

**From:** Dan Mack  
**Sent:** Friday, December 02, 2016 3:02 PM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council; #CI-StPaul\_Ward1  
**Subject:** Police Civilian Review Board

St Paul Council Members and Dai Thao,

I live in ward 1 of St Paul. I have lived in St Paul for a majority of my life. I went to school here in the city and now work in St Paul. I am writing you about the Police Civilian Review board. I believe the board should have police officers on it. The board needs some perspective from an officer's point of view, especially a police officer that lives in the city. I do not have any faith in the Human Rights and Equal Economic Opportunity division in the city. I have read releases from the HREEOC and believe that they do not have the expertise to investigate police related complaints.

As a citizen in Ward 1, I would like to keep the Police Civilian Review board as it has been with civilian (citizens) and police officer working together to keep the police department accountable in their actions.

Thank you

Ward 1 Resident

Phone caller asked that police be left on the civilian review board.

Phone caller asked that officers be kept on the internal affairs review commission.

**From:** PAUL GINA NP LODA KUNTZ  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 03, 2016 7:57 AM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
**Subject:** PCIARC

I am writing to express my concern with removing the two police officers from the PCIARC and in moving the committee to the office of Human Rights. It simply doesn't seem right that our police officers will not have a voice on the committee if they are removed. Please consider all other professionals, whether they are doctors, lawyers, or dentists, are judged by others from their same profession. Who better to provide insight on tactics and policy than another officer.

By removing the two officers on the panel we would be the only profession who doesn't have a voice in the discipline process.

Thank you,

Paul Kuntz  
17xx Juliet Ave.

From: Ginny Semelis  
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2016 12:00 PM  
To: \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
Subject: Reject Mayor Chris Coleman proposal !!

Dear St Paul City Council,

It is crucial that rank and file officers with experience in the field remain on the Police-Civilian Internal Affairs Review Commission. Please keep St.Paul FAIR!!

Signed,  
Supporter of our Law Enforcement

From: Imants  
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2016 12:42 PM  
To: \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
Subject: Police Civilian Review Commission

Policemen belong on the Review commission. Please! The reasons are so clear they do not need an explanation.

Imants Semelis, a very concerned citizen.

**From:** Michelle Bailey  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 03, 2016 8:11 PM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
**Subject:** Street cops

To whom it may concern,

I think the council needs to keep street cops on the commission and don't give oversight to HREEO. You don't see doctors, dentist, lawyers ect. Not on their board. These officers protect and serve your streets they deserve to have their voices and opinions heard as well and have a vote.

Michelle B

**From:** Cindy Kuster  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 04, 2016 10:46 PM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
**Subject:** Keep St Paul Fair

Dear Distinguished Members of the City Council,

I am writing you to ask that you Reject and Rescind Mayor Coleman's proposal to remove Police Officers from to Review Commission.

I am the sister-in-law of a retired St. Paul Police Officer, an Aunt to a current St Paul Police Officer and the Aunt of a young man that wanted so badly "to do good" as s St. Paul Police Officer, but resigned after 6 months on the force because of the stress and pressure put upon him to perform his job under the scrutiny of a society where everything is judged and juried by the media.

Over the years, I have seen the changes that being observed by social media constantly, has affected the way police Officers, including the two men mentioned above, perform their jobs and how it affects their daily lives.

Years ago, I went to the Citizens Academy put on by Ramsey County. I had never shot a gun. I had never been in a situation where there may or may not be danger lurking around the corner. I had never been present when a crime was being committed. I had never had to fear for my life or the lives of the people around me or commit to using force, (shooting a gun), to protect against this. Yes, this was all simulated, but, it raised my blood pressure and scared the heck out of me.

Decisions I made during those classes were instantaneous. I cannot imagine being a Police Officer and having to go through these scenarios on a daily basis.

Our judicial system, and our society as a whole, is based on the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution where a person shall be judged by his peers.

How can a Police Officer's performance, during a crisis situation or otherwise, be judged by someone who has never been there?

Therefore, I again ask you to Reject & Rescind the proposal and keep Officers on the Commission.

