U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
MINNESOTA STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

CIVIL RIGHTS AND POLICE PRACTICES IN MINNESOTA

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017

+ + + + +

Frey Moot Courtroom
University of St. Thomas
School of Law
1000 LaSalle Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403

MINNESOTA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Velma Korbel, Chair
Robert Battle
Jacqueline Beaulieu
Matthew Dobratz
Leticia Guadarrama
Denise Huynh
Kirk Kolbo
Teresa Nelson
Nyagatare Valens
Robert Vischer

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

PANEL 1: Academic

Tracie Keesee, Deputy Commissioner of Training, New York City Police Department
Emily Baxter, Director, We Are All Criminals
James Densley, Metropolitan State University
Ebony Ruhland, Robina Institute

PANEL 2: Community I

Benjamin Feist, Legislative director for the ACLU of Minnesota
Shane Zahn, Director of Safety Initiatives and the Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District
Justin Terrell, Justice Manager for the TakeAction Program of Minnesota
Louis Porter, Council for Minnesotans of African Heritage

PANEL 3: Community II

Henry Jimenez, Executive Director of the Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs
Roxanne Anderson, Board Chair of the Minnesota Transgender Health Coalition
Jason Sole, NAACP
Fartun Weli, Isuroon

PANEL 4: Law Enforcement I

Janee Harteau, Chief of Police in Minneapolis
Lieutenant Bob Kroll, Minneapolis Police Department
James Stewart, Sheriff of Anoka County

PANEL 5: Law Enforcement II

Deputy Kellace McDaniel, Hennepin County Sheriff's Office
Michael Gallagher, Bloomington Police Officer Federation
Chief Todd Axtell, St. Paul Police Department
Lou Ferraro, St. Paul Police Department

PANEL 6: Policy Makers/Judiciary

Eugene Borgida of the University of Minnesota
Mark Kappelhoff, Former Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, DOJ
Barbara Johnson, Minneapolis City Council Member and President of the Minneapolis City Council
Andrea Brown, Police Oversight Commission and Ramsey County Public Defender

CONTENTS

OPENING REMARKS and INTRODUCTIONS.....6
Chair Velma Korbel

PANEL 1: Academic
Tracie Keesee, Deputy Commissioner of Training, New York City Police Department.....18
Emily Baxter, Director, We Are All Criminals.....29
James Densley, Metropolitan State University.....41
Ebony Ruhland, Robina Institute.....54

Q&A.....68

PANEL 2: Community I
Benjamin Feist, Legislative director for the ACLU of Minnesota.....82
Shane Zahn, Director of Safety Initiatives and the Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District.....94
Justin Terrell, Justice Manager for the TakeAction Program of Minnesota.....103
Louis Porter, Council for Minnesotans of African Heritage.....112

Q&A.....119

PANEL 3: Community II
Henry Jimenez, Executive Director of the Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs.....142
Roxanne Anderson, Board Chair of the Minnesota Transgender Health Coalition.....149
Jason Sole, NAACP.....156
Fartun Weli, Isuroon.....173

Q&A.....183

PANEL 4: Law Enforcement I
Janee Harteau, Minneapolis Chief of Police.....199
Lieutenant Bob Kroll, Minneapolis Police Department.....214
James Stuart, Sheriff of Anoka County 218

Q&A.....228

PANEL 5: Law Enforcement II

Deputy Kellace McDaniel, Hennepin County.....238
Michael Gallagher, Bloomington Police Officer
Federation.....247
Chief Todd Axtell, St. Paul Police
Department.....252
Lou Ferraro, St. Paul Police Department.....260

Q&A.....263

PANEL 6: Policy Makers/Judiciary

Eugene Borgida of the University of
Minnesota.....286
Mark Kappelhoff, Former Deputy Assistant Attorney
General, Civil Rights Division, DOJ.....301
Barbara Johnson, Minneapolis City Council Member
and President of the Minneapolis
City Council.....319
Andrea Brown, Police Oversight Commission and Ramsey
County Public Defender.....329

Q&A.....336

OPEN FORUM.....348

CLOSING REMARKS.....387
Chair Velma Korbel

Adjourn.....388

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:00 a.m.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Good morning everyone. The meeting of the Minnesota Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil Rights will come to order.

For the benefits of those in the audience I shall introduce my colleagues and myself. My name is Velma Korbel. I've been a member of the committee since 2009, and I'm honored to serve as Chair of this committee.

I am employed by the Minneapolis Department of Civil Rights, and it's a privilege to be here with you this morning, so thank you for being here and welcome.

I'll introduce the members of the Minnesota Committee who are here, and I do have some people who shall be joining us in progress, but I will introduce the ones that are here.

To my left is Reverend Robert Battle, if you would just acknowledge yourself sir, is a senior pastor of The Berean Church of God in Christ in St. Paul. He has had a life of service and continues to fight for

human equality. He is currently a doctoral candidate in education at the University of Minnesota.

Mr. Matthew Dobratz is currently a student at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. He has previously worked as a strategic consultant here in the Minneapolis area and has worked closely with Minneapolis neighborhood organizations and other nonprofits in order to build a better community engagement and development.

Ms. Leticia Guadarrama is an educator working for Minneapolis Public Schools in the Global Department and is a member of the Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs.

Mr. Kirk Kolbo is a Minneapolis attorney with a general litigation practice. In addition to trying and arbitrating cases he's argued appeals in the Minnesota Court of Appeals, the Minnesota Supreme Court, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and the US Supreme Court.

Mr. Nyagatare Valens is a management analyst for the State of Minnesota. He describes

himself as a collaborator and a problem solver. He believes that solutions to any community issue are there. It is a matter of being able to bring people together.

And our host this morning is Mr. Robert Vischer, Dean of the University of St. Thomas School of Law. He is a teacher and published author. He received his law degree from Harvard University where he was an editor of the Harvard Law Review. Thank you, Dean Vischer, for inviting us here into your impressive space.

We have a few members who will be joining us in progress this morning. Dr. Kenneth O. Doyle is professor in the School of Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of Minnesota. He is also the director of the mass communications and research division at the University of Minnesota, and he is the vice chair of this committee.

And Ms. Teresa Nelson, who is the interim executive director and legal director for the ACLU Minnesota. She is, in addition to being a member of this committee, she is also on the Supreme Court's

advisory committee on rules of public access to records of the judicial branch and data practices subcommittee of the Minnesota Criminal Juvenile Justice Task Force, and her specialty areas include Fourth Amendment, privacy rights, policing, voting rights, special justice, LGBT issues, reproductive freedom, student rights and criminal justice.

As the rest of our committee members join us this morning we'll just have them acknowledge they have made it here.

Also present this morning are Melissa Wojnaroski, she is a civil rights analyst out of our Chicago office.

Carolyn Allen, an administrative assistant.

Olivia Wilks, a civil rights intern.

Victoria Moreno, a civil rights intern.

We're also honored this morning to have Commissioner Karen Narasaki, of the US Commission on Civil Rights with us today, and she will be addressing you shortly.

The US Commission on Civil Rights is an

independent bipartisan agency of the federal government, charged with studying discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or any administration of justice. In each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia an advisory committee to the commission has been established and they are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation to advise the commission on relevant information concerning their respective state.

Today our purpose is to hear testimony regarding police practices in Minnesota, and related civil rights concerns. Recent police shootings and concerns regarding excessive use of force have garnered national attention to patterns of disparity in police practices in marginalized communities.

In hopes of improving police practices and strengthening the relationships between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve, on December 14, 2014, President Barack Obama signed an executive order creating the task force on 21st Century

Policing. The committee would like to frame today's conversation within the context of the recommendations put forth by this task force. The task force identified six pillars that offer insights into strategies to cultivate community trust while pursuing more effective crime reduction tactics. These pillars are building trust and legitimacy, policy and oversight, technology and social media, community policing and crime reduction, officer training and education, and officer safety and wellness.

Since that time a number of incidents, both nationally and here in the State of Minnesota, have returned the topic of police practices to the forefront of national concern.

The US Constitution, along with other federal laws, protects citizens from law enforcement discrimination and misconduct in the administration of justice.

The committee is seeking to better understand the extent to which policing in Minnesota may disproportionately impact individuals on the basis of race, color or other federally protected classes.

Today's testimony is to focus on police practices in the State of Minnesota, the effectiveness of available laws, and 21st Century policing recommendations to address outstanding equal protection concerns.

If speakers today begin to veer away from the civil rights questions at hand, and to discuss possibly important but unrelated topics, I will interrupt and ask them to refrain from doing so.

At the conclusion of today's meeting the committee intends to prepare a report to the US Commission on Civil Rights detailing findings and recommendations for addressing this issue of national importance.

This report will be available for public review, and we are grateful to all panelists and members of the public for their willingness to share their related experiences with us today.

As with any such meeting there are ground rules to ensure the smooth operation. I would like to outline the ground rules at this time.

This is a public meeting open to the media

and the general public. We have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations within the limited time available. The time allotted for each presentation must be strictly adhered to. This will include a presentation by each panelist of approximately 12 to 15 minutes. After all of the panelists have concluded their statements, the committee members will engage them in question and answer.

To accommodate persons who are not on the agenda but wish to make statements we have scheduled an open forum today from 4:20 to 5:00 p.m. If there is time before our mid-day break we will also accept statements at that time.

Anyone wishing to make a statement should connect with Melissa Wojnaroski or other commission staff to have your name placed on a list of speakers.

In addition written statements may be submitted to committee members or staff present here today, or they may be sent by mail to the US Commission on Civil Rights, 55 West Monroe Street, Suite 410, Chicago, Illinois, 60603, or by e-mail to MWojnaroski,

that's M-W-O-J-N-A-R-O-S-K-I, at USCCR dot GOV. And I don't expect you to remember all of that, so Melissa has business cards that are available at the sign-in desk outside of the auditorium.

Though some of the statements made today may be controversial, we want to ensure that all invited guests do not defame or degrade any person or any organization.

As the Chair I reserve the privilege to cut short any statements that defame, degrade or do not pertain to the issue at hand.

In order to ensure that all aspects of the issues are represented, knowledgeable persons with a wide variety of experience and viewpoints have been invited to share information with us.

Any person or any organization that feels defamed or degraded by statements made in these proceedings should contact staff during the meeting so we can provide the opportunity for public response.

Alternately, such persons or organizations may file written statements for inclusion in the proceedings.

I urge all persons making presentations to be judicious in their statements. The advisory committee appreciates the willingness of all participants to share their views and experiences with this committee.

Finally, the rules for the question and answer portion of the panel discussion are as follows; the committee may ask questions of the entire panel or individual members of the panel after all panelists have had the opportunity to provide their prepared statements. Advisory committee members must be recognized by the Chair before asking any question of the participants.

In addition, because of the large number of members and the short amount of time each committee member will be limited to one question plus a follow-up.

When five minutes are left in the session the Chair will announce that the last question may be asked.

At this time I would like to turn the podium over to Commissioner Karen Narasaki of the US Commission on Civil Rights.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I bring greetings from Washington, DC from my fellow commissioners. We want to thank you and your colleagues on the Minnesota State Advisory Committee for having this very important briefing.

The Minnesota State Advisory Committee has a long history of producing high quality reports on important civil rights issues in the state. In 2013 it issued a report addressing racial disparities in unemployment. In 2011 it issued a sweeping review of local and federal civil rights enforcement agencies.

The reports that we get from our State Advisory Committees are extremely critical to helping us meet our mission. So I also want to thank our commission staff out of the Midwest Regional Office, David Mussatt, Melissa Wojnaroski and Carolyn Allen and their able interns for their hard work in putting this together today.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge all of the panelists for coming to share generously their time and their knowledge on this extremely important national topic.

We have a long history of examining police practices, including our 1981 seminal report, Who is Guarding the Guardians? And a follow-up report in 2000.

After the deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner and protests across the country, the commission held a briefing in New York two years ago to identify different police tactics that could be employed to avoid lethal police interactions with the communities and to recommend other reforms in the legal processes.

Prompted by Ferguson our Missouri state advisory committee held meetings across the state regarding policing strategies. They issued an excellent report last year on how municipal fragmentation, implicit bias, and responses to police misconduct contributed to a stress between law enforcement and the communities they served.

Yesterday in New York City our New York state advisory committee began a two day hearing on police practices.

Our report based on our 2015 hearing is nearing completion, which is why I'm here because I

wanted to hear the testimony in person because we're hoping to be able to incorporate some of what we hear today and our fellow commissioners at our hearing in New York in our final report and recommendations in that report.

I chose to attend this particular hearing because I believe the perspectives of communities in America's heartland are critical on these issues.

I very much look forward to hearing everyone's testimony and questions. Thank you for allowing me to participate.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Commissioner Narasaki.

I would also like to point out that we have been joined by community member Jack Nafolio, and Jack is the litigation director for the Indian Child Welfare Act Law Center, which focuses on services and advocacy for Indian families. Mr. Nafolio is also a representative of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibway.

At this time I would like to turn the meeting over to our first panel. Good morning.

MS. KEESEE: Madam Chair, thank you so

much for this invitation, good morning, Commissioner Narasaki and members of the Minnesota Advisory Committee.

First let me thank you for the opportunity to speak before you.

My name is Dr. Tracie Keesee, and I'm the Deputy Commissioner of Training for the NYPD, but I'm not here wearing that hat. I'm sure I'll have some training questions later, which is fine.

I was invited here to testify as my role as an academician, a 27-year veteran of policing, and the co-founder of the Center for Policing Equity. So my role this morning was to frame how we sort of got to where we are today and what themes should we able to get to in 21st Century Policing.

We're going to do a little bit of a deep dive quickly to be judicious in those six pillars, but also one of the questions that we are all asking in law enforcement today is where do we go from here.

So I'm going to set for you the landscape of policing of Minnesotans, and how they situate themselves in that landscape and how they are following

a lot of us today.

So conversations about policing civil rights is a discussion that emerged alongside the early appearance of a formalized police structure in the United States, which occurred about the 1700 or 1800s. Policing's well documented history took two forms in the United States, the Watch System made up of community volunteers whose role was to keep watch for suspicious behavior and to intervene, and in the South in the form of Slave Patrols, whose sole function was to return slaves to their owners.

As policing matured it was accompanied by the rise of urbanism, and its older form of policing became localized and politicized.

Also growing in its presence was the insistence on the recognition of a person's freedom from the infringement of government. The force of this insistence culminated over centuries into the civil rights movement focusing on government infrastructures to provide equal access, opportunity and protection.

As critical issues continued to emerge from the policing functions several formalized

investigations or commissions into policing practices emerged.

These are a few of the most notable and you'll sort of get a sense of where 21st century policing is falling in.

The first is in 1960 President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and during that particular hearing it identified a need for police departments to examine their organizational functions, along with crime prevention, fairness and treatment of juveniles, just to name a few.

The Knapp Commission in the '70s and '80s, this was investigating corruption in New York City. It brought to light the power of police culture and its influence on corruption and the commission's call for the creation of external oversight mechanisms for police.

In 1994 the Violence Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act authorized the US Department of Justice, Civil Rights Divisions, to file hiring practice lawsuits against police departments who have

demonstrated patterns of violating the civil rights of the communities they served.

Additionally, this authorization also provided the Civil Rights Division with the ability to enter into consent decrees, and these are things you would have been hearing here in the past decade or so, the ability to enter into these consent decrees with departments, that hopefully provided codified guidance for police reform.

Throughout most of the historical reform efforts positive results have been documented and often used for lessons learned. However, in the most recent decade, we have grappled and we continue to grapple with examples of civil rights violations in some communities, specifically communities of color, which has resulted in the inability for the police to have a meaningful and sustained level of trust with those they serve.

It was noted earlier, on December 18, 2014 President Obama's Executive Order established the 21st Century Policing Task Force. The charge of the task force was to identify best practices and to make

recommendations to the President on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction while building trust.

After months of testimony from community members, law enforcement executives, officers, and professional organizations, and academics, the Task Force identified six foundational pillars for 21st Century Policing accompanied by 59 recommendations and 92 action items.

The six pillars of community policing, as it goes to 21st century policing, was noted, and I'll also do a little bit deeper dive.

The first one is building trust and legitimacy, and when you hear the word legitimacy you will hear the term used throughout the day, procedural justice, the ability to give people voice, for officers to act in a neutral manner, to make sure they are objective and they are fair. And you will hear this time and time again, because the research has told us that when the officers take their time and explain what they're doing and allow the people that they come in contact with to express their experience and what is

1 happening with them we find we have a reduction of use
2 of force and we also have a higher satisfaction. And
3 that's even with someone who has received a ticket
4 during that encounter.
5 Policy and Oversight. Examination of
6 policy, we've heard this conversation over the last
7 decade, use of force is what always comes to mind.
8 The need for peer reviews, the enforcement
9 practices and then looking at disparate impact. How are
10 we operationalizing these policies, and what are they
11 doing to the communities?
12 Technology and social media. Leveraging
13 technology to meet the needs of an ever changing
14 community, and the number one thing that we've been
15 having our conversations about and that I testified to
16 during the 21st Century hearings on body worn cameras,
17 you will hear that time and time again. As we talk
18 about how we incorporate technology, most of them did
19 not talk about privacy rights and how we would do that.
20 Community Policing and Crime Reduction.
21 This space for us is not new, and I think for many of
22 us who have been doing this for quite a while, we find

it interesting that we continue to reexamine the notion of community policing. What does that mean? Let alone not just that, but crime reduction efforts, which would lead to the co-production of public safety and the co-production of public safety is very different, because it also really emphasizes the need for mutual accountability, and these are terms we have not heard in a while. And so as we begin to move forward these are spaces in which we need to have a better understanding about what that looks like.

Officer Training and Education. We know that there's always been a tremendous interest in whom do you recruit to come into law enforcement, and how those things are done.

The issue of diversity has always been, I saw, as a former police officer, it's always been in the forefront. We have come now from the notions of diversity to inclusion. As we look at police organizations and we look at the policy taught, and we look at the leaders from the top, and we're now asking ourselves are we having the same representation that we may be seeing all around in the policy making spaces?

So again it's about our education. How do we really continue to develop our officers and how do we train them?

Training, which is my specific area, is another area that is often underfunded and typically questioned. The first question when something goes wrong, in regards to training, we also need to be able to look at the evidence-based training. One of the things historically policing has not done is look at those things that we know work and what doesn't work, and when we have something that doesn't work, how do we begin to go about changing that.

So that's another case in which more work and a lot of conversations will still be had.

Officer safety and wellness, again, is something that's not new. Officers will tell you the number one concern is being safe when they do their job. In order to do this the question becomes one of how do we not just make it safe for officers, but for community as well. We are not only talking about trauma of community, we're talking about traumatized officers and how are those issues dealt with, how are they

managed by organizations and communities at large.

Each of the six pillars and its accompanying recommendations not only craft in taking the protection of civil rights, and officer safety during the encounters, but it was hoping through its long term application would provide some historical reconciliation and routinize transparency and give rise to a more democratic form of policing. It's been two years since the release of 21st Century Policing Recommendations and a separate lengthy quotation guide.

So again, this was not done without any type of guidance. Some of the recommendations have even been embraced and implemented by some of the police departments, and for others it is seen an unfunded mandate.

Community members have expressed mixed reviews about the task force recommendations. Some believe that the recommendations didn't go far enough to bring about authentic, sustainable change, while others laud the substantial, descriptive recommendations because they represented a culmination

of voices that have been impacted by poor policing practices.

Today with the new administration it has yet to be determined whether the 21st Century Policing Recommendations will continue to be a road map for law enforcement. However, another call has been made for yet another commission to re-examine police practices and crime control. It should be noted that any kind of change that takes place within police organizations does not require federal level approval because policing is a very localized function.

Even with all of the forward movement with 21st century policing and some of the innovative work that's been happening throughout the police departments throughout the United States and here in Minnesota, challenges still are occurring. For example, challenges such as identifying best methods for cultivating and sustaining authentic partnerships. What does that mean, and what does that look like? The challenges of co-producing public safety, which will require the examination of power differential.

The sharing of power, what does that look

like. Would we be remiss if we do not mention the challenge of addressing the issue of race in policing today, including its historical vestiges. Finally, the collection and analysis of evidence and data surrounding policing initiatives, while accounting for the fact that policing does not occur in a vacuum, so other contributing factors must be weighed.

There has been some remarkable progress made in policing. Policing is very complex, and there is still more that can be done.

The question for many of us is where do we go from here?

So with that I'm going to thank you and close my remarks and pass them onto my colleague.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Dr. Keesee.

MS. BAXTER: Madam Chair, Committee, thank you for inviting me to join you here today to discuss one of the greatest civil and human rights issues of our time.

One in four people in Minnesota has a criminal record. That's a quarter of the state's population that has had contact with police and our

courts resulting in an official record, one that has, for many, devastated opportunities to move on and move up. Yet while one in four Minnesotans has a criminal record, I contend that four in four Minnesotans has a criminal history.

Let me tell you a story.

Several years ago a man came into the Council on Crime and Justice, the organization where I worked. He needed help expunging a criminal record. You see, years ago when he was just 18 he had swiped a single bottle of Michelob Light from a gas station refrigerator in a failed and foolish attempt to impress a girl at a house party. He didn't make it to the end of the lot before he was nabbed. He was charged with a theft, he plead down to a petty, cut a check and thought he was done with it.

Then several years later, decades in fact, after maturing significantly he decided he wanted to become a cop. He was categorically denied. Turns out that a petty theft is a permanent bar to serving on the force in Minnesota.

More recently I was told another story by

1 another man.

2 When he was 17 he and seven of his closest
3 guy friends, so eight teenage boys, decided that they
4 would break into a local liquor distribution plant
5 building. Over the course of several months they
6 planned and plotted. They had walkie-talkies and a
7 mockup of a blueprint of the inside of the building.
8 They had a decoy car and get away van.

9 One night under the cover of darkness they
10 pulled it off. Taking a hack saw to the side of the
11 building they bust in and got away with loads of beer
12 and schnapps for the ladies. They broke into a nearby
13 cabin, unused in summer months, to store the loot until
14 the hubbub had died down. Once it did, he said, they
15 threw an epic senior party.

16 But that wasn't the most interesting part.
17 The most interesting part he said was that these were
18 transferrable skills. The attention to detail,
19 delayed gratification, and even a criminological
20 interest, perhaps it's no surprise he said that two of
21 us are now chiefs of police.

22 One's a victim's advocate, one's a nurse,

one's a coach, two are professors. But more importantly, two are now chiefs of police.

You see, while there are many similarities between the two stories, the teenage hormonal need to impress girls with stolen booze perhaps being chief among them, there are also a few important differences.

Our eight burglars were white and solidly situated within the middle class, and the gent that swiped the forty was a person of color.

There is another important distinction. The first teen was caught and will likely pay for that theft for the rest of his life, and the other eight were not, and will likely only be reminded of their crime over friendly beers at a ball game.

In what little time I have with you this morning I'll leave the more sophisticated statistics to my dear friend Dr. Ruhland, and my new friend. Instead I want to share with you a few more stories.

Gather research and narratives for the We Are All Criminals Project. These are stories of people who have gotten away with it, people who consider what life would have been like had they been caught, people

who reflect upon race and class privilege that allowed them to skate through life unscathed by a criminal record. I contrast these stories with stories of less privileged people who were caught, people who will forever suffer under the stigma of a scarlet letter, or a criminal record.

While the project is now national, the majority of the stories that I've collected over the years are from this state.

It was, after all, my experience as a public defender and then public policy advocate in Minnesota that led me to develop We Are All Criminals.

With these stories, this research, I hope to offer to you a way of examining the deep and disparate impact of policing, and our broader criminal justice system upon people of color and Indigenous People in Minnesota.

Pertinent to today's gathering, of the more than 300 stories of uncaught crimes collected, there are several about interactions with police.

For example, as a teenager this man fashioned himself to be the next Steven Spielberg. He

and his friends dressed up as bank robbers -- complete with replica firearms, briefcases stuffed with stacks of fake cash, and nylons pulled down over their heads -- the camera was set up on the back of the car, the venue was an alley, and the backdrop was a bank. An open for business, middle of the day, bustling with bodies bank. One of the customers spied the young men and frantically called the police.

Within minutes they were surrounded by squads. Drop your weapons! One of the guys refused to put down his gun, not fully comprehending what was happening. The police officers continued to shout until he complied. Afterwards this man said they, the police, lectured us energetically until they ran out of words and they let us go. They even let us finish with the shoot, he said.

Or take the gentleman for whom I took this rather unappetizing photograph. Now a successful business owner, years ago he and a friend tried to terrorize two people with a fake gun, one a buddy on a date and the second a pizza delivery guy. They were successful with the latter. When the police caught up

with them, he said, my baby white face, letterman jacket, and compliant response to the police de-escalated the situation completely and quickly. At a certain point I could tell one cop was almost laughing at the comical scene. Now, if we had been two African American teens, we would have been at least booked, probably jailed, and maybe even shot.

Instead we got back in the car and drove home.

By the way, each of the men in these stories could have been arrested, charged, and convicted for felony terroristic threats.

Now, not all stories I've collected have involved officers laughing alongside the participants.

When they, the police, questioned me, I just got really indignant, she said. They ended up apologizing and letting her and her unsearched car, go.

It's been less than a year since an elected official penned in a local op-ed, don't be a thug, and don't flap your jaw among other pointers if you don't want to get shot by police.

This is the rhetoric of some of our leaders

in Minnesota. Four weeks later Philando was killed.

Time and again I've heard from stories of people who have gotten away with it, lawyers, doctors, policymakers and business owners who say that their race provided them with a shield of humanity. They were seen as kids, not criminals. People, not problems. Even when police caught them in the act they were given second chances. And these participants went onto lead rich and fulfilling lives, untethered to past mistakes.

I grew up in a very affluent town, he said. It was the kind of place where it was easy not to have contact with police. The few interactions I had were very respectful and innocuous. A tap on the shoulder, a suggestion to go home.

Not everyone is afforded that same presumption of innocence.

For some, in particular black and indigenous people in Minnesota, their mere existence is seen as always already criminal.

It didn't start with Philando Castile or Phillip Quinn or Jamar Clark or Terrance Franklin.

It didn't start with the countless black and brown and native Minnesotans who may not have been killed, but who were followed, accused, arrested, abused, chewed up and spat out as if they weren't somebody's son, daughter, father, mother, sister, brother, mentor, leader, provider, or believer. This didn't start with them.

But I would like to think that it can end soon.

We're asked today if in Minnesota police and community relations in communities of color differ significantly from police relations in white communities.

In a word, and as demonstrated in these stories, yes.

And we're asked what barriers are preventing the implementation of task force recommendations, including the recommendation for meaningful officer education, and police force efforts to build trust and legitimacy among communities.

I believe one of the greatest barriers to achieving these goals is the poison that permeates this

state. Implicit bias. It's in the squad car and in the courtroom, it's in the legislature and city council. It's in the soil and in the water. And like carbon monoxide, it's in the air and we're all breathing it in.

It's what leads state representatives to use coded language to blame the victim, and officers to pull the trigger, release the dogs, or tackle or tase someone who doesn't look like them, doesn't remind them of their sons, their sisters, their elders, themselves.

When we see someone as a threat, or as an other, community relations are doomed. And interactions can be deadly.

We need more training.

Implicit bias can start with calling out false narratives and false dichotomies of clean versus criminal, us versus them. Once we've identified that bias we can work toward empathizing with one another.

As this law enforcement officer said, when you work in this environment long enough, you become calloused. You have a tendency to look at everyone else except yourself.

She recently realized that it could have been me. It is difficult to look at yourself in a flawed way, you know, she said.

If we examined our biases more closely, more critically, we can challenge them and end them. Then policing in Minnesota would be safer, more effective, more equitable, and more just.

This much is clear; we cannot continue this divisive paradigm. This warrior rather than guardian paradigm. This idea that, for example, a teen who swiped a bottle of beer is forever wholly unfit to become a cop, a teen who lived in a heavily policed neighborhood, a teen whose skin marked him as always already criminal long before he stepped foot in that gas station. This idea that a white or affluent person is someone who deserves a break, while a poor black or brown person is seen as a direct and immediate threat.

If the criminal justice system was designed by people who believe they might one day be involved, he said, then we would have justice.

I'd encourage those listening today or those later reading this testimony to consider what's

your story? What would your chalkboard say?

To the 75 percent of us who've gotten away with it, we must be honest with ourselves when examining our privilege, and understand how that privilege has bred bias, and how that bias prevents us from truly seeing one another.

To acknowledging a common humanity, and once we've cleared the air and rid the poison, our policing here in Minnesota can and must reflect that, embrace, foster, and jealously and zealously guard that. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Ms. Baxter.

MR. DENSLEY: Madam Chair and the Committee, thank you so much for the opportunity to present here today.

I plan to speak primarily on Pillar 5, which is officer training and education, but I thought it has significant implications for Pillar 1, which is building trust and legitimacy.

The key to effective policing according to Sir Robert Peel, who was the founder of the first metropolitan force in 1829 is that the police are the

people and the people are the police. The operative word here is people, and there is an old adage, an organization is only as good as its people. So I ask you among police agencies in Minnesota, who are the people?

Let me reframe this as a research question. Who selects into law enforcement and who does law enforcement select? In my view selection is the process that lies at the heart of policing practices that disproportionally impact individuals on the basis of race, color, sex, and any other federally protected classes, and that's the reason why we're meeting here today.

Here's what selection looks like in Minnesota. Minnesota is the only state in the nation that tasks colleges and universities, not police academies, with police officer education and training. To become eligible for a Minnesota Peace Officer License someone must earn at least a two-year degree from a regionally accredited college or university and successfully complete a program of Professional Peace Officer Education, which I will refer to henceforth as

PPOE, from a college or university that is certified by the Minnesota Board of Police Officer Standards and Training. That's the POST Board.

Now in theory, this sounds great. The system was designed to diversify the police force. It was intended to educate all law enforcement practitioners. And it certainly guarantees that Minnesota we have the most degreed officers in the nation.

However, there are problems inherent in that system. Problems related to what economists call adverse selection, and in layman's terms, selecting the wrong people.

So, first, who selects into that system?

Well, PPOE programs are costly in terms of time and money. Law enforcement candidates in Minnesota will invest two to four years at minimum into education and training, at an estimated cost of $15,000 to $100,000, depending on the college or university they attend with no guarantee of a job at the end.

Now, you could say that about most professions, but the difference here though is that

candidates are studying for a degree in law enforcement. Period. In fact, it is a degree tailored to law enforcement in Minnesota. Not Wisconsin, not California. Just Minnesota.

That's a pretty narrow workforce preparation compared to, say, a degree in psychology or economics. There is a low market value of a criminal justice degree outside of the criminal justice system.

For this reason, the vast majority of law enforcement students are people that have always wanted to be cops. People attracted to a mythologized version of policing. People who grew up around cops, as family and friends. People who, research will tell us, tend to be more conservative, tend to have more authoritarian or socially dominant personalities. That alone is a selection bias. But the high financial and opportunity costs associated with PPOE programs compared to a traditional police academy model will dissuade low income and second-career candidates. Not to mention the historical and cultural barriers of entry for women and black or minority ethnic candidates. So there's a diversity issue there.

That's the supply side of the equation. On the demand side, PPOE programs are expensive to run. Think about insurance liability for 20 year olds walking around campus with guns. Schools need large numbers of full-time equivalent students in their classes in order to continue to offer them.

This creates a disincentive on the university side to screen candidates out early, even if deep down programs know that that student will never be a successful peace officer, a peace officer that our communities deserve. To explain, the vast majority of PPOE programs are housed in open access and open enrollment colleges and universities with few barriers to entry. Some schools don't even run criminal background checks until the program is very nearly complete. So, we have people who probably shouldn't be cops for social or behavioral reasons, and people who can't be cops for legal reasons, being trained to be cops. I think that's an ethical problem.

But at least they're getting a good education, right?

Well, maybe. It's the POST board that

establishes the learning objectives for PPOE. Colleges and universities are certified by the POST board to provide education leading to the licensure, and they must incorporate those learning objectives into their curriculum.

In 2011 there were 150 learning objectives. In the most recent revision, 2017, there were approximately 600.

Now, given that the typical associate's degree is 60 credits, that's ten learning objectives per credit before we even get into general education requirements. Now there is some overlap between these 600 learning objectives and the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing Recommendations. But for the record, the terms implicit bias and procedural justice are entirely absent from the 2017 update and the objectives say things like discuss crisis intervention, not actually practice it.

Interestingly how the 600 learning objectives are met is at the discretion of the individual colleges and universities. They have academic freedom. As a professor, I love that. Except,

all colleges and universities have to do to appease the POST board is demonstrate that each of those learning objectives is met at least once in the course of the curriculum. They do this by checking the boxes on a course matrix. The emphasis here is on the quantity of the coverage, not its quality.

With approximately 30 different colleges and universities that are offering PPOE there is a ton of duplication of effort, but also variability. Some programs are almost entirely online, for example. So imagine, students learning community policing without ever stepping foot into a physical community. But the most important variable again is quality.

According to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Certification Standards for Academic Programs, no more than 50 percent of required criminology or criminal justice courses that are baccalaureate level should come from an associate degree program. Owing to PPOE, violence in Minnesota, it is often way more in Minnesota, owing to transfer pathways between partner schools.

ACJS recommends at least two-thirds of

core required courses be taught by full-time faculty with terminal degrees. In many PPOE programs, part-time or practitioner faculty without advanced degrees teach the vast majority of the courses.

ACJS says that no academic credit should be awarded for life experience or for military, police academy, or other professional training. Awarding blanket credit for courses in a block is also frowned upon. Yet, many PPOE programs offer substantial college credit for prior learning and life experience. And part of the reason for this is that colleges cannot afford to offer the big data tools, body cameras, drones, smart guns and less lethal weapons that the cops of the future will be expected to use and, in some cases, are already using, so they have to get that training outside anyway. This is a true story, PPOE students in this state learn to drive in unmarked Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors. Once hired, however, they then end up driving supercharged Dodge Chargers. The technology is outdated. The curriculum is outdated.

Further, many of these programs offer

technical skills training in a block. Now skills is defensive tactics, firearms, driving, and it becomes the de facto finishing school for the program.

Skills emphasizes assessing threats and conducting tactical protocols, which is obviously important, but the way it is taught is an immersive paramilitary experience, and it leaves students with a limited view of the responsibilities and realities of policing. It is during skills, for example, that officers learn about Tasers. They are physically tased as part of this process. Students literally line up and take turns to ride the lightning. I'm told they do this so they understand what it feels like to be tased, to which I reply, well, do we shoot them also? You know, so they know what a bullet feels like? In reality, this practice is tantamount to hazing, it's the vestiges of a violent police culture. And while some schools are moving away from this practice, it is only because it costs too much in Taser cartridges and insurance liability, not because they think it's wrongheaded.

So this is where that implicit bias, that

brutality and everything else, kind of incubates it. Owing to the PPOE requirements I can't think of one college or university in the State of Minnesota that would meet these rigorous ACJS certification standards. The reality of law enforcement degree is that students find themselves taking courses like Interrogation and Interview Techniques, or Minnesota Traffic Code. Thus, what started as a valuable opportunity for a rich education turns out too often to be mere police training. In some cases, students are earning college credits for training that is masquerading as education, hence why some programs are administered by customized training departments.

