

**Council/EDA Work
Session**
City Hall Council Chambers
October 14, 2024

AGENDA



ACTIVE DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission Council Discussion
- Per Brooklyn Center City Council request, City staff are prepared to discuss resolution recommendations for the establishment of the Brooklyn Center Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission (scope and authority, commissioner composition, and operational impact).

Council/EDA Work Session

DATE: 10/14/2024

TO: City Council

FROM: Dr. Reggie Edwards, City Manager

THROUGH: N/A

BY: OCPHS, BCPD, BCFD, Recreation

SUBJECT: Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission Council Discussion

Requested Council Action:

- Per Brooklyn Center City Council request, City staff are prepared to discuss resolution recommendations for the establishment of the Brooklyn Center Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission (scope and authority, commissioner composition, and operational impact).

Background:

Resolution 2021-73 adopting the Daunte Wright and Kobe Dimock-Heisler Community Safety and Violence Prevention Act currently reads as follows: The City will create a Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission.

The Director will provide the Mayor with a list of candidates to serve on the committee and the Mayor will recommend candidates to the City Council for appointment. A majority of the committee members must be City residents with direct experience being arrested, detained, or having other similar contact with Brooklyn Center Police, or have had direct contact with one or more of the other services to be provided by the new Department.

The City Council may appoint City staff to serve as liaisons to the committee, but no City staff member will have a vote on the committee.

The committee will: review and make recommendations regarding the policing response to recent protests; review the current collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Police Department and make recommendations prior to the renegotiation of the agreement and before its final approval; recommend the City Council create a separate and permanent civilian oversight committee for the new Department; review Chapter 19 of the City Code and make recommendations with regard to repealing or amending provisions or penalties therein, including fines and fees; and periodically make any other recommendations to the City Council related to initiating programs or policies to improve community health in the City.

Budget Issues:

N/A

Antiracist/Equity Policy Effect:

Strategic Priorities and Values:

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Upload Date	Type
2020 Review Board Presentation	9/17/2024	Backup Material
Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission	9/17/2024	Backup Material

Civilian Review Boards Police Department



Brooklyn Center City Council Meeting, November 23, 2020
Richard Gabler, Commander

Background

- There are approximately 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States.
- As of 2019 there were estimated to be about 150- 200 Civilian Review Boards in the United States.
- There are approximately 422 law enforcement agencies in Minnesota.
- Only three Civilian Review Boards were found in Minnesota.
- National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) is the leading professional organization identifying best practices and resources for review boards.



Goals of Review Boards

1. To improve public trust in law enforcement
2. Ensuring public input in the police complaint process
3. Promoting fair and thorough investigations
4. Increased transparency in the complaint process
5. Deterring police misconduct

(Office of Justice Programs, 2016)



Types of Review Boards

1. Investigation Focused
2. Review Focused
3. Auditor/Monitor Focused



Investigation Focused Review Board Model

- Conducts independent investigations of police complaints.
 - Investigations may parallel or replace Internal Affairs (IA) investigations.
- Investigations typically completed by civilian investigators.
- Organization typically operates separately of Law Enforcement.

Examples: San Francisco, CA; Washington, D.C.; and San Diego County, CA



Review Focused Review Board Model

- Generally made up of a citizen-volunteer review board and often include police officers.
- Typically reviews completed IA and complaint investigations.
- Usually makes complaint finding recommendations to Chief.
- May receive complaints from the community.
- This is the most common type of review board.

Examples: St Paul, MN; Indianapolis, IN; and Albany, NY



Auditor/Monitor Focused Review Board Model

- May participate in the IA investigation process.
- May evaluate and review police policies and practices and make recommendations for change.
- May also evaluate for larger patterns of misconduct.
- Members are typically well-trained in analytics and tend to be experts in policing.