Sincerely,

Cindy Kuster

From: Gerrie Ganzel

Sent: Friday, December 02, 2016 2:35 PM

To: \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council

Subject: Police-Civilian Review

Honorable Mayor Coleman:

I am the wife of a retired Saint Paul Police Officer (28 yrs of service) and also the mother of a Saint Paul Police Officer. I am very proud of their service given to the City of Saint Paul. As I worried about my husband's safety during his service years, I now have a more intense worry about my son's job. Although the job is the same as my husband's was, the current culture of the city is much more dangerous. I and his father and his entire family worry for my son's safety each and every day that he is working for the City. It is a different type of worry - one that only the family of a Police Officer experiences.

The removal of Police Officers from the Review Board is definitely a way to lose the trust of your police force. Each situation they encounter is unique and civilian members of the board will have no understanding of the circumstances unless it can be explained to them by a professional - and Police Officers are professionals. By not having a Police Officer on the Review Board, the outcome of situations and decisions made would of course be biased. Civilians do not have the training or capability of understanding policing.

**KEEP POLICE OFFICERS on the IA Review Board!**

Kindest Regards

Geraldine R Ganzel

From: Daga  
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2016 7:06 PM  
To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward3  
Subject:

Sir, we have met in the past my name is Dave Garman I live in the Mac Groveland area of your district and am in a unique position to comment on why I am against the proposed changes to the civilian review because I am a police officer for a neighboring town as well.

This appears to be in line with the current pandering of the continued false narratives of these special interest groups. I would be happy to speak in person, on the phone or further this dialogue by email. I would even volunteer to be a citizen on the commission.

I understand your busy so I'll just conclude by saying my wife and I are against the proposed changes.

**From:** Bob Spaulding [<mailto:bob@spauldingklay.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 03, 2016 6:38 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward3  
**Subject:** PCIARC

Councilmember Tolbert,  
In front of you is a once-in-a-generation chance to make sure we have a balanced conversation around police misconduct in St. Paul. I and a number of others have spent the last few weeks working to understand the challenges of the PCIARC, reaching out to experts, and getting insight into various perspectives.

According to two independent analyses, balance would best be achieved by ensuring the PCIARC is an all-civilian commission. On its face, that might take some time to appreciate. So I want to explore this question: wouldn't a mix of civilian and police be more balanced?

No, say the independent experts:

As long as system wide disparities exist in the treatment of people and their experiences, whether based on race, class or any other difference, that disparity needs to be addressed to move towards a just and equitable society. In the case of the PCIARC, implicit bias in favor of police creates an inequity in the system that jeopardizes the overall purpose and impact intended by having civilian oversight. This is not a criticism of the many people who have invested a significant amount of time and energy into the work of the PCIARC; rather it is a policy and system weakness to be corrected regardless of who serves on the PCIARC. The goal is to ensure an accountable and respectful relationship, balanced between police and community. (U of M Report, page 28)

The idea that balance is achieved simply by putting police and community together on the Commission is an inaccurate, overly-simplistic view of balance. Actual balance is only achieved when we acknowledge and thoughtfully compensate for the structural imbalances present in the broader society: bias toward police perspectives, and bias against people of color, who are disproportionately the victims of alleged misconduct.

Alleged misconduct is already reviewed through a police-only internal review process. If balance is the goal, then that ought to be paired with a civilian-only review process in the PCIARC. Then the Chief can weigh perspectives and make a determination as appropriate. That's what true balance and procedural symmetry looks like. There is no reason that the PCIARC would not consult police early and often with the police in such a process.

There had been discussion of finding "compromise" by making the police on the PCIARC non-voting. As I've reflected on this proposal, I've come to really appreciate Councilmember Noecker's insight: such a "compromise" might actually bolster police perspective. If you must compromise, there are better ways to do that. But instead of focusing on the politics of compromise, I'd ask you to follow the truths around this issue reflected in the independent reports.

Finally, the U of M report suggests establishing a "restorative mediation option", and I support their recommendation as one option available, if all involved feel it would move us toward deeper understanding. But for cases that don't pursue that option, we need to structure the space to ensure that civilian and police perspectives can be fully articulated and understood, free from undue pressure. Then, and only then, can true understanding be assured to take place. The dynamics of race and policing are too important, and too complex, to short-circuit this process.

That's why I stand now with countless others, and with the independent professionals at the University of Minnesota and Berkley Advisors in asking for the balance of a fully civilian-only PCIARC. At the end of a tumultuous two years, I could imagine no better time to make this change than now.

Respectfully,  
Bob Spaulding  
Resident  
Ward 5

**From:** Jonathan Oppenheimer

**Sent:** Sunday, December 04, 2016 9:47 AM

**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward1; #CI-StPaul\_Ward2; #CI-StPaul\_Ward3; #CI-StPaul\_Ward4; #CI-StPaul\_Ward5; #CI-StPaul\_Ward6; #CI-StPaul\_Ward7

**Subject:** PCIARC Vote Comments

Dear St. Paul City Council Members,

Regarding the votes you have taken and will take on December 7 regarding changes to the Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Commission, I am deeply troubled, on a number of levels, by the prospect of police officers remaining as voting members -- and remaining at all. After watching video of the debate you all had and public comments that were made at the last Council meeting, as well as reading the 2009 Berkshire report and recent U of M reports, I will echo many of the sentiments expressed by Councilmember Thao regarding the sadness I feel that the city remains more committed to appeasing its police force than it does showing the courage to follow through on the racial equity goals so often espoused by our city leaders. I would not go as far as to say it's an "all-time low" for the city, but I do think history will judge the Council harshly if together you miss the opportunity to heed the recommendations of both of the aforementioned reports to remove officers as voting members.

Indeed, it is not hyperbole to suggest that such a decision, as was portended by the recent votes you took, represents both the epitome and a strengthening of the structural and institutional racism that has been the hallmark of our country for over 2 centuries. While several of you, in various venues, have bemoaned the recent election of Donald

Trump and the heightened divisiveness that has arisen with his campaign and election, by refusing to take a bold stand on the side of marginalized groups in our city, you fail to adequately push back against the powerful institutions that are so mistrusted in our country; rather, you fall on the side of the powerful, which is deeply regrettable. History, current and recent events, and my own experience make clear that our policing system in America -- and indeed in St. Paul -- is designed to protect the police at every turn, police men and women who need such state protection the least. I need not rehash statistics and anecdotes of officers avoiding punishment for egregious acts, of police officers across the land protecting one another at every turn -- no matter the legality and decency of their acts -- nor the realities of a Commission that has only advisory power and poses no real threat to officers who are the subject of complaints -- we know that beyond the Police Chief having the final say in such matters, that the Police Union will do all in its power to save officers' jobs, except in the most egregious cases of misconduct (and usually only those caught on camera). No, you all know these realities. And in addition to hearing an outpouring of support from constituents on the side of an all-civilian Commission -- or at the least non-voting officers -- and having recommendations dating back to 2009 (most of which were ignored over the past 7 years) that officers not be voting members, you continue to kowtow to the Police at every turn. We've all heard the reasons for such deference -- the need to have both sides weigh in on police issues; the need for pragmatism and agreement in a partisan world; the respect we owe the men and women in blue who put their lives on the line; the need to have police trust the system, and on and on -- but they ring hollow in the face of racial oppression that is ever-present today and widespread mistrust of our police officers. Yes, most of the SPPD is made up of upstanding, decent folks, but that, too, misses the point.

I've heard various versions of the argument that the votes that have been taken and the impending changes to the PCIARC are significant and substantial -- essentially that citizens should be happy with this progress. This argument, too, stands on the side of incremental changes in the face of an American history that makes pretty clear that bold, courageous changes are now in order. Today more than ever, our majority-white City Council owes the 40% residents of color of this city a vote that goes as far as possible to build trust between our police force and our brothers and sisters of color. The only way that such trust can be built is if Council members find the courage to stand on the side of the most vulnerable, not the good men and women with a badge. The reality is that no one knows just how various compositions of Commission member make-up would play out -- Would it make a difference at all? Does a police presence influence decision making, whether they vote or not? Would the Chief respect recommendations if no police officers voted? -- so playing that guessing game often misses the point. Instead, what we know to be true is that members can seek police expertise when needed, and they'll be reading reports filed by Internal Affairs, and the Chief has the final say on matters anyway. Given all of these factors, what then becomes most important is the perception of the public about the integrity and independence of the Commission itself. If the public, and especially those who are most likely to suffer abuse at the hands of the police, do not have faith in the system, then we fail to move forward as a city with deep racial divisions that are vast and oppressive -- regardless of whether we want to publicly acknowledge just how deep they are.