PPOE thus has created a course of study paradox. Is a law enforcement degree the best preparation for a careers in law enforcement? The FBI figured this out a long time ago. They take people with any degree providing they are good people, then use the residential at Quantico to teach the law enforcement stuff. Herein lies the issue. Is it that a college education genuinely improves the skills, habits, and social and personality attributes conducive to

policing, or is that a college degree is simply a reliable indicator or a signal of underlying prosocial attributes which were always there? If high ability people are inherently better cops that low ability people, then perhaps a college degree is merely the mechanism to signal that ability to their employers.

Which brings us to the final part of the selection process, when police chiefs select PPOE candidates into their agencies.

Now colleagues and I recently published a study of police hiring practices in the State of Minnesota in the journal Policing and Society. We interviewed a random sample of 31 police chiefs across the state.

Thankfully, our findings suggest that police chiefs want in their people exactly the same thing that our communities want. They want cops who are trustworthy, truthful, responsible, and respectful, and in many cases, they have them. The chiefs also said that individuals do not necessarily acquire these traits through formal education and training. Instead, the PPOE process was creating a

time lag between learning and practice. Students were studying things in school years before they ever actually used them, thus they needed to be retrained anyway. The State Patrol and certain larger municipal agencies, like Minneapolis and St. Paul, have their own academies. Some communities, like St. Louis Park, are creating their own paid 16 week Suburban Law Enforcement Training academies, and some universities offer post-baccalaureate certification programs. The implication is that communities are not entirely satisfied with what's coming out of the traditional PPOE programs.

Less than half of all PPOE graduates actually get a police job in the state. Not to mention the number of PPOE graduates who then wash out of the job during field training. Doesn't that strike you as odd? College makes people license-eligible, but there is no guarantee of quality. It is the individual law enforcement agencies -- and there are 448 of them in the State of Minnesota, each with their own culture and hiring practices -- who control who gets licensed and who stays licensed.

Chiefs care about quality. So do communities. Where was the degree obtained? What was the student's major? What was their GPA? They don't want the guy who, owing to liberal college policies, was able to retake firearms class three times en route a C-minus GPA as their next cop. There is a risk that the current system, with its shallow curriculum and emphasis on technical skills, is merely credentialing candidates, and it's not educating them.

In sum, unless adequately funded and resourced, colleges and universities are not necessarily well positioned to deliver police officer training. There are things that colleges and universities can do, promote partnerships between researchers and the law enforcement agencies, champion program evaluation and evidence-based practices, provide a safe space to explore empathy, implicit bias, procedural justice, de-escalation and so on. For example, I would much rather students learn about structural inequality in America from a sociology professor than from a retired beat cop. But the current system is not focused on these things.

People matter. Minnesota has a very unique way of showing it. But only by understanding the source of adverse selection into law enforcement in this state, can we ever hope to effect change in our communities.

Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: And next, please.

DR. RUHLAND: Thank you, Madam Chair and Committee. I'm going to present some posters that I did with a police department here in Minnesota. I'm going to focus on community and police trust in a high crime area.

I apologize, the font is a little small, but I will go over the PowerPoint. The focus on my presentation today is the lack of trust between the community and police, but also lack of trust that police have, in high crime communities, of the community. So I'm going to focus on how this mistrust develops in these communities.

The methods of my research that were used to look at this issue were interviews and focus groups with community members living in high crime hot spot

areas, as well as interviews with a small sample of police officers and ride-alongs with graduate students at the University of Minnesota conducted with police officers.

So how does this mistrust develop? It's important to recognize that individuals living in high crime areas, so the interviews that we conducted with community members and as well as observations that we conducted in these hot spot areas, it's important to recognize that communities want and often need a police presence. It's not that they don't want police involved in their communities. They often mentioned that in high crime areas, they can't walk to the park. They don't feel safe walking to the park. They don't feel safe walking to the stores. So they want a police presence. What they don't want is the tactics that the police are currently using. They want more of a community policing model, and I'll talk about that in a little bit.

Currently used in many departments and often used within the Minneapolis Police Department and St. Paul and other police departments here in Minnesota

is called hot spots policing. And hot spots policing is a geographical, confined policing tactic, and it focuses on high crime areas to saturate the area with police.

There's many different techniques underneath -- used under hot spots policing, but the hope is that if a police presence is in the geographical area where crime is high and concentrated areas, then that crime will disperse or cease.

Often used in hot spots policing is using traffic stops and searches as stops to catch bigger fish, so you're pulling people over for minor offenses, no turning on a red, not using your blinker, with the hopes of finding potentially drugs or finding people who have warrants or finding somebody suspect in another crime.

These techniques are not used in other suburban areas. They are commonly used in low-income, racially diverse areas.

Other tactics used under hot spots policing are surveillance techniques, such as shots fired, GIS mapping, cameras surveilling the location,

with a great deal of resources being dedicated to these surveillance techniques.

Less common are prevention techniques that build relationships through community programs or problem-oriented policing. So problem-orientated policing initiatives focus on direct issues and use in a variety of tactics to understand the underlying drivers of crime.

So whereas hot spots policing is really responding to crime, problem-oriented policing is trying to get at the underlying factors of why crime is occurring and understanding the community context of why crime is occurring, and hoping to fill the underlying issues to address the reasons for crime.

The growing use of hot spots policing, however, is a critical shift within law enforcement. It moves it away from person-based policing to more focused on the criminal activity.

And I contend that the use of hot spots policing and the policing tactics further decrease the trust between community and police and police and community.

So in our interviews with community members, we asked them, you know, what leads to mistrust of the police? What leads to the breakdown of the relationship between the community and police.

So in addition to these hot spots policing techniques, we also heard about historical trauma. This historical trauma being the past experiences with the police, dating back from the civil rights movement, dating back to the Jim Crow era, and this historical trauma is being passed from generation to generation. So having family members in their 50s and 60s are being treated a certain way by the police and telling their children not to trust the police. This historical trauma goes from generation to generation.

They also talked about the disadvantaged community factors, so poverty in the hot spots areas and how that results in racism. The current laws and the current collateral consequences that impact disadvantaged and poorer community as a whole were another reason.

Some people felt that the impacts of racism and the impacts of this historical trauma left people

angry and led to further criminal activity which led to further police involvement, which is just this vicious cycle without addressing this historical trauma and the systemic racism.

Individual interview participants also talked about the lack of educational opportunities and the lack of educational and employment opportunities in their community. The lack of opportunities caused individuals to be involved in criminal activities, and the results of collateral consequences that result from criminal records, often led people to sell drugs or to commit theft because they could not find legitimate income to support their needs.

They also talked about, in these higher crime areas, lack of opportunities for youth, which caused idle time and caused them to hang out, which is considered loitering by many.

But also, the breakdown of police/community relationships was attributed to police responses. So the community does not trust the police to respond to their calls for service.

So it was considered that if they called

the police for help, there was a concern about the long time that it took police to respond once they made that call to 911.

They also did not trust the police to handle the situation currently. Individuals who called the police often reported being treated like criminals. So a victim called, but when the police arrived, they were often treated like criminals.

There was also a concern that community members were perceived as thugs or criminals just because they lived in these certain, high crime areas, that just because they lived in them, there was the perception that they were up to no good and that they were criminals.

I just presented a few quotes to highlight the police responses. So in regards to police response, this individual says, it showed up as a high crime area. So they made a call to the police, and in this case, it was a domestic situation, but it still took them 30 minutes, because if I'm risking texting someone, or if I'm making a phone call, that's going to escalate. Why would I call?

So in this situation, why would I call the police if the police are not going to show up? And in this situation, the individual said, I would prefer to call my cousin, who might come over here with his gun, but my cousin is going to handle the situation in short order, and that's street justice.

My family is still going to be here when the police aren't. So it's important to look at how police relationships and how response time, how the police handle situations in high crime areas can lead to further criminal activity.

And that's why it's really important that we focus on building police and community trust so that we can ultimately decrease crime in these high crime areas.

Another respondent said, one of the tensions is, when you call the police, they don't know if you're going to be seen as the perpetrator. I could call for something, and I don't trust that if I call them, I'm not going to be the one slammed down and being treated like a criminal.

So again, if they call, are they, when the

police respond, are they just going to automatically assume that they're the perpetrator.

There's also the idea of police preconceived notions about who communities are. So one community member asked, how do you build trust with somebody who already has these preconceived ideas about who you are? That you are less than a person, that you don't deserve justice; you don't deserve equal rights. So I'm leery of partnerships between the police departments. I'm leery of partnerships with almost anybody because of the element of racism.

So we also interviewed police officers in these high crime areas. We asked police how they felt about patrolling in these neighborhoods, as well as ride-alongs that we're conducting via graduate students.

We found that police often have a fear of the community as well, and often there is a lack of -- or a distrust among the community.

One police officer mentioned that after the Jamar Clark shooting that they were no longer patrolling by foot or not patrolling by foot in these

communities as frequently because they did not feel safe in the community any longer.

There is also a perception of guilt that officers view of the community members. So one of the graduate students was doing a ride-along, and the officer said to the student doing the ride-along, look at the youth right there. It was an African American youth that was walking down the street. He had a hooded sweatshirt on, and the hood was over his face, but it was a warm and dry day. And the officer said to the student, look at that dude. He couldn't look more guilty walking down the street.

So there's an assumption that just because this kid had a hooded sweatshirt on on a warm day that he was up to no good.

One of the things that was uncovered during the ride-alongs as well is that many of the officers -- or the officers that conducted -- that participated in the ride-along lived outside of the Minneapolis area. They did not live in Minneapolis; they lived in suburban areas.

That was interesting in how they perceived

the neighborhood, the community. Many of them perceived -- would mention it as a war zone, just a degradated community, and it's interesting having that perception when these officers aren't living in the community, versus would their perception be different if they lived in the community?

The police also mentioned the unfair view that the community members have of the police, and many of them thought that they were being treated unfairly by the community. They felt they were being judged or called racist, based on action of a few, and not being looked at as individuals.

They feel that the community often has unfair, preconceived notions about who officers are, based on what they hear or see in the media, but that community is not willing to also partner with the community and see the good in officers.

So these quotes illustrate some of the points that I just made, so police were frustrated that there was a lack of constructive conversations with the community.

So this officer said, in a community

meeting setting, you hope that you can do this in constructive way, that there's a two-way conversation between the system at-large and members of police departments to answer their questions and their concerns.

But again, you have closed-minded individuals coming in, and all they want to do is to comment and complain, not much is going to be accomplished. So again, from this officer's perspective, community members already have these preconceived notions and just want to come in, complain, and not have constructive conversations. This view by an officer talked about the unfair view of the police. Our goal is to prevent it from happening.

So we devised policing strategies to try to prevent crime from happening. If you do that too much, we're considered racist; we're brutal. I don't know what other term you could use for going out and trying to either prevent a crime or arresting those are committing crimes. This idea that they feel like they're doing the best that they can, that they're

trying to, through their hot spots policing techniques, prevent or decrease crime, but when they do that, they feel as though they're considered racist.

So how can we build trust between community and police? We need to have real and authentic relationships. So, often, community policing is thrown out as a technique, but what is community policing?

The community members, as I mentioned, again, understand that they live in high crime areas, and they want that crime to stop, so they want a police presence; they yearn for a police presence in their community. They want the police to attend community events, public forums. When they have Community Night Out, National Night Out, they want the police to attend those events.

And police were attending those, some of those events. But when they went to those events, they were not interacting with community members. They looked bored. They looked like they didn't want to be there. They came to community forums, and they quickly left. But they wanted police to authentically engage

in those community relationships.

And I think that that would also help to build trust in the community when police are walking in the community, talking to neighborhoods.

There is a lot of good research in Camden in New Jersey where police officers are going up to people, going up to their doors, just interacting with people, and thee effects that that's having on decreasing crime. So it's not only about will you trust but also about decreasing crime in these high crime areas.

Then also, alternative responses to crime. So this -- in order to build trust and decrease crime in these high crime areas, it has to be beyond the police. The police are a starting point, but partnerships are needed with community-based organizations, with educational systems, with employers, with businesses, and then also finding -- looking at the ways in which we spend resources. So a great deal of resources go to surveillance techniques. It's very costly for GIS mapping for surveillance, for cameras, and for shops, also, but

maybe looking at putting additional people or more resources into community policing techniques.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Dr. Ruhland.

That concludes the statements from our panelists. Do we have any questions from committee members?

MR. KOLBO: I have a question.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Kolbo.

MR. KOLBO: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question for Dr. Keesee.

I would be very interested to learn, based on your opinion and based on your experience as a New York City police officer and a Commissioner, concerning a practice I think originated or for which the New York Police Department was one of the originators, and that's a policy or practice known as broken windows policing. Which as I understand it, you can probably better define it, is a policy of encouraging police officers to enforce laws related to low-level crimes, misdemeanors, gross misdemeanors with a purpose of sort of sending a message to the community, particularly high crime communities, a message to the potential

criminals that criminal activity is not tolerated in that community.

I think it's been credited by some as one of the reasons for the serious reduction in crime in New York City since the 1990s.

My question to you is, is broken windows policing, as I defined it or as perhaps as you can better define it, an effective and appropriate technique for reducing crime, especially in high crime areas? And is it a policy that a department can implement that still respects the civil rights of individuals in the community?

DR. KEESEE. I think one of the things we need to be careful on is how we're defining broken windows and how we're using that.

So historically, in New York, it was implemented in various different fashions. That's always going to depend on who the leadership is and how that policy is sort of crafted.

The way, when you talk about that today, is really along the lines of problem-solving and problem identification. So you will hear about

focused deterrence, how do you know what is going on in small areas that involve small groups of people. So we look at it on that piece.

And we also look at, on lower level crimes, how do we address that? Typically, low level crimes, arrests over low level crimes we look at historically is not always the best way to go. And do we then look at these co-productive models of public safety where you do have other entities coming in and assisting. So for example, one of the ones that we used a lot is mental health, right. Critical incident training. You will hear that a lot.

So we know that we have, in our -- those of us who have mental health issues, homelessness. And the ability to deal with those issues, not necessarily on a low level crime and making that a criminal piece, but how do you then begin to address that from a social piece? So along with homelessness, mental health issues, you usually have folks that are urinating in public. As a crime, how do you address that? Is ticketing always the way to go? So in New York, it is much different, depending on who is in charge and how

that is to be handled that day.

Today, one of the focuses that we have is we have Neighborhood Coordination Officers. This is really the adage that, in order for officers to address low level crime, to sort of intervene before they grow into bigger, you have to have, one, officers that are not tied to the 911 calls, who have the ability to go in and to engage and then be able to address it.

Some of the techniques in New York that have been used over the decades have garnered sort of result mixed results. And we have tried to look at the adverse impact they've had. But how does the form of your need vary from department to department and depending on the communities that they serve?

So I don't want us to get into a thinking that, because it works in neighborhoods in one place, it's appropriate for another place. I think that you have to, with the community, really look into what are you trying to do, what is your outcome.

CHAIR KORBEL: Other questions? Mr. Vischer?

MR. VISCHER: A question for Dr. Densley.

What would be the downside of Minnesota moving in line with other states away from a degree requirement for the police academies? I would assume that the thought is that giving this to college and universities sort of dissipates the power of police culture and training. Maybe that's inaccurate. Are there other downsides that would be present if Minnesota to be more in line with other states?

MR. DENSLEY: So interestingly, I actually still believe that there should be college requirements, personally, just speaking from my experience. But I don't think that it should be the kind of most popular pathway into the profession, if that makes sense.

So, what I believe in, and I used the analogy in my remarks, it's kind of how the FBI do it, which is you would have still a requirement to have a four year college degree. It could be in any discipline and subject, and then there would be these sort of training academies that would then take those graduates both into the program.

Now I think one of the biggest barriers to

something like that is financial, because if you could provide incentives to go through those academies, through state funding, even if those academies were still administered by colleges and universities, which is where the more specific focus on the fact that this is supposed to act toward a program -- these programs do exist already, but at the moment, you just have such variability in the number of routes into the profession, if that makes sense.

What of the big challenges, though, is the money, because as a sense at the moment, individual students are paying for their own education to get into that career. And that's a lot of money.

If we could create scholarships and pathways for low-income students and students of color to enter into that profession, that's going to require those investments on that front end.

And so the way I envision it is not that we just say, you can enroll into a police academy out of high school. I actually think, in some ways, the model had it right.

And what police chiefs told us, as well,

during the research is that what they did like about the four-year degree program versus the two-year degree, which is the current mandate is a two-year degree, is that it created a degree of sort of maturity, if you will. The students were just naturally a little bit older as they entered into the profession. Because one of the other changes that the chiefs said that they experienced was having people who were just too young to be making -- engaging in communities in these meaningful and authentic ways.

It's very difficult for a 20-year old to go to a domestic dispute, for example, and to have sort of authority and experience over things to really be able handle all that in a way. And a four-year degree program automatically put some distance in that.

But I would say that the only the thing -- the biggest priority would be financial, to provide those incentives for people to get that training, and then we can diversify who is entering the profession.

CHAIR KORBEL: Other questions for the guests? Mr. Battle?

MR. BATTLE: All of you are engaging. I

could ask each a question, but I'm going to limit it to one. And that would be to Dr. Baxter.

CHAIR KORBEL: If you could move your microphone just a little bit closer.

MR. BATTLE: Sorry. I had a parishioner who happens to have been white, and the police puller her over, and she got time to talk and to roll the window up, and she said, I can't hear you. She mouthed that. He said go ahead.

Now I also had other parishioners who are not white, and they'll make you get out of the car and arrest you. So I want to know from you how do we get the policemen to feel flawed at we do.

CHAIR KORBEL: To feel flawed, is that what you said?

MR. BATTLE: Yes, flawed.

MS. BAXTER: Thank you for sharing that. I think, and this might be self-serving, given my particular niche, but I think that really the officers, either in training or officers in the field, need to look at their own criminality, need to be honest and humble and recall what they have done and then really

take a look at how their lives would have been affected had they been caught. You know, swiping a single bottle of beer from a gas station refrigerator, that shouldn't haunt you decades later.

And I realize that, as Dr. Densley said, that the law is the law, right? But the law needs to change. It's not carved in stone.

And this is actually a post-recommendation. These are the proposed word rules that prevent that particular individual from becoming a cop. And those are the things that need change. That's what we're here to do is to help change those things.

I think that the only way we're going to get the, kind of, impetus to change those things is if we, the people who have not been directly affected, so the privileged people and the people that tend to hold power, take a very hard look at our own privilege and what we have gotten away with, and really pick apart the false dichotomy that we have created of us versus them, or clean versus criminal, or good versus bad. And I think that has to start with the people who have

the most power, not just the legislators, and not just the attorneys -- or let's say the people in the courtroom -- but the people with honest --

And if we can inject some of that introspection and humility and true consideration of one's privilege, then I think we can begin to uncover implicit bias, and we can begin to truly see one another as human beings.

As likely, the cop that allowed that parishioner to go was probably white and saw a bit of himself, or of his mother or sister or neighbor in her, and so he didn't see her as an obstructionist or didn't see her as a criminal.

So, yes, I think that if we can start to strip away some of these false barriers that prevent us from seeing one another, we'll be more likely to see each other as human.

In those stories that I shared where people have gotten away with it, or even this cop who let the parishioner go, that's not bad policing, right? I think it's good. I think that having authentic interactions, like the gentleman who was outside of the

bank filming a scene, they were energetically lectured and then allowed to go.

It's not like police just turned a blind eye to them; there was a conversation. And I think that shows not just the disparate effect of policing in Minnesota, but it also shows the possibilities.

We do have good interactions between police and community, but that is not true across all communities. Does that make sense?

MR. BATTLE: It does. Thank you very much.

CHAIR KORBEL: We've got time for one more question. Ms. Beaulieu?

MS. BEAULIEU: Yes, Dr. Keesee, in your experience and training, do you have anything where the police have, at the same time, training together with the community?

DR. KEESEE: So there's a couple of things that we do in training. We have, so you know, we've gone through an extension revision of how we train, not just our recruits, but what we call in-service, so our senior officers.

The inclusion of community starts with curriculum development retraining. Since we are serving the community, we really want to know that what we are training officers and educating them to do is doing what we want it to do. So it's critical that we do have the voice of the community in curriculum development.

We also involve community in a lot of observing of our courses, and then what we have done is that we send our officers out. What's interesting about New York is that the boroughs themselves where these kids come from -- there's five of course --- they usually, typically never leave them. So they're cities within cities.

So one of the things that we do within the first two weeks of onboarding is we literally load them up on buses. We send them out into the community where they meet our community partners -- we have already identified community partners -- where they begin to engage.

And then as they get partway through their academy, we actually send them to the precincts where

they are going to be for fourteen days where they reengage with their community, and they begin to understand what's happening in their own neighborhoods that they're going to be serving and those particular historical cultures.

We also have what we call a Citizens Academy, not in the traditional Citizens Academy, where we teach citizens how police work. We actually send in-service officers to the community to learn about the history of the community and the history of the interactions with police. So we very much have community involved in the sort of onboarding of our officers.

The key though, and I think for us, and the challenge for us in law enforcement, is how do you advantage historical narratives. We want this to be a healthy engagement when we have both parties as you have spoken to coming with historical trauma. It is something that you have to really manage very well, because it's been very successful.

And part of that, having a community involved in developing the curriculum, helping to train

officers, means that you have to do some groundwork. So those early conversations about experiences with police have to be done. The authentic relationships, they're up and running. Because the community has to build tolerance for it, for the checkbox training. It has to be something that is going to provide service or provide a change. And also that the behavior they're expecting to see out of the officers will be managed. So it is something that can be done, and we have done that.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much to all of our panelists. It was just a rich, varied discussion. It was exactly what we were hoping, the way we were hoping to start the day.

Thank you very much, and now a quick message from our host.

PARTICIPANT: Welcome. We're glad to have you here at St. Thomas. We hope you make yourselves at home. Restrooms are over there at the corner, across from the elevators. If you need something to eat or drink, you can go up to the second floor, take the skyway over, and then you enter the

business school, and you'll come to a food court with lots of selections there.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. We'll break now until about 9:45. Thank you all for coming.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Welcome back, everyone. Joined by us today are committee members Teresa Nelson, also committee member Denise Huynh.

We will now turn this over to our panelists. Mr. Feist?

So we have our first community panel, and I would also just remind folks if they wish to make a statement, we'll have, hopefully, two opportunities. We'll have, hopefully, some time before our midday break, and then we will also have time this afternoon between 4:20 and 5:00, so I would turn this over to our panelists. Welcome.

MR. FEIST: Madam Chair and members of the committee, my name is Ben Feist. I'm the legislative director for the ACLU of Minnesota. Thank you very much

for having me today to be part of this important discussion that we're are having.

I'm going to spend my time talking in some high level details about work the ACLU has been doing around the areas of policing, and in particular, racial disparities that we have seen in Minnesota.

I'll first point to the fact that Minnesota has significant, persistent racial disparities and arrest rates going back to the 2003 analysis of police stops throughout the state of Minnesota by the Council on Crime and Justice and the University of Minnesota Institute on Race and Poverty.

It was an important study that found significant racial disparities in police traffic stops and the individuals who were subjected to searches. In the face of the report's troubling findings, very little was done to address racial disparities in policing, unfortunately.

Everyone understood that racial disparities were lived in Minnesota, and now we had data to suggest this was exactly the case. But, again, very little is done to move things forward and to bring this

to a better place than at that time.

We then move forward in time a little bit, and I have some slides today. The ACLU -- the national ACLU and the ACLU of Minnesota joined together to do pretty big research piece and report entitled, Picking Up the Pieces, a couple of years, 2015. But this was really kicked off by information -- sorry, it's going been difficult for me to go back, so let me make sure I'm on right spots here. This was really kicked off by a report on racial disparities and marijuana possession and arrest rates.

The national ACLU looked at this issue throughout all of the states and found, perhaps surprisingly, that Minnesota actually had some of the worst disparities among the states. As you can see, the main point here is that blacks are 7.8 times more likely than whites to be arrested for marijuana possession. And in Hennepin County in particular, that's 9.1 times more likely.

This largely led to a belief that we needed to look closer at Minneapolis and trying to identify what was going on here.

So the Picking Up Pieces report looked at Minneapolis police data from January 2012 to September of 2014, analyzed only low level arrests, and the key finding is that black people are 8.7 times more likely than whites to be arrested for these low level offenses. And Native Americans are 8.6 times more likely than whites to be arrested.

The information that was compiled has a lot of very pretty graphs, and I don't have time to go through all of these in detail, but I want to show some of the data here just so you can take a look.

I think the information in the graphs really speak for themselves here. When we have the average annual low level arrests broken down by race, we have 3 percent of the white population versus 28 percent of the black population, or 27 percent of the Native American population. Very staggering numbers.

I apologize. This is a little small for you to see on the screen, but what we're trying to show here are the black communities of Minneapolis on the left, and on the right, the location of all low level arrests for this time period and the very obvious

overlap.

The next slide is showing youth arrests, and again, the youth population in Minneapolis may be only 30 percent black, but the youth arrest rates in Minneapolis are 60 percent.

This slide shows that the top ten charges, or shows the top ten charges that account for 64 percent of all of the charges, and the interesting things to look at here is the fact that a lot of these are dealing with driving offenses, and driving offenses that in particular tend to go in cycles.

When you have no proof of insurance, driving after revocation, driving after suspension, no insurance, no valid driver's license, you can see how people get caught in this type of cycle, and the issue keeps compounding.

We also note that there are some other ones in here, including just low level warrant arrests, public curfew violations, and trespassing. And so it is really fairly minor things that are happening, but again, very disproportionate percentage.

Again, I won't spend a lot of time on this

slide, but the numbers keep breaking down here: low level warrant arrests, 62 percent black versus 20 percent white, 14 percent Native American percent, and 94 percent arrested on low level warrants are booked.

We also wanted to point out that a lot of the low level charges that we were seeing through this report had a connection to issues being homeless and poverty in Minneapolis. So a lot of the common low level charges included consuming in public, loitering, and public urination, other issues again than we believe point to the fact that we really need to deal with that as its own issue.

Let's skip through little bit here. Before I move on here, I'll also say that this report did focus on Minneapolis, because that was the data that we were able to collect and spend a lot of time analyzing. And we had reason to believe that it would show significant disparities, but as we all know, there are going to be significant disparities as well in other cities, St. Paul for example, but also, I believe, throughout all of the State of Minnesota if we were able to do a full survey. We would not be surprised, due to what we know

incarceration rates around the state. So as much as we would like to do additional work in this area, at this point, the best data that we have is about Minneapolis.

On a second note, we also have some information through Metro Transit. Similar disparities were identified by the Metro Transit Police Department in December of 2015, and this really stems from some stories we've heard about unequal fare enforcements on the Green Line in particular. There have been a number of high profile incidents, excessive force by Metro Transit police, and data was released to the ACLU of Minnesota and also analyzed by Metro Transit at the same time, and that showed some interesting disparity information.

On the first slide here, our data is black adults are 26 percent more likely to be cited rather than warned compared to white adults. Native American adults are estimated to be 152 percent more likely to be cited rather than warned when compared with whites as well.

And as with other things, we have looked

at corrective action, often pointing to implicit bias training, training on working with people with disabilities, directive to use or to issue warnings for first time fare evaders, and a comprehensive review of policy and procedures.

So to bring this back to the back end of this issue. The prison population here in Minnesota, we know that black people -- and this goes back a few years I believe in the data -- but black people are only 6 percent of Minnesota's population, make up 35 percent of the prison population as of January of 2016.

Native Americans make up approximately 1 percent of the state's population but nearly 10 percent of the state's prisoners. 83 percent of the state's population are white, but they make up only 53 percent of the inmate population.

As we all know, the disparities didn't happen overnight. Disparities in arrests and incarceration align with state-wide disparities around other things, including education, jobs, and economic well-being. So we can't fully disconnect all of those factors. We've looked at this in terms of factors

including implicit bias, breakdown in police/community relations, police policies and training, criminalization, voter criminalization, criminalization of homelessness, the broken windows policing tactics that we've discussed a little bit earlier today, and issues with healthcare for example.

So that ends the portion that I have slides on today, but I did want to move on quickly to some of the points that are actually encouraging after this work had come out. We're encouraged that police departments in this state have adopted some reforms that are consistent with the recommendations of the task force.

The Minneapolis Police Department, for example, is making encouraging steps toward implementing some implicit bias and procedural justice training. Also stop-and-frisk data collection and use of force policy reform providing stronger guidelines for de-escalation.

There's also new professional codes of conduct and rules and duties for officers to report another's misconduct, and duty to intervene if they see

misconduct. And we view all these as very positive changes.

We will also acknowledge that other police departments in the Metro area are making progress in a number of reforms, and you might hear from others today more specifics on that.

Unfortunately, we were equally disappointed that there is a lack of commitment on the state-wide level to implement task force recommendations.

The Governor's Council on Law Enforcement and Community Relations recommendations have been largely consistent with those of the Presidential Task Force on 21st Century Policing. But the Minnesota legislature has not moved forward to implement the majority of policy recommendations or fully fund these efforts.

I will point to a bill that is moving up the Minnesota legislature at this point with strong bipartisan support relating to training.

House File 346 -- was Senate File 445 -- does provide direct appropriation to increase the

amount of money that the departments are getting specifically for training, and that is in general a good thing.

This also states this bill that the training must include crisis response, conflict management, and cultural diversity training.

Again, not necessarily a bad thing, but from the ACLU perspective, we believe that likely does not go far enough. It does not mention procedural justice or implicit bias training, for example, and other police practices that we think are essential.

The last thing that I will talk about today with my time is the idea that body cameras might be one way to restore the public's trust. The ACLU always had a complicated relationship with body cameras. We saw on one hand, there was a privacy issue that needed to be balanced with accountability and transparency.

Ultimately, as we engaged in the debate at the state legislature, we believe that body cameras would be a good thing to have to restore the public's trust, but only if they did so with policies in place that really protected privacy and made sure that there

would be true assets to these videos. Unfortunately, we believe that the law passed last year at state level, which classifies all videos as private data, really missed the mark and made body cameras more a police surveillance tool that will be perceived as a threat to the community, rather than something that will really helped to restore the levels of trust with the same people.

The law also left nearly all of the operational levels of body cameras to each department's decision.

So you see many of the departments here have implemented the body cameras in Minnesota or are looking to pilot projects start to come out with similar policies, many of which we think are really deficient in terms of officer discretion, the ability to turn the camera off and on as they please. A lack of notice to individuals that they are being filmed, which we think is one of the cornerstones of body camera policy, that you be able to actually know that there is potentially video that could help in some circumstances and also stop certain types of bad conduct as well on both sides,

and a number of other things. Including the not allowing recording exemptions for legitimate privacy concerns. For example, not being able ask for the camera to be turned off in someone's home.

So with that, I will turn this over to the other panelists. Thank you very much.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Mr. Feist.

MS. ZAHN: Thank you, Madam Chair and members.

My name is Shane Zahn, and I am Director of Safety Initiatives for the Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District. The Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District is a 501(c)(6) business-funded/business-led. The most recognizable thing that you'll notice that we do is our Ambassador Program.

We have both safety and cleaning ambassadors throughout seven days a week, 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., roughly, in 120 square blocks of downtown. We roughly hire anywhere from 50 or 70 ambassadors that are out there. So what the Improvement District is for is a cleaner, safer, and greener downtown.

We run off roughly a $6 million dollar annual budget, which is through business assets, so the businesses pay into, and they have us to have above and beyond base, core services.

I'm privileged to be in this role because I know it's business-funded/business-led. And that's a lot of money for businesses to pay in. But before I go into my presentation and talk, I want to let you know how I got into my role.

I was a former executive of Target Corporation in assets protection, and as a part of the Safe City Initiative in 2007, Target Corporation had many employees downtown that just didn't feel safe downtown.

The number one safety concern, believe it or not, is panhandling and quality of life issues like drug dealing.

We knew this because of a perception survey that actually came out of the Downtown Council and University of St. Thomas in 2006 with downtown employers. So with that Target reached out to the first precinct police department to help them with community

policing strategies and support.

I office out of the First Precinct. I was there since 2007. Yes, I didn't always have gray hair.

It was challenging. Being a civilian from a corporation in a police department to help them build upon community policing strategies, and I had four areas that I came in with: violent crime, quality of life, chronic offenders, and emergency preparedness. A lot of our crime efforts are around prevention, engagement, and community policing.

So with that, little did I know I was running a 501(c)(3), called the SafeZone Collaborative, at that time led by Inspector Harteau, now Chief Harteau, it was challenging because there is a sense of civilians, law enforcement, corporations. That first month was very difficult, but slowly and surely I started earning trust with even the lead officers, the squad cars, the supervisors.

In 2009, the downtown improvement district was formed. They hired me from Target Corporation to stay in my role, the director of safety initiatives and to build on those three roles that I talked about:

prevention, engagement, and community policing.

We have done some great things over the years, especially with Chief Harteau in MPD2.0.

Some of the things that I'm real proud about is some of the engagement strategies we have done. We work with St. Stephen's homeless street outreach team, Youth Link, we also work with a Youth Coordinating Board. I'll give you an example, at the time, Deputy Chief Hardison was an inspector downtown.

We were having a lot of issues with youth fighting downtown. We started strategizing and looking at our policies, going "We needed to do an 8:00 curfew. This is getting out of control."

Little did I know was the resources are out there in our communities and I went and engaged with the Youth Coordinating Board, and didn't realize they had a youth congress. And one of their mottos that sticks to me to this day is "No decision about us without us."

So me and Hardison went and talked with this group and said what do you think about this 8:00 curfew? They started laughing at us, and I'm like what is so funny?

They go, this isn't going to work. We work down here, we play down here, this doesn't make any sense.

So we started thinking, what can we do? So we ended up hiring Youth Coordinating Board, the outreach advocates in peer-to-peer, Danny Pha (phonetic) did outreach and still does for the Youth Coordinating Board.

We started building on that. We hired Young Link to start doing homeless street outreach youth. We have now out there four peer outreach workers supervised by Jose Acuna. These youth that we have are either homelessness or are out there experiencing homelessness and are out there and they see some articles about that.

Danny Pha said that that's business investment that we put into that.

The other thing that we're really proud about is the Chronic Offender Program that we run out of First Precinct, and we help pay and fund for a dedicated city attorney, a probation officer. This is a holistic approach to some of our problems with safety.

Why I bring this up is because innovation is very important and bringing community partners to the table is very important.

This Chronic Offender Program is using data. Who are the most prolific offenders? Not so much violent, but the livability issues. We know there's a social problem, chemical dependency, housing, you name it. It's very complicated.

So with this, we work with St. Stephen's, Salvation Army, and a lot of social service providers and we meet weekly and we talk about the best trajectory for that offender.

Three years ago, I think, I had -- just had one of those ah-ha moments. The first year we started this. It was very difficult for social services and police and probation all sitting in a room talking about these offenders, and what is the best way to correct course? And when I knew we made a lot of progress is, because we built this relationship up together by meeting, conditioning and meeting, is when I asked social services for homeless outreach saying, "I think the best course of action is jail." And I had a police

officer saying, "No, I think the best course of action is housing opportunities." How did we get here?

Since that this program has seen over a 60 percent reduction in recidivism rate data with our chronic offenders and it is not displacement.

We have being doing this for five years and the Humphrey Institute has done some Capstone Projects; we've won awards for it. But the interaction of us meeting every week is, I think, really important and raising a holistic approach, not just incarceration. It's looking at housing, chemical dependency, all these other things.

The other thing that I would like to share with you is, not only do I office out of First Precinct, but we run some of our day-to-day operations out of there. We have a safety communication center that has connected over 60 corporations downtown with a common radio channel. We have St. Stephen's outreach team on there.

We just came out this year with an app for social services because, like I said, we have a lot of them out there, YCD, St. Stephen's. We now have an app

for when police are dispatched to police calls, we can dispatch outreach calls. We can know when they're on-scene, we can know what's happening with that situation. This is something new that we just are doing this year outside of the box.

But what I think is important here is, in our community, there is not one size fits all. Each community and each issue is different. Whether it's quality of life concerns, because perception is reality, or violent crime.

You know, we have two different ecosystems downtown, daytime ecosystems compared to nighttime and weekend ecosystems, with bars and nightclubs. Quite different; many different strategies apply.

But we don't do this in a silo. We do this with our partners and that's what I'm really proud about, the community policing, 21st Century policing strategies.

These are very difficult times throughout our country, but also they're very exciting times, because we're changing our culture of what policing looks like. I think some of our biggest challenges that

we face is what is too much enforcement and what is not enough. Where is the balance? What else can be done besides enforcement?

Recruitment. I mean, I can't tell you -- who would want to be a police officer today? With all the eyes and ears, where is the national level of recruitment going on today to make our next generation 21st policing, as diverse as it can be in the communities that we serve.

And it's support. I think bad media impressions. It's very difficult, whether it's social media or media, to get positive stories out there happening. Because they're happening in your community every day. But a lot of times bad news is what sells.

So any of those positive things. I could sit and talk to you all day about proactive things we're doing downtown. It's like the tip of the iceberg, no one is seeing what is below the water level.

We have to bring that iceberg up above the water level because there are so many great organizations that are out there doing great things in

their communities. How do we embrace that like First Precinct has?

I'm very privileged to still in the First Precinct and running operations and collaborations.

I have the funnest job in the world because there will be mornings I'm working on youth violence prevention to securing the Super Bowl. But I'm not doing it alone, I'm doing it with corporate partners, community partners, social outreach partners, and our law enforcement partners.

I'm going to leave you with this, we're doing a lot of great things. We still have a lot of great work to do. It's exciting to be innovative and be a part of 21st policing, what might look like.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you.

MR. TERRELL: Hello, everyone. My name is Justin Terrell. I'm the Justice 4 All program manager at TakeAction Minnesota.

I just want to start by saying thank you for having me here with you, and sharing all this great information and I appreciate the work of all of those who I share this space with.

So I want to start off by, TakeAction is a state-wide people's organization. We believe that we have our share of values. We can build the power to change who decides who benefits. We believe we are up against structural racism, gender oppression, and corporate power, corporate power that doesn't work with the community, that those barriers get in the way of a better Minnesota. And we work everyday to try and make a better Minnesota.

My work at TakeAction Minnesota is focused on criminal justice reform. More specifically, what happens when people come home. So we focus on areas of employment, housing, and democracy, so people who can't vote.

And I'm here today because we actually want to focus on policing, specifically over the last five years of my work it has been an issue that has come up nonstop. So we've started to process the engaged communities across the state to talk about what Minnesota policing could potentially be doing.

So I'm going to start with a story. One of my good friends, who is also a part of a program, had

been a part of our program, he was noticeably absent from my son's first birthday party. And I was kind of like, you know, "That's messed up. Where you at, Bro?"

And at the end of the day I got a call and he told me that he just got out of jail.

So I asked him, what happened? He was driving an Uber at the time, and some Fifth Precinct officers drug him out of the car while he was waiting for a fare, and assaulted him and took his property and detained him and so he missed my first son's birthday party.

I can tell this story over and over and over again, and that is why we have to work out these issues.

I wanted to say that the way things are is not an accident. The issue with policing is not a new issue. It actually -- you could, you know, if you wanted to, go back to fugitive slave laws. If you really want to talk about the roots of community policing issues between the black community and policing. Frederick Douglass described it as they took possession of his body.

And so we need to have a real conversation

around the criminalization of people, specifically the criminalization of black men and what that means for policing and the standard that it was built on top of.

So the other thing I wanted to point out is that the way -- so other thing is that these are people-made problems. And this is good news, we made these problems which also means we can fix them. We listen to Minnesotans across the state and these are some of the things we've come up with as potential solutions to our current situation

So one -- and this is actually a conversation I had with police officers last week. We actually can't police our cops with the problems that we're dealing with in our communities. These are not police issues, so if you want to talk about coming up to help with drugs and how drugs are sweeping through our community and causing all kinds of problems, that's a public health issue or an economic issue.

You're talking about a black market trade that if those folks had an opportunity for fair market employment opportunities those folks would not be committing crimes. Or one could argue that some of

those drugs that they sell shouldn't be considered illegal in the first place, considering we are the highest illicit substance using country in the world. So we should probably reevaluate some of that.

So a lot of these are economic problems or housing problems, employment problems, public health problems. None of these issues can be solved by policing.

A gun and a badge does not address those issues. It's time we start talking about it that way.

I had the pleasure of meeting with Valerie Jarrett at the White House during the Obama administration to talk about barriers to employment. It was a room full of formerly incarcerated folks, people that I'm humbled to be in a room with, people like Doris Nunn and Norris Henderson, a man that spent 27 years inside of Angola prison for a crime he did not commit. I consider those to be mentors and working together, it's humbling.

So in those conversations we talked about 21st Century policing. We talked about some things that could work and so I was excited to be able to share

that experience with this group.

So some of the issues that we would like to see in Minnesota, one, I want to give a shout out to Black Lives Matter for the work that they did with the Fourth Precinct. Because one thing I think we all need to pause to recognize is that there will never be a grand jury again in the City of Minneapolis to decide on a police-involved shooting. That is a direct outcome from the brave young people of color who sat in the cold and demanded justice for Jamar Clark. That's one policy that I've heard from across the state. People support it, as well as our national partners, we would like to see us moving in that direction.

Civilian appeal authority. So I served on the civilian appeal authority for six years, I looked at a lot of autopsy reports on black men, and what I can tell you is that process needs to be enforced and given more authority. And then I know there was a lot of work in their department to structure the board in a way that makes sense. And I support restructuring, I think our members would like to see more.

Community investment. However, if we know

that the problems in the community are not policing issues, it would be interesting to see some of the resources that are, you know, that our state just appropriated -- is planning to appropriate to the police, we would like to see some of those dollars go into the community to address the issues that the police cannot solve. So more community investment. I'm fine if it comes through the police department, but the community should have a say on how some of those dollars get spent.

And then there is the simple recommendation you'll find in the 21st Century policing document that talks about community surveys. Police should actually be asking people in their communities that they serve how they feel, about the way that they serve on a regular basis and vice versa.

I don't feel like I need to cover the Statewide Policing Task Force, but we support that task force being permanent.

Training dollars. I feel like -- I'm rushing through, I'm being sensitive to the time, but I could expand on these issues very much. Training

dollars I do think is a good idea, however, there should be a broader discussion about what that means and how to we need to focus on that.

Data tracking. We'd like to see a place where use of force gets tracked across the state, that is accessible to communities.

And officer peer review and early warning tracking systems are also something that our members would support. This is the reality that the thin blue line of the blue code, that there's all kinds of interpretations of what that means. And what I know is that some officers, when they respond to a call and they hear other officers are also responding to a call, one officer may give a cell phone call on a personal line and say, "You know, I got this one, you don't need to come to this call." Because they didn't want the officer creating problems at the call.

That is a huge problem for officer safety. We would like to see some sort of support for officers to avoid these types of incidents.

I'll just close. There's a couple members that would like to see a new standard that allows

officers to be terminated from their employment based on if they violate a policy that taints a case for the prosecutor, if they were caught lying or any sort of dishonest act, we believe that officer should be allowed to be fired, if that's the case.

So then I'll close with this, very simply, like it or not, our liberation is bound to each other. So, we have a saying in J4A, "I can't get free unless you get free, and you can't get free until we all get free. So let's be free."

The reality is we don't see the police as a problem, we don't see the police as our enemy. These folks live in our communities, some live in our communities, and we are committed to getting liberated from the status quo that justifies murder of our black men. And we want to envision past that status quo and we cannot do that without police officers, we recognize that our liberation is bound to their liberation, and let them know that they have fears as well, and so our hope is that we can -- I would just like by saying that we are all in this together and we need to envision something better. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Mr. Terrell.

DR. PORTER: Good morning, I'm Louis Porter and I'm with the Council for Minnesotans of African Heritage. And I would like to start this morning by referring back on an essay that I read by one of my colleagues, Sylvester Monroe, a long term reporter and writer with the Washington Post.

And Mr. Monroe tells the story of his daughter calling him, and she had been reading the coverage of police-community relations and deaths of young black men. And she was extremely upset, and she was referring to the Philando Castile case, Jamar Clark case, and many other cases. And she was in tears and upset and enraged. And as fathers would do, he said, "Honey calm down." Her response was, "I can't calm down. I'm a mother of a black son." So at the Council we have been trying to address that situation for some time.

The Council of Black Minnesotans was founded in 1980 and in 2015 it became the Council for Minnesotans of African Heritage. Last year we had a forum on police and community relations, and I just want

to share some of the findings of that forum of some of the things that came out.

Some of the recommendations included oversight and accountability, development of a system of civilian review boards, for each community made up of as broad a group of community members as is possible to construct. People who represent diversity of political thought on both sides of the political aisle. The diverse racial, cultural and class make-up of a community. Civilian review boards shall be responsible for doing an independent investigation every time there is an incident of police using force resulting in death or serious bodily harm.

Educational training. The purpose of the new model of educational training that must be introduced needs to be about helping departments move towards systemic change, changing the culture of policing. Training that pushes departments towards a new level.

The community/police model brings emphasis on such topics as the hows and whys of community policing, white privilege, cultural competency,

including heavy emphasis on historical trauma among people of color. Emotional intelligence, the strong self-assessment of oneself. Nonviolent de-escalation of potentially violent confrontations. Exploring alternative roles for police at the nexus where law enforcement and social services meet. That is, nonviolent involvement with the homeless and mentally ill, intoxication on drugs or both, domestic violence situations, et cetera. People who are competent to understand mental illness. Community relations. Strong residency requirements for police officers, mandating that they live in the communities they serve. More foot patrols facilitating development of personal relationships with residents and business owners.

I contend say that over and over in our research and in looking at what works in other cities that is key, when you can tear down the walls between police and community members so that young people, shop owners, people on the street feel comfortable talking with police as people and things begin to turn around.

A strong, sustained commitment to include diversity, a strong and sustained program for youth run

by police officers focused on building equality, youth can be nurtured over a long period and encouraged to become police officers.

And finally, body cameras. We know that body cameras are important but they have to be used properly. Legislation mandating that all of us in the field wear them and keep them on at all times.

We must see strong bipartisan support striking a balance between protecting officers and law enforcement and community demands for more police accountability.

A diverse and bipartisan group of citizens must be empowered to review body camera footage whenever there's an incident involving death or injury.

Ensuring full disclosure and transparency. This is supposed to be more funding through private funding rather than tax money. We know that the management of body cameras is as important and critical as having them.

As I listen to my colleagues speak so much of what they said resonates with me. I remember personally as a young man getting that conversation that

most young black men get, and that is you must be careful around the police. The police are not going to treat you as they would treat a white teenager. Know that your life may depend on that, be differential to police.

Until we get to the point that that conversation is edited, changed, that conversation does not have to be there and is fraught with fear, we will never make any progress.

Some of these examples of community engagement we know work in other parts of the country and include community walks where once a month the chief takes his command staff to the streets.

A community police council, police liaison officers. Community service team and police surveillance academy, whereby --- it's a 15 week program designed for at-risk teens who have shown a propensity for making bad decisions.

These students are temporarily enrolled in alternative school, because they have committed serious conduct violations or criminal infractions. Police mentors volunteer and are nominated by staff lieutenants to participate in these alternative

academies, these are things that worked in Ohio, collaborative community police advisory boards.

Reading on, citizens' comment cards, citizen police academies, the objective of which is not to be a reserve officer, but to produce informed citizens, and a police-involved and balanced program.

There are many lessons to be learned from other cities, but we know that the biggest lesson, the sum total of it is based on relationships where people and community get to know police as people, and when the police get to know their residents as people and not an us and them mentality.

The importance of community relations and service to policing. Strong relationships of mutual trust between police agencies and communities served are critical to maintaining public safety and effective policing.

The police officials rely on the cooperation of community members to provide information about crime in their neighborhoods and to work with police to find solutions to crime and disorder of problems.

We know that historically this is what's worked. Sir Robert Peel, who is called the father of modern policing, said from the years in Great Britain he said that the ability of the British police to perform their duties is dependent upon the public approval of police actions. The police must secure cooperation of the public to the degree that the cooperation of the public can be secured. This diminishes the proportionality to the necessity of the use of force. Police must seek and preserve public favor. In using physical force when necessary police at all times retain a relationship with the public and should always divert their actions strictly toward their functions. The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder.

Community policing by the Community Oriented Policing Services Office and released by the National Crime Prevention Council says that community policing is a philosophy that promotes and supports strategies to address the cause of crime, to reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem-solving tactics and community-police

partnerships.

Sylvester Monroe ended his article by stating that we have to start seeing one another, and truly seeing one another, and that's not going to happen as Justin said --- it's not just a policing problem, but it's not going to happen until we're going to school together, until we're living together, going to worship together, and getting to know one another as people. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you.

Are there questions from members?

MR. KOLBO: Mr. Porter, I do have a question. That is the report that you --- and the research that you mentioned on the Council on Minnesotans of African Heritage, who was the recipient of that report?

MR. PORTER: The report of the Council, we've made it available to any organizations and people that would like it. I'm happy to get you a copy of that.

CHAIR KORBEL: So does the Council then advise the governor? Is that the role of the Council?

MR. PORTER: Yes, the role of the Council

is to connect the legislative process with people of African heritage, and including serving as counsel to legislatures as well as the governor on behalf of residents of African heritage.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. Questions from the panel? Mr. Vischer?

MR. VISCHER: So it seems that successful paths forward depends obviously on the community, policing and community partnerships, but also partnerships with the business community and service providers. And with the business community there will often be an absence of trust at least going in, and I'm guessing sometimes even social service providers there will be an absence of trust.

So this is open to the whole panel. What have you found most effective, not just in establishing trust between police and community members, but between the business sector, social service providers and obviously the community if we really want everybody at the table, what works at that trust level among the various stakeholders most effectively?

MR. ZAHN: I'll take that. Trust isn't

given, it's earned. It takes time. One of the things that I think I've learned is don't over-promise and under-deliver, set your expectations and make them realistic. It's like a highway, there's a fast lane and a slow lane. Some things take longer to do and some things are quicker to do.

But I think when you're working together you get commitment versus compliance, and that's the key to collaboration. Don't just meet to have a meeting, set some objectives, set some goals. And I think that's important. And find out --- don't be afraid to reload, if something doesn't work try something different and don't be afraid to fail because you learn from that as well.

MR. PORTER: If I could piggyback on that I'll tell you that what I've observed, when you get various groups at the table, youth and the police, there's always some nervousness and distrust in the beginning. That is only solved by continuing the conversation. And so often you see conversations start and just as you're getting somewhere people will lose interest and something else will come up and the

conversation doesn't continue.

So ongoing meetings and facilitation of the conversations that break down the mistrust and builds trust over time is going to make this work.

CHAIR KORBEL: Questions from the panel? Ms. Huynh?

MS. HUYNH: This question is for Shane, but it's also for everyone as well. I think there is a lot of concerns from civilians right now about police funding and how that impacts civilians when it comes to police misconduct or police brutality, or whatever you want to label it.

My question for you is how do private competing interests affect decision making, and how does who's at the table really play out for them?

You mentioned a lot about having 1:10:05. The issue that I notice is the people who are actually effected by the decision still aren't at the table. The people who are in front of us still aren't at the table. So it's social service providers who are making the decisions, it's not the people who are actually impacted by the decision.

My question is where are the people who are on the receiving end of these decisions at the table, they don't seem to be, and how do the people who are at the table who benefit from it, and that includes all of us who are people who are social service providers, who are researchers, who are business folks, how do they benefit from it and how do they benefit from that and how do we take our private interests out of that to do better for everyone?

MR. ZAHN: Yep, continuous engagement and being receptive to listening from all ends.

Just last night, for example, I was sitting on a public forum for a downtown neighborhood association and crime and safety was the key topic. I saw it on Channel 9 last night.

So how do we reach out to those organizations and usually -- this is something that I talked about with Chief Harteau. Go through organizations that are in communities, and Chief Harteau set up a youth advisory council, and at first we were like let's go out and select youth anonymously. We backed up and said, no, let's use organizations that

deal with youth and are the advocates for that.

One example we had a youth summit and we went into talking about body cameras with the youth. What is your input? With the police department.

We talked about a traffic stop, we brought in a squad and put them in the role of a police officer, and these were groups that we were using through Youth Link, YCD, Pillsbury, a lot of different organizations that we've collaborated on.

Do we have an opportunity to do more? Absolutely. I think that's the hard part is managing expectations. We're not going to satisfy everybody, I realize that.

What we can do is do our best to make sure the people are at the table. And even like I said, even through our social outreach team, engagement team that we have, just hired a livability team that's out on the streets talking to people in their environment that they're in. What can we do? We're listening. So we have am and a pm livability team that is out there too, out on the streets downtown six days a week, but going out there and doing that work too.

And then again too, how are decisions made, we have advisory groups, we have committees, we have meetings.

Do we always get it right? No, I'm not going to pretend we do. But we do try to make progress and measure the progress and find out where we have to reroute if we have to.

I think the biggest challenge is the balance, what is enough and what is not enough? Where is the balance in between there when you're managing expectations and different opinions? Is it a Target employee, or is it that homeless vet that has been out on the street, and has been in a shelter more than, you know, six months? Is that an emergency? I think it is. Housing would be a very appropriate way.

We've been talking to the county, too, for example, on chemical dependency. Why do we have to wait for somebody to commit a crime to get assessments in jail? We should be out on the streets and getting assessments out there before there is actually any criminal intent even in there, if it's a quality of life.

So looking at things to do a little bit

differently and not taking on too much.

I think progress takes time and having a plan is important. And we do, every year we set a plan together and talk to our communities and stakeholders.

PARTICIPANT: Do you mind if I just ---

CHAIR KORBEL: Please.

PARTICIPANT: I also just remind us that on the agenda there is only two people that I can identify on this panel who have criminal records, myself and Jason Sole.

So the other thing is like, we need to include formerly-incarcerated community people and the family members in these conversations. So that's one.

And the other thing is most tables that we want people to be at are built to exclude them, so we need to reexamine how we build tables in general. So that --- there is whole list of folks I that I could name who actually feel comfortable coming to the tables, and have power at those tables. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Ms. Nelson, you have the table.

MS. NELSON: Thank you all for being here.

I have --- like on the last panel so many questions for all of you after being here all day.

I think what I want to focus on is just to thank you for your comments about the fact that a lot of the problems are not problems that police can solve. So I guess my question would be for all four panelists.

If you can talk about work that you have done to get more of a statewide commitment to addressing those other issues. For example, the Downtown Council. With all of the businesses in the downtown have you come together to say, you know what State of Minnesota? You need to put more resources into housing, into homelessness, advocacy, into treatment, et cetera.

So I would like all of you to kind of speak to what you are seeing at the state level, and what you are seeing that is doable.

MR. ZAHN: I'll start. $6 million dollars a year is a big investment from businesses to employ ambassadors to do programs and outreach. Many other things that we do. I do think we have a opportunity, we do lobby at a state level and a social level, and the reason why we do that is because we're at the table with

St. Stephen's every day and we know how important --- like even SSI, when you are into a housing unit you only get $98 to really spend. That's horrible. How does anybody live off $98 a month?

Absolutely. Mental health, I mean this needs to be addressed, jails are not the right place to put people that need help. Chemical dependency, the same thing.

There has to be more done on that. There is a lot of work ahead of us. That's the key, and whether it's through activism, whether it's through lobbying, or whether through business pressure, whether it's talking to your electives, it's very important. These are conversation that have to happen and investments that have to be made.

We did one for example, we worked with Kathy Tendering at the time with Harbor Lights with the top 50, and we put a $450,000 investment into the most prolific shelter users and moved them into the housing and used state resources and funding with a small business investment that pulled into a state investment.

So more things like that need to be addressed and they should be addressed, I believe.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you.

MR. VALENS: This question is for Justin Terrell. So let's say we are calling like today and say, I need a bill and pass it right now. So how is that going to work?

MR. TERRELL: I spend more time trying to avoid the Capitol than go there, but. So there are bills that --- honestly we can use some of that Chamber of Commerce lobbying power right now to move some wheels, because with the current political landscape at the capitol we just don't see movement --- so Senator Dibble is working on a bill that would offer alternatives to detention for police officers, so right now if an officer sees a kid smoking pot on the street he's going to take him to JDC, well what if you just took him to his aunt's house. That's probably a better outcome than having a kid spend the night jail. What if you got to talk to the kid or know that kid, or got to know his aunt, right.

We want to encourage officers to consider

themselves to be guardians, not enforcers or an occupying force. So Senator Dibble is working on that bill, there is also a sitting oversight bill at the state level that he's interested in. There are multiple bills. There is not a whole lot of political will to pass them.

And unfortunately that's the case where, instead of working on this issue, we're calling, trying to prevent a private prison from opening in Minnesota, so it's a big chunk of our work.

I had a response to the previous question, but it's not coming back. Do you mind restating it?

MS. NELSON: Yes, so just to increase funding on a statewide level for all of these issues that I think we mostly all agree on, that are not issues that the police can solve. How do we get more effort from our legislature to fund those?

MR. TERRELL: So I actually have a really good story on that and it involves firing corporation. So if you work downtown you may remember them firing people from the streets and shutting down restaurants from hiring people with criminal records.

That brought out strong headlines since, however we know that employers can use background checks. You know, housing is damn near impossible to get if you have a criminal record, so you work with a lot of guys who come and get political during the day and then go to the shelter. Or I got guys who can't, they don't pay their rent. But, it's not just their rent, it's their baby mama's rent because they can't be on the lease. So this creates a whole other dynamic that the police end up having to respond to.

Because what happens if they cannot pay the rent for their family? Well, they have to be evicted, and now the police are on the scene, right? It is ridiculous, and we need to simply provide more assets and employment for people so that they can pay the rents or find housing so they aren't forced to be in the streets.

That does cost money, and it could be provided from the appropriate partners and friends, if you will. And I mean, our campaign is asking them to do just that.

MR. PORTER: I wanted to follow up.

Hearing Justin say that he avoids I can always use people at the capitol helping me to lobby and helping me to talk, I should say to advocate on behalf of citizens of African heritage.

When we have been successful at the capitol it's when we're able to fill the room and legislators tell us all of the time that yes, we can talk, those of us who are paid to talk we can do it all day. But nothing is as powerful as filling the room with people who feel strongly about an issue. So I've taken to working really hard at that part of it, not avoiding this issue but going there and maybe enforcing those we elect to deal with issues such as this one.

CHAIR KORBEL: Ms. Huynh, a question?

MS. HUYNH: I do have a follow up. Again, funding issues, I didn't ask the question as clearly as I could have, but I have some questions about how private competing interests or corporate interests affect work with police partnerships and how is that managed and how can that be done differently?

MS. ZAHN: What do you mean by that?

MS. HUYHN: I guess when you had responded

I did have some follow up questions about whether the youth are paid for their time, whether community members are paid for their time? Are they ---

MR. ZAHN: I'm paid, I'm not a volunteer. I'm paid by the Downtown Improvement District to be in the role that I'm at. There are business assets. The ambassadors that you see out there, that is not volunteer. They are paid by the city, not the county or the state. They are paid by the businesses downtown.

Same with the outreach that we fund. St. Stephen's, Youth Link. What we do, we, the livability team was a new program that started last year, so a lot of these initiatives that we do, we fund a Youth Coordinating Board.

One program that I'm doing right now is that we are finding police officers out there to do community engagement. Why that is exciting to me is because one of the guys that was in it was a student at NCPC member and I personally started to mentor him. He went from police reserve to CSO, which is a great program with Minneapolis, by the way. You get paid plus your education paid for, and now he's an officer at First

Precinct. That's fantastic

So businesses paying for initiatives and programs and working in outreach. This is an investment that we made.

But we have a Board of Directors, we have an Executive Committee. I wish I could just start writing ideas, we use a collaborative approach with ideas and strategies and initiative, and then we prioritize where those investments need to be. But it was a good question that Teresa had, was what other assets can be made?

It can't be just businesses doing this alone, there are a lot of community organizations that put their investment time after time through volunteers or through donations or anything else like that. So I think getting more of that to happen is very important, but we do have a considerable investment for our downtown.

CHAIR KORBEL: The last question, please, belongs to Mr. Dobratz.

MR. DOBRATZ: Dr. Porter, you both brought us to the interview boards and I'm wondering, with all

kinds of experience, with access to information when you're on those boards, how effective do you feel you can be with that information that you're given, you mentioned autopsy reports, what else are you given that makes you feel effective, and what information do you wish you had further access to?

MR. PORTER: So my experience with civilian authority in Minneapolis was, actually my introduction to it at the time. I had access to what I thought was a lot of really solid information from police reports, statements from the folks involved in what happened. Some files had video, photos, and if you really want to know what all information to get, go to the Hennepin County website and look at the report that Mike Freeman put out after the Jamar Clark case because that is exactly what you get pretty much when you are on a civilian review authority.

For us the issue with information wasn't so much about access on the particular case. It was more about the information we weren't getting, and actually I have to shout out Kenny Baker, who's in the crowd, that does not happen very often, so I shout out to you.

The reports on the performance of the police chief, there are a few others on the City of Minneapolis website right now on these kind of reports on what the complaint process looks like, there's graphs in this report. All kinds of information, and that's -- so I would say that, you know, we need more information like that.

We need it collected at the state level, we need to be able to track, you know, how often officers are using undue force. I think that's the information missing from the public.

The only other thing that I offer to civilian review authority off the top of my head is subpoena power. Which is really, we need to have subpoena power and officers should have to participate in the process. That's the most important information is actually hearing from the officer and being able to look at the data, the evidence.

PARTICIPANT: I have not personally served on the board but I have heard often and constantly from people who have and observed it. The problem is the board don't have enough power, don't have enough teeth, so you

know, there is a fear that a lot of times it is just for show, so if that happens, let's give them some power.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Kolbo, you have a question?

MR. KOLBO: Yes, for Mr. Zahn. We're going to be hearing this afternoon from two law enforcement panels, but I'm interested in the fact that you've spent a lot of time working directly with the police officers in the streets, on the field, and kind of a two part question. In light of what there are a number of charges that get made by some that police are engaged in a systematic bias or discriminatory policing.

What have you observed, at least personally in terms of with your work with the police in the Minneapolis department, the police that you work with in that area.

Secondly what are you hearing from the police officers about how they believe, perceive where things fail or not.

MR. ZAHN: I think it's very challenging to be a police offer and as I talked about social media and media impressions, most of these police officers have

families. But it doesn't matter, if a bad thing happens in another city or our city, everybody who wears the badge as police officer has authority.

I can't speak to what police officers are I'm a civilian, but what I can tell is that I imagine that is especially when you talk about quality of life concerns.

Our perception wasn't violent crimes and safety concerns. It was about panhandling and loitering. In our limited ability team, you talk about how do you engage all elements that are out there, whether it's economic or racial.

One thing I can tell you is safety is at every foremost of everybody's mind no matter who you are or what you do. So how do you find that balance? What is enough and what is not enough?

I think the resistance to authority sometimes nowadays, especially with phones out and all of these other things, I'm a parent of three kids, all teenagers, three daughters, and I'll give you an example of resistance of authority, even in the mindset of an officer where you can have your backing from here to

there.

My daughter had a coat down in the kitchen and my daughter steps over it and I asked her to pick it up, she's 14 and she said that's not mine. I thought, whoa. You know here's - you know - me trying to talk it out to get something picked up and my blood pressure went up to here because that's not what I asked. I asked you to please pick up the coat, and she said that's my sister's and I don't think I should have to do that. Now my mind set is up here.

I'm like using authority and power with compassion but when my blood pressure is above here going, I just simply want you to please pick the jacket up. It was just so frustrating because I had a long day at work.

But it just shows you sometimes even with our kids nowadays is the lack of civility is something I just keep hearing over and over again. Unfortunately, you can see it with my kids. I think I'm a great parent, but I see this in our generation of youth. We need more avengers out there. We need more people working with youth.

We need jobs. Employment policies are really important, so going back to your question is where is the balance? What is enough and what is too much? There is just excessive confusion I feel from both communities, from law enforcement, from everybody on what to do when it comes to law enforcement.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Zahn, you mentioned a little bit a couple of times that you information during the day and evening. Who is getting that information? Is that a report that we would be able to obtain?

MR. ZAHN: Yes, it is. And I believe we have it on our website. I can put you in contact with Joseph. I know we have been also doing some work with other community organizations, and our perception is that is helping as well.

If you go on our website you can see our data and our annual report posted online. So there is a great asset there as well.

CHAIR KORBEL: It is 11:01. It is time for our break and we will reconvene back here at 11:15. Thank you to the panel.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went

off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to our panelists. We have one panelist potentially joining us in progress. I thank you all for joining us this morning.

I would just remind those of you who wish to make a statement about the proceedings, or any of the information regarding this topic that we do have or we may have some time just before our midday break following this panel.

But we do have some time in general this afternoon at 4:20 we will make time for individuals who are not on the agenda and wish to make a statement.

At this time I would turn over to our second community panel. Good morning.

MR. JIMENEZ: Good morning everyone. My name is Henry Jimenez, I'm the Executive Director of the Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs.

Before we go on I would like to encourage the public to meet the person next to you, if you can. Can you do that? Nobody is doing it. Thank you.

And I assume that all of you here know each

other. The reason why I'm saying that is because we're here about police practices, and I think one important thing we need to discuss is building relationships. And sometimes we forget to do some of the simplest things in the room, and that's to get to know the person next to you. And in order for us to understand what the needs of everybody in this room is we need to get to know each other.

I have the privilege to be able to do that for my home community as Executive Director on the Latino Affairs Council. I get to represent the interests of the Latino community throughout the state in the legislative and policy making process at the capitol.

There is a couple of handouts that I passed out, hopefully everybody got it. I want to bring your attention to this here that has our logo on the top. Those are our four priorities of the legislative area of focus are education, health and economic development, and immigration.

We're a state agency in that we still have to talk about immigration. I can't wait until the day

I don't have to talk about immigration, because it's really frustrating to me when I want to talk about education and economic development with the legislators. Yet, almost every single meeting that I have I end talking somehow about immigration because a legislator might have asked me about where I'm from, they might want to know how they voted in their district, and then that leads to immigration somehow. Somehow most of these conversations lead to them.

I also feel that if you asked Latinos in the present State of Minnesota, the majority would say that immigration is one of their highest concerns. In fact after the election it became the number one concern by far in the Latino community.

In the State of Minnesota there is 300,000 Latinos or close to 300,000 Latinos, which is about six percent of the Minnesota population. About 50 percent of the population is under the age of 25, and 90 percent of those under the age of 18 are native born, almost 90 percent.

So why is it that this is an important topic for our people when the future of our community is native

born, at least here in Minnesota? The issue is about half of those youth under the age of 18 have a parent who is an immigrant or a Neo-American is what I like to say to the state.

So our job has intentionally and unintentionally always led to immigration. So I just want you to take note of our guidance. If anybody wanted to know what the ethics counsels did, at least you know what the Latino Affairs Council is doing at the Legislature by looking at this guidance.

I know I already probably have two minutes left so I'm going to make this quick.

CHAIR KORBEL: You have plenty of time. Take your time.

MR. JIMENEZ: I want to bring to your attention some bills that are impacting our community and fortunately and unfortunately, because these are two different bills, bill number 26, for example, house number 26, a very short bill that didn't get a hearing, at least as of yesterday. It probably won't hopefully, and it talks about coordinating with the Department of Homeland Security when an individual becomes eligible

for release from the custody of a state or local law enforcement agency.

It has an issue of immigration of the code of the Federal regulation entitled 8 Section 287.7. I won't read the rest, I think just the very first line will tell you how this could be detrimental to some of the safety of our Latino community or how they would -- the relationship that they would build with law enforcement.

This is pointing in the opposite direction by the way, at least in our community. And these are the type -- there are a couple of these similar bills I can introduce at least this session that would have that similar type of impact. And I think that the reason you're here is because we want to know how we can make relationships better at least in the policing side. This one would make it worse.

This is a specific example for the public and I want to make sure that you get a copy of it, of this bill. That is House file 26.

And unfortunately as much as I don't want to spend time on bills that might not even get a hearing,

I need to spend time to understand in case it does get a hearing, and it takes away from our time to be able to focus on education, economic development and moving forward in progress.

So I just wanted put that for the record. I can't wait for the day I don't have to, or our community doesn't have to deal with immigration.

Now there is another bill Senate file number 1720 on a probable work on folks like group media who has been working on these type of bills. I believe you have it semi file 1720.

This would be certification for victims of a crime. This is trying to create a uniform system across the state for U visas and how they get given out. I know because of this group's efforts over 100 U Visa applications having been filed in St. Paul Police Department, and I believe less than five have been granted.

I have to pause because that makes me think there is something wrong there. But I would like to give credit to the St. Paul Police Department because Officer Lasabo is working towards changing that and I

believe they are working on a new way to approach these new Visas. But this would make it where it would make it uniformal across the state. Or attempt to start having similarities across the state, because I think it's terrible for someone to have to think of having to file a U Visa and thinking well what city would I have to file it on? I hope that folks never have to think about what city they should file it on. They should file it in their own city, because they should be treated the same way across the state, yet that's not the case.

So I want to bring that to your attention, and of course obviously you already have heard about what is going on nationally and how the Latino community - immigrant communities are feeling across the state and across the country.

That's not any different here in the State of Minnesota. I used to get 20 phone calls a week, and after late November I get 20 phone calls a day. It's in reference to things we don't do as an agency. I can only imagine what folks that do this type of work, how many phone calls they get.

I'll leave it at that, and thank you for

coming and giving us the time to tell you how we feel here in Minnesota, it's a great state, a state that I choose to live in, and a state that I chose to come to. And I want to make sure that the way that I feel about this state continues onto the rest of our Latino community.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much.

MS. ANDERSON: Good morning everyone. My name is Roxanne Anderson, or Rox. My name tag says Out Front Minnesota, but I no longer work for Out Front Minnesota. I'm the Board Chair of the Minnesota Transgender Health Coalition. The Minnesota Health Coalition is committed to improving health care, access, and quality of health care received by transgender and nonconforming folks in Minnesota through education, resources and advocacy.

Transgender folks face discrimination as we've seen in a way that can be meaning shadowed to some other minority groups. In the State of Minnesota we're a little bit lucky in that my former employer Out Front Minnesota really went to bat when we did some of our human rights legislation to ensure that folks that

identify as transgender or gender nonconforming are protected under our Human Rights Act of Minnesota.

Policing in trans communities is nothing new. In fact, many of the ways in which LGBT folks celebrate hinge on a very important alliance between members of the LGBT community and police officers.

This riot of course known as stone wall. Stone Wall riots are what many cities and LGBT communities celebrate every summer. It is the pushing back of those who would impose a difference upon individuals. So what we do at THC is really make sure that transgender folks can access the health care system.

We have been really fortunate to be an organization in the City of Minneapolis as they work on the Transgender Work Force Group, or now it's being rolled out as the Transgender Equity Council and before that -- there is kind of two parts of it, but of the transgender issues were really identified five priority areas for the transgender community, and one of those areas was policing.

Our very first Minneapolis transgender

that we summit focused on community engagement. And right after that we followed up with policing.

From the very first community that we were that folks felt very intimidated, folks did not feel safe with the officers that were in the room and part of the work force group.

We worked alongside Chief Harteau and Deputy Chief Aaron Rondo to ensure officers in Minneapolis had an understanding of the unique challenges that some transgender folks face.

And through that community engagement process we found that folks were feeling like they didn't want to engage if officers were the ones to be there and they were going to be in uniform. So our Police Chief listened to that, and Deputy Chief Rondo listened to that and the next year officers showed up in their golf shirts and their khaki pants and made folks feel engaged and welcomed in a really different way. So like my colleague I think one of the very most important things we can do is engagement and getting to learn about each other and getting connected with each other in an important way.

Why don't I give you a little bit of information and kind of fill about the trans community? We have had lots of studies. Most recently a national study by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force did a specific kind of zero in on the trans community, and in their report in just in turn there is lots of information about trans community and how they are subjected to community policing, and policing in various ways.

Gender is this thing that is imposed by society on all of us, and we get that. We get that identification or we get that label, we get that more. It's given to us. It's handed to us, and we have the assignment of male or female.

And we know how that that distinguishing between male and female we view as kind of a reptilian thing. It says who we're safe with and who we're not safe with.

By our very nature as humans we are labeled people. And what's important to know I think about trans folks and community policing is that very labeling that often makes transgender folks suspect. What I mean by that is, often transgender folks don't have the

ability to have their ID or their identification match the way in which they present. And so when they come into contact with law enforcement they're often seen as being not truthful, being deceptive, of trying to run game, and play score with officers.

So in Minneapolis we're super lucky that Deputy Chief Rondo plays a part on Transgender Work Group and has that knowledge of our community to bring back to his officers.

In June of 2016, last year, the Minneapolis Police Department released their interactions with the transgender and gender nonconforming individuals. It's a new policy that is the result of this meaningful police and community collaboration that has happened with Chief Harteau and Deputy Chief Rondo and maybe other members that make up this body.

Why is it important and what are some of the things in which transgender folks have come up against? I think it's really important to just kind of pause at that very statement. And that is that LGBT folks have rights and certain protections under the law right now because of revolting against police departments.

In that very rebellious act of Stonewall transgender women, mostly transgender women of color who are of Latin and African descents fought back against harassment they were receiving at the hands of the police in Minneapolis, in New York.

I want to read some of the statistics so I'm going to pull them up from my smart phone. You can find this same information if you care to look for it.

So as I said in February of 2011 the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force along with the Center for Transgender Equality released this larger than ever survey of almost 700,000 respondents. And the report that came as a result of this is called Injustice At Every Turn.

Transgender and gender nonconforming people may have higher levels of interactions with police. They are more likely to interact with police because they are more likely to be victims of violent crime because they were more likely to be on the street in homelessness or being unwelcomed in their own homes.

Because of their circumstances, these folks are often forced to work in underground economy,

and because they face harassment and arrest because they are simply out in public while being transgender.

51 percent of respondents have had contact with the police as a transgender or gender nonconforming person.

46 percent of all of those surveyed felt they were uncomfortable when seeking police help.

22 percent of those who interacted with police reported being harassed by police officers due to their own implicit bias.

Transgender people of color reported that way to be much higher at 22 to -- sorry, 29 to 38 percent.

20 percent of those folks were denied equal services.

Six percent report being physically assaulted by police officers.

15 percent of African-American transgender people were physically assaulted by the officers that were arresting them.

Two percent were sexually assaulted by those officers.

Seven percent of African-American

transgender people have been assaulted by the police.

So around incarceration, 16 percent of trans and gender nonconforming people have been sent to jail and the figures were 47 percent for African American, and 30 percent for Native American and Indigenous folks. 21 percent of men transitioning to women, F to M, have been incarcerated compared to ten percent of those female to male folks.

So again we're looking at what is playing against that bias and misogyny, and a bias towards those folks who are presenting as gay.

70 percent were arrested or held in a cell solely due to anti transgender bias by the police office.

60 percent of those who have been incarcerated were physically assaulted.

15 percent reported being sexually assaulted by inmates or other staff while incarcerated.

So what does all of that mean? When you compare that with folks that are identifying on the plain of two spirit or Native American, we see those violence and assault rates go up.

Let me give you a couple of little filler stories. It happened right here in Minneapolis in 2005, or actually it was St. Paul. In 2005 the St. Paul police arrived at the home of a Native woman asking for her husband. And when she asked if they had a warrant, she was told they did not. The officers pushed in the door, knocked her down and her child got injured in that exchange.

She asked for an ambulance and the officers told her no. Eventually officers did call the ambulance and there were no charges filed in that case. Very interesting.

And so if you do the research you can find that there are many, many folks that have multiple identities, and one of those multiple identities come in contact with the folks that don't have training around the biases that we all have.

We see discrimination, and we see police interactions happening that may be changed or happen differently.

I feel that we're really privileged actually in Minnesota, especially in the City of

Minneapolis, to have a body like the Minneapolis Transgender Equity Council that works hand-in-hand with police officers to get the information and education they need so that when they come into contact with a trans individual they have different information.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you.

Mr. Sole: Don't give me a mic and set me out. All right.

I want you guys to really get out of your head, just feel it from the heart. This stuff is really emotional for me, just going through it with all of the calls, but in Minneapolis and NAACP, this stuff, so I want you to just follow along with me about law enforcement in Minneapolis and abroad.

So that's something to look at visually to look and learn. Oftentimes when they talk about law enforcement we just totally disregard the history of it. I'm not talking about slavery, but the history of law enforcement in America, like we can't get past that.

We talk about there is a history. We don't actually talk about correlations. We need to actually look at and trace their genealogy. We need to trace it

to see how it's infused in today.

Some people are in uniform and have a badge and a gun and are related to former slave masters and slave holders and people who work on the front lines trying to prevent people from having any civil rights in the 'fifties and 'sixties and throughout. We need to acknowledge that.

For me, when I was in Duluth, this was last year, I took a picture where the three guys were killed, where they were lynched on First Avenue there. I just wanted to feel what happened to them, feel the space.

In doing that I made a post, let's not forget the people that were killed here, let's acknowledge that they existed, and let's acknowledge what happened to them.

I even mentioned it at the conference, about 700, 800 people there. I mentioned it at the conference that I was there for.

The very next day, Mike Tusken, the police chief, did a press conference where I took the picture. And he said, I can't lie. My great aunt is the one who lied on those three black men. He's the police chief,

that's a direct correlation from the past to the present.

We need to acknowledge that and be able to draw those lines and make it more clear that it was a long time ago and time will heal. No, it's not a long ago; it's still happening. It's just been more sophisticated now.

So beyond my trust, and most people don't even stand up in those situations and they did deal that closely with slavery or lynchings and things like that, we need to be more clear about how that still impacts us.

Beyond that, we need to look at the history, as far as slave catchers, and I don't want to go through all of this because many of us know this. We need to start acting like we need to identify good officers when we see them. Hey, this is a good one. I know some good ones. I do. I'm not here to talk about the good ones; I'm here to talk about the bad ones who do a lot of terrorism in our communities, and that's what we need to acknowledge.

If the system allows for one person, or one

cop to be rogue, the entire system is at fault. If there is one rogue cop in any department, the entire system is flawed. Because if you're a good guy or one of the good ones, you should be diligent to get rid of the bad ones.

So we need to acknowledge the past, go on from slave catchers with the flashlight and the whip to a more formalized form of law enforcement that has to be looked at when we look at Minneapolis or St. Paul. We have to look at the roots of that.

Even here, I mean I know you seen me yesterday, and I didn't really want to show up here the way I showed up yesterday, but it's a lot of frustration coming through. We have to acknowledge that Minneapolis Police has been around for 150 years. I'm losing my patience with having conversations with them to get it right. You have had 150 years to get this thing right. I'm losing my patience to get it right.

Let me show you how it works. I'm about to use my intellectual labor in other ways. I shouldn't have to tell you how to do your job. And not only that, you give us reports and tell us that there are

comprehensive reports. I'm educated. I know a PowerPoint presentation from a comprehensive report. I can tell, so it's disrespectful, it is demeaning, and it shows that people are really not trying to do work. They convene certain groups of people. You know, people who they like, they say come on, tell is this, tell us that. Let's do this. But when people tell them things they don't like, we get excluded from the table. I was there for the first initial conversation. I was there at the beginning of all of this, I was with Rondo and all of those folks.

But as I continue to rise up against the practices saying let's not just talk about it, let's actually do this stuff. Let's do it day to day, let's stand up, and I got excluded from the table.

So it's like, I don't even know where the process is at this point, and I got to keep chasing behind them. If we want to have practices that work it has to be transparent, there has to be more dialogue. I haven't read a DOJ report thoroughly yet, but I wish -- I hope I can make some time to get to it.

But we need to acknowledge this. At this

hearing -- I forget when it was, it was last year sometime -- I talked about militarized weapons or, you know, wearing the camouflage and all of those things. And in that meeting Harteau said, we don't have military weapons here, and she even went as far as to say have you seen any? Which was really like, you know, I don't even know why I'm wasting my time constantly coming to this table.

But we went in the back, she took me and three or four others back, we didn't get anywhere, pretty much arguing. And other people tried to make it cordial, but these are the moments where we could actually could do something different and they're not willing to listen to the community folks, because they always say you guys don't know what it takes to be a police officer. I know what it takes to be a black person in America.

You get paid to do your job. You signed up, you filled out the application, you went through the physical. Don't tell me you have a tough job. I want to erase that from the conversation. You can step off and get a new job. I'm still going to be black.

Beyond there, we tried to have these conversations. November 2014 I got into a lot of trouble for saying that I was just coming back from Ferguson. Got into a lot of trouble for saying Minneapolis is one bullet away from Ferguson. I said that in a community forum well before Jamar Clark was killed.

But we had an opportunity. We had a bunch of people was at that meeting, close to 200, a lot of people were there. Harteau calls 30 minutes, an hour beforehand and says she's not showing up. She heard there was a threat, you know a threat to her.

Now in the Star Tribune the next day you got a picture of me, Dr. Rose Brewer, Jennifer Singleton from Police Conduct Oversight Commission, and Michaela was the moderator.

Now I'm sitting there, we're all on this page and you're talking about people threatening you, and you're reinforcing the stereotype against me, and I didn't deserve it. I didn't deserve to be sitting up there trying to do the right thing and then I have the chief of police turn it around and act like somebody who

was in there with us was threatening to harm her. And if there is a threat why don't you send some officers to help people who are in there. It's a threat, like come on, you're not going to do anything about it? Beyond that, Jamar Clark gets killed but that was a missed opportunity.

We could have figured out some things that would have prepared us for the Jamar Clark situation. We could have addressed it right then, it was called Lessons from Ferguson, so we all were prepared to do that then, that was a missed opportunity. So Jamar Clark gets killed.

Now I analyzed that case from top to bottom. If you read the Star Tribune articles, I put out extensive articles, because I analyzed that case from once I made it to that scene, looking at the blood, talking to the family, pulling witnesses out. I analyzed that case from top to bottom.

I know what happened in that 62 seconds. Jamar Clark should not be dead.

I outlined the policies that were violated. After a critical incident no officers should ride in the

car together. Harteau went on record saying the officers violated no policy, I outlined five policies that they violated.

I can't form a relationship with liars. I'm not at that point in my life, where I need to have friends, or have colleagues, or people I work with who are liars. I'm not there. I'm comfortable enough to walk away from that relationship and do other things in my life. I'm not going to keep coming to the table saying, hey, can you try this? Let's do this.

We keep hearing training. Some people can't be trained. I'm a trainer. Some people can't be trained. It's not a civil bullet. Some of these things will help and change the system on some levels but we got to understand what we're up against.

Now to talk about Ringgenberg. You talk about hiring practices this is another practice piece if you're looking at law enforcement. Ringgenberg never should have been hired by the Minneapolis Police Department. Should have never been hired because this is what he did. This is what he did, ironically to a man with the last name Clark just like Jamar Clark, he

brutalized this guy. Used racial slurs, was fired by the San Diego Police Department. Why would the Minneapolis Police Department hire him? Why?

Did they hire him because they knew he was like that? Why was he patrolling, why was he going out there at 2:00 in the morning with this background? So that's a practice that needs being looked at as well. And when people protest, when I say I haven't read the DOJ report, that's my bad. But when we rose up we saw what they were working with. We saw how they tried to treat people. We saw them harass people. We even heard the negative comments when five people were shot.

People knocked on the door asking for help and the response was, isn't this what you wanted? No, we didn't. Five people get shot and the charges were weak. If that would have been a black person who shot five people of any race they would have got sent away. No weak charges, no premeditation, nothing, you shoot five people.

This is what we're talking about. This is what we see, the hatred. This is what many people --- and I have a voice, I'm older, I drive. We have some

young, current youth who don't have a voice like mine, who can't sit at this table, so they lead protests, which is legal. It's legal to protest, and I'll be there to support them every day of the week. But it's important to acknowledge what we bring out when we do these things, we bring out the most hateful people.

I'm going to speed it up, I'm passionate about this stuff. But when you have somebody who comes down here and talk about killing eight black guys, not only that, you have to draw the lines between white supremacy and law enforcement.

Because after he have shot five people who did he call? He called his friend who was a Mankato police officer. Why would you have a friendship with someone who you know is a white supremacist? Why? I think it's very telling, and I wonder if the police weren't some of the people who called him down there to do it.

Because we saw those racist tapes from him. We saw it, I went to the court and had to sit through that. Some of the racism that was being spewed from a law enforcement official who got all of this power. We saw how he chose to use it, how he chose to vilify black

people. Bob Kroll is coming here. I was hoping he would be here, for this part man, really.

I was hoping man, I'm just getting sick of them. White supremacists, heat. They know this is a white club. Why we playing? Come on if you really want to do this stuff, get rid of people like that.

That's when I know this stuff is real, because a lot of times I'm a part of the stuff, and I'm like hoping and praying it's the solution. I'm hoping this is the right table to take us out of this subjugation. Hoping that this slavery will end. Like I said we pour our hearts out, it's like are people really listening?

Why would you allow this guy to stay there? Look at his record and see how many times he's been in front of Internal Affairs. How many officers do you need?

I got too much to tell you. I think we need to acknowledge beyond law enforcement and look at what is happening with the legislature as well. I just left over there, nothing but hatred going throughout committees. Passing all kind of things, opening a prison, it goes,

stand your ground, it goes, whatever. It goes.

We need to acknowledge it's not what we asked. Once the session ended last year, he vilified Jamar Clark, go to the article in the Star Tribune, if you want to not get killed, don't be a thug. Pull up your pants, don't be out at 2:00 am, a bunch of trash. And you're the Public Safety Chair. If you want to do the work this is how we get there.

He shouldn't be in there making decisions, because I know what he thinks of people that look like me, people who look like my daughters, that's very real to me. So we rise up. Like I said I'm putting a lot on the line, you know I understand when I go in my home I got to watch, I got to close the garage doors to make sure my daughters are okay.

This is real for me, there's people who want to harm me. But I'm going to put everything on the line, not just sit in the ivory tower and write books. I'm at that point in my career, I can do that. It's more important that I come down there because there's guys behind the wall that see hope, somebody who can fight that felony conviction, somebody who is willing to rise

up and use their platform for good and do it with integrity.

So you're going to constantly see me, you're going to constantly hear my voice because I'm sick of this. I'm sick of this. Now things are coming out about, the woman lied, to have Emmett Till killed. That was a lie. Mike Brown didn't rob the store. These things come out later, so I'm going to sacrifice everything right now even if that means death, I'm going to sacrifice it right now because I know what I want to see in this world. I know what we can be.

So I end with this: a lot of us are at the point where we're tired of trying to work this stuff out with the police. You have to think, did it make sense for a slave to try to negotiate with the slave master?

I'm beyond trying to talk to them and tell them about their stuff, they get a check at the end of the day.

The NAACP is volunteer. I'm not going to keep coming to them telling them how to do their job. 150 years of trash, not identifying one officer who did good over here, one over here. No, if the system allows

for one rogue cop to stay in uniform, the entire system is flawed. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Mr. Stoll. Fartun Weli?

MS. WELI: I don't know what to say after that.

Good morning, Madame Chair, committee. My name is Fartun Weli. I'm proud to be here this morning. I'm black and Muslim, on behalf of all Somali Americans I would like to extend solidarity to all the refugees and migrants of the world who are facing tremendous hardship, and say to them to be strong and may God and his angels be by their side.

I'm Executive Director of Isuroon, and my profession is public health with 20 years of health care experience. I migrated to Minnesota in 2000 so I'm a Y2K immigrant, and I worked hard to achieve some of my dreams and some are still on the bucket list. I will get to them soon hopefully.

My interests are addressing the root cause of poverty, racism and the other issues affecting women of color. The organization I lead, again it is women

that --- community-driven organization and it's motivated by the belief that Somali women and girls deserve to be healthy and have strong bodies.

We are linguistic and cultural bridge connected to wellness and information, trusted health care providers and financial literacy, civic engagement and leadership. Our name, Isuroon, means a woman who can take care of herself.

With our courage and our resources Somali women and girls in Minnesota can overcome obstacles such as language barrier, racism, religious intolerance, navigate a complex and unfamiliar health system and become advocates for their own physical and social wellbeing.

Our programs, quickly, we do research. Our research we specifically do research which is community participant research. That means the communities are the driving seat. They choose what their priorities are, develop with culturally-specific programs, communication strategy.

Our biggest program right now is ethnic food shelf. Minnesotan people of color, immigrants are

struggling with poverty, which I'll get to later.

We serve 200 Somali families per month. We have refugee case managements that connect more refugees to community resources, and help them move to upward mobility. It's very important that we catch them the first year. Otherwise they are stuck in poverty and it's the either system, they are stuck in poverty.

Go to the health literacy and civic engagement. When our Co-Chair had approached me and said could you testify, I said why? We have been to so many tables talking about how bad our community is hurting.

So with our relationship he said this is a very important space, we need to come in and talk about it.

We talk about community relationship. Usually what happens to the conversation about how to work with person of color, how to work with women of color, how to work with immigrants, comes down --- the office is located on the twenty-fifth floor. And then the community is invited in, to get their body in. And women of color in Minnesota, whether it's an immigrant,

or African American or Native American, they are at the bottom of the barrel.

Our state always ranks top three top five, but when it comes to people of color and immigrants we are also in the worst healthcare, poverty, lack of jobs, lack of housing.

So when police people or people who are leading the community relations, community outreach, invite the community in, which mom will come to the table, when she is worried about feeding her kids, or trying to find a safe place, or trying to find her teenager in trouble because of the poverty that has been sweeping through our community, to find a police or to try to out of prison or something. The priority is very obvious.

And then we hear from the police groups in other communities who are trying to work with people of color, where we invited them, they never come. Where is the priority? It's almost like they never understand. Honestly we're trying to figure out, what are their priorities.

So there is totally different priorities

and it's easy to dismiss because from the get go, there were no strategies. Every year the same strategies being developed. But if you look back, nothing is being developed and nothing is being moved, as Jason was talking about.

Given that Minnesota right now has the largest Somali police officers in the police. Police officers our communities they're doing well they're trying to outreach to our community, other communities of color.

Actually I speak for Somalis, we have about 18 or 19 police officers, but those police officers are almost struggling as any other person of color that is in the institution that Jason was talking about, the root causes of racism is there. So they really are surviving.

When I developed this presentation I talked to some of our Somali professionals, I talked to new moms, I talked to people who have been here for a while like me. And they say, why are you going there? You will be labeled as a troublemaker. Doors will be closed. Even coming here and talking to you and our human rights

there is an invisible line in the middle that you cannot cross, no matter how educated, no matter how committed you are.

Because people in the system have a way of cutting you off. It is that fear of intimidation, don't speak about this, don't speak about that.

Somali also right now, with the rhetoric about racism and Islamophobia. Somali women are also on high alert. If you look at what is happening in Somali right now the famine is wiping out women and children.

The women who came here with our kids is almost like some of us are survivors of that kind of famine. Survivors of refugee camps, they see their boys and girls the last resort of hope and dreams.

What they are fighting is poverty. Right now every Somali kid, their moms think that they are a target for potential terrorists. All Somali mothers are either paranoid or there is some truth to it because they feel they are always attacked. Their boys will not get any chance to even get a court or a hearing because of some incentives.

So how do you build trust is the key here. Our priorities are totally different. We're not talking about the same level of conversation. People are already trying to say, we'll change the system. Their intentions are never moving forward and trying to have a person of color, an immigrant person, an equal.

We hear oh, you have a language barrier. You don't understand the system. Some people have Bachelor's degrees, it doesn't mean if you don't speak English you're stupid. In fact some people speak eight languages, they're PhD holders. People are acting like they're stupid.

The only thing is I don't speak English , but I practically can manage the whole system that you're running, I know what you're doing. So there is a way to remove the responsibility and dignity from immigrants.

Immigrants in Minnesota will contribute. Even though poverty is what we're facing, which is the first generation of immigrants always look at, poverty is the key because that's why they move from where they came from.

We're contributing. For example, Somali women have the highest small owner shops, about 75 million dollars we contribute to our state. What we're doing is -- those investments never came back to the community to claim. The system that exists right now whether it is the health, education, whatever it is, the healthcare system, our schools, it was never designed to serve black person or immigrant person upward mobility.

It's the after fact. So how can we succeed? How can a woman of color or an immigrant woman be at the table when she is busy putting up fight of poverty?

Long story short. Nothing about the present task force was not done. The internal and external investigation of the use of force in cases of police use of force resulting in death, officer involved in shooting, that's the part I'm reading about, the action items of the report.

The fact that these recommendations had to be included in this report completes the point that neither priorities for external and internal

investigation, those solutions are not met, or are not put in place, nothing.

Moreover, despite these recommendations, the federal government has taken no steps to recommend or promote implementation of these recommendations at the state, local level where the vast majority of police misconduct issues are arising.

In conclusion I want to thank you for being here, I want to thank you for listening to all this passion conversation, but we're sick and tired of talking.

People are actually pulling us in and coming to the table.

But to build trust, we have to stop justifying shooting of black kids so a white cop can get away with it. A life has to be important, how do you bring communities to the table when they already know a black kid is being shot, a Somali kid is being persecuted, is being set up to be a terrorist? Because from the eleven years old, having trouble with school, he's already being labeled as a potential terrorist. Let's nab him, let's get him.

If we want to build relationships we have to build trust. We want to build trust. We want to come to the table, but not when the decision is made, twenty-fifth floor. We're not interested, but we come to this table over and over again because we're desperate for relationship-building. We're desperate in some sort of movement. That movement is not going to come from the police system. We as communities of color need to be empowered. We're already empowered, thank God.

The report talking about police mental health system, helping the police to understand and figure out about the pressure.

What happens to the community that is living under the scrutiny of police officers, what about the community that's living under terror about the mental health, where is that community's support? We're also concerned about the police's mental health. Yeah, we do, I care about them, I have friends who help.

All I'm saying is hopefully the next time I see you here, or your other colleagues come here, we want to see one step moved forward. Persecution of the

police who are killing our people, they need to see a law that is equal. Protect and serve is not for only white people. Thank you very much.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you for your statements panelists and I will open this up for questions from the committee members. Are there any questions? Mr. Vischer?

MR. VISCHER: So this committee has no direct authority, we're an advisory committee, so we will be very good at issuing reports and you've seen reports in the past.

If you could advocate for the committee to get behind one concrete idea that possibly could be implemented in the foreseeable future, what would that idea be?

MS. ANDERSON: I would go for implicit bias training by and for those folks that are affected, not by some big firm or some strategist, but really having in-depth training by those folks that are most affected by police brutality. Paid. Paid.

MR. JIMENEZ: The current situation for the Latino community I would say for no police

department or no police officer to be used as immigration enforcement officers.

MR. SOLE: I would want you to try to get the police departments to clean house. If you could do one thing, get rid of all of the ones you see, and know, who done, you know, bad things. So clean house. If you could do one thing, go in there, clean it up top to bottom, get the ones out of there. I know you got union challenges, but we need to see officers that care about the people they're protecting and serving. So I want you to try to implement some form of cleaning house or weeding out all of those who, you know, are immoral or do things that are unethical.

MS. WELI: So what everyone said are great ideas. The biggest barrier or kids of color, women of color is poverty. Our state is a wealthy state. They know where the money is. We as immigrants, we people of color contribute to the state.

If one thing can be done is, what we contribute. Parks get money because we pay taxes. We invest into the state's tax and economy. Some of that money should be coming back to the community and

investing in it.

So we're not becoming vulnerable women and their families are in poverty, the investment comes in. I'm not saying we're still going to be protected, but at least we don't have those Somali ties out and more community members are coming to the table and driving that agenda because right now it's all about priority. I would like to put the poverty fire out.

And when you talk to legislators, when you talk to people who supposedly are at the table in the system, they all worry about where are they going to get at that money? When a person of color asks for resources for their community they're like, where is that tax money going to come from? I have to protect tax payer dollars.

It's never, what does the person of color contribute? We're always looked at, but we contribute so much money. We need to find those dollars badly for our community, so it's poverty.

Long story short. And poverty has been happening for hundreds of years, I'm just an immigrant, I've just been here for 16 years, but I know how it is

1 treated in our communities of color.
2 For us to have moms and dads and youth to
3 be to be at the table, we have to address the poverty
4 and those dollars aren't coming from us. We just have
5 to get those back into the community.
6 CHAIR KORBEL: Any more questions? Ms.
7 Guadarrama?
8 MS. GUADARRAMA: This question is for Mr.
9 Jimenez, mainly. We have had panelists before you from
10 the Council for Minnesotans of African Heritage, and he
11 said that even though the board --- the board
12 representing communities of color are appointed by the
13 government, they are not -- really they don't have
14 really the power and as well as they are not consulting
15 especially in connection to police practices and
16 immigration.
17 MR. JIMENEZ: That's a good question. My
18 colleague Dr. Porter and I as well as Cea Byrd of the
19 Asian Pacific Council and then Ms. Olsa from the
20 American Indian Council and myself are the four ethnic
21 councils in the state. We have a staff of four. We do
22 stand by our work. We have a budget of 386,000 a year.

I think as much as we want to take on policing and any others things that are not fair it would be very difficult. And the reality that we face right now is just focusing on these four areas is --- I have a staff or a team member of mine in her last pay period was 123 hours in a two-week pay period. That's not normal for anybody. That shouldn't be how people work, right? That's just focused on her education area.

Imagine how much more we're focusing on these other areas like health, for right now it's an uphill battle whichever way you see it, at the national or state level.

So as much as I do want to address some of these policing issues and how often I get these questions about what is the relationship between the police department in St. Cloud or Worthington in reference to immigration enforcement.

It would be something I would love to be able to do where I can go across the state to meet with the sheriffs and say how important it is for them to make sure they address those concerns to our Latino communities across the state. Unfortunately for the

next couple of months the legislative process will have bills like the one that Jason mentioned where it is detrimental to our communities. And the place that our communities should have expected us to be right now is at the state capitol. As you can see in the bills that I showed you, the first was 26, and the first day of bills that were introduced I identified three bills that were detrimental to our community. The first 29 bills that were introduced three of them were detrimental. Not positive but detrimental to our community.

And there are almost 4,000 bills introduced already, and there's four of us. Those are the realities that we face, and I'm hoping that we can establish a better relationship with the governor's office and other state legislators, both Democrats and Republicans, to make sure that they can say, you know our council does provide quality information from our public committees. But the only way I can do that is by obtaining and receiving that information from our committees. And so we're as strong as our communities are.

So I don't know if that answers your

question, but it's my attempt.

MS. WELI: I just want to add quickly because part of the work I do is through the legislation as well in our communities, again it comes down to money power. We have so many things to do, just give you one thing and you focus on that where what is required for our communities, immigrants and people of color, is a system thinking. Siloism doesn't work for us. And it never did.

Those of us who are figuring out how to work and help our communities, we cannot just focus on the police. We have to focus on the -- preventing our kids from meeting the police.

It starts from pre-pregnancy, maternal and child health, child development, education, the whole life cycle, and that requires a continued funding and a continued support.

So again the priorities are being set for us, which ones should we choose and which ones should we not. So we are always in that space of who does make the decision to give the money they are going to give you, are also dictating where you cannot have a fire

coming through all of the areas so they would control you with their resources.

CHAIR KORBEL: Any other questions from the committee, if not, we've got about ten minutes before we need to break. Anyone from the public that wishes to make a statement may not be able to join us when reconvene at 1:15. If you would like to do so, please do so now and I just ask that you limit your statement to about five minutes and also please note there is an opportunity for you to write your comments and send those in and also there is an open forum session this afternoon at 4:20. If there is anyone who would like to come down and state your name and your statement, please. Mr. McAfee, and then you.

MR. MCAFEE: I think what pains me is ---

CHAIR KORBEL: State your name please, for the record.

MR. MCAFEE: Jerry McAfee, M-C-A-F-E-E. I forget who it was that said that to do the same thing twice and expect a different result, I think that they call that stupidity.

I've been sitting in this seat for over 20

some years. The only thing that's changed about any of this has been the names. I've heard about the civilian review authority, well many of us helped start it. The reason why many of us who helped start it walked away was because they took subpoena power out of it, because it wasn't going to be effective then and what amazes me is that we continue to think there's going to be a different result when we were told even people in our community, if you join this committee it's not going to do any good, it's only going to lead to frustration.

To my brother Kirk, you talked about New York, they had something there called code four, they had weed and seed, and a lot of other of those things started by Chuck Wexler with Honeywell and a lot of the other companies supported where a bunch of our people was harassed and arrested for crimes against property. They just rescinded one last year about spitting on the sidewalk.

I'm wondering when do we get to a point where we utilize what's been done. I'll guarantee you if you go back 20 years or more every police chief has said the same thing. If you're expecting for this crime

and this issue with the police and stuff to be solved it will not be arrested away. It will not be arrested away. And we continue to think the same thing because what winds up happening on the real, and my beloved brother was wrong when he talked about how great it's been with the police and businesses and stuff, they are doing that stuff downtown to try to help get stuff right for the Super Bowl and not exacting change.

Here is what needs to happen from my perspective: A, we got to do it as a community because to expect the police to have a good relationship with the people that they are supposed to contain and maintain, all you got to do is look at when they sign their pledge, what's in their pledge when they take their oath of office, it basically talks about they can't deal with criminals, well if you got a bunch of criminals in the community, how you going to turn around after you took this oath of office to deal with it and not sit down with folks who want to turn their life around.

Most of us know that when we do something one time, they're going to hold it against us forever

and 16 days. So the change begins with us as a community and then as we deal with it as a community nobody needs to tell us anything about money because -- we know we need some but you know what, change is going to have to come from us without the money. Because to expect anybody to fund our freedom we're going to continue in this crazy cycle because they're not. Who in their right mind would ever think that the minute Sessions gets in the first thing he does is take away the ban on private prisons and not think that that won't come down on our heads. Because they are going to continue to do this. And so I say in closing, what we have got to do is come up with our own plan and our own system for dealing with our own issues A), to try to minimize the contact between the police and the community because the bottom line is this, the African American police officers that we got on the force, how many of them are brought on charges.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, sir.

MR. FEIST: Madam Chair, may I be excused please?

CHAIR KORBEL: Certainly. Your name,

please, for the record.

MS. REDMOND: Leslie Redmond R-E-D-M-O-N-D. Hello, it is an honor to be here with you all today. I'm a Washington DC native. I came to Minnesota three years ago to attend law school at the University of St. Thomas School of Law. I'm a first generation college student. My introduction to the legal field was from the opposite side growing up in the inner city of DC and seeing the war on drugs, there were a lot of faces that look like mine that were constantly being incarcerated. But the faces that were defending them or prosecuting them didn't look like mine so I thought in order to see the change that I want I have to become that change, and we know that change only happens from within.

With that said, I think that it's time to bridge the gap, it's time for us to come together as a collective whole. No man is an island within himself.

One of the huge issues is that we think that it can be one or another. We think they can be the lawyers and the judges, or the police officers, or government, or the community, and that's where we fail.

The community, government, police

officers, we all have to come together and not only have dialogue but actually move toward solutions. We do a lot of alternative dispute resolution and I see that they're solution-oriented, but it's important also to have that information-gathering period where people are able to give their testimonies.

I grew up in a family with a number of police officers, people who've retired off the force in Washington DC, and to be in Minnesota and experience the fourth precinct in the governor's mansion was extremely disheartening. For the first time I felt like America was fighting against me and not fighting with me, and to see it physically. There was a war going on in our own backyard and people wasn't even having conversations about it. Major media outlets wasn't even covering it.

I was there the night where the five protestors were shot. I was there standing beside a three-year old and an eight-year old. And what was ironic was that it was a police officer and I did an interview with Democracy Now! and stated this, it was a police officer who was over the precinct walls with

a ski mask on, that looked identical to the gunman. This was right before I stored those photos in my phone and moments before the gunman came down. I thought it was just a method of trying to interrogate us, to make us feel frightened. However when the gunman showed up, and when the police officer did not run to our defense, but they came swarming from the other area and ended up macing the protestors and this was what I saw with my own two eyes, this was nothing that I read in the newspaper.

And so for me, I just felt like wow, has it come to the point where we become so set in Republicans against the Democrats, and police against the community where you can't stand together and see right versus wrong. Where is our moral authority in this time. It's not about black, it's not about white, it's not about voice, it's not about community members. It's supposedly for the betterment for America, for the world, for humanity and we have lost sight of that. It's time for us to recognize the wrong and realize there does need to be a paradigm shift. We do need to change and challenge the status quo. But we can do that

together, it doesn't have to be an or approach, it can be both. But in order to move forward we have to acknowledge what has happened, what we want to see happen and be able to move forward and create authentic change and that only happens together. And recognize that Minnesota has been doing good work, but we want to do great work and move forward together.

So thank you. I think this conversation is the beginning, I think to whom much is given much is required. You all have been given a great position. You can create change and I urge you all to listen to the testimonies, listen to the stories because they are real and let's create change together. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. We will use this as a stopping place. We will recess and reconvene here in this chamber at 1:15 for our first law enforcement panel.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Good afternoon, everybody, my name is Velma Korbel. I'm the Chair of the Minnesota State Advisory Committee to the US Commission on Civil

Rights.

This is a public meeting open to the media and the general public. This will include a presentation by each of our panelists for approximately 12 to 15 minutes. After all of the panelists have concluded their statements committee members will engage them in questions and answers.

To accommodate persons who are not on the agenda but wish to make statements we have scheduled an open forum for today from 4:20 to 5:00 p.m.

If there is time before, at the end of this panel we will accept statements. If not, please put your name on the sign up list to make a statement at 4:20 this afternoon.

At this time I will turn the mic over to our first law enforcement panel.

Good afternoon.

CHIEF HARTEAU: Good afternoon, thank you for having us. I'm Janee Harteau, the Chief of Police for Minneapolis.

Instead of just prepared remarks, I put together a Prezi visual with a lot of information so I'm

going to go over it quickly, but you also have a copy of it. I'll try to highlight, and I'll try to set my timer so I won't go too long.

CHAIR KORBEL: I've got you.

CHIEF HARTEAU: Okay.

So before I go into what we do with the 21st Century Policing I think it's important to set the tone with where we started at the end of 2012, 2013 when I became chief.

We embarked on what we call MPD 2.0, and that was us really transforming our organizational culture into one of a culture of accountability, and one that was grounded in our core values.

And one of the things that I had mentioned in my swearing-in was the guiding principle I would ask all officers to abide by and ask the question of all of their actions, and that was the simple question but it had very strong meaning. And that is, did my actions reflect my accountability in all the interactions.

The other component of 2.0 is our core values of commitment, integrity, transparency, and our goals for the department, which are public safety,

public trust, employee engagement and morale. I firmly believe that -- our number one priority is public safety, but we can't do that to the level we need to unless we have strong, solid public trust and we have healthy, engaged employees.

So that's where we began -- and this is not working.

We believe that accountability starts top down, so we looked at new performance management training of our supervisors so that supervisors knew how to be supervisors. And I never ask anyone to do anything that I wouldn't do myself so this was really the beginning of our change in our culture.

Immediately after I introduced 2.0 I actually asked the Office of Justice Programs to come in and take a look at our discipline process and give us a thorough diagnostic review of what those look like. And I did that because I heard community members ask for years to come in and have an inside look, a third-party look. And I'm one that believes when you're really close to something sometimes you can't see things that need to be changed and can be improved, and I'm not

afraid to have somebody come in and say, you can do this better. And that's exactly why we did that.

We had the Office of Justice Programs come in, they were here for two years, they gave us five recommendations to improve: performance management; communications; community engagement; our early intervention system for our officers; and police conduct and review. So we have committees that --- next -- that consist of community members, MPD leadership -- and keep going -- and community members.

Next one please.

So these five sub committees set to work on improvement processes since 2013. Next.

So then we come to 2015. The President's 21st Century Task Force, and the six pillars in the task force and what we did learn is I assigned all my key staff to look at those six pillars and say what are the recommendations? What is it that we're doing that support those recommendations, what are we not doing and why aren't we doing them and let's prioritize them. What we did learn is we were all looking on the path of many things that supported the pillars. We weren't

doing all of them certainly, but we were doing many of them. Next.

So one of the key components of the ability to public trust is procedural justice training and sustainability. We have, as you see up there, all of our sworn officers have been trained in both implicit bias and procedural justice training.

We were moving in 2017 now we have a key ambassadors within the organization that train on a more continual basis on procedural justice, not just internally with our civilian staff, but also out in the community. So we've been training and we've been scheduling for this year to involve the community in that training as well.

Another part of that is I believe it's the sustainability, so we put together a vision in which we have our community collaborative advancement, and that is taking the initiatives we've done to talk more about those with the national initiative and other incentives and ensuring that we institutionalize it in everything we do. We cannot be just as simple as training, it really has to be do you practice procedural justice.

Do you do that in your promotional process? Do you do that in fairness and other ways? It's about having a voice and being respectful. We need to make sure that we do that with our officers and we do that with the community. Next please.

As most people know we do have body cameras on all of our responders, they do that both on duty and off duty. Next.

Tracking dashboard. So as Theresa knows, it was brought to our attention by the ACLU, is that there were some discrepancies and certainly disparate treatment in how many people of color were in the categories of traffic stops, suspicious persons. But for me it wasn't as simple as the numbers, it was the why.

The only way we could really understand the why is if we started to track the numbers. So what we now do, beginning on September 15th, we got to get the computer to cooperate with what our needs were to capture the data. It's a look at any time an officer does those proactive things, suspicious vehicle stop, suspicious persons, traffic, truancy, curfew and

others, we get all of the demographic data, not just ethnicity, gender, we do other things as well, if somebody identifies as trans, so we make sure that we have those components in there.

We also look at if we received a 911 call with the description of the individual to make sure we're making all those connections, so we need to truly understand what's transpiring with those stops and why. We know the disparities of the numbers. But we have to understand why. Next.

And if you can zoom in on that, thank you.

So in 2015 we also looked at our uses of force and how we do training. I'm actually a board member of the Police Executive Research Forum that came out with the 30 guiding principles to change use of force, and the recommendations, we have implemented most of them, not all of them. Some are just not viable for our department in how they are, but most of them are. We have been doing de-escalation training has been for many, many years. But we made some changes in them as well.

We also had a great emphasis on telling

officers it's okay to slow down. I'm not saying retreat, I'm saying slow down. I think as a society we expect officers to end a situation quickly, and we're saying you can keep yourself safe, but everybody needs to be safe, which is part of our sanctity of life policy.

It means everybody goes home safe at the end of the day, not just the mindset of the officers go home safe, which I want them to go home safe, but the goal is that everybody goes home safe, so we have a new sanctity of life policy.

We also have the duty to report and a duty to intervene. So if an officer sees another officer engaging in what they deem to be unnecessary uses of force, they do have a duty to intervene and a duty to report. Those are two things that theoretically should have occurred and really frankly did, not all of the time I assure you, but most often, but now it's actually a policy. Next.

We also track positive police conduct, and what I mean by that, for years we've been doing what most people have is some type of program. We do meetings every week, we talk about crime trends and patterns,

where we put our resources, what does the crime look like, and we hold people accountable, how many traffic stops did you make, what did you do? Right?

Well, we found that, more than outputs, outcomes matter and people care about process, so we also need to know what gets tracked and what gets measured. It is done. So now we're sending the message that we're interested in the positive police contacts. And what you do in the community has a positive impact on crime and relationships, but isn't captured in those categories of law enforcement activities being a risk, so we now track those and we've only been doing it now, this is our third year so our numbers are pretty dramatic, because we've been having a trend, they continue to go up all the time, because officers know we're watching that and supervisors know we're looking at those things. Next.

Complaint process updates. We learned sometimes through things that we have done, sometimes police, our commissioned police community, now I've forgotten -- Police Conduct Oversight Commission, I'm sorry, they went out and we learned unfortunately we

weren't as good as we thought we were with letting people know what was the complaint process, right, how you make a complaint.

When you go to a different precinct, it was as though you were going to a different police department, you're getting a different response.

That's on me, that's on the leadership. We didn't train our officers, we have desk officers that come and go. Nobody really owned the desk. Back in the 60s, 70s we had desk sergeants. We don't have those anymore.

So it's clear to me that to give them adequate information and train them on how to do complaints, we have cards that people get handed out so they know exactly who to call, and there is a manual sitting at the desk, whoever is there to explain to people the complaint process.

So there is always this belief that if I can't make a complaint I can make it not easy for me that we don't want to take on, that's an accurate, we just need to educate our officers on how to accept those complaints.

National initiatives, so very shortly after the President's Task Force recommendations came out on 21st Century policing. There were over 100 cities in this country that put in for the national initiative, and that was basically a three-year award and assistance from the Attorney General's office to help us in areas of procedural justice, implicit bias, and racial reconciliation. We were out of those 100 plus cities, we were one of six that were selected.

So we've been working with the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice. Next. The improvements we have made is we have created a division solely focused on our hiring and recruiting and making sure that we are obviously reflective of the city that we serve, but ensuring that we're going out and actively recruiting frankly the good cops. I want diverse cops not just in ethnicity frankly, but in their view of the world. Because we deal with a variety of people, we deal with people in a variety of situations, we deal with those with mental illness. So if we can get officers that have more skill sets, and more experiences, and more understanding of the community,

which I think is the greatest characteristic a police officer can have, then that's what we want to tap into. So I have an officer who is now a commander with four years of experience who has taken this on, this is really what his life's seen.

On there it says one of our most recent graduation class, 40 percent was diverse, actually my last CSO class, which is our community service officer class, was 66 percent diverse. We're certainly increasing our numbers overall in the department. It has 22 percent diversity which is a slight increase over half. We're moving in the right direction. Next.

It's really hard to capture all we've done in community engagement. So we've listed just a handful of things, but what's highlighted on there is cops love cars. So beginning with my tenure I really want to focus on bringing frankly a suburban feel to an urban department. When I'm told more often than not it's people complain to us that we don't know your officers. We see them drive by really fast and they don't see us unless it's during a crisis. Well, how do you take a very busy department where cops are running

from call to call, and do you give them an opportunity to connect with people. You have more and more neighborhood beats. You have cops out of their cars connecting with people. I was a beat cop in Chicago in the mid-nineties and that's when we were "Murderopolis," and that's when we were calling the National Guard to take care of things, so anybody who tells me that violent crime is worse than it's ever been, I'd love to talk to them.

But I learned everything I needed to know about being a good cop frankly and being a good chief by walking a beat. I didn't have that squad car, I didn't have that barrier, I got out and I talked to people and I knew everybody and they told me everything I needed to know. We had a great working relationship.

There is a plethora of things we're doing, but one of the things that we're trying to ensure is that we have enough resources so the officers can connect with people outside of the crisis. They have that as part of their assignment, that they're not just handling 911 calls, and I'm recruiting. Next slide.

Between 2013 and 2015 we actually started

working with the Police Executive Research Forum, we're looking at procedural justice in a very concentrated area, and we looked at Cedar Riverside, and we thought if we could really have an impact and create a process to really improve procedural justice, it would be a good place to start, with a group of folks that of course due to history and past do not have a whole lot for the police department, and so we had 12 officers that worked there. We talked a lot about policing, how things work, how we report crimes, you know what happened, crime went up there, and people that didn't work, well crime up because people started reporting it, because they knew what was crimes and what weren't and they had trust in the police department. We have two beat officers, actually one is promoted to sergeant now so he is no longer a beat officer, and they were great at all they did. We wanted to make sure that we took other officers and they could have that same type of relationship. Next.

MPD is one of the first national initiative cities to begin this. I actually go out, meet with a variety of communities, some of those are listed there.

We're actually talking about history, I acknowledge history, I acknowledge the role, this isn't about me personally saying I did anything wrong. I'm okay with saying, you know what, law enforcement did play a role, whether people want to agree or disagree, in racism in this country and the history. I make that acknowledgment. We just talk about, we have to make certain acknowledgments in history before we can move forward and so that's what those sessions are, where we're starting from. I'm sorry. Thanks.

MPD self-care. I just want to mention this briefly. We do know that members of our community certainly that are exposed to violence and trauma and we see repeat cycles of violence because of that, but our officers too have been exposed to trauma, and we're doing resiliency and self-care for officers. We have to take care of them. People don't want to talk about that a lot, but that is the key need. We can't just hire the right people, we have to ensure they're also going to take care act of an aging department and I resemble that remark.

I've been here 30 years, you know, two weeks

ago, and I'm 35 so that's a shock. But our officers have seen a lot of violence over their careers, they have seen a lot of things, and they don't send them home when they see those. When you see a baby die, or you see a murder in the street, they don't go home, they go to the next call. We need to take care of them. Because when you look back into history, and you look back into uses of force, oftentimes those that use force have more history of brute force and exposure.

I'll just say there is just a plethora of things that we're doing, and I would encourage you to go to insidempd.com, you got a copy of this, you got a copy of that, so you can really look at all of the initiatives because I couldn't possibly touch them in the time that I have.

LT. KROLL: Madam Chair, my time's going to be this much, so that's the nice part about going after the Chief. She can continue on. I may be here for questions. I have very little.

CHAIR KORBEL: Okay, we'll come back to the chief, because I'm sure we'll have questions for her too. Why don't you go ahead, Mr. Kroll.

LT. KROLL: Do I need the mic or not?

CHAIR KORBEL: I probably would do the mic because we're also recording.

LT. KROLL: I'm Lieutenant Bob Kroll, president of the Police Officers Federation of Minneapolis. I represent the officers of the rank of patrol officer, sergeant, and lieutenant with the MPD. As I said, the nice part about going after the chief is she has pretty PowerPoint presentations and very well spoken, I'm the opposite end of the spectrum. I made myself available for questions. I don't have a prepared PowerPoint or much of a statement other than we've complied with what the president's task force had requested our department to do in every aspect, and I think it's time we move forward. There is a new president now. The last president I think did more to hurt race relations in this country than help them.

And there's a couple of specific cases that it started off with, Professor Henry Gates and Sergeant James Crowley in Massachusetts. It was a simple matter of the sergeant was responding to a burglary in progress and an African American professor was there who refused

to show ID. He made an incident out of it and the officer took him into custody. The president comes out and says the officer acted stupidly, the sergeant acted stupidly. I think that hurts.

All of our officers are looking for is immediate compliance and question after the fact. If everybody in a perfect world complies with the directives that are given to them, law enforcement on the scene that are discovering dynamic, rapidly evolving situations, the idea is comply with what the officer requests you to do and question after the fact. And I think that was it, from the very start of the presidency, set us back and things go on from there.

Of course we had the Eric Garner situation, he said he couldn't breathe 11 times. Now if you can't breathe, you can't say you can't breathe, particularly 11 times. It was a false narrative, and then you add the Ferguson, the hands up, don't shoot. It was investigated and proven that hands were not up.

So those types of false narratives that were perpetuated in the media and perpetuated by politics at play, whether it's through peace

organizations, things like this. This has set us back greatly and our officers have borne that and they're doing the best they can to move forward, we've had extensive training as the chief has highlighted, and the false narratives that are out there are that it's dangerous to be a minority in a major city. Your life is at risk because of the police. And the facts of the matter, quite honestly the exact opposite. Our officers go out into dangerous areas all the time because their heart is in what they do to protect the people that live there.

We had some just yesterday, they did an after-action report was disclosed on the north side, Fourth Precinct occupation. And the people that didn't have a voice there were the residents that lived there, and had to endure that for 18 days, the ones that tried to work and raise their families there. So they didn't have a voice.

One thing I wanted to touch on about our data collection to illustrate my point is we see a lot of data collection at the end of suspicious vehicle stops, suspicious person stops, racial composition

data. All of that data is great. However if you're not recording what the unbiased 911 caller reports in, whether it's a victim, a witness to a crime, if you're not willing to track that data and keep all of it and analyze it, the end result data is invalid. With that, I'll turn it over.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you Mr. Kroll.

SHERIFF STUART: Thank you, Madam Chair and committee members. For the record my name is James Stuart and I have the privilege to serve as the Sheriff of Anoka County since 2011. I'm also on the Executive Board of the Minnesota Sheriff's Association and the Board of Directors for the National Sheriff's Association, and I've been asked to speak today about the suburban law enforcement agency's perspective during this important discussion and I'll speak very broadly on the topic so that we're out of here by eight, so I'll try to be decisive. It's always dangerous getting in line with an official microphone.

The Anoka County Sheriff's Office provides a wide array of very specialized services to the entire county, which serves approximately 350,000 residents

across 21 cities and townships.

I'd like to say we have the best of all worlds in our county in that we have many diverse populations, while our urban environments on the south end are connected to Minneapolis, through the bulk are suburban areas and then having rural areas on the north end of the county.

In Anoka County the mission of the Sheriff's Office is "to protect and serve the community in a manner that preserves the public trust". We value that public trust. And these are not just words to us. This is something our employees embrace and live by on a daily basis as they proudly serve as ambassadors to all members of all our communities and all our community members. We know that without the public's trust there is little value to the service that we provide.

This is very important to me as the Sheriff, especially you see, because the Sheriff is the elected chief law enforcement officer for the county. I report directly to the people.

So it's not just our role to protect and serve in a variety of ways, but the Sheriff also exists

to bring that balance amongst the government branches as we are sworn to uphold and defend the constitutional rights of every single citizen within our boundaries.

While I know there may be naysayers to this statement, our agency's culture and proud history does speak for itself.

The findings of a task force created by former President Barack Obama on 21st Century Policing is an interesting evaluation of the perceived needs of our local police forces and law enforcement agencies and provides recommendations on how to improve existing practices. As you know, it stresses the importance of transparency, accountability, community engagement, and continuing education and training for our law enforcement officers through the pillars that everyone is aware of.

But because no law enforcement agency is exactly the same, we also need to be careful not to blanket any of the required changes into a one size fits all requirement. Additionally, we must remain mindful that without funding the addition of required training or programs often means that other things, training or

programs that are already in place - may suffer.

While most agencies would support the majority of the efforts outlined by the Task Force, they are typically considered wish list items due to the financial constraints.

Prior to the release of these findings and due to the diverse populations living in Anoka County our team had already identified any need for strategic and standardized trainings, and we send our personnel to each of these. I am fortunate to be part of an agency that has always strived to be innovative and progressive in meeting the needs of our communities.

Aside from our annual 12 hour use of force training, which covers basic and advanced applications of use of force techniques. Cultural diversity, implicit bias and crisis intervention trainings were also added in recent years to our in-service training regimen that is required of all licensed and uniformed personnel.

Our staff also undergoes mental health training to maintain open lines of communication with those who are struggling in a variety of ways.

It is our belief that if we can continue to learn and communicate, that we still hold the key to being effective problem solvers within each of our communities.

In Anoka County we also agree that the value of the relationships that we establish with community partners and our community members individually. We pursue model policies, transparency, and any efforts to bring regional value. We proudly embrace our roles as ambassadors as we serve all members, again, of each of our communities.

I feel it is important to create leadership opportunities within our agency by providing members of our team the chance to be involved in the programs that invest in the development of establishing those positive community relations.

Members of our team and our community, young and old are positively impacted by the wide variety of programs that our office coordinates to continue making positive yet critical connections with our youth. Our deputies spend a day with kids from our neighborhoods out on boats often fishing for the first

time, as we reach out to a variety of communities through our annual CAST fishing events. CAST is an acronym for community and sheriff together.

Our team members also engage in schools and classroom visits and safety camps, and any other programs that you heard the chief discuss, because we also embrace that outreach effort. We see this as an opportunity to help those students connect with our law enforcement officers and see our squad cars and equipment up close and personal. We also strive to develop future leaders through our Police Explorers Program. We are involved in numerous other programs supporting charities, community and civic groups, and efforts to help or serve our citizens. Our activities are specially geared towards ensuring that we are not just responsive to our community, but that we are an integral part of that community.

Maintaining these positive connections helps us grow in our roles as the protectors of our communities. Today I offer only a small snapshot of how policing in the 21st Century impacts and will impact Anoka County.

While the men and women in law enforcement strive to make positive improvements across our nation the media has reported on the perceived erosion of trust between the police and public oftentimes the facts are not allowed to be a factor.

Our protectors often feel the strain of that broad brush that officers are sometimes painted with.

Interest in criminal justice and law enforcement related fields are already declining. The criminal justice programs in the colleges have seen a decline in enrollees in law enforcement across our entire nation, including my own have experienced dramatic declines in our applicant pools.

As applicant numbers dwindle the challenge of broadening our desired diversity within our agencies also becomes more difficult.

I was raised by a Hispanic step-father in a household that embraced diversity in working together for positive change. So I share the frustration of so many when I see racism and divisions swell across our nation. However shocking to many I have not seen those

issues rise up or swell within the law enforcement community as is often being portrayed. Those behaviors are simply not tolerated, at least in the agencies that I routinely interact with.

It is our job now to develop future leaders willing to swear an oath to protect your safety and mine. We need to work together to find a common path, to find a common goal and a common vision so that we can truly unite as a community of mutual trust. The acceptance of division and hostility is a benefit to absolutely no one.

It is my recommendation that each agency must employ leadership that engages the community that it serves. That the agency identifies the unique aspects of its own population and develops new ways to reach out for new partnerships and collaborative efforts.

Hopefully these collaborative efforts will also develop partnerships that will lead to efforts that will also aid in addressing the societal breakdowns that are often overlooked or considered too political to actually discuss. Efforts that help us as communities

to focus on civic duty, accountability and personal responsibility.

It has been my experience that the vast majority of our nation's protectors embrace the concepts of community involvement and community outreach. That is why they have willingly sworn an oath to protect and serve each of us, even if the cost of doing that requires them to lay down their own lives on our behalf. That is who they are and to me that is pretty amazing.

Are there problem officers or even agencies across our country? Of course there are, because human beings are involved. However we must not look at all of our protectors through a negative lens. Especially since no one wants the bad apples removed and picked out of this bunch more than the rest of our protectors who serve us with dignity, pride and honor.

My concern is quite simply for our future, for the future of our children and for the future of our grandchildren.

The question I pose to you is what will our collective future look like if the public is goaded into

being the enemy of our protectors and our guardians?

What will our nation look like when the good hearted people no longer want the jobs where the citizens that they were sworn to protect swear at, spit at, and even assault them as a matter of accepted practice?

Having a very limited pool of law enforcement candidates quite honestly should be an image that terrifies each and every one of us. Our protectors accepted these roles because they care about our communities, about you and your family. That fact should not be lost during any pursuit of improvements.

We all want the same things. Let's figure out how to work together to arrive at the goal without finger pointing, without malice and without rhetoric. Our children's future literally depends upon it.

Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Sheriff.

Well, we've heard from the panelists. Are there questions from the committee members?

MR. KOLBO: I have a question.

CHAIR KORBEL: Yes, Mr. Kolbo.

MR. KOLBO: My question is for both Sergeant Kroll, and Chief Harteau.

There is a phenomenon that has been reported on as the Ferguson effect, which as I understand it, is due to the recent very high profile police shootings around the country, in Ferguson and equally here in the Twin Cities. Some police officers are backing off from proactive and discretionary policing to minimize or avoid the risk of themselves being caught up in a huge media frenzy.

My question is to both of you, from the point of view of a police officer in the street and department. Are you seeing that phenomenon here in Minneapolis by police officers backing off? Oftentimes these cities report that crime goes up as a result of that. Are you are seeing that in Minneapolis? And if so, what is it you're seeing?

LT. KROLL: It's difficult to measure. You don't know what an officer sees and does not take action. I'm hearing it from officers that because of lack of community support, lack of political support, adverse effect in the media, that they're thinking twice before

getting out and investigating suspicious circumstances. However, there is no way to actually document and track that suspicious person stops are not happening, if suspicious people are not there, they're not going to be stopped, so it's a very difficult thing to measure.

Of course you can look at crime rates and you can look at statistics on those stops in the past, and the chief highlighted we have data collection now, so maybe analysis of what they do, she can probably speak more to the stats than me. I'm hearing it, but it's a very difficult item to measure.

CHIEF HARTEAU: I'm not surprised with that, I actually would concur with Lieutenant Kroll. It is hard to measure, we're trying to strike a balance of ensuring that people take time on their calls. I don't want this to be a drive-through service. So if one time somebody might call the police, I don't want our officers to just be in and out, we try to get numbers. I'm not interested in numbers. We don't have the resources we used to have, so we're not measuring apples and apples, we're asking officers to do other things

that they didn't use to as much, and so you're out doing community engagement, that takes time, you may not be making that stop.

But I also hear all the time, I'm very proud of our officers and I know they're working really hard. So when I ask those questions, what is the feeling out there? I'm always asking. You got your finger on the pulse. Bob's closer to them. I need to know that and I'm not hearing it. I would say probably with select individual officers probably, but a blanket? No.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Vischer?

MR. VISCHER: This is a question to build on Sheriff Stuart's remarks at the end of his comments, but I'll open it to the whole panel.

There have been in some circles a perception that when there have been officers who engage in misconduct it's too difficult to get them out of the force, whether it's because there is a culture oriented away from turning in one's colleagues, or even when misconduct is identified there are personnel rules in place or for other reasons it's just hard to remove them, do you think that perception has ever been accurate?

And if it was accurate in the past and is no longer, what were the key steps toward improving the situation, or do you think it still has some accuracy, and if so, what needs to be done to improve the situation to make it easier to remove officers that engage in misconduct?

SHERIFF STUART: Madam Chair, Mr. Vischer, I think absolutely it probably was a reality. My personal experience, that was before I came a law enforcement officer. I think a lot of that has evolved over the years because of the desire for professionalism. I mean, we're fortunate here in the Midwest, we require college degrees, we require skills training, we require the ongoing training. I think quite honestly we require accountability and transparency. We want to be, I tell my team all the time, all I expect from you is the absolute best you can give, because our citizens deserve it, and I think that's an important aspect to bring to the table because as we have seen that evolution, and I think the coining of the phrase thin blue line. Back in the day I think there was an interpretation of that thin blue line meant this wall or this gridiron of protection in which things

were hidden or maintained within law enforcement.

Nowadays, whenever I hear or think about it, I envision that thin blue line as representative of everyone who raises their hand and swears an oath to protect our citizens, and all that means is that thin blue line between chaos and normalcy, and we walk that thin blue line in order to serve all of our citizens.

And, cutting to the chase, nowadays we just don't see that to the same degree, I'm not proud to say it but it is a reality that I'm not ashamed of. Our agency has arrested a wide variety of officers from other agencies, unfortunately. But that's just a part of the reality. We hold ourselves to the same standard, we hold ourselves to a higher standard when it comes to the law. But internally we hold ourselves to a higher standard. I tell my team you need to remember if you screw up you can be lighting fireworks off in the cabin, somebody else could get away with it, but because you're a police officer they're going to be upset with what they're seeing, and that's not acceptable. I don't want any of our team to put themselves in the position that compromises the image of all of us. As I said before,

we want those bad apples picked, because it reflects on the badges of all of us.

CHAIR KORBEL: Ms. Nelson and then Mr. BEAULIEU.

MS. NELSON: Yes I would just add a couple of things. I totally concur with what the Sheriff is saying. I've seen it dramatically change over the 30 years I've been at this job, there certainly was some level of culture of protecting each other. No doubt about it. I don't see that now. Not to any level of consistency, not that there isn't isolated incidents; as the chief one of my greatest challenges is my ability to be as transparent as I would like, because I can't necessarily talk about this on a case by case basis. My main frustration, frankly, is with arbitrators. I may make a decision to impose discipline, or to terminate an officer once I've made a decision knowing all the facts that I know, and those decisions are overturned. That's a frustration.

LT. KROLL: I agree with a lot of what the Sheriff mentioned about our law enforcement community in this state. I think when all of us started we were

one of only two states in the country that required a two year degree. I'm a firm believer that you should have a larger staff doing thorough background investigations, and I agree with what the chief said, you don't see the types of incidents occurring from when we started. With regards to the arbitrations, when it's a serious matter and the chief and I meet, people don't hear about the ones that we agree on and we don't arbitrate when an officer got fired.

That's happened recently. That's happened in the past year, at least within the last two, but that happens from time to time, we do discipline for some things, sometimes we disagree. Sometimes the union wins and sometimes the administration wins.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. So this question is directed at Lieutenant Kroll, but I would also welcome thoughts from Chief Porter and Sheriff Stuart. So Lieutenant Kroll you mentioned a bunch of items that may have a negative impact on the relationship between police and community, but two years ago you told me and my colleagues that you viewed policing and complaints like you view a basketball game,

in that if you're not getting any fouls you aren't playing hard enough. And I would just like you to explain what you mean by that, and also what impact that approach to policing has on the relationship between police and the community.

LT. KROLL: What I mean by that is we're paying officers a fair wage and you should get productive work out of that. Show me an officer that has never had a complaint in 30 years and I'll show you an officer, what we call in the department a low-level slug, an officer that doesn't do anything. If you show me an officer that has a lot of investigations and all of them turned out to be false, and I've been that officer on the witness stand, when the numbers come in and lawsuits and things like that; when you're making 8 times the contact with citizens and you're making 21 times the arrests then your counterparts, you're going to get complaints. By and large in our crew the officer that doesn't get those complaints doesn't get out and investigate anything. And that's not what we're paying our officers to do.

SHERIFF STUART: Madame Chair, Ms. Nelson.

I want to expand on that, having been the hard-charging assertive officer that wanted to change the world at one time. I too --- I know it's a surprise --- also received some complaints. What is especially beneficial for us to understand, is that someone might file a claim because they got a ticket, they got stopped, they didn't like that they were inconvenienced. So they want to create a hardship for that officer who created what they deem to be a hardship against them. What we find more often than not is when we say, "Well we will review the tape, we'll review the camera," they say "Oh, it's recorded, never mind." And so just for perspective there are oftentimes a fair number of people that make things up against officers just to try and have a little payback . Once they realize that that isn't going to come to fruition, then it's dropped.

CHIEF HARTEAU: Madame Chair, Ms. Nelson. I would just add a couple of things. I certainly agree with the other panelists and the Sheriff. It's not as simple as saying you have to have multiple complaints if you work hard. I would say that's inaccurate, that's a very false statement. I know many highly decorated

officers that have very few complaints, but if you are going to get some --- I myself had a couple --- but you need to look at what the complaints are. Are there consistencies, are there patterns? And I'm sorry but so many people continue to have the same complaint, he said this, he did this, over and over again. I don't think this is coincidence.

PARTICIPANT: I'd like to add to what the Sheriff said about the community and policing together. So there are programs similar to that. Let's say, if I had money, a little more, just to bring together the community and the police, because I think that's smart. So let's say I wish I had $6 million dollars some I can bring the police and the community together, so we can mend the trust. If someone said I want to give you more money to get that trust to come back, what are you going to do?

MR. MCDANIEL: Madame Chair, Mr. McDaniel. I have a whole laundry list if you want to talk about money we can start plugging these things into place. But no, I get recharged when I go to some of the national

events, for example I came back from a conference in DC this past January, and hearing the youth outreach efforts and some of the other committees that I'm a part of --- there's a lot of great things happening across the nation. Of course I come back with all these ideas, and as you alluded to, it typically takes dollars or resources or at least staff time to implement them. So most of the things get put into a folder on my desk called the wish list file. At some point in time we revisit a lot of those, we try to continue working towards those. But it does seem to take resources. This past event a few years ago we put together a team in the department to bring their sheriff office boats and resources for fishing, and long story short we have a bunch of deputies who volunteered their time, their own boats, and that's been much more interactive. The fire department comes out, and, well the focus behind that was that community outreach, we want these kids to see law enforcement in a positive light. When I was a kid I didn't have a lot of positive interactions with law enforcement, but I did have a very positive relationship with an officer when I was about knee-high to a grasshopper, and it made me

realize I wanted to be one of the good guys. And so I remind our staff, and I share that story with our staff to let them know that you don't know that one moment in time when --- that one contact is going to change somebody's life like it did for me. And so we try to create as many of the opportunities as we can so that we can hopefully develop that future recruitment and really have a positive impact on the community.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, one final comment. In our company comments this morning we did ask all of our panelists to pre-submit their comments, although we did have an unsolicited comment from a panelist this morning, about Lieutenant Kroll, that where a statement was put forward that Lt. Kroll is a white supremacist.

LT. KROLL: I absolutely deny that. That's a statement that reoccurs from time to time, and there's absolutely no factual basis for that whatsoever. Never has been.

CHAIR KORBEL: Alright, thank you. That's all of the time we have for this panel. If we could have everybody back here in five minutes so we can continue. After the break I'm just going to call the

next law enforcement panel.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: We are on the record. I remind people that we do have a public comment period set for 4:20 this afternoon, we will go to 5:15, 5:30, depending on how many people want to make a statement.

Thank you very much and at this time I have turned it over to our law enforcement Panel 2. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY McDANIEL: Good afternoon. I'm Kellace McDaniel and I'm filling in for Sheriff Rich Stanek. And I'm on the engagement team. The Sheriff has been in law enforcement for 33 plus years, he's on his third term, and he's a big time member of the our 21st century policing.

Today I'm just basically going over the a quick slide show. I was going to show a video today which could I think speak better to the people, but so with that I'll start part of the slideshow.

What the Sheriff's Office believes is that we need to have an actual rule before your community

policing and that sort of thing we like to try to get there as a team. We like to get there before an actual warrant or a sweep, including traffic stops and that short of thing. The Sheriff is pretty passionate, he's a big advocate of that. Not only am I a member of the community engagement team, all of our officers are part of our community engagement team.

So time line in 2007 our sheriff created a CAB, community advisory board. Basically what it is is it's members such as school officials, law enforcement, business owners, and what we do is meet at least six times a year as a CAB advisory board and basically they help us implement some of our policy and procedures with the sheriff's office.

In 2007 we started with probably five members within the sheriff's advisory board. Right now we're 30, 40 plus strong members. These are some of the -- I'm not going to read everything, but these are some of the things we actually do as a board. I already mentioned that they help us with our officer policies and that sort of thing and they're a big part of our 21st Century Policing.

This is one of my specialties as a community engagement team. We started in 2012 with just the sheriff and one sergeant. We are eight strong now, have now one lieutenant that's just was newly added, and we have myself besides my duties as supervisor, I'm in charge of the African American social religious leaders liaison, Latino liaison, Asian liaison, Native American liaison, too, so we're kind of everywhere as far as that work in the community. My job is solely community policing, which is the oldest form of policing.

The sheriff had an opportunity to go Washington DC to serve on the 21st Century Task Board, one of his main goals was to testify on building trust and legitimacy, which is something that we as an agency feel very strongly about.

As you see up there those other six pillars, those are something in semester training as law enforcement officers and deputies that we teach not on a daily basis, but I would say four semesters a year. We teach diversity training and we touch on those six pillars. This basically goes over what I said.

A lot of this stuff is in our Strategic

Plan, it's in our pamphlets. WE translate a lot of our lingo in long Spanish and Somali.

Our guardian mindset, I know Sheriff Stuart was talking about fishing and that sort of thing, we also have a program called Hooked on Fishing, Not Drugs. Basically do it with different diversity groups, mostly kids. One of the main things I like to see is a kid that has never fished before, to see there face after they catch a fish. You may ask how this ties in with 21st Century Policing. Well 21st Century Policing actually gets us out in the community.

This is one of the mindsets and one of the things we do for our kids and there is many others. This is just the initiative, basically just the yellow dots that you see. Those are states, cities, counties that have taken on the 21st Century Policing mindset derived from President Obama, as we all know.

In 2016 & '18 we got a Cops Grant which added two more individuals to our community engagement team. We added basically a Lieutenant on that and another liaison person. This is past task force recommendations.

With that not only do we have a CAB, an advisory board for the sheriff, my team has what you call councils. The councils are, as listed, are the East African Council, Asian Council, Latino Council, Native American Council. We have these small sectors of councils, and we're out in the community having a round table, so to speak, and a lot of those resident councils end up being our CAB members. It's kind of a nice concept to be out in the community and talk about some of the things going on in today's world. Support in the community, you can see some of our events, there's a lot of them and I listed some of them that we do yearly. Obviously we're at the State Fair, National Night Out, I know there are a lot of organizations that actually do the same thing. One of the big ones that I enjoy is Cinco de Mayo, Somali Independence Day, and Mexican Independence Day, so we're huge in a lot of those parades and that sort of thing, too.

We have PSA, public safety messages and I know you may have seen me in a few of them. Texting while driving and that sort of thing. Like I said brochures and things like that are the in long Spanish and Somali

and we're looking at other languages, too. These are some of the radio stations that we're involved in. A lot of Latino radio stations, Asian, African American; we will actually go on the radio and talk about some of the things going on in the community, in the sheriff's office, talk about new laws, use of force. Things that the community wants to hear from the sheriff's office. Social media is huge. One of those six pillars talks about it, we've incorporated Facebook, everybody's on Facebook, we have some of our messaging on Twitter. The Sheriff is pretty passionate about a lot of this. It's a good way to actually to get out information about the sheriff's office, it's an easier way.

The one picture you'll see, these are officers in the community that actually had an opportunity to get out and do community policing. They're actually playing basketball with the kids.

So I talked a little about -- another thing we do on our team is our hiring process. Within the last few years we have had the opportunity to actually go out to college fairs and help recruit not only law enforcement officers, but some of our secretarial work

and some of the jail personnel and that sort of thing. That's kind of where it starts in the sheriff's office. You work in a certain sector and you have the opportunity to kind of work your way up as a deputy. The sheriff's big in hosting certain meetings in the community, as I said. We do a lot of work with the East African community, a lot of stuff with the Liberian community. Basically he talks about how we hold one day citizens' academies, which is a big factor in what we do.

We have what we call items of business in our sheriff's office, jails, courts, investigations. People like to know what we do in the sheriff's office and one day citizens' academies pretty much talk about that. It's a one day eight-hour deal and it talks about what the sheriff's office does is these lines of business. That's about it.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. Welcome.

MR. GALLAGHER: Hello Commission members and others in attendance today at the Civil Rights and Policing Practices Minnesota hearing. I'm happy to be in front you have and honored I was invited to be part

of this discussion.

My name is Michael Gallagher. I am a 28 year veteran officer in the State of Minnesota, and I am currently Police Officers Federation President.

If you're unaware the officers in the State of Minnesota are at a higher level than other officers around the United States. We have higher education, ongoing education requirements and are licensed professionals here in Minnesota. I am one of 10,722 licensed officers here in the State of Minnesota, from 437 different agencies here and are proud to you serve everyone in this room as one of your police officers.

I work the road. My duty assignment is in uniform. I go to police calls for service and I have contact with citizens of state, and with citizens from around the country and world due to my job assignments in Wilmington.

My discussion with you today is from another viewpoint. It is from a viewpoint not often heard or discussed. It was a viewpoint assumed; this viewpoint is often misstated, misunderstand and misreported. The viewpoint I want to discuss is the

viewpoint of the average Minnesota officer.

This officer is the one going to the calls, the one dealing with the community and different calls of service throughout the state, which my police colleagues answer on a daily basis.

This officer rarely is in TV news reports, newspaper articles or other media sources, which assume which surround each of us today in this modern electronic world. I'm here to tell you how the officer feels, and to be a voice that is not heard. Although you will not get this from the media, or even some leaders of the communities we serve, the Minnesota officer does not care what color a person's skin is, what religion they follow or where they live.

If someone calls 911 or contacts the police by other means, the Minnesota Police Officer is there to help that person. No other racial or social or economic factors matter. The officer is here to provide protection, service, and to handle the call the best way possible to serve the individual and the community that they work for.

Minnesota officers are professional and

they are trying to integrate and build close bridges with the communities. In doing our daily jobs we are building trust and legitimacy in areas that each officer works. Pillar 1 deals with building trust. Officers around the state do this on a daily basis, whether International Falls or down in Worthington, Minnesota.

The police service has changed very greatly since my 20 years of service started, especially in the past five years with new community programs being developed with even greater interaction with community each of us serve. These programs are brought forth usually by departments. And many times officers volunteer their own time and hours to be involved in these activities in the community.

One of these programs are focused on high risk use in children and to have a positive interaction with police officers. Other programs involved are police athletic leagues, bike programs, Coffee with Cops, et cetera. There is just so many different programs we have now it's unbelievable.

The bridges departments and officers are trying to build -- people on the other side are trying

to build those bridges back towards the officers. We need community leaders from these groups to attend these events and help build the bridge back. Each citizen could come face to face with one of our Minnesota officers at a protest, and later that day citizen needed police service for a medical reason, a traffic crash, being a victim of a crime, or to report something -- we would send a Minnesota police officer to support that person.

You wouldn't believe this if you just sat and watched TV. But many citizens call from around the state, and they thank us for the job that each and every Minnesota officer does.

We come from all races. I honestly feel a deeper sense of pride when these come from people of color. I think to myself, these people get it. Everyone benefits from a strong police and community relationship. Both sides need to continue to work together to continue this relationship and make it grow. It is good for the people and it is good for us as police officers. This is not about race, it's about making our communities safe.

Just the other night there was a quote on TV -- quote, some people just don't matter to them. Just demeaning us as a police. I beg to differ, but all people matter to the officer of Minnesota. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chief.

CHIEF AXTELL: Good afternoon, thank you Madam Chair, Commission members. It's really an honor to be here today, as St. Paul's police chief. It's a very exciting day for us as we actually launch our 21st century report. We had some media interviews this morning, so it's really timely that we're here today.

I'd like to start by thanking each and every one of you for your dedicated service to making Minnesota a better place to live for all of us. I firmly believe that policing is as much about relationships as that is about enforcement. If I don't -- if you don't enforce the law in an equitable manner, our relationships will absolutely suffer. I'm not going to deliver trust and service with respect adequately every day, and certainly without exception. I also know we're not perfect.

As I believe the sheriff had mentioned earlier today, we're human. To be human is to accept -- possess implicit bias. We're getting better in law enforcement at recognizing that regardless of where we come from or what we look like, we all come from all beliefs and in law enforcement we need to continue to acknowledge that. All members of law enforcement and in our community need to acknowledge that as well.

We have made mistakes in the past and will certainly likely make mistakes in the future. We're committed to doing better. That was why I wanted to be here. The only way to effect real positive change is to start by acknowledging the mistakes of the past, discussing them and working toward solutions.

I'm also honored to lead women and men who serve with compassion, dignity, respect, and commitment to doing what's right. And I have one of those officers sitting next to me today, who came to talk about their experience on the street.

I'll introduce you in a moment.

We don't always see the great work that our officers do, but trust me, I do. Before we discuss our

department's role in addressing policing practices that disproportionately affect people of color, I'd like to share some information about the St. Paul Police Department. We have 620 sworn officers who answer to nearly 300,000 calls for service each and every year. They also investigate 13,000 crimes which include aggravated assault, robberies, rapes, and murder.

I've been chief of police since last June, and I'm lucky to have taken the reins of a department that is dedicated to the principles outlined in the President's task force for 21st century policing.

The chiefs that came before me built a solid foundation of community service that we continue to build upon. And I know Reverend Battle is here today. He can attest to that. And, Reverend, thank you, sir, for your service. From top to bottom, thank you.

As an agency, we're committed top to bottom to the six pillars highlighted up here. I would like to take a quick look at the website we launched today. Senior Commander Rob Thompson is standing here, he spearheaded this project for me when I became chief. He worked with city officials, he worked with us, and

really put a great, interactive website that allows our community members to help hold us accountable to the promises that we make. It's interactive. They can provide feedback, suggestions on policy.

As you can see, the six pillars are listed up here, and we'll give you one example of one of the pillars. Pillar one, people want to know, what's the St. Paul Police Department doing related to immigration?

We can scroll down and see what the recommendations are, where we are lined up with each of the recommendations, and then we can click on a link. So one of the links I -- Recommendation 1.9 related to immigration. There's also links to media articles relating to our initiatives at the Department, and our Department policy. That specifically talks to how we deal with immigration issues. So please take a look at the site if you get a chance later today or sometime this week. It's www.stpaul.gov/police, and you'll see our 21st century report.

As I said, each of these pillars is part of our DNA. Like I said, we're really proud of this

website and it shows what we've done in the spirit of recommendations and we still have some work to do. And so as you can see they're not all filled out targets so we still have some work to do in the long partnership with our community.

We're doing the community engagement like our countless partnerships with our communities and our junior police academies. Our law enforcement career program that was just launched last week where young members of our community can get aid for school. Communities that sometimes have been disenfranchised now have opportunities to make sure that we become more diverse with the community that we serve. When I took over as chief we were about 19 percent diversity within the ranks, and our community is 45 percent diverse. So we have a lot of work to do.

I'm very proud of our staff. Our first academy that started was back in December was 55 percent racial diversity. So we have a lot and we need to continue to work hard in our response in our community.

As you probably know we have had a couple of incidents over the last year where officers were

1 involved in incidents that don't meet our high standards
2 for which we hold ourselves accountable. As difficult
3 as it is for me to recount, on a couple of these were
4 highlighted in the media. The only way to acknowledge
5 mistakes made in the past, discuss them openly and
6 commit to moving forward.
7 Last summer I know many of you were aware
8 of a K9 officer apprehending an African American male,
9 who was kicked by an officer three times. That was on
10 videotape. I apologize to Mr. Baker, I apologize to the
11 community, and I apologize to our officers because the
12 actions of that officer don't reflect the values of our
13 Department. I want to make apologies for that as we
14 move forward.
15 We recently had another officer strike a
16 vulnerable teenager who was handcuffed after she spit
17 on his face. Because both of these cases are still open
18 there is only so much I can say about them. But I bring
19 them up because even though it's an exception, because
20 these are extremely rare within our department, one is
21 too many. We shouldn't shy away from our
22 responsibilities as a police department to hold

ourselves accountable to those standards.

We also know that using force is a rare occurrence, and I think it's safe -- it's appropriate to highlight that because we see instances of use of force in the media that really paints a broad brush that that's what we do on our job. Out of the nearly 300,000 calls for service every year in St. Paul, two-tenths of one percent result in the use of force. That's why we consider ourselves guardians. Because if we consider ourselves warriors, one has to be at war. The fact is that the warrior comes out of a cop two-tenths of one percent of all of their activities. That's why it's very important to adopt the guardian mindset.

Here's what looks better, what's doing better, looks like, in the St. Paul Police Department. Each and every year, we are committed to ongoing implicit bias training, every year. Crisis intervention training for every officer. And again, training, training, training is really being fair to the cops and our community to make sure that every officer understands the expectations so she or he can succeed.

It's not easy to say you're sorry and that

you might not have all the answers, especially for cops. But owning our mistakes helps change the culture in law enforcement. We need to continue to do this at every rank. I'm here to tell you that we are listening. We share your values. We're not simply the police department; we are your police department. We will deliver trusted service with respect, and on those rare occasions where we don't, we will take responsibility and action in order to get it right.

Having said this, I would like to introduce a great public servant. This is the boots on the ground cop that answers calls for service every day in the city of St. Paul. He works a very challenged area of our city on Payne Avenue, and I asked him to come with me today because I get time and time again feedback from all of our community members on the East Side how Lou treats people with respect and dignity and compassion, and he does that at the same time of locking up the bad guys that need to go to jail. And that really makes me proud as a chief to see that this job can be accomplished and still get the positive feedback from our community. So I'll introduce you to Officer Ferraro. Thank you.

OFFICER FERRARO: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Members. My name is Lou Ferraro. I'm a St. Paul police officer, and I work patrol in the Eastern District on the East Side. I've been a St. Paul police officer for 14-and-a-half years, and I've worked patrol all 14-and-a-half years. I'm also a field training officer, and I train the new officers who graduate from the police academy and then want to continue their legacy of becoming a police officer.

One of the most important things that I believe that we need to do as patrol officers is that -- build up the community trust. One of the things that we do that through is community engagement.

Over the past several years, the St. Paul Police Department has added a new type code/incident code that we can participate in as patrol officers working the street. And that is called a community outreach event. Before, it used to be called police proactive visit. Police proactive visit. What are we doing? We're actually going out into the community, and we are reaching out to the community. So the St.

Paul Police Department has developed that for us as patrol officers to use on a daily basis. And what does a community outreach event actually do? It engages us in the community, and that's what we try to do every single day. Whether it's on a call for service, or whether we're going in between calls, and we have ten minutes where we can stop by the local church on Payne Avenue. On Monday nights they have their dinners, every single Monday night. And we stop by the church on Payne Avenue and Rose, 1173 Payne, and we do a community outreach event. Or we go to the library on Seventh Street. When we walk in, when we smile, we say hi to people, and we shake hands. Or we go to just local business on Payne Avenue, and we do the exact same thing. We can also go into community rec centers. And that's how we are seen: not only as patrol officers or police officers, but just as a regular person. In order for us to build that trust, we need to be seen as a regular person, because that's all we really are. Yes, we have a uniform on, but we are here for the community, and we are here to build that trust of all of the community members that we work for. And I have a vested in the

city of St. Paul because, not only do I work for the city of St. Paul, but I live in the city of St. Paul. And when you go from calls to calls every single day, and the East District is, I believe, the busiest district in the city -- when you go from calls to calls for your entire shift, you start to see things that other people don't see. The community doesn't see it. The politicians don't see it. The administration doesn't see it. And those are the things that the community needs.

What does the community need? The community needs family and youth leadership training. How can we bring that family together? How with we do things for the youth of our community? The needs of the community, education and job training. How can we help these people become better, better members of our communities?

One of the other focus issues that we need to do as a society, not just the police department but as a society, one of the focus issues could also be poverty and income. On the East Side, that's a huge issue, and we, as police officers, we see it on every

single call that we go to. And those are very important issues for the inner city.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you to the panel members.

Any questions from committee members? Mr. Kolbo?

MR. KOLBO: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question for each of you or all of you. With the controversies of the last several years, police shootings, protests that have erupted in the streets, on the streets, there has been a narrative out there, put out by some of these folks, some of the protesters. And we've heard some of them, some of this thesis this morning from some of the panelists. That thesis is police have, in a systematic way, especially in major, metropolitan areas, in a systematic way are engaging in racial and discriminatory, ethnically discriminatory police practices.

My question to you is, what is the effect of that narrative that is out there in the public media on the morale of your boots on the ground officers. How

is it affecting them, and how are they reacting to it? And is it affecting you at all in terms of retaining and getting good police officers? It's a broad question, but I would appreciate your reaction to that narrative and how it affects your officers.

CHIEF AXTELL: Thank you, Commissioner. It's a very fair and, I think, a timely question to ask. It's absolutely impacting the officers within my agency. Morale does take a hit when there is a broad brush narrative that gets painted upon all police officers that wear the uniform, because sometimes we, whether it's the media or community, doesn't understand what Officer Ferraro just talked about, that whether we're wearing this uniform or not, we're human. We have our own life experiences. We've had ups and downs in our lives. We have family members.

I have a son that is a St. Paul police officer. He's been on the job for two years. So I think every night, as he's supposed to be going home at about 2:00 in the morning, about, is he going to make it home? I know, because we have father-son talks, not chief-officer talks, about some of the challenges that

he's seeing on the street as well.

So oftentimes it's unfair, because the few bad apples that don't get plucked can ruin it for all of us. But we all have to remember to be fair, that this isn't just a law enforcement problem, right? I often talk about the social wheel that we're dealing with. Disproportionality. It's a big wheel, and law enforcement is one spoke of this wheel.

And the other spokes, there is disproportionality in education, economics, health care, housing, and I could go on and on and on. And to put all of the pressure on that one spoke to fix all of society's disproportionality is absolutely unfair, but I also understand that we have a role to play in helping that wheel. Thank you.

DEPUTY McDANIEL: If I may add, too, a lot of that has to do with the training and the -- I know the sheriff's obviously pretty passionate about training, about certain diversity groups and that sort of thing that goes on in the community.

The other thing I want to say is I'm on several panels where you are in the community, and your

job basically is to build those trust relationships. But maybe because of the community or because of the particular officer that's there, you're not getting things accomplished.

A good example is maybe that meeting will -- is supposed to last two hours, but because of the behaviors and that sort of thing that's going on in the room, that may be shortened to about 15-20 minutes, so you're not getting anything accomplished.

CHAIR KORBEL: Comments from both panels?

OFFICER FERRARO: I will quickly say that the morale of police officers and the police department is a very important thing, and with me being one of the senior members of the shift that I work, I always try to monitor morale. I always try to see if I can do something to improve morale. And morale can be affected by many different things: what we see, what we're -- what the media has to report on different instances, what we see on the news, what we actually go through, what we deal with on a call to call basis, or lack of communication.

Communication helps a lot, and not only

when Chief Axtell communicates to us, but also when we communicate with each other. And it's important for us to try to improve our morale so that we feel like we can be the best officer that we possibly can be, because if our morale is a little bit lower, then what type of service are we going to provide to our community?

We always -- and I will say it again. We always try to provide the absolute best service to our community on every single call.

And when I train the new recruit coming through the academy on field training, that is one of the things that I try to instill on those new probationary officers is that, so they realize that it's important to earn that trust and earn that respect on every single call, on every single interaction when we are working. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Other questions?

MR. GALLAGHR: Just kind of quick, since he asked everybody, I kind of dealt with it a bit in my speech that I gave. I think as an officer, if you sit and listen to the media all of the time, it really brings you down, and just by going out, you that level of

interaction with somebody in the community, and they say, we really appreciate you, the job that you're doing; we're behind you. It really erases a lot of that.

We're among the most senior officers at our department, and you've got to deliver that message down to the younger officers, and tell them that, you know, we're supported, and bring that message home to them. And that's what we try to do.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Vischer?

MR. VISCHER: So one thing from other panelists we've had, especially this morning, was this breakdown of trust between police and some communities. And there have been multiple sources of that breakdown in trust. I'm curious, as to, from your perspective as law enforcement, do you think there are ways in which, over the past 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, law enforcement has contributed to a breakdown in trust? And if so, how did it happen, and what is the path forward?

Are there steps that need to be taken to restore trust, beyond getting out on the beat again and

building relationships you talked very eloquently about it? Or is that really what it boils down to?

CHIEF AXTELL: Thank you for your question. Yes, over the years, as I mentioned earlier, we certainly, as a profession, have made some mistakes throughout the history of policing in America. We are working hard to evolve from some of the --

Some of this process occurred over the years because of the -- when I talk about the two-tenths of one percent of what we do is a use of force, that warrior mentality portion. The warrior mentality, I believe, over the years has been more prevalent. That has led us up to where we are today, the mentality of not all but very few officers that paint, again, the broad brush of, I'm the police officer. I'm telling you. This is what you're going to do, and you're going to do what I tell you to do. That type of approach never works. It absolutely doesn't work. So when we have those officers that engage in that type of approach, that diminishes the trust that we have with all of our communities.

Another thing we have done recently over

the last years, Chief Harteau talked about traffic stop data. We have been collecting traffic stop data in St. Paul for near 16 years now, but we've never published the data and what it shows. Last fall, we decided to do just that, and we're committed to quarterly and annually updates to our traffic stop data, which measures the race of the person stopped; the reason for the stop; were they cited; were they frisked; were they arrested. And that put data sets to help us hold ourselves more accountable. But again, understanding, to be perfectly fair, we are one spoke of a big wheel of all of these other disproportionalities, so I'm not going to say that law enforcement -- we have to be transparent, and we have to have those courageous conversations about how policing impacts all of our communities. But again, I believe those are the things that are going to lead to building better relationships: when we start to show more data sets, when we allow people access into our department. Because I don't want any members of our community to ever wonder what it is the St. Paul Police Department does, how we do it, and why we do it. And this is why we've launched the

21st century website today so that people can ask those questions and find those data sets and information on the website and provide positive or negative feedback to us. Thank you.

MR. GALLAGHER: And if I could just add, in agreement with the chief, one of the big things about becoming a cop is we find out that police officers come into certain agencies and find out that, you know what, the job is not for them. Unfortunately, some of the critical incidents do happen with those particular officers, but then it's too late when we do have forms of internal investigations and that sort of thing for that. I just, I know that the sheriff reaches this; I've reached this on my own. You've got to be ethical and professional in everything that you do. If you have those key things, then for the most part, everything will work out.

CHAIR KORBEL: Ms. Huynh and then --

MS. HUYNH: Hi. Thank you for your testimony. Let me try to frame my question here. I also wanted to share with you all some of the comments that were made during the community panel and just get

your responses and your thoughts on them, so this is for everyone.

One of the recommendations, Mr. Vischer asked if one -- if the community could have one recommendation to come out of our final reporting, what might that be? People had a variety of responses. One of the responses was around the issue of the immigration and deportation that is happening right now. A person said that they felt that no police officer should be ever used as an immigration enforcement officer, and I would be interested in hearing your comments about partnerships with ICE, with of Department Homeland Security, and how that is affecting marginalized communities, and communities of color right now. And what's the moral responsibility and the legal issues that you're dealing with as police officers handles that, especially because they're a very direct and immediate impact on our African, Latino, and Southeast Asian communities right now.

CHIEF AXTELL: Thank you very much for that question. I'm very proud of the history we have within the St. Paul Police Department on how we approach

immigration issues. We are your local police department. We enforce local and state laws. First of all, we do not have the authority to enforce federal immigration laws, and that's by design. That's one of the great things about this country, is we have the separation of local law enforcement and federal law enforcement so that we can police to the community standards.

I have said during my entire career that if our police department is viewed by our immigrant communities, people that may being disenfranchised, as an arm of government, that we will come in to sweep them up and deport them, there will be several things that will happen. First of all, we won't have the trust of any of our communities in St. Paul. Victimization rates of members of our community that may be undocumented will go through the roof, because if they are afraid of reporting crimes because of fear of deportation, they will be victimized at higher rates, and other people will perpetrate violence against those communities, because they know that they're not going to report crimes. And there was a young officer,

actually several robbery reports from members of our Latino community that were undocumented, because the robber knew that they weren't going to report that crime.

So there's a lot of considerations that we take in as a result of this. We have done a lot of community outreach in the community engagement unit that we're very proud of in St. Paul. If you look on our website, you'll see many languages that our officers are talking to our communities, talking that we are your police department; we're your local police department. We do not enforce federal law, and that's by design.

OFFICER FERRARO: If I could just add real quick, because I know that this is a big issue of the immigration laws and that sort of thing, as the chief stated, a lot of that stuff is federal law. So it's something that the only thing we can do as an agency is educate, train our officers of all the sort of things that are going on in the community.

Being out in the community and being on the community engagement team, right, I hear a lot of different types of rumors. And almost -- a subject

matter that you can actually tell, being on duty, which I think it probably needs to be talked about within the community and with law enforcement officers.

DEPUTY McDANIEL: I think there's -- there is no change right now in how we do our business from six months ago, absolutely no change, and I don't see that urgency because of what the chief just said.

I'll tell you all, it really came to fruition for me when I was talking with a Latino gal, and she noticed the police officers at a restaurant that I used to go to. And she said, hey, are the cops going to come and lock us all up and other things?

And I assured her, absolutely not. That's not going to happen. I didn't realize the fear that the Latino community had, especially with all of the wall and everything like that. But it is something that we have to address as police officers and from our administrators and so forth and get that word out.

CHAIR KORBEL: Go ahead.

MS. HUYNH: This would be, I think, to any of the panelists. First of all, I want to make sure you're all following us because there are people sitting

kind of where you can't see what we're doing.

So I appreciate your ability to handle this. I guess my question would refer to encountering people who are suffering from mental health issues. I think that that can create a unique challenge in dealing with those encounters. Is there -- how are you dealing with that? Are you training on things, or how are you dealing with that? Because a lot of times, I'll see a family calls for help dealing with their loved one who's dealing with a mental health challenge, and it can be very difficult for the family.

CHIEF AXTELL: Thank you very much. It's a very, very important topic that we're dealing with.

We all know people in our lives, whether it's family members or friends, that deal with some type of a mental illness. And it's just that: it's an illness, like any other illness. So first of all, we have to work on removing that stigma and educating our public and our officers about the signs of when people are in crisis.

So crisis intervention training is something that is ongoing in the police department.

All of our sworn officers have gone through crisis intervention training. Every academy that comes on, the fourteen-week academy, we put our officers through, in addition to requirements for the POST or for the State of Minnesota, one full week is dedicated to crisis intervention training, where we talk about de-escalation. We talk about what are the signs of people in crisis and how we can best serve our communities that are suffering from crisis.

One of the things we have changed is the approach within our communication center, Ramsey County communication center, in cooperation with us, is when we get some of those calls where a roommate will call the police and say, can you send the cops? My roommate is acting strangely. Well, really there is no crime to act strangely, so we don't want to expose our officers to those unnecessary interactions where things could get out of control based on somebody that is in crisis. They see a uniform and have a different reaction. So some of those calls where it doesn't require a police immediate response are now diverted to Ramsey County Crisis so that a mental health professional can help the

caller through what is going on and hopefully get it treated as a mental health issue and not a law enforcement issue.

Other opportunities moving forward, we are looking for funding opportunities so that we can partner up mental health professionals with officers who are responding to those calls for service where we know mental health is an issue.

So we've come a long way, and we have a long way to go, but we are encouraged by the momentum and the awareness that our officers and our community are receiving right now.

OFFICER FERRARO: If would add, not only does it involve crises; it involves management of well-being. When it happens on the street, individuals that have a mental illness, the sheriff has, within the past five years, has actually identified a team of practitioners and nurses inside of jails. So once an individual is arrested or detained, after that, there is a process to go through, where individuals can see counselors and have medical attention actually quite differently in a bunch of ways.

CHIEF AXELL: I don't know if you're aware, but there is some legislation going through right now. We're trying to get a lot more funding for police officers for consultation and crisis intervention training. It has support, and we're hoping that that gets through and gets passed, so there is even more training coming, but it's a hot button issue. The administrations of the police departments are training the officers in all of those things that we hope we can get more coming up after this legislative session, if everything goes right.

OFFICER FERRARO: If I could just say one more quick point. I'm sorry. I apologize. I actually did go through the crisis intervention training, and I think it was as an amazing training session of five days.

We as patrol officers use those techniques on almost every single call, and it may not even be dealing with someone that is suffering from a mental health crisis, but, absolutely, we do have a lot of mental health crisis calls on a daily basis. And over the last 15 years, I think that particular call has

increased in numbers, and that shows that we as police officers, we as medical professionals, we as the fire department and ambulance, it's important that we understand that situation that those people are dealing with. And we want to try to help them. That's what we are there for. We want to try to help that person. And whether it's to bring them to the hospital so that they can take a look at their medications and make sure that their medications are working for them, or bringing them to the hospital so that they can speak to a nurse and talk out what is going on. But we do want to help those people that are suffering through a mental health crisis because they're our community members. So thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Dobratz has a question.

MR. DOBRATZ: Thank you everyone for your testimony. I want to hear, Chief Axtell, since it's so fresh with the report coming out today, were there specific barriers that you saw with the 21st Century Policing recommendations, any recommendations that you said, this is going to be harder for our department to meet or to kind of exceed at? Were there some that people in your department and your leadership said that,

these are the ones that we definitely want to encourage and enforce because we do think that it will have the greatest impact compared to the other ones?

CHIEF AXTELL: Thank you for your question, yes, absolutely. There are going to be, some recommendations, we're unable to achieve, because state or local law prevents us from doing certain things. But any time we're looking at trust and transparency and legitimacy, those were the things really where the rubber meets the road with police agencies in our communities. Those are things that are going to bring us all together.

So I was most encouraged about releasing the data sets, being more transparent with our data sets. That's one of the recommendations that we followed up on from this report. In addition to community engagement, which is why we created our Community Engagement Unit. There are many more opportunities to close the gap. And please, if you get a chance, to check out the website. I'm really excited about it; our staff's done an incredible job with it. I can't wait to get home tonight because it's the first

time it's live and open the public, so I'm going to get in there and play around with it myself.

CHAIR KORBEL: I have one final question for the panel. In the earlier panel, Chief Harteau mentioned that her department has created a policy, a duty to report policy, that requires of cops, that have witnessed or been involved in some bad act by a fellow officer, that they have the duty to report that bad behavior. Are there policies like that in place in your jurisdiction?

CHIEF AXTELL: Yes, we do. We do have a duty to report policy. And again, that is something that you can find on our website as well. Questions like that specifically, yes, I'm here to answer that, of course, but if you are somewhere at some time wondering how does the St. Paul Police Department deal with reporting another officer for acts that aren't within policy, you can read there on our website.

CHAIR KORBEL: Right.

MR. FERRARO: And I'll just add, short, that those of on the street have read the policy and have proceeded to use it.

CHIEF AXTELL: We do also, in fact, if you're asked about it and you lie, you're fired. So it's plain and simple. From the other panel, we as cops have so much pride in what we do. We don't want to have those, quote -- it's been used many times -- bad apples either. We have to -- we have a lot of pride in the things that we deal with. We don't want that around us.

CHAIR KORBEL: If you would just indulge us with one final question.

MS. GUADARRAMA: This is a real quick question for Sergeant McDaniel, how often does the resident council, especially the Latino, meet.

DEPUTY McDANIEL: I can answer that. We usually have about three to four cops per year who are Latino. That's for all of our councils.

MS. GUADARRAMA: Because it wasn't in the picture, and I heard from other members here who are in the council, who say we only met once.

DEPUTY McDANIEL: Yes, I mean, we are in the process of restructuring community engagement team right now, where we're actually going to be adding more individuals from the community to our team. Appreciate

the question.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you to the panel, thank you for taking your time in the afternoon to spend it with us. So we will take a break right now and get ready for our next panel that convenes here at 3:10. Thanks so much.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Good afternoon, everyone. Are we on the record?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.

CHAIR KORBEL: We are. We will get started with our final panel. This is our policy makers and judiciary panel.

I'll just remind everyone that we do have a public comment portion scheduled for 4:20, because it's going to be immediately following this panel, so if there are members of the public who would like to make a statement on the 21st Century Policing issues, please sign up.

We have four people signed up already. Please sign up if you would like to make a statement on

the record at the 4:20 public comment session.

And now I'd like to turn it over to our panel. Welcome, good afternoon. Thank you. Dr. Borgida?

DR. BORGIDA: Good afternoon. Thank you for inviting me. I'm Eugene Borgida of the University of Minnesota. I'm in the psychology department, and I have an appointment in the law school, been there for four years.

I would like to talk today about bias and prejudice reduction programs that can lead to persisting change in policing, or I guess the question is, can such programs lead to persisting change in policing?

The first one, just to mark my spot here on the turf. I am very much -- Pillar 5, this talk is really Pillar 5 of the Task Force report, going to be focusing in on training and education, really, is what the thrust of this talk is going to be about.

My focus is on this question before you: can implicit bias or prejudice reduction programs lead to persisting change in policing? And persisting change,

I mean over time. Current psychological science on reducing implicit, subtle bias and explicit, overt bias will be reviewed selectively. I'll take you through some studies that are pretty much state of the art, and we'll ask the question, how does this research inform policy making for people who are understandably eager to determine whether police training and programs, like the one used in Minneapolis and elsewhere, fair and impartial policing, whether such programs are effective to foreshadow things. And the point here is that we know very little about the effectiveness over time of these kinds of training programs to reduce bias in police departments.

The quote that we have here from piece by Carey last year in the New York Times, police officers have reported, in written evaluations, anecdotally, that the implicit bias training helped them. No studies have examined its success in reducing bias or whether officers who have taken the training are less likely to be involved in shootings or other uses of force.

So that is an accurate a statement from a

scientific point of view. We really have to dig in on that point. I will try to dig in on that point.

There is a need to know whether and in what ways these programs are effective. Do they actually reduce bias, or do they have no impact whatsoever, or do they cause harm? Those are questions that anyone should ask about any kind of program. Those are the questions that educating and training people, is it accomplishing its goals or is it in some ways dysfunctional?

The bottom line that I will get to at the end is I would like to recommend a collaborative research between the Minneapolis Police Department and the University researchers to design, assess the impact of ability of bias training on implicit bias with psychological science as a foundation is as a starting point.

The starting point is a starting point that I'm pleased to put up from the task force. This is actually a quote from a colleague of mine at Stanford, Jennifer Eberhardt, "All human beings have biases or prejudices as a result of their experiences and these

biases influence how they might react when dealing with unfamiliar people or situations. An explicit bias based upon race, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, or other attributes. Common sense shows that an explicit bias or an overt bias is incredibly damaging in police-community relations and there is a growing body of research and evidence that shows that implicit bias, the biases people are not even aware that they have, is harmful as well."

This is the phenomenon. There is very little debate about the existence of subtle bias. Social scientists have documented this now for 40 years, so I'm not going to take -- spare you through a magical mystery tour of how all this works. I think we're starting from the standpoint of whether or not one can reduce these sorts of biases and what techniques do we know based on psychological science and social science that might suggest ways to improve of the effectiveness of these training programs.

I'm going to take you through the key studies fairly quickly and absolutely open to questions as we go along. Some of these studies will be

complicated. I've tried to simple them down to the fundamental points.

The very first assessment of best practices when it comes to prejudice reduction programs was done by two researchers -- Beth Paluck and Don Green done in 2009 and they were very interested in assessing the body of work that had been done in prejudice reduction programs up to that point in time, a total of 985 studies as a matter of fact. This is a qualitative review in contrast to a quantitative review. They talk about --- they define prejudice reduction in a very broad way. A possible pathway from an intervention and there are a number of examples of interventions that leads to a reduced level of prejudice. That's a pretty rough definition of prejudice reduction. They evaluated a very rich database, most of which was published in peer review journals, a wide range of methodologies excluding -- they excluded gender as a topic. I can tell you why, but it's one of those annoying academic side points, so I'm not going to get into it. What was their conclusion in 2009? That the causal effects of prejudice reduction program intervention is, quote

unquote, "remains unknown." So this is in 2009 based on 985 studies assessing everything that's ever been done, examining them ethologically and statistically, and they concluded that we really don't know what the best practices are. There was a suggestion that what we call extended interview contact, bringing people from different groups together to have substantial, significant interactions with each other, could be effective in reducing prejudice and cooperative learning situations seem to suggest that as well. So that was the first review, not a very upbeat assessment of what we know. It's the kind of thing that the can be discouraging or it can be motivating, and I tend to think it's motivating.

The second important study to point out to you is a study done by Patricia Devine and her colleagues at the University of Wisconsin. They studied implicit racial bias and they treat implicit racial bias as a habit. They view implicit bias as a deeply ingrained human tendency. It's analogous to a habit, and if you're going to try to break a habit, you have to do a lot of different things to try to break a habit. Not

just in the short term but in the long term as well. That was there, sort of, approach.