Examples: San Jose, CA; Los Angeles, CA; and New Orleans, LA



Types of Review Boards

	Investigation Focused Agencies	Review Focused Agencies	Auditor/Monitor Agencies
Receive Complaints	Frequently	Frequently	Frequently
Decide How to Handle a Complaint	Frequently	Rarely	Sometimes
Review Police Investigations	Sometimes	Frequently	Frequently
Conducts Independent Investigations	Frequently	Rarely	Sometimes



Types of Review Boards

	Investigation Focused Agencies	Review Focused Agencies	Auditor/Monitor Agencies
Recommend Findings	Frequently	Frequently	Frequently
Recommend Discipline	Sometimes	Sometimes	Sometimes
Have Civilians on a Board	Frequently	Frequently	Frequently
Have Paid Professional Staff	Frequently	Sometimes	Frequently
Costs	Most Expensive	Least Expensive	2 nd Most Expensive



City of St. Paul

Term:	3-Year terms; no members can serve more than two terms in lifetime.
Other Duties:	Advise on department policy and prepare an annual report.
Budget:	About \$16,000 (2019) and members receive \$50 per meeting attended.
Meeting Frequency:	Minimum of quarterly and up to twice a month. Meetings are subject to open meeting law.



City of St. Paul

Agency Size:	629 Officers
Review Board Type:	Review Focused
Authority:	Ordinance; Ord. No. 102
Dept. Responsibility:	Human Rights Department (full-time Review Coordinator)
Final Discipline Authority:	Chief of Police
Board Size:	9 Community Members. Officers were removed from the panel in late 2017/early 2018



St. Paul Complaint Process

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Complaints can be received through the Police Department or the Human Rights Department.
- Initial complaints are reviewed by a Senior Commander and assessed for completeness and a policy violation.
- Investigations are completed by St. Paul Internal Affairs.



St. Paul Complaint Process

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Review Board reviews all IA investigations involving external complaints regardless of nature and internal complaints related to:
 - Excessive Use of Force
 - Inappropriate Use of Firearms
 - Discrimination
 - Racial Profiling
 - Improper Conduct/Procedures
 - Poor Public Relations
 - Any other complaints referred to the group by Human Right Department, Mayor or Chief of Police



St. Paul Complaint Process

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Review Board reviews the investigative file to include Body-worn video and makes a recommendation to the Chief for complaint disposition and discipline, if any. Recommendation then forwarded to the Chief of Police. Board does not receive the IA Investigators recommendation. If the board sustains a complaint they are provided access to the officer's file to help inform a discipline decision.
- Complainant may offer testimony during the hearing. If this occurs the officer(s) may also offer testify.
- In 2019 the Chief of Police modified the PCIARC's discipline recommendation 7 times.



St. Paul Complaint Process

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Possible Dispositions include
 - Unfounded-Allegation is false or not factual
 - Exonerated- Incident complained of occurred, but was lawful and proper
 - Not Sustained- Insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation
 - Sustained- The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence
 - Policy Failure- The allegation is factual. The officer followed proper department procedures, which have been proven to be faulty.
- Recommended discipline may include:
 - Oral Reprimand
 - Retraining
 - Written Reprimand
 - Suspension- not more than 30 days
 - Demotion



St. Paul PICARC Board Selection

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Board Member Selection
 - Made by the Mayor based off recommendations from the Human Rights Department.
- Training (prior to assuming board duties):
 - Topics related to police work
 - Investigation
 - Relevant Law
 - Cultural Competency
 - Racial Equity
 - Implicit Bias
 - Participate in Ride Along with Patrol Officers



Continued

St. Paul PICARC Board Selection

Police Civilian Internal Affairs Review Board (PCIARC)

- Failure to complete the required training, data practices violation or missing more than three trainings will result in removal from the Board.



City of Minneapolis

Agency Size:	Approx. 800
Review Board Type:	Investigative and Review-focused
Authority:	Ordinance Ord. No. 172
Dept. Responsibility:	Department of Civil Rights
Final Discipline Authority:	Chief of Police
Board Size:	Minimum of seven members; four appointed by Council, and three appointed by mayor. Individual review panels consist of two citizen and two officers at Commander level. Panels rotate members based off meeting availability.



City of Minneapolis

Term:	2-4 years
Other Duties:	Prepares Annual Report
Budget:	Members receive \$50 per meeting, OPCR budget is \$1,036,000. OPCR consists of 5-6 full-time staff.
Meeting Frequency:	Minