procedures

IX. Select Candidate Recommendations for Inclusive and Welcoming Community for Sharing at Community Conversation #4.

X. Preparation for Upcoming Task Force Meetings

XI. Announcements and Updates

XII. Adjourn

The Announcements and updates portion of the meeting can be used for new items.

III. Review of March 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Accepted as is.

V. Discussion with subject matter Experts

A. Video

Two videos were shown, one police body cam and one from CNN about incidents officers face and virtual reality training that is available. These types of videos would help provide perspective to CRB members who do not have experience with situations officers face. The videos also go along with Blink and how quickly decisions are made.

B. Citizen Review Board

A former member of the St. Paul Citizen Review Board talked about his experience. He was on the board for about seven years when Norm Coleman, Randy Kelly and Chris Coleman were mayors and William Finney and John Harrington were police chiefs. He reviewed hundreds of issues a year, on average about 30 per month, with varying levels of severity. There are many forms, shapes and sizes of CRB's. The NACOLE (National Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement) report, [Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: A Review of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Various Models \(September, 2016\)](#) describes 3 models, Investigation-focused, Review-focused, and Auditor/monitor-focused. St. Paul's uses the Auditor-monitor model.

When serving, members attend a civilian police academy for ten weeks of training. St. Paul's CRB was established in city code in 1993 with influence from the community. Two officers were voting members at that time and gave an important perspective but needed to be tempered. Examples of issues included use of force, discharge of firearms and disciplinary action.

The CRB took a lot of work to get in place with working with the police union, obtaining subpoena powers and determining the make up. The make up of the group was diverse. Discussions could be heated but were healthy in the long run. There are no officers on the board today because some felt there was too much sway from the officers. Mayor and police chief need to be on board 100%. One year they went twelve months without a full board.

Members are volunteers and served two, three-year terms then cycled off. Complaints are brought to a coordinator in police internal affairs. IA investigates the complaints then brings all cases to the CRB. The board could sustain the IA decision which might range from retraining to time off without pay to dismissal. The CRB could recommended a more severe penalty if it was warranted. The final decision was with the chief who may have had more information than the CRB due to privacy issues. The board could look for trends and make recommendations to the chief. To be most effective the board needs to be fully staffed.

In general, the department was community focused. There was push back from police on the board but at times they came around and saw the viewpoint of the citizens.

There was also outreach to the community that the CRB was supposed to do. This made people more aware of the CRB and more complaints would come in, some of which did not warrant review. Quarterly meetings were held for the community but there might be five people in attendance. Sometimes they had police protection at the community meetings.

They didn't have incidents like we do now with social media and cameras being easily available. He suggested caution with the lens you use when reviewing cases and videos. There is always more and sometimes requests needed to be made for more information if it was available.

Look at the makeup of the commission and determine your goals. Building trust with the officers requires their involvement as voting members and learning police culture. There were times where officers recused themselves from cases.

Regarding the performance of the department, they would bring patterns to chief but no one asked for an overall performance. Some communities in St. Paul thought the performance was good and some did not.

The case result was sent back to the complainant. Community was informed with more general statistics like, "of 40 use of force cases and 20 were sustained."

Kenith Bergeron, Senior Conciliation Specialist with the DOJ Community Relations Service who helps communities form CRB's at no cost provided the following in an email.
Civilian Review Boards

A municipal body composed of citizen representatives charged with the investigation of complaints by members of the public concerning misconduct by police officers. Such bodies may be independent agencies or part of a law enforcement agency.

Some of the newer civilian review board models, however, provide board members with investigatory as well as review authority. Some of these models contemplate that the board will conduct parallel investigations to supplement the internal affairs investigations. In a few localities, the review board has subpoena power and can force a police officer to testify. A few jurisdictions even grant sole investigatory power to their civilian review boards. But it is very rare for a civilian review board to have the final say as to the disposition of an investigation or discipline to be imposed on an officer. These ultimate decisions generally continue to be the province of the chief of police. Nonetheless, all civilian review boards with independent investigatory authority seem to have the power to make recommendations to the chief on disposition and discipline.

Police Advisory Commissions

Police Advisory Commissions generally advise police chief or make recommendations on how to improve police community relations. Some do investigate complaints like Philadelphia and St. Paul others as those listed below do not:

Philadelphia; Vermont State Police; Lakeland Police Advisory Commission (LPAC) - Medford, OR: Police Advisory Committee

Civilian Review Commissions:

St. Paul, MN; Syracuse, NY; Philadelphia, PA; New York, NY; Baltimore, MD
Newark, NJ; Atlanta, NJ; New Haven, CT; Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART); Las Vegas, NV;
Ferguson, MO; Cleveland, OH; Cincinnati, OH

C. Joint Power Authority

Mayor Bartholomay of Circle Pines talked about the JPA for police service between Circle Pines, Lexington and Lino Lakes. There are different options with a JPA and depend on the level of service, budget and community issues. Pros for the agreement include having a seat at the table for decisions like the size of the force, hiring, and training approaches. A stand alone department is an option but small size and costs can be challenges. Seventeen officers for three cities allows for better training and more diversity.

Cons include potential difficulties with collaboration and relationships. The mayor passed out copies of an article about Barriers to Collaboration. There is also the potential loss of city identity with a JPA.

Regular communication is needed to build relationships that will weather difficult times. Official meetings as well as other meetings need to be scheduled to gauge how the agreement is working. He also recommended structuring the agreement to make it difficult for a partner city to leave and requiring remediation before leaving. Line up ordinances across cities to make enforcement easier and consistent. A couple of officers could be assigned to a city more frequently to build community relationships. The biggest item is the budget. Types of crime and services requested drive the dollars. Circle Pines current cost is around \$900,000.

Two representatives from each city and city admins and mayors meet quarterly. Letters are reviewed if received. They hire and fire the chief. The chief hires the police staff. Monthly operational meetings are held with the city administrators and the chief. There is no review board. Liability lies equally with all cities. They have insurance and follow state statutes.

Warnings are issued on first occurrence. These are tracked and a ticket is given on the next occurrence.

Joel Hanson, the Little Canada City Administrator talked about their police contract with Ramsey County which they have had since 1960.

Seven city managers meet monthly to discuss budget and operational issues and they have been working well together. They looked at Roseville and Maplewood and the county was the best value.

Ramsey County Sheriff's Department serves 75000 people. Service is events driven with 20

percent shared between all cities in the contract. Little Canada is the most active city versus North Oaks. They feel the county has done a good job.

City council has not had many issues. The sheriff handles these whether it be a personnel issue or reassignment. Regarding liability, Ramsey county is on the hook and they are insured.

The downside is a disconnect with police. Officers are deputies and residents don't know who they are. Complaints are few and far between and usually involve parking tickets but nothing serious. There is heightened awareness lately and city councils and managers need to be aware of situations that could arise.

Nine months notice is required for a city to leave the contract. Remaining members need to reallocate the budget. They use the LA county model which has been tweaked.

The department uses a schedule of four, ten hour days. More deputies are on the street during the heavier call times. Little Canada has 24/7 coverage but does not have a dedicated officer.

There is a new record system that provides more and better data around stops and crimes committed. The department controls HR issues with the sheriff having the final decision. The city can dispute the decision but the only recourse, if not satisfied, is to leave the contract. This has not been an issue. One instance where the council was involved involved an aggressive deputy who was reassigned and hasn't been a problem since.

Community engagement includes Coffee with a Cop and giving DQ certificates to children doing the right thing while riding their bikes. Getting officers out of the car is a challenge but more face to face contact and proactive police visits would be appreciated by the community.

Commendation to the draft committee of Kate, Peter D. and Jim working with Kathy.

Suggestion was made to hear from a panel of experts on community policing, representatives from nonprofits and marginalized communities which would mean another meeting or a longer meeting next week. More needs to be done with inclusion. Tough conversations are needed but we don't seem to be willing to have them.

We have one meeting left to cover policing and two more for inclusion work. One comment was made that the level of discussion in the task force meetings seems too detailed for providing recommendations to the council. Another suggestion was made to add another meeting on Tues. April 25th.

VI. Break three minutes.

VII. Review of March 30, 2017 Police Panel

Feedback about the panel was generally positive. Members enjoyed hearing about the "Lights On" program which uses grant money to provide vehicle fixes for free. CRBs or an advisory council can be effective ways for citizens to be involved. A diverse department doesn't mean hiring one or two officers of color.

Hearing about one department that can't have civil discourse between members and doesn't know how to resolve this was disappointing. The hiring process doesn't always vet out problem officers who are only uncovered when something bad happens. First line supervisors are key for department performance.

VIII. Select Candidate Recommendations for Inclusive and Welcoming Community for Sharing at Community Conversation #4

This was not covered in the meeting.

IX. Fine Tune Recommendations for Policing Policies and Procedures

A request for volunteers was presented earlier in the meeting but a draft committee was not formed.

X. Preparation for Upcoming Task Force Meetings

Included in section XI.

XI. Announcements and Updates

Melanie met the chief from Duluth who said the social worker program was working well and they plan to go with a higher level social worker. Mental health and chemical dependency were their biggest issues. The Metro area has been going away from the social worker model and providing basic level of knowledge to all officers.

Schedule of upcoming meetings:

The Tues. Apr. 18th meeting will be from 6-9:30pm.

May 1 - Last community conversation

May 2 - Recommendations complete

May 3 - Council workshop - We will need a representative to make a small presentation to the council.

May 9 - Last scheduled task force meeting

How will marginalizing and profiling be addressed? How are we treating each other and how can the community be more inclusive?

One suggestion was made that more detail is needed if the task force is to be credible. Another view is that we won't be successful if we get into too many details. Perhaps something in between is attainable. Some recommendations can state that more time is needed. Give and take will be needed with the recommendations. Some feedback from the community conversations say the recommendations are too general. Others say the process is taking too long.

Members were requested to leave Tues. April 25 open in case another meeting is needed.

XII. Adjourn

10:10pm