They didn't just, sort of, come into this giving awareness, let's just sort of make everybody aware of bias and then we'll be good. That wasn't their approach. Their approach was actually, throw the kitchen sink at it, because what it is is actually very deeply ingrained. So this was an approach that was a very multifaceted approach. A field experiment, intervention condition and control condition ran over three months. It was designed to reduce implicit racial bias in a group of University of Wisconsin college students. Okay, so that's obviously a drawback which I will come back to.

The intervention, across time, was more effective than the control in reducing measures of implicit bias, as measured by the Implicit Association Test, the IAT, which is the most commonly used measure of implicit bias. It also was particularly effective not surprisingly for people who are concerned about discrimination for the subset of people in this study going through this study who became aware of their own

bias, and either committed to, you know, developing concern about discrimination. This effect of the intervention over time was even stronger. And it increased over time people's concern about discrimination, and elevated their personal awareness of bias.

Now, to show you how they accomplished that -- I'm not going to get into this too much, this is an overview to measure that I'm not going to get into overview of the design. You can see that there was a baseline here, over in the far left, the explicit measures, using measures of racism, explicit survey measures.

At zero you see there's another baseline measure of implicit prejudice using the IAT, and then you see how these measures are collected over time, at different points over a 12-month -- 12-week period of time.

The important thing is look at that they threw at these people in the intervention condition. You can see here that they used stereotype replacement, talking to people about what are the alternatives to

stereotypes? Counterstereotypic information imaging, you know, impressions of people who are counter to the racial stereotypes that people hold.

Individuating information, you know, talking to people about what people are like as individuals, trying to break them -- move them away from categorical thinking. And a couple other different perspectives, personal contact and perspective taking. We tend to think, well, just put yourself in the shoes of the other person, or sit down and have coffee, and have contact and we'll be good.

There are different theories and different settings in psychology and social science that have taken up each and every one of these components. What these researchers did was to smush them all together in one intervention training program, to sort of say let's not be too pristine about this. Let's go at this, because we're trying break a habit. We're trying to break the prejudice habit, and we probably shouldn't be too theoretical about it.

So they threw a lot of components at it, and you don't know what component in particular drove the

effects, but they threw the kitchen sink at the habit, and they broke the habit. And you're dealing with, already fairly liberal-minded college students, so, you know, this is not done a sub-sample -- it was done with, you know, University of Wisconsin undergraduates who are probably, you know, more progressive than most.

Another study, a very important study, that came out in 2014, by Al DeWine and his colleagues from Harvard, conducted a research contest. So this is a different methodology, right, the last study I talked about was an experiment over time. This was a study that involved a contest. They invited a number of researchers across the country to propose experimental interventions that would be based on theory, and social psychology. My field of study is social psychology, I'm the head of the program in social psychology, so we teach these kinds of approaches to undergraduates and graduate students. And this particular study came up with 17 different interventions, based on 17 different approaches, and then we're pitting then against each other as a question of which of these approaches would be more effective for reducing the bias.

All they wanted to do was to show which of these approaches might be more effective. 17,000 plus people participated. High powered, detect a very small effect, okay, so if an intervention was going to be effective there was enough power statistically in this particular study design to pick it up. What does it mean to win?

Well, to win, if those interventions elicits and average Implicit Association Test score closest to the point of no implicit reference between whites and blacks. So basically if you're intervening by putting people into a conversation where they're having close personal contact. I think that was one of the interventions.

Or if you're putting people into an intervention where they were thinking about counter examples, or what we call counterstereotypic exemplars, okay, so Oprah Winfrey for example was one of the individuals who was thrown out as a counterstereotypic exemplar. There was a discussion about that. So the question was, if you're exposed to those types of interventions, does the implicit prejudice score drop

down so that there's no difference between whites and blacks on these implicit association measures.

And then you computed the effect sizes across a number of studies within an intervention category. You've got a number of different intervention categories, and a number of experiments within each category. So taking the perspective of others they did a number of other experiments within that context, and they looked at the effect size of exposure to that intervention.

Now this is a scary figure, and I'm not going to go too much into it, but on the left side you see all the different interventions that they tested, all 17 of them plus what they call faking the IAT. You know, the IAT is the test that is associated with Project Implicit at Harvard, a very well-known test used both in terms of research and practice, and it's pretty hard to fake it. But you can give people specific strategies, and say, here's the deal with the IAT.

So when you see a foundation of X, you know, of a category with an evaluation term like white = good, don't take that --- don't' reject that, take your time

when it comes to white = good or black = bad. So they give strategies to kind of bust up the test, to fake the scores. That turned out to be pretty effective, and you look at when they adopt the faking line they usually do pretty good.

But what you see here is --- well what you see here is on the left side all the different intervention approaches that they took and they studied in this thing. What you see here is the zero point. Coincide is an effect size, okay, so as you move from left to right we'll pass the zero point this direction, that's the stronger effect of the intervention. And so these black dots we see here that are to the right of this zero point tell you how -- what the effect side of that intervention was. The critical thing is that some interventions besides just the faking IAT we're quite effective. That very top one is vivid counterstereotypic scenarios. Another one is practicing --- with thinking about counterstereotypic exemplars. Priming multiculturalism, getting people to think about multiculturalism and being specific about it.

So the point here, is that this is a paradigm, a quantitative paradigm that allows you to look comparatively, and see which approaches were the best at reducing implicit prejudice. And some were better than others. Okay.

Counterstereotypic exemplars with strong intentional strategies to overcome bias. Where you give people specific strategies for thinking about becoming aware of their bias and counteracting their bias. That was effective. And the value of conditioning; you essentially put people through a conditioning exercise where people's thoughts about individuals and different groups change over these sessions.

Now, there are caveats to a study like this. Eighty-five percent of the interventions were completed in five minutes. So that's the bad news right? The good news is, wow, we did all these interventions, the bad news is they did these boom, boom, boom using the Project Implicit database. That's a database with 17 million people who have taken IAT scores, and so they sign up and they do these interventions with those

1 people, but it's under five minutes.
2 So there's a need for longer intervention
3 sessions, other samples, other settings, other
4 measurements besides the IAT would be useful. There is
5 no evidence in this study, 2014 quantitative state of
6 the art study --- there was no evidence whatsoever about
7 the durability of these effects. So for the
8 interventions that we see here that were effective, they
9 were effective within five minutes, and there's no way
10 to know from this study whether these effects will
11 really last. And so talking it over with a group
12 discussion, and talking about Barack Obama and it's a
13 college and it's in a group discussion was all done in
14 five minutes, so you don't know whether any change or
15 diminishment in the implicit association score lasted
16 beyond that point in time. So that's a problem.
17 So they decided to do another study in 2016
18 and only one away from finishing these studies. That
19 same group from Harvard, they tested nine
20 interventions, many of them the same group that I just
21 put on the board, to ask the question, do these
22 interventions change people's implicit racial

prejudice scores over time? These were non-black university samples, student samples. They used five different interventions with counterstereotypic exemplars as the driving --- as the core of the study. One with prime multicultural ideology, again these people are randomly assigned to one of these intervention conditions. And then they measure their implicit scores, evaluative conditioning and then intentional strategies.

They measured the scores of these people who have been assigned to these interventions immediately time one. And all interventions that were studied showed a significant --- a statistically significantly drop and a reduced implicit prejudicial preferences. Five of those were very significant.

At some time several hours and several days after being exposed to this intervention none of the interventions were effective. None were effective. And even for the interventions where there was a delay of one day, after one day, any effects that reduced implicit bias disappeared, were not found.

So the point here is that implicit

preferences as you see on the slide rebound very quickly, and can we kind of carbon date that by saying it's about a day you exposed people to these interventions.

So short-term malleability in implicit preferences does not necessarily lead to long-term change. Putting people in a room and going through one version of these interventions is not going to do the trick.

Here's another hideous slide. The only thing you have to know is the black lines on the right are the effects after time one, so for all the interventions on that side you see effect sizes that bump up, you know, pretty high on the statistic --- all the black lines are right measurement right after exposure to the intervention, people randomly assigned to the intervention that take place pretty quickly.

The neutral circles, that are all hovering around zero, to the left of the line, that's time two. So you can just see now all of those effects for each and every one of those interventions snap right back.

You know, and that's not going to be a surprise

to people in this room. A surprise because we know how deeply in the brain these kind of prejudices are. By the way, none of these interventions have an effect on explicit prejudice. Those studies look at explicit prejudice too, it's just that no effect, the prejudice level's unchanged as a function as a function of these interventions.

So, a few caveats, first of all, effective mechanisms for long-term change preferences may not attest --- you may say, my God what are these people doing? I mean this is their job. This is their day job, and they're coming up with these effect showing that you can you produce an effect, you know, in the immediate moment, but it dissipates within a day. Maybe they should switch careers and go to law school.

We don't know that these are that effective, because we may not have really tested the proper mechanisms. We may need longer more intensive interventions, okay, all of these are real quick hitters, five minutes or less. So the question becomes, maybe pick these interventions and test them for longer sessions, more intensely face-to-face.

That was done by Devine in Wisconsin, and her colleagues following up the study I showed you in 2012. They tripled the sample size of that study, the three month field experiment. They did another and failed to find the same effect that they obtained early on.

Also the other caveat -- the final caveat is, maybe I have the right interventions but the wrong ovulation, because all these studies the psychologists do, you know trying to change adults implicit preferences, and they're pretty ingrained, I think by the time they're an 18-year old University of Wisconsin student these biases are pretty ingrained. So if you look at the literature and psychology you see that these kind of biases develop as a toddler age. They are deeply ingrained in-group, out-group preferences and racial preferences and surface very, very early, and they may strengthen over time because there are environments that can strengthen them.

All right --- this is just --- almost there. The final study just came, it was just published by a mixed team of investigators, the only thing I want to

point out here is it was a very sophisticated quantitative analysis. What I want to show you, is in this study that was done was what we call the quantitative net analysis. So it looks at and aggregates the numbers, and tries to determine if there is an effect across a number of studies.

And what they did was they looked at 426 studies, over 72,000 participants in those studies. Okay, here's the critical statistic, of 426 studies, only 22 -- only 22, that's 4.6 percent, actually examine whether these effects persisted beyond a single session. And of the 22, only nine found some significant effect over the day or up to a week.

So the point is, people's understanding of implicit bias, and the reduction of implicit bias, I think is predicated on a lack of awareness scientifically of the fact that the bias exists but is very hard to change. And if you can change it, it is very hard to find the conditions and the factors that sustain, and, you know, maintain the sorts of changes that are necessary. So my final slide is this.

Summarizing thing for you, psychological

science has the comparative effectiveness of a lot of different interventions. For decades, psychologists have studied prejudice reduction and have different theories about how to do it. We've looked at, and mapped, comparatively the effectiveness of these approaches. And those studies that I showed you target some ideas that I think are important to incorporate into police training programs. Those training programs now do not incorporate all of these kinds of ideas, and they certainly don't seem to be operating on the premise that you need multiple components built into these training programs, and we can talk more about that.

Secondly, effects that are obtained do not persist. Implicit prejudices are deeply ingrained and rebound quickly. We all know that, so we're talking about K2 here in terms of really trying to develop an approach that can intervene and change views. Not impossible, because there are some encouraging findings. But I do think that our research collaboration between the Minneapolis Police Department and the University of Minnesota researchers,

both the law school and the social science group, would be a useful idea, to design these kinds of programs and to test the effectiveness of a multifaceted implicit bias, prejudice reduction program.

Draw on the intervention research, for example, introducing racial disparities, and bias in health care. There is a whole literature now showing that some of these interventions, some of these very same ideas are very effective at reducing racial biases between white physicians and African-American patients. In particular, a number of studies have tried to take up that question in a very interesting way. So I would call for collaboration between police and by university researchers to really dig in.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you Dr. Borgida.

Mr. KAPPELHOFF: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Minnesota Advisory Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you as you examine civil rights and the efforts in Minnesota to implement the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing recommendations. These are critical issues for our state and our nation, and I am grateful to the

Advisory Committee and to the Commission for holding today's hearing.

My name is Mark Kappelhoff, and I am a District Court Judge in Hennepin County, however, I am testifying this afternoon in my own personal capacity, and the views I present are my own.

My perspective on these issues is informed by my nearly two decades working as a civil rights prosecutor in the Civil Rights Division at the US Department of Justice, where I enforced the federal civil rights laws related to policing practices, human trafficking, and hate crimes. As a senior official in the Department, I supervised and prosecuted police misconduct cases across the country, and I oversaw the Department's criminal and civil investigations in Ferguson, Missouri, Baltimore, Maryland, among others, and played a key role in the Justice Department's police accountability and criminal justice reform efforts.

Police encounters resulting in the deaths of young men of color in Ferguson, New York, and Chicago, among other cities, launched an important national conversation about race, policing, and community trust.

This conversation has continued robustly here in Minnesota since the officer involved shooting deaths of Jamar Clark and Philando Castile.

My remarks will focus on three key aspects of this conversation: The factors that contribute to the erosion of trust between the police and the communities they serve, particularly, communities of color; the importance of police-community trust; and some of the strategies that work to accomplish this goal, including the strategies that work to accomplish this goal, including the strategies that are being implemented in Minnesota. Throughout my comments, I will reference the excellent work of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, which provided recommendations for implementing policing practices that have promoted public safety, while building public trust.

Factors that contribute to eroding Police-Community Trust.

Before addressing how to build police-community trust, it is important to identify some of the factors that contribute to eroding community

trust. There is no single factor, but there are a few that I will highlight.

For some people, it stems from our nation's complicated history and the struggle for civil rights, and the role that police have sometimes played in that history. As former New York Police Commissioner William Bratton told an audience of officers, "None of us were troopers on the bridge at Selma. But it doesn't matter that these things happened before many of us were even born. What matters is that our history follows us like a second shadow."

For millions of Americans, this shadow has been cast by stories of police misconduct and abuse that are passed from generation to generation, and then validated by personal experience, or through high profile incidents that are broadcast on our television screens and through social media.

Another source of mistrust involves the state of our criminal justice system - and its ability, or lack thereof, to serve all Americans equally. These perceptions, the data, and the real life experiences fuel the belief in certain communities of color that the

criminal justice system is biased against them. It reinforces a narrative that routine encounters with the police will necessarily end badly and that they will not get a fair shake in a criminal justice system that seems biased and unfair.

Importance of Police-Community Trust.

Building and sustaining trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve is central to ensuring that we have a fair, equitable and effective criminal justice system. Criminal justice research has shown that people feel better about interactions with police and the legitimacy of the criminal justice system if they are treated respectfully, fairly, and have a chance to offer their point of view. This concept is commonly known as procedural justice or procedural fairness. Procedural fairness research informs us that an individual's respect of the justice system is tied more to the perceived fairness of the process and how they were treated, than to the perceived fairness of the actual outcome.

And whenever procedural fairness is violated or whenever people see or experience things

that sap their confidence in the fairness of the process of our justice system, the effects can be corrosive. People are less willing to cooperate with law enforcement, less willing to abide by the law, less willing to view the law and those who enforce it, as legitimate. This makes our police officers' already dangerous jobs even more difficult. This makes everyone less safe. And, it allows that alienation that people experience to build into resentment.

Accordingly, in my view, it's critical that we develop and implement policing policies and practices based on the principles of procedural fairness, equity, and effectiveness.

Strategies, Polices, and Practices that Build and Sustain Police-Community Trust.

There is no one-size-fits-all solution that will produce nationwide trust between law enforcement and communities. In fact, to the contrary. Each community needs to craft polices that reflect the challenges and the values of its community.

And it will not happen overnight. It will take a sustained effort of developing and implementing

evidenced-based and constitutionally-based policing practices. Importantly, it will require buy-in inclusion, and participation from all segments of our communities: from the police, community leaders, the judiciary, educators, policy-makers, the business community, and anyone else who wants to come to the table in a meaningful way. Indeed, we are all in this together. Meaningful change depends on candid engagement between stakeholders in every community to build trust, to provide police resources to help them effectively serve, and to build a criminal justice system that ensures procedural and substantive justice.

With that said, I would like to call your attention to several core elements that I think are essential to building trust between the police and the communities they serve. These elements are incorporated throughout the US Justice Department's Report on the Ferguson Police Department and they can also be found in the President's Task Force Report on 21st Century Policing.

Community Engagement, Procedural Fairness, and Implicit Bias.

First, police departments should implement policies and practices that foster positive community engagement and procedural fairness. This means encouraging community policing strategies within police departments that create opportunities for positive interactions between line officers and police leadership, and community members. These efforts humanize officers in the eyes of the community by providing opportunities to interact with officers in a context other than in an enforcement action.

Also, police departments should require procedural justice and implicit bias training for every officer in their department, from the Chief to the most recent graduates from the academy. These trainings increase awareness among officers and provide them with the knowledge and tools to engage in positive individual interactions with community members on the city streets.

Notably, last year, the Minneapolis Police Department launched a program to train every MPD officer on procedural justice and implicit bias. This effort was in conjunction with MPD's participation in the

Justice Department's National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, an innovative program designed to enhance procedural justice, reduce bias, and support reconciliation between communities and law enforcement. The MPD has fully implemented this program and, as a result, to date, it is my understanding that most MPD officers have been trained on procedural justice and implicit bias.

Transparency and Accountability.

Second, transparency and accountability are essential elements to building trust between communities and their police departments. Policies and practices that provide for transparency and accountability ensure that the public has a complete picture of how its police department operates, which in turn, helps to demystify police operations, reduce distrust, and promote greater cooperation from the community.

Also, every police department must have a fair, consistent, and effective accountability system. This means regular supervisory reviews of officers, early warning systems to identify problematic conduct,

and appropriate, equitable, and consistent discipline when warranted.

Accountability also should include after-action reviews of police operations. Police departments grow stronger when they adopt a culture of self-examination, and become learning organizations that evolve and improve their policing practices.

The Minneapolis Police Department and City of Minneapolis recently engaged in this type of after action review when it invited the Justice Department COPS Office to conduct an independent review in the response following the Jamar Clark shooting. Yesterday, the COPS Office issued its report and made a number of important recommendations that the Chief and Mayor have agreed to implement. I view this after -action review as an important step forward for the MPD and the city with respect to both transparency and accountability.

Data Collection and Analysis.

Next, it is imperative that the police departments collect and analyze data on police interactions with the public. This is necessary so

departments are able to identify and find address any bias or other issues that undermine trust between the public and the department. I would recommend that all police department collect and analyze data on its enforcement activities, particularly stops, searches, arrests, and the use of force, as well as information on complaints and how they are processed and resolved.

Police Departments Should Provide Officers with Support, Training, and Resources.

Finally, communities must provide police departments and their officers with the support, training and resources they need to do their jobs. Every day across our country police officers risk their lives to enforce the law and keep us and our communities safe.

This is why, from the de-escalation training, to specialized police units trained on how to interact with individuals in crisis, it is imperative that the police departments are provided with the state-of-the-art knowledge, training, and equipment they need to be effective and safe.

No less important is a commitment to

officer safety and well-being, to ensure that these public servants have the personal and professional support to be safe and to cope with the stress and trauma of one of the most dangerous jobs in the country.

In closing, let me again thank you for holding today's hearing and for the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon. I look forward to answering any of your questions.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Ms. Johnson?

MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon Madame Chair and Members of the committee. My name is Barbara Johnson. I am a Minneapolis City Council member and President of the Minneapolis City Council. I consider it an honor to be in front of you today. I would just like to tell you a little bit about the work that I represent.

I have the far northwest corner of Minneapolis, and as many of you know that particular area of Minneapolis is quite challenged with higher crime rates than the rest of the city, higher rates of victimization of its citizens, and it also is the part of the city where we see the most complaints of police

misconduct and the attitudes of constituents are quite different at times regarding their interactions with the police.

So it's a little bit of a challenge to represent that community, but what I would say is that I know and in speaking to my constituents across the board that people are concerned for their safety. And so they expect when they make a 911 call to get the police to respond in a timely fashion, in a helpful way, and they expect to be respectfully helped, and that is across the board.

I think one of the things that is a challenge for us as a community is to listen to people's experience that they have had, and I guess to listen to peoples' experiences that they have had with the police over the years and how that brings them to where they are when you're talking about the issue in front of us.

I just spent yesterday participating in Minneapolis with two ladies who have been victims of drive by shootings into their home, and just that that experience, how awful that was, one of the ladies started out saying, "and I have this challenge with

police. When I was 13 years old I was accused of a crime that I did not commit and it was a terrible situation for me and I am never forgetting that." In the back of her mind that's what she is dealing with when calling the police to respond to this house where this very, very serious incident, where this bullet came into her children's bedroom and through the plaster, and got sheetrock dust on them it was so close. I just find that this is a -- it's important for all of us to listen to what peoples' experiences are and take them exactly as they tell us how it happened and where they come from.

I also have to say in my background I worked for many, many years as a nurse. I worked almost all of my nursing career in mental health. I was really pleased years ago, almost 10 years ago, when our police department invested in training our officers in crisis intervention training. If you look at the logs of police calls domestics are probably the highest percentage that police officers get, and mental health and mental issues are very influential in so many of those calls, as well as circumstances that come out of other calls, so our police officers are trained in crisis

intervention. Not just people that wanted to be involved in that, but every patrol officer has been trained in it --- that's a 40 hour training, a weeks' worth of training and people will get a refresher as well.

It's a sort of thing at that you have to continually polish your skills, and that will happen.

I'm really proud of that. And when I listen to what is going on in the legislature, other communities we are looking at this very kind of training, and in Minneapolis we have a luxury of a large department. So when you take 12 officers off the street you can replace them with other people. The smaller departments really have a challenge providing that kind of training for their officers.

The state has an obligation to help those smaller departments. Our officers also have received procedural justice training and implicit bias training, and actually that training now has been open to the public, to the people, so that citizens can come there to look at their own bias and internal thinking and learn from that.

In looking through the recommendations of

the 21st Century Policing, some of the things jumped out at me that obviously are positive interactions with the community so are extremely important.

Our police chief has done an admirable job in insisting that her officers attend community ice cream socials, the hot dog night at the local church, and people really enjoy sitting down with the officers in a social setting and meeting them and listening to what their stories are, not just about their families, but about all kinds of things. It's great to listen to the types of conversations people have when they're in a social situation with officers.

We also in Minneapolis, on the north side, I'm really happy that we have the Police Activity Scene. And it's an organization for young people to interact with police in usually athletic situations, but there is also after school tutoring of some summer camps that go on, and really there are opportunities for people to meet a police officer in a social situation, again, as a children. So that they understand when they meet a police officer, in perhaps a more challenging situation that they have meet people in a more positive way and

the connections that children make with these officers as well as the teams of officers --- bike cops --- people really appreciate that interaction with our police officers too.

I also am able, with the things I hear from people as I talk to my constituents, with the city vote, you know what do they want to see in police in their community? One of the things that people talk about is residency, and that is something that would require a change in state law.

I am a daughter of a Minneapolis fire fighter, and I grew up in Minneapolis in the 1950's, when fire fighters and police officers and all city employees actually had to live in the city. And it was a wonderful way to meet your neighbors and understand what different jobs people did and, again, it created a sense of knowledge and of neighborliness that is lacking today. And I think people really feel that, that there is a disconnect between officers that live so far away. We have done what we can in the last few years with getting people points on entrance exams for the city residents.

We just -- and that actually has helped, and

we actually just passed a land policy in the City of Minneapolis. We have a lot of empty lots to be built on in north Minneapolis, so we have offered a financial incentive for people to build on these lots, and there is an extra $5,000 incentive if you're public safety personnel or a teacher. And I've actually met people who are interested in that.

And we also have a challenge with diversifying our police department, and we've invested in a community service officer program to bring people into our department, to help them with their education, and then diversify the department.

It's been interesting to me also to look in our community, which is a very diverse community, and different challenges over time with different cultural groups deciding that police, that law enforcement is a good career and a lot of it as I think through this and listen to people, is family attitudes. That if you're from a culture that values law enforcement you would think that is something that would be of interest and you'd like to see your children doing that. That's been a little bit of challenge.

I think we're on a good mark. The only thing that I just want to mention for the years, my 20 years on the city council when I first came on the city council the number of women that would be in a rookie class that was being sworn in was much higher than it is right now, and that's a big challenge I think for law enforcement in general. The chief has told me that is actually the trend across the country that there are fewer and fewer women going into law enforcement, we see it sometimes too in our fire department. So investigating why that is, what are the challenges. If you think about it, it may be a more stressful career for people when the hours are as varied as they are in law enforcement, there may be changes to be made to make it a more appealing career for women because I think it's really important. And as a woman, that would bring a special skill to some of the techniques that need to be used, the de-escalation, the thoughtful listening to people and respectful way that people are treated. So that's really important to me.

As I look through this too there are so many things that jump out. Language, one of the most common

complaints when people meet and complain to our review committees is language. And that is so important for people to be treated respectfully and using appropriate language. You know, in all interactions that any city employee has with people but particularly police.

The other thing that I noted was some of the language about young people in the system, avoiding getting young people involved in the system as much as possible. There mother of three children, had teenagers, lives with those times. Kids do incredibly stupid things, and to get to put into a vicious cycle because your brain isn't totally formed is a terrible thing. We have a real responsibility to intervene in ways that are positive that don't give children a criminal record.

The other thing that jumped out at me was some of the conversation about economic development and as someone again who represents part of north Minneapolis the ability to have a business, to grow your business, public safety is an important part of that mix that needs to happen to have people invest and then also grow in a community. And so partnerships between

business and law enforcement are truly valuable. And we have been actually with our last budget we have invested in outreach for the business community in north Minneapolis to tell us what they would like to see the police do to try to increase public safety in our big commercial corridor, West Broadway.

Just as I --- all of these recommendations are interesting. They're important in many ways.

I think one of the things as I'm listening to some of the discussion too about implicit bias. We have a really segregated city in Minneapolis. We have children that grow up in schools, in our public school system that have 90 percent white kids in the school. On the north side we have schools that don't have any white children. So when you grow up in that circumstance and are never exposed to people of color until you get into high school or college or on the job, you're at a disadvantage. And that's a horrible thing and I think we have to look at that as a city is that being part of the challenges that we face, we are a very very segregated city.

So again I thank you for the ability to come

here and speak to you today and just tell you about my personal experience. I'm very proud of our police department. I'm proud of our citizens and the great city that I live in and represent, and you know, I look forward to implementing more of these recommendations as we move forward in a more caring environment and more thoughtful treatment of each other. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. Good afternoon.

MS. BROWN: Good afternoon, thank you for having me. I'm Andrea Brown, Chair of the Police Conduct Oversight Commission and I also happen to be a Ramsey County Public Defender. So that uniquely positions me to have many opinions about the 21st Century Policing and Minneapolis specifically. So I'm going to stick to mostly the Police Conduct Oversight Commission, what it is briefly, please cut me off if you don't want to know all of the ins and outs. I think it's important to understand the framework from which I work. As the Chair of Police Conduct Oversight Commission I am a civilian, I was appointed by the mayor and then reappointed by Mayor Hodges. And this was ---

Minneapolis is a hybrid, if you will, of oversight.

If you look nationwide there's many different types of oversight that cities do, Minneapolis is a hybrid. The Police Conduct Oversight Committee focuses on the policy portions of police complaints. So we look at --- we do statistics, we do data, we look at complaints that come in and peel from them patterns and trends. From there we compare that to the policies that the MPD already has or doesn't have. We make recommendations, and therefore make change.

So two of the things that I want to highlight that are in the recommendations that Minneapolis has already done, and what we can improve on is what I want to be before I let you bombard us with questions. One is that yes, Minneapolis is participating in the national initiative, and therefore a lot of CIT training, implicit bias training, and the procedural justice training are being met. What I'm interested in is how is it being met and how do you evaluate that to see if it's actually beneficial.

I can tell you from personal experience and from my commissioners, we had somebody go to the CIT

training that all the officers had. The review with that they thought it was a great starting point, but there are other things that can be addressed more specifically, especially de-escalation. That's the huge, to combat use of force. That the escalation is something that really needs to be modified in our continuing CIT training for our officers.

As far as the data collection transparency, the oversight commission really works on those two things, we pride ourselves on being what I consider neutral. We don't --- we're a neutral policymaker. We are not for the MPD all of the time, we are not for the citizens all the time.

I like having that flexibility, sometimes we win, sometimes we don't, because it allows us to be fair. If we have accurate policies, if we have efficient and effective policies, then citizens are protected and officers are protected. We really pride ourselves on that.

We not only talk to the community and see what is going on in the community in looking at their complaints, but we also talk to the officers. What do

they need to do their job, and to do their job well without fear of losing their job or fear of a complaint. Because if you have an officer who is fearful of a complaint coming down the road they're not going to do their job effectively at that moment and then they get a complaint. So one of the two -- we do researches and studies, so the data portion is there for Minneapolis.

I have great respect for our legal analyst who gives us these reports, but also looks at nationwide what's going on, best practices and how is it effective for Minneapolis. Because that's what the community wants to know, is how is this going to work in Minneapolis. It's good that it works in Seattle or New York but how is that going to affect us when we are a city that is deeply segregated, north Minneapolis, south Minneapolis, sometimes citizens from those two areas don't ever to go the other area. So when we did a data study what we found was MPD initially was just keeping track of race, age, things that you find on an ID when you do an investigatory stop. We all know through data and research that people of color and poor

1 people are the people who are the most stopped by police
2 for traffic stops, random time stops, things like that.
3 What our staff focused on was, what was missing.
4 What from the 21st Century policing
5 recommendations what was missing for MPD and for MPD,
6 we made nine recommendations, submitted them to the
7 chief and the chief took them completely and implemented
8 them, so these are policy recommendations, we're now
9 changing the policy to match that.
10 And I can say it's been two years since
11 we've done an investigatory stop. My commission just
12 voted last week, I believe. I believe it was last week
13 that we were doing a kind of evaluation, a two-year look
14 to see where we're at with that data.
15 In Minneapolis as of now, a police officer
16 cannot do an investigatory stop, cannot clear that call
17 without getting certain demographics, and it's more
18 than the demographics on your driver's license. It's
19 perceived race, it's actual race, it's gender, it's
20 perceived gender. They have to have a reason for the
21 stop before the call is cleared. And I think that that
22 is super important because when you're talking about

policing and transparency and communication. What has been lacking in the past is that officers pull you over and you don't know what they are doing with your license, you feel like you're being mistreated and then you do a complaint. Where we're trying to curb that with what we're doing with PCOC.

One of our other biggest studies is that on mental health. And so, Minneapolis, we do feel we've always been proactive in trying to curb any negativity that can arise between citizens and police officers.

One of the latest things is mental health. It is rampant nationwide and we have a co-responder model that we are now highlighting in Minneapolis, and we will go from there and we will continue to look at the data for the evidence, you know, so it's something that the council has invested in, the mayor's office has invested in, the citizens can get started -- we can get started with citizens who came to our POC meeting on a Tuesday night and said hey, this is something important to me. This is what I want. How will we get there? And they worked with us, and my commissioners and then we partnered further to get this actually to come to

fruition and have something in Minneapolis.

So that's what's happening in Minneapolis specifically, when you think about -- I know you have heard all these theories and ideas and recommendations, but I'm kind of the person that can tell you what's happening in Minneapolis, how is this working and honestly the Police Conduct Oversight Commission could be a full-time job but we are all citizens, we live in Minneapolis, we love our community and that's what want -- that's why we do what we do in addition to our normal day jobs.

So I could go on but I'm very interested in the questions you have, if any, about what is actually happening in Minneapolis, in these policies because there is so many that we can implement and so many we have implemented, but I just thank you for your time.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you to the panelist.

Are there any questions from the committee members?

MR. KOLBO: My question is for council president Johnson.

As you mentioned, you represent and live

and work in a historically high crime area and I'm interested in hearing from you in terms of what you hear from your constituents, and I'm sure you hear a lot from them, and, as you mentioned, it's not always consistent perhaps, but what are you hearing most from your constituents? And in your opinion is it based on a resident or a long-time resident what is the most important thing that can be done from the policing standpoint to reduce the amount of crime and particularly violent crime, which I think is on the rise in the last five or six years.

MS. JOHNSON: I think probably the thing I hear most from my constituents is they want when they have a challenge from a truly violent crime incident they want a fast response, and we have had a challenge with that in Minneapolis. We are beefing up our actual number of officers. We lived through the recession where we cut back and that affected our response times.

And with the uptick in violent crime that became a problem and so we invested in more officers. With the violent crime, I think part of it is and I would hear this from I would say almost across the board,

people that are really violent criminals need to be away from our society. So it's disturbing to people when they see that when an arrest is made, a charge is made, and someone has a very long history, we they hear about that. That I think is a real challenge.

And the other thing I think we don't do well enough as a city, as a department is telling the story. Even with the county attorney's office too and with the judges of telling the story about what happens when someone is arrested for a violent crime. You know, how did the case get put together? People are interested in that and then what's the outcome? You know, that person is no longer, you know, in the community. I think people want to hear that.

MR. KOLBO: Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Battle?

MR. BATTLE: I have two questions: one for the professor, and one for the judge. The question for the professor; I would like to say are there differences in the bias between the ethnic group, the Hispanic, the black, the Asian, the African? Do you see a difference there?

MR. BORGIDA: The studies that I have printed typically use samples that do not include any minorities, so these studies are based primarily on white participants. These are kind of larger scale studies. I think there is one that showed a look at Asians and Latinos and showed that the effectiveness of some of these interventions was not really predicated on the sample. It didn't really seem to be the case that some interventions were differentially more effective than others. Having said that, these interventions are not particularly culturally sensitive. They are not really interventions that have customized or shaped their approaches to different, you know, cultural groups. And that could have easily been done. There could be that kind of approach. The studies have not done that.

MR. BATTLE: Thank you. I would like to ask what are the cultural judgments?

JUDGE KAPPELHOFF: What is the culture?

MR. BATTLE: Do you see a culture biases there?

JUDGE KAPPELHOFF: Well, I think as the

professor said, are there certain biases, is that your question?

MR. BATTLE: Biases, you say a black person comes in front of the judge. Is it more likely to get sentenced? We know all the facts are in the study. We have 91, I think, in Minnesota that are incarcerated. So I'm trying to find out where did it come from, the policeman that stopped him in the street or the judge who sent him off?

JUDGE KAPPELHOFF: Well, I think to my comments, and based on my experience, I should share this, I spent years not just as a federal prosecutor, but also as a public defender for a period of time, so I've been in different portions of the criminal justice system.

I think all parts of it, I think it's an important point to understand, I think a lot of the issues get laid at the feet of police officers. And that I don't think is always fair. A lot of it is societal problems. A police officer is responding to a domestic assault incident or responding to a person in crisis; well, that's a societal problem. And we

expect officers to solve or resolve very complex problems. But each part of the criminal just system can contribute to a bias at some point in time. That can start at the inception, they encounter it on the street with the police officer, through the criminal justice system, the prosecutor, all the way up and through the judge.