In a city where so many are proud to wear the DFL label, it is clear to me that we are far from progressive and indeed too fearful -- especially in light of the recent Trump election -- to proudly stand up for the ideals the Democratic party, at its core, should represent. Those ideals mean siding with the most vulnerable, even if it means sacrificing or wavering in public officials' never-ending full-fledged support of our police officers. They simply hold too much power to profile, detain, arrest, harm, kill, and criminalize -- often for life -- men and women of color, while white citizens enjoy the benefit of the doubt at every turn. I, like Councilmember Thao, am sorry if when presented with this opportunity to make a small dent in centuries of awful treatment of our fellow Americans, we Democrats further ignore the plight of these residents of color. I will fight like heck for police to be paid better, to be honored for their bravery and commitment to public safety, and to be protected from unfounded accusations -- something the PCIARC is charged expressly with doing. But I would challenge any one of you to point to an officer whose life has been ruined by an angry civilian review board that was out only for blood. On the other hand, we need not look far to find thousands of people whose lives have been ruined by an overzealous and patently bigoted and unfair criminal justice system. I encourage you to meet some of them and see first-hand how being labeled an offender or a felon or targeted unjustly leads to a lifetime of harsh treatment from our society. These are facts.

Lastly, while I'm sure you had enough of the cancer analogy at the last meeting, it struck me that the debate missed a couple of key points about cancer, which I've seen up close and personal. First off, the fact that we're even publicly referring to this problem with a cancer analogy is either problematic in its own right, or it must be acknowledged that we're assuming that the downside to not countering this issue effectively is often a lifetime of pain, anguish, and early death. I would argue that the state of our current policing in America does, indeed, lead to those awful outcomes for far

too many people, disproportionately African Americans and Latinos. But more to the point is the idea that effectively treating a cancer often means attacking it from many different angles -- ie: surgery, chemotherapy, nutrition, behavioral habits, ongoing observation -- and that the one thing you wouldn't want to do is ignore any one approach that, together with others, could conquer the disease. You especially wouldn't want to ignore an approach that has been recommended by experts on two occasions in recent years. To do so imperils us all, even those, like myself, who likely will never face any problems at the hands of police. And the notion that leaving police officers on the Commission is somehow a part of this cancer treatment regimen is utterly baffling to me.

I stand firmly on the side of removing all officers from the PCIARC. If that does not happen, I strongly urge all of you to consider making officers/commanders non-voting members. And if that is off the table, the least that should be done is insisting on retired officers/commanders serving in those voting roles. I hope you will all consider that while the ramifications of these decisions will likely have zero impact on your lives, you were elected to stand on the side of those who have little or no voice, and who now, more than ever, need your courage on this issue.

Sincerely,  
Jonathan Oppenheimer  
Ward 4

Jonathan Oppenheimer  
[www.crimnal.org](http://www.crimnal.org)

**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2016 1:57 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward3  
**Subject:** PCIARC Changes

Dear Councilmember Tolbert:

I am writing to request that you please vote to remove police officers from a **civilian** review board. A civilian board should be allowed to review and investigate complaints unencumbered by the burden of the presence of the very force they are asked to review. If police input is needed, it can be available at any time through 'expert testimony'. The police do not need to be nor should they be a constant presence on this committee.

Public trust in the police department is at a very low point. You/we need to restore faith in this department. Keeping police on a civilian review board creates further mistrust and doubt that fair and impartial investigations can occur. Please follow the lead of other major cities (Baltimore, St. Louis, Milwaukee, etc.) that do not include police officers on their civilian review boards.

In addition, this committee should be moved away from the SPPD and placed under the jurisdiction of the City's Office of Human Rights - for the same public trust issues mentioned above.

Saint Paul really needs your leadership on this issue, especially in light of all of the unrest that has occurred since the killing of Philando Castile.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
  
Rachel Goligoski  
St. Paul, MN

Mayor Coleman and Board,  
Plain and simple, if you truly want your community equally represented, street cops need to remain on the commission for the Police and Civilian Review Board.

**From:** Jessica Banks  
**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2016 2:05 PM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_Contact-Council  
**Subject:** Independent civilian review board

Dear City Council members,

I'm writing to express my support for the independent, all-civilian police review board proposed for the city of Saint Paul. This board would serve an essential counterpoint to the existing Saint Paul Police Department internal review board.

Police department culture is not always in line with the culture and values of the general public, and the police chief should be hearing that dissonance to disrupt the insular bubble of only internal police review.

Additionally, only 22 percent of SPPD officers live in the city of Saint Paul. The people of Saint Paul need confidence that the department that acts in our community is not just responsible to itself, but to all the citizens who live here. An independent civilian review board would help with the perception that the police is not accountable, or even in touch, with our city's people and their values.

I urge you to vote in favor of the independent, all-civilian police review board, as an important progressive step toward improving public safety in Saint Paul.

Sincerely,  
Jessica Banks  
14xx Jessamine Ave W  
Saint Paul, MN 55108

**From:** [rrgoli@aol.com](mailto:rrgoli@aol.com) [<mailto:rrgoli@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2016 1:54 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward7  
**Subject:** PCIARC Changes

Dear Councilmember Prince:

I am writing to request that you please vote to remove police officers from a **civilian** review board. A civilian board should be allowed to review and investigate complaints unencumbered by the burden of the presence of the very force they are asked to review. If police input is needed, it can be available at any time through 'expert testimony'. The police do not need to be nor should they be a constant presence on this committee.

Public trust in the police department is at a very low point. You/we need to restore faith in this department. Keeping police on a civilian review board creates further mistrust and doubt that fair and impartial investigations can occur. Please follow the lead of other major cities (Baltimore, St. Louis, Milwaukee, etc.) that do not include police officers on their civilian review boards.



In addition, this committee should be moved away from the SPPD and placed under the jurisdiction of the City's Office of Human Rights - for the same public trust issues mentioned above.

Saint Paul really needs your leadership on this issue, especially in light of all of the unrest that has occurred since the killing of Philando Castile.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rachel Goligoski  
St. Paul, MN

**From:** Scott Pakudaitis  
**Sent:** Friday, December 02, 2016 11:02 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward7  
**Subject:** Internal Affairs Review Commission

Dear Councilmember Prince -

I support Mayor Coleman's proposal to move the Internal Affairs Review Commission under the auspices of the Department of Human Rights and Equal Economic Opportunity. I believe this move will improve the transparency of the review process and will lead to increased community confidence in Internal Affairs decisions. Please support Mayor Coleman in this endeavor. Thank you.

Scott Pakudaitis  
8xx E 3rd  
55106

Mayor Coleman and Board,

I write to express my belief of the importance of keeping street cops on the commission for the Police and Civilian Review Board for the community to be equally represented.

Thank you,

Katie Habeck

**From:** Heather Soucheray  
**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2016 6:31 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward6  
**Subject:**

What do you suppose teacher's boards are made up of? What do you suppose medical review boards are made of? What are safety review boards at constructions sites made up of? What about legal review boards? Run review boards for paramedics? If you said anything other than those professions you would be wrong!! Would you want a plumber reviewing the surgery of your loved one?! Would you want a teacher investigating safety violations at your construction site?! Of course not! That sounds absurd!

Why on earth would citizens of this great city want a review board for police officers that isn't made up of police officers.....let alone a board that doesn't even allow ONE SINGLE member of that profession on the board.

Even with the distrust of police in this day and age, we still need that perspective on the board. That is how we can come to reasonable and responsible decisions for our police force.

I don't want to live in a city where the police are afraid to do their job and I think it's irresponsible and reckless for people to think any other option is acceptable. Officers still need to be on the board!!!!

-A concerned citizen