So I think there are different aspects to that that I think we have to examine throughout the entire criminal justice system. And I think that's what's important about this is it isn't just one part.

I think the chief mentioned during his discussion that they once spoke of this wheel. I thought that was thoughtful. I think that's right, the police department, they are one spoke and we're all in this together.

I think examining these issues throughout the criminal justice system and the studies that are out there, I think it's an important question to look at that. And that's why I emphasized in my remarks data collection. I think we need to collect data, not isolated stops or searches and arrests by police

officers, but I think we should look at the entire criminal justice system. And I think we've done a little but of that, but we can do a lot more, not only in Minnesota, but also across the country. Because the only way to find evidence based policies is to have the evidence to support that. So my view is collect the data and find out where the bias exists.

CHAIR KORBEL: Any responses on that? All right, Ms. Nelson?

MS. NELSON: So this is for all four panelists. Earlier panels mentioned that the legislature right now is considering a bill that would provide some training and provide some money for training in de-escalation. It does not mention implicit bias or things like procedural justice. My question for all of you is, from your perspective, if you were the god of the legislature, what would you like to see happening? What would be kind of one of the most important things for the legislature to do on a statewide basis to address the issues that we're seeing in policing?

MS. JOHNSON: I can start. I think that

finding the right training is the most important. From my experience is that it's a big process. Whoever has the best proposal and bids is who you go with. I think if the state legislature is going to take a serious approach to training all Minnesota officers, city and state and county, right? We have to make sure that we have the best programming out there for our population. And I hope that is something that they take their time in assessing, and I don't know if it would be feasible to do that, have that program, a couple of people or a couple of officers attend those programs before deciding which one is best, but instead of just a big process where something is submitted because you can submit something, great. And in actuality it doesn't go as planned. So that would be my main goal.

PARTICIPANT: I think it's important that whatever comes out of the legislature, as long as mental health training is what they are focusing on mostly at this point. But you've got to start somewhere. And I think the mental health training has been in place for a very long time. And actually our mental health training initially was developed with the Hennepin

County Medical Center Crisis Intervention Program that they have had for many years, and it's an excellent program.

But I also think it's really important to think about how you do that in a way that's effective for small departments. Again, we can take 20 people off the street in the training, and there's other people to take their place. It's just impossible in some smaller departments. And so how do you, you know, on a region-wide basis, offer that training that works for the schedules of the officers and the departments? That would be a challenge.

JUDGE KAPPELHOFF: I'm going to defer to my colleague to my right.

MR. BORGIDA: I think that the procedural justice approach, at least from the social sciences, the social science community, is enormously important. I think Judge Kappelhoff captured it, which is people care less about outcomes than they care about the process. They have to feel satisfied with the way they're treated, they have to feel respected. And what flows from that is trust and community building. You are

building community capital that way. It's not necessarily outcomes that drive that according to that body of work. And that's an enormously influential body of work.

And so I think it's important to keep that in mind. And I know that de-escalation is something that intuitively appeals to the legislators because they can get it. And some of this procedural justice stuff seems a little diffuse and academic in its orientation.

But it's been field-tested in observational studies, so it is an important idea. Having said that, it isn't an idea that's a one size fits all. There are a lot of cultural differences that are associated with procedural justice. Different communities of color have, you know, different orientations to what constitutes procedural justice and how you establish trust and there has to be some cultural sensitivity.

Now, on implicit bias training, I think it's important to do, don't get me wrong. I just am not a big fan of throwing things up and seeing what hangs

on the wall. I think you have need to craft these things and you have to do it in way that's informed by the evidence that exists. And I think you have to have a commitment to testing it out to see what works. I think we're all in it to make sure it's effective. I don't think the police officers are out there saying I don't want to be debugged, leave me alone.

And that's the point I'm trying to make, which is some of these programs, including the one in Minneapolis, many of us feel actually sort of underscore existing biases that people see as politically correct. They resist it, they are who they are, they have deeply ingrained views and they'll do it because they have to do it, are told they have to do it. And some of the evidence suggests the only way you're going to change people who have that view is to create an engaging and personally involved and personally important exchange with people so they really start to understand it's not just about them, it's about their relationships with other people in the community.

So I think the legislature needs to really pay attention to all these programs. And I want to

underscore that big data is crucial in all of that, because the data that you collect is the body of data that you use to evaluate all these programs. My comment about we don't know whether a cop who has been through implicit bias training is someone who is less involved in stop and frisk, less involved in, you know, behind the scenes, you know, we don't know that. That may be true, and certainly theoretically we hope that's the case, but we don't know that.

And for all we know the people exposed to these programs are the worst offenders. I mean, there are plenty examples of social programs in the United States that have been evaluated where we learned -- like DARE. Remember DARE? I mean, that was really quite counter-productive. So there are lots of programs. Scared Straight. Scared Straight where you take children into prisons? All the data suggests that what happens in Scared Straight is it increases the probability of kids committing subsequent crimes.

So, you know, I think they really need to commit themselves, not only to the training programs, but to subsidize ecological data so you can use that data

to evaluate all these programs.

I spoke twice as long as I intended to.

CHAIR KORBEL: Mr. Highland, we'll take your question first.

MR. HIGHLAND: This question is for the Council Member. So this morning somebody, Shane? Yeah, so he was talking about they work with Minneapolis. He was talking about a business model in Minneapolis. Does that program have something particular for the north, to our area? If not, how can we work with them to make it>

MS. BROWN: We have actually, on West Broadway, we have what's called a special service district. And part of the work that they do is public safety, and they have met with some of the business owners on West Broadway to talk about the models that they have, which is a cooperative effort to link businesses together so that they act in conjunction with each other to enhance the public safety. That's a model. It's our downtown. You have people with more resources so they're able to invest in radios, in private security, and when we have a challenged

community it's hard to get that special service district going because people just aren't bringing enough income to sign onto something bigger.

But we are working through him on this last budget that we passed, that was one of the initiatives that was in there was an allocation for West Broadway, $250,000 to do different strategies for public safety on that commercial corridor. And that's a significant amount of dollars. And we've been using some of the techniques which they found, which include, you know surveillance cameras. But then also coordination among the businesses to address public safety through their own initiatives and working with each other.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. That concludes this panel. Thank you very much for taking your time from your afternoon to share your expertise with us.

We're going to take three minutes to allow this panel to transition. Again, if you have not signed up to speak, the sign-up is still open and we'll get started here in about three minutes.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed following a brief recess.)

CHAIR KORBEL: Dave Bicking, you are signed as the first speaker.

MR. BICKING: Hi, I'm Dave Bicking from Minneapolis. I work with the CUAPB, that's Communities United Against Police Brutality. We work every day specifically on efforts to improve policing. We have a 24-hour hotline. We field many hundreds of calls every year. We work with those who have experienced police brutality and unfortunately with many families of those who have been killed by police in Minnesota. That informs our extensive policy work and research.

We are well-known locally, including to the chair of this advisory panel, yet we are not surprised that we were not invited to be on the panel or even notified of this event. We will submit written testimony, however. In the meantime, I agree with Jason Sole that it is hard to be patient and hard to engage in one forum after another.

We have seen reports come and go, but with little if any change in the bad conduct, harassment, derogatory language, excessive force, and even killings that we are seeing and are reported to us. That

continues to be particularly prevalent in communities of color. The happy talk from many panelists, particularly from law enforcement, can't hide the statistics. With 150 years of this problem in Minnesota, and with the people in all the different roles talking here about how to improve, why is this problem so intractable?

It is good that people have pointed out the historic uses of policing as slave patrols, as servants of economic interests, as enforcers of racism. Well, there are still economic interests and there is still racism, and they are still protected by a system of policing that extracts a terrible price from those who are being by policed. Police are used most prominently in undesirable areas so that wealthy commuters aren't bothered and serves the downtown business interests, as you heard today.

There is many other areas but essentially it is not control, and those with the most oppressed areas are the ones needing the most control, and most over-policing in order to keep order.

So there are powerful forces resisting

change. It's good also that you heard about historical trauma, but we must not overlook current trauma. A lack of trust doesn't just come from historical police behaviors; lack of trust is a rational response to current police practices. Public relations and community engagement won't change that. The police themselves must improve.

And I agree with Jason Sole that it is critical to get rid of the really brutal and dangerous officers. Until that is done there will not be trust. If you encounter an officer and you don't know if this is one of the good guys or one of the ones who has a long history of brutality and just unprovoked violence, you can't trust that officer.

So, because those officers are still on the force, we conclude that they must be useful to maintain that control. Thus it is not surprising that civilian review boards are kept so weak, for instance. Those are a function of the city government that hires the police. It is outrageous, but not surprising, that a Minneapolis police officer can cause hundreds of thousands of dollars in lawsuits yet never even be disciplined, let

alone fired.

Since the so-called civilian oversight was overhauled in the city about four years ago in Minneapolis, there has been hardly any discipline of officers that is due to complaints received from civilians. We've been tracking this, and for four years so far, based on data that comes entirely from the Office of Police Conduct review and from Data Practices Act requests. And over four years so far we have seen that only six officers have been disciplined resulting from civilian complaints. That's six out of over 1,500 civilian complaints in that time. And three of those were simply a written reprimand.

Somebody talked about officers being fearful of complaints. I don't think so. In fact, we have officers, when people say, "I'm going to file a complaint," they just laugh at them. And that makes sense because that's what --- nothing will happen.

You can't build trust when there's so little accountability. In our written testimony, we will tell about an important new policy initiative by CUAPB, a requirement that officers have individual

professional liability insurance, like doctors, nurses, teachers, so that they have individual responsibility for their conduct. So the insurance premiums would go up if there was a history of lawsuits or an excess of complaints. That would be a deterrent for the officer. Really bad officers could not obtain insurance and could not work. We collected over 9,000 signatures of registered voters to get this on the ballot. Let me tell you it was very, very popular on the streets. But the city essentially cheated to prevent the public from having a chance to vote on this initiative. But the idea has become widely known and supported nationwide.

We have many other concrete recommendations, which we will submit. But to sum up, the problem is not police-community relations, the problem is continually bad policing.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, Mr. Bicking. Mr. Scott, Corian.

MR. SCOTT: Corian Scott of the Community United Against Police Brutality, and I was wondering if any of you ladies and gentlemen are from Minneapolis?

Just one, two. Oh, so and there is no police here, so how are we going to communicate between the police and community if the police are not here and members of Minneapolis are not here? What can you do from this point? Any of you, can ask the police to stop killing unarmed black people? Any of you? So, I guess we are at the same spot where we started. Nothing. That's all.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Would the next two speakers come up please and sit at the mic.

MS. PORTER: Good afternoon. I'm Gloria Porter, and I work here at the University of St. Thomas. I'm the community liaison for the college of education, leadership and counseling, and for the last eight years one of my primary duties has been recruitment for that whole college and one of the programs that I recruit for is a Master's in public safety and police leadership.

Because I recruit for that program that's given me an opportunity to know a lot of officers. I'm at precincts. I'm at the FBI. I work with the county, so I know chiefs of police, I know deputy sheriffs, I know agents. I know folks at the federal reserve. For

the last six years I have done a workshop for the St. Paul police academy on mutual respect. For the last seven years I've been a community partner for the State Patrol helping interview and select new State Patrol officers.

All that said though that's not what I wanted to speak to you about today. I wanted to speak to you as a resident of north Minneapolis none of the contacts, none of the work that I've done with various agencies kept me from being stopped by the police and cited for reckless driving, for changing lanes on the street to avoid someone coming the wrong way on the one way. The officer cited me, not the person going the wrong way on the one way.

A week later in almost the exactly same spot I was stopped by another police car for having snow on my window, and as that encounter escalated there were comments were made about my physical appearance. I was choked by one officer and kicked by another.

Weeks later I was stopped on the same street by a police officer, well at least that time he was stopping me to let me know that I had a brake light out.

But my teenager was in the car with me at the time, and my kid started to cry and the officer, I think thought I was kidnapping the kid and said what's wrong? And all my kid could say is I'm not going to let a police officer rough up my mom again.

As recently as December I was on the way to work and I was stopped by a Minneapolis police officer for having an air freshener hanging from my rear view mirror. And after he stopped me --- apparently the call went out -- and two other cars of officers answered the call, so I had three police cars with five officers watching me for being stopped for having an air freshener.

In January I got stopped and the police officer ran my plates and asked for my license, and then told me that there had been a misunderstanding.

What's apparent to my family and myself is that in north Minneapolis they're looking for some Ma Barker who is black, middle aged and drives a beige sedan, and while we can sort of laugh about this, it's sad that no matter how much and how many officers that I know and how much work I do with police officers I'm

still getting stopped.

I even made up a sign that says I'm not her. But I can't help but think if I did not have all of the positive experiences that I've had with officers to counter balance all of these negative experiences, what would I be thinking about the police in north Minneapolis?

And so many people who look like me in north Minneapolis don't have the luxury and benefit of getting to know officers on a personal level.

I mean, the St. Paul police officers I take a bet because I do this workshop. I get invited to every graduation of the police academy. They take bets on how long it's going to take me to cry. But if I did not have that to balance that, what kind of trust and how do you think I would feel and how my family would feel about the Minneapolis police? Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. Next is Janet Nye.

MS. NYE: My name is Jan Nye and I live here in Minneapolis, and I'm a member of the Commission Against Police Brutality. I would like to correct

something that Mr. Kappelhoff said. He talked about how dangerous the job of a policeman is or a policewoman. Actually statistically according to the Bureau of Labor Standards it comes about 11th as far as danger and there are more dangerous jobs in the fishing and lumber industry, roofers, garbage men, cab drivers baseline delivery drivers, bartenders, and so that is a myth about police. They do not have the most dangerous job, and their fatalities are not from being shot at. As we all know they're in cars a lot, and they do high speed chases, so this is what they usually succumb to.

I would like to underscore what several people have said as a different approach, to you know, the violence going on in our city. And I also would say that statistically Minneapolis is among the worst as far as racial disparities in the area of incarceration, in the area of joblessness for minorities, and also with kids, minority kids not doing as well on tests in school.

So we have a problem here. And I thoroughly liked what I've been hearing just lately and that is I believe, because I believe in the fundamental goodness in people, however I do believe that people

need consequences.

But what I've been hearing is we need more jobs. We need to recognize more jobs for people and better paying jobs because I believe most people want to work for a living.

I take the bus all of the time and I talk with people who have low-level jobs, but they are happy. They go to their job and they're probably not making that much, but they have a pride because they have been able to provide for themselves. Most people are going to choose this, believe me, over drug dealing. Drug dealing is a product of a poor society, and we have plenty of money in this city, plenty of money in this country, to do the right thing, and we have plenty of jobs that had to be done, so that's one thing that I want to say.

And I want to say and another thing is that I need this implicit bias thing, it's immaterial. It's like, it doesn't even make sense to me to deal with something that's so -- obviously we all have a bias, but what we need to do is in these officers to give them consequences and we also need to do this for 99 percent

of the people in the government, and that's where I'll leave it. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Next, please.

MS. ALLEN: How you doing. My name is Chountyll Allen. I'm with Black Lives Matter St. Paul. I just want to really point out how African Americans are being targeted in St. Paul. In St. Paul we represent seven percent of the population, but we're pulled over 20 percent of the time. That came out in the racial profiling report last year in December. That's an issue.

I can give you all a personal experience that just happened to me on Friday. It was 5:00 in the afternoon, I'm riding downtown in, I don't know where in St. Paul, but the historic Rondo neighborhood in the community of Ford and Fogerty. I get pulled over by a New Brighten police officer. Why? Why? Because he knew it was an opportunity to try and pull someone over and give them a ticket. I have asked him why are you pulling people over in our community and he said it's St. Patrick's Day. I said this is the Rondo community, we don't get down like that. It was 5:00 in the

afternoon, and you're just targeting us. This is a problem. They find all kinds of different ways to target on the black community constantly. And we are the most oppressed people, we're the ones that are poverty-stricken, and they are targeting in on us to make their profit. That's just not fair. We have got to get a break somewhere. We have got to get a break somewhere, and when I think of all things the things that Bob Crow says around Obama not being on the side of civilians, this is America.

Our constitution is founded on the right to stand up for our rights, the right for our freedom, and if we are not free we should be able to stand up for our rights. And if our President doesn't stand on our side at that point, where are we, what country is this.

To have somebody who is in that much control over our police department who's here to protect and serve us and our communities thinking that is like, where are we? I don't know even though where we're at any more. Do we want to uphold this constitution? Do we want to uphold the laws that are set in front of ourselves here? And are we all part of this league of

people? Are we all part of this great government that we speak of that we call ourselves working for? And what does that represent?

It's time for everybody to step up, government officials, police officers. They want to call themselves representing the flag, being so patriotic. Step up. There is nothing more patriotic than following the constitution. There is nothing more patriotic than upholding the law legally, not stepping, not targeting in, not structuring their budget around where they can make money, that's not patriotic. And that's all I have to say.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Good afternoon.

MR. HER: Good afternoon. Thank you very much all of you for the proceedings today. My name is Chong Her. The situation of complaints that police misconduct actually, I say something right. When I see them at especially beyond something like that, something going on at this moment.

But I know police, what they are doing. Without police, there is no police and we can't sleep

very well. So you can protest for this because what they doing, you should know them because what happens for the community if you don't have police to pay? But I am the one that was seeing every day on how the police are working.

When I go to Starbucks two police are behind me, they're looking to see if this guy is going to do something because he is doing something. When I was outside, I see them every day on 9/11, 2/11, 6/11, the month is supposed to be July 11th and November 11th. They called me and told them to go. I complained for Minnesota state and attorney general's office and I tell them that what happened at this moment, even five departments, ambulance and altogether one time they stand in front of me and state emergency without any reason. Together is tomorrow is too. I will see them. Some state and market they come and say blah, blah, blah, like that -- because you are a Muslim, you are the trouble maker. So I appreciate the United States country.

I am American citizen. I love my America because my country was everything was destroyed in civil

war, something happened. So I come here to the United States people, they help me, I love them. They are always united, they are always great people. Sweet people. You see them when you go outside. Millions of people are protesters, 99 percent they are white. They are decent. They get arrested. Why? Because they love you, they are immigrant. They are American citizens, they are born here. But that's the way you show, you know, you love America because all of the people are united. So we love our police, but we need our police to get more education and police, nice police and working in our community very well. So thank you. I love you. I love our senator Amy. I love Senator Al. I love our father Mark Dayton. Without them, without of them our police they are not working very well. They always commanded community for police and justice. Thank you all of you for give me the time to speak today.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. COHEN: Hi, my name is Jay Cohen. I'm here as a member of a collective Asian-Americans know as Rad Azns. That's pronounced rad Asians. We have a written statement. I would like to emphasize one of

your panelists mentioned before that there are systemic biases in play in Minnesota. I just wanted with our statement emphasize that we acknowledge those systems biases too within the confines of this panel and policing. And we believe that other social determinates are affecting the outcomes that have to be examined for justice. Also we stand in solidarity with black Minnesota and these outcomes affect Asians as well and that's often invisible.

I'll read from our statement. We are Asian Americans from many different ethnicities and nationalities who together request attention in systematic inequities experienced by many Minnesotans from communities of color and particularly we bring in solidarities with black Minnesotans who are deeply impacted by systems that deal grave criminal justice disparities.

According to a recent report white people make up 62 percent of the US population but only about 49 percent of those who are killed by police officers.

Africans Americans make up 24 percent of those fatally shot and killed by the police, despite

being just 13 percent of the US population.

Communities of color indigenous Minnesotans experience forms of police misconduct including Asian American Minnesotans.

As has been stated before, Minnesota is wealthy state our median household income is over $60,000 a year. We are long standing and proud in the common good, but as other panelists have mentioned Minnesota's communities of color and indigenous communities have a very different experience. And I can't emphasize enough how visible that experience often is.

According to 2015 data, black households have a median income of half that of the state income at $30,000 a year.

These disparities extend to educational outcomes. 85 percent of white students graduate Minnesota public schools on time, while less than 60 percent of black and Latino students graduate on time. A shocking 49 percent of indigenous students graduate on time.

These disparities extend to health care.

27 percent of black Minnesotans receive optimal diabetes health care compared to 41 percent of white Minnesotans. This is data measured by non-partisan, non-profit organizations tasked with evaluating our health care systems.

We're writing to emphasize the moral urgency of Minnesota's situation and with a real frustration from personal experience. Economic data, suggests Asian Minnesotans have a median income of $72,000 a year, which is above state average. But Minnesota's south east Asian communities, particularly Hmong Minnesotans, who comprise the largest sub-groups of Asian Minnesotans, live in poverty below $12,000 a year.

Asian Minnesotans who are born in Laos experience significant health disparities including disproportionate rates of untreated Hepatitis B infection. We struggle invisibly and the experience of struggling invisibly in the face of affluence is real for us and we can no longer stay silent.

We formed out of an early organizing effort, APIs for Black Lives. And in December, 2015, APIs for Blacks

Lives partnered with the grassroot group, Asian American Organizing Project to conduct door to door knocking with Asian households on the north side. We canvassed Asian American neighborhood residents about the police killing of Jamar Clark and their own experiences with police.

Overwhelming the responses from the door knocking survey called for more transparency and accountability. While the majority of residents answered they have not faced police abuse, many of those put this response went on to express situations involving what could be described as police abuse such as excessive force, racial profiling and indicating that they did not relate to the term police abuse. They used the term discrimination to describe what happened to them.

Several respondents linked the killing of Jamar Clark to the 2006 killing of Hmong youth, Fong Lee, which also occurred on Minnesota's north side.

Asian Americans residents predominantly answered that the fourth precinct occupation by Black Lives Matters protesters did not affect them in a

negative way. I lost the mic. I'll speak up.

The surveying effort tells us that the police misconduct in the Asian American community is overlooked and underresearched. And suggests that communities of color and indigenous communities connect our struggles against systematic abuse.

Albert Einstein in 1946 wrote; your ancestors dragged these black people from their homes by force in the white man's quest for wealth and an easy life, hey have been ruthlessly suppressed and exploited and degraded into slavery. The modern prejudice against Negroes is the result of the desire to maintain this unworthy condition.

The point of this data and of this letter is to not we want about black communities or other communities of color, and indigenous communities to experience white Minnesota as normal. Many of our Asian communities come to Minnesota and the United States seeking equitable opportunity. The hope that many immigrants bring and the resilience, innovation, and persistence that refugees bring are amazing assets that are wasted and really disregarded by the majority

--

Minnesotans of color and indigenous communities are vital to our future. Our liberation and our success depends on not on charity, but on how we recognize the assets in communities of color and indigenous communities we take in contempt all around us, respectfully. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you.

MS. ANDERS: Hi, my name is Linda Herman. I'm the executive director of Asian Americans Organizing Project here in the Twin Cities. We're a nonprofit organization serving and empowering Asians communities in the Twin Cities. Through civic engagement and community organizing, we develop the communication for the delegation community members to address issues affecting neighborhoods and families.

Chong mentioned a little bit about our collaborative effort in December 2015. We door knocked in north Minneapolis Asian folks about their interactions with police and in relation to the fourth precinct occupation and killing of Jamar Clark.

I want to focus on two different questions

being asked, share the stories that are often not being heard because of racial barriers people where people are too nervous or really too scared to speak up. So we had asked, have you many have your family faced police abuse here in north Minneapolis such as racial profiling, wrongful arrest, wrongful suspicion, physical aggression, searching without a warrant, being pulled over, ticketed, or followed without a reason. We asked that 70 percent of respondents answered no and some answered unsure. but the respondents who stated that they had not experience police abuse went on to describe a situation involving that would be characterizing as police abuse such as aggressive force and racial profiling.

I want to share one of the story of one of the residents that talk about their experience. He was an elder man who was held at gun point. He was unarmed. He was going to drive away one night after being followed home in his vehicle. Due to the language barrier, his father was unable to understand or comply with the officer's command. The police quickly escalated the situation by drawing firearms and he his immediate

compliance wasn't shown despite the plea from the resident explaining that his father did not speak English.

Another resident relayed, how the police had --- a traffic stop without giving him a reason why. Others describe how they were accused of using drugs when being pulled over without the police having any valid reason for the suspicion. I also want to highlight how language barrier has, in the case of the --- who was attacked by police canine, and still after the police officer had found that she wasn't the burglar or the suspect they were looking for, they were dragging and pulling her based on her accounts. And so this physical and unnecessary force is a big problem.

I also want to highlight the second question we asked, what would you do to improve the police and community relations? Overwhelmingly, the 80 percent of the residents suggests transparency, accountability, and better training for the police, and improved media coverage that represents the viewpoints and these communities of colors, immigrant communities, and other -- neighborhoods.

I will be submitting a more detailed report, but I'm just going to just talk to some of the key highlights here. We are also currently writing an article based on our 2016 door knock conversation with Asian residents in terms of their interaction as well, and currently we have -- I'll share an excerpt with the St. Paul experience where residents who had positive experiences with police, they didn't provide details as why it was a positive except that the cops are nice and understanding.

Those who had negative experiences with the cops detailed the interactions such as one resident who reported an assault and a theft and the police did not care to investigate. We also mentioned how police disproportionately take the wrong cars in the streets. Another resident described how he was pulled over and the cop ordered him to step out of the car, proceeded to degrade and shot at him.

Many residents do feel like the police care about them because of the length of the time police take to respond to their calls.

I just want to highlight and emphasize the

connection with the Minneapolis and St. Paul door knock conversation with each resident, especially around the racial profiling of the police, use of unnecessary, aggressive force, even small acts of aggressiveness that makes communities not trust the police.

Lastly I want to share a personal story of my mom that I did not know until recently when I started talking to her about Black Lives Matter and killing of Jamar Clark, which she shared with me that -- about 10 years ago, she dropped my dad off at work, she had pulled out of the parking lot, and there was a female cab driver who drove, it was snowy, had bumped into her car so she called the police. The police came there --- an officer came there, assumed that my mom did not speak English so he told the cab driver, oh her car is really old so, I'm not going to report this and we don't want to jeopardize your job. From there on, my mom didn't say because she thought the police wasn't going to help her to resolve her. From there on, she did not trust the police at all.

I just want to thank you for the time we shared and the work we're doing and my personal story

of my mom and distrust with the police.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much.

MR. VANG: Hi, my name is Jon Vang, I am a resident of north Minneapolis and been living there for my whole entire life. I was born in a refugee camp and came here when I was like two years old.

I really have thought that as an Asian American, that the experiences that black people have with the police would never be an experience that I would encounter. Right? And I had such an awakening when that was -- when I experienced that. And it was multiple things that had led up to that had allowed me to see that here in the US and in north Minneapolis, right, that how men of color were treated very differently from the police. I would get stopped and I would be asked if I was this person that they were looking for and which I would have no idea what it was -- and it would be small things like that.

Eventually one night, in the dead night, in the harsh, Minnesota winter weather, I was pulled over by one of the north Minneapolis cops, right, and it was because I went to school and I had a parking little tag

on my car so that my car wouldn't get towed at school. You know how crazy those parking spots are at school, right. You pay $200 and you get a this little thing, and I had a little thing in my rear view mirror and as I was driving home, I got pulled over by the cops. They said that they pulled me over because of that, right, but then after, that he told me which I wasn't sure why he said that, he said that I had some sort of criminal record or something that and they need to search my car.

I wasn't sure what to say. I was a young male just trying to get home from school and I didn't say anything to them so they just pulled me over, took me out of the car, asked me to step out of the car, and started searching my car. That a day when I went to school I got some packets of salt with me, table salt with me to school to season my food. Based on that packet of salt and he told me immediately that narcotics, that was drugs that I was holding, and they even had it tested and they told me it tested positive for narcotics. I'm letting you know if that tested for narcotics I don't know what we're eating. What are we eating that that was table salt? So I was arrested and cited and taken

to jail because I had possessed salt, but for them it was narcotics.

And on the way there they are racially profiling me asking me if I was this person, calling me retarded, making me feel like I was small and dumb questions and then kept on pushing and insisting me that I was this person that they were looking for. And because I knew I wasn't that person I just didn't talk to. And at that time, I was too traumatized to talk to them.

They took me all the way to jail and because I had refused to talk to them or do anything with them, right, that I don't know what they did. They just felt like they were stupid or something? They just came back and dropped me off at home and that was it, right? But that night they took everything from me. They took my honor, my dignity, my car, my wallet, my money, everything, everything was gone. I had to start from zero again. So that was really hard because after that experience why would you want to trust the police, right? You can't carry anything with you, salt. Like think about it, like the most basic thing. Like salt or

seasoning, right? You can't even carry that around with you so, you know, I really believe in police transparency and accountability, that wasn't right,

And these things, these micro-aggressions that really causes community distrust within the police institutions.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who hasn't spoken? Is there anybody else who needs to speak, please come up to the mic.

MS. AGNY: Hello everybody. My name is Ashley Agny. I am the co-chair for -- mental health chapter, I mean committee for -- in Minneapolis. I'm also a public servant. I've been a social worker for a number of years I'm also a -- So I understand the struggles of the public eye and how hard it can be for police officers because it's really difficult for protection our view for people in the community views of us as child protection workers.

But I wanted to come from a perspective of trauma. When I was a young girl, maybe about six or seven years old. I grew up in a small town called Saginaw, Michigan. One day I was hanging out with my

grandmother and all of a sudden, the police just bust in and that was the first time I ever seen a police officer in my life where I remember. They bust in with dogs and police guns and everything and our front door was gone and they rushed us into a bathroom, my grandmother and I. And I don't know from then on, I don't know what happened out there, but I do remember them letting my mom know they got the wrong house, they had to raid our house was the wrong house.

The police officers came by and says they are really sorry for experience that you had. Police officers came by and helped fix our front door. We didn't have a front door for a little while, and that was my first experience of police officers.

As a school social worker, especially when Jamar Clark had gotten killed I had a number of little black babies, kindergartners, first graders, up to sixth grade coming up to asking me, are they next? It's hard for me to talk to children about that, especially with my own experience, but I do my best to say, no. I try to encourage them and in the back of my mind I'm not sure.

I've had in that same capacity I've had a number, too many unfortunately, of my little precious white babies they tell me that they want to be a police officers and I will say, well why do I want to do that? I always ask whether they want to be an astronaut or a doctor. I always ask why. And a couple of them tell me because I want to kill people. How do I talk to my babies about that? These are our kids, six, seven-year old children who have this narrative, whether it be true or not, this is a narrative and we're not having those conversations so their growing continuously with that narrative.

I'm sure that many of you may know about the Clark and -- experiment where they had 71 percent of children back in 19 -- maybe '60 when they did the experiment they had 71 percent of those children, black and white choose the white doll, the smart doll, and the black doll as the bad doll as the dumb doll. They did that same experiment recently and got those same results because we're not having those conversations with our children. The police -- whether that narrative is true or not, I haven't had many police officers come into my

classrooms and talk to my students about just having a good day, talking to them about their job, the good that they do on their job.

And so I just want to say that before I go, I appreciate you guys hearing us and listening to these testimonies. I'm not sure where they'll go after this but I appreciate it.

The last thing that I want to say is in regards to narrative, they are powerful. I've seen and I've learned and I'm sure many of us have heard, when you're at a restaurant -- you will -- what maybe 20 to 30 percent of the time people will tell you if they had a great experience, right? But if they had a horrible experience oh boy, 70 to 80 percent of the time they will share that.

So what I mean by that is there may only be 20 percent of our police officers, 20 percent of our public servants, I pray I'm not one of those, 20 percent of them who are not fulfilling their jobs well, aren't serving our communities well, but those 20 percent, that's the narrative that's going out. We really have to do our best so we go out and bring down those bad

apples, it makes us as a community look bad. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you. Go ahead, sir.

MR. JON VANG: Hello. My name is Jon Vang and I do work in the community with a group called Man Forward, and one of the issues we're tackling right now is the deportation of the Cambodian refugees who came here. And a lot of the people that I work with, they are really concerned about, you know, how this plays into what's -- the interaction with police and what is going to happen for them in the future, and how the police are going to treat them when they encounter the police.

And for me, my own story is I've been through the justice system and during my time there I've seen so many incidents where I completely understand why our community does not trust the police or trust the justice system. Growing up, I saw how police officers who are supposed to act morally and ethically and uphold the law, but they search peoples cars without explaining their rights. They just do what's the bare minimum to cover their own butts. And they continue on this rampage in the community to, you know, try to uphold the

law or, you know, as some of the previous persons said, they want to increase revenue for the police department. And, you know, in the community we don't trust them because we have seen a lot of this stuff happen and the reason why we're here today is because there is a lack of trust from the community in the justice system and law enforcement.

Part of that problem is that the police, they promise all types, "Oh yes, we're going to do all kinds of training, we're going to hold people accountable. We're going to have these communities forums to, you know, hold people accountable and we're going to take action on this." But nothing has happened, nothing's happening, it's just more promises to cover up the previous promises.

And we see many people, many police departments, especially, I think more recently over the past year, they are trying to reach out into the community but they're not listening. And when I say not listening is, when people are asking for, you know, accountability, they're not asking for police officers to dance on YouTube and say, "Hey, I'm human, too."

They're not asking for police officers to do the mannequin contest and say, "Hey, I'm human, too."

We understand you're human, but we need accountability for you, because if you are human you make mistakes, admit to your mistakes, and hold yourselves accountable. Be ethical and be moral. Because when you hold these positions of power and you act in accordance to these responsibilities and roles that you're trying to portray, that's when you're going to build the trust in the community. Because if we see you and you're acting unethically, how we can we trust you to represent us and feel that you are going to treat us fairly when there is a lot of stuff out there where a lot of police officers are not even holding each other accountable. Because they don't want to be singled out against the people that you work with even though they're wrong. So if we want to build trust again that's what they need to do.

And it's really sad that we have a lot of these community committees that are trying to hold police accountable, but then they have no real power in doing that and it leads us right to where we began where

there's no accountability, more promises to cover old promises, so I hope that the things that you have heard today you can bring back changed policy and really hold the police accountable to build the trust that we need in our community, because we don't hate the police, we hate what they're doing. Thank you.

CHAIR KORBEL: Thank you, sir. I show that Ms. Ashley Agny was the last speaker that was signed up to speak. Was anybody else signed up to speak? If not we will go ahead and close out the public portion of the agenda.

Just a few closing remarks. I want to thank you to all of the panelists that were with us today. I want to thank the members of the public that provided statements here at the end.

I also want to thank my colleagues on the advisory committee. This was a very emotional and rewarding experience. This record of the proceedings will remain open through September 30, 2017. If anyone would like to submit written comments to mwojnaroski@usccr.gov. This is is Melissa Wojnaroski here, she has cards, there are some at the sign-in table,

and I'm sure that Melissa will make sure that you get one, so I'm not going to read all this again because it would just be crazy. If you would like me to read it again -- oh, there it is, thank you.

If you provided your e-mail when you signed in at the meeting, we will send you the follow-up information, including the minutes and the transcripts from this meeting and a link to access materials included in this proceeding. We will also notify you when the commission is meeting for discussion and when their report is ready.

Again, thank you all very much, and please travel safely on your way home. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off at 5:28 p.m.)

1

2

3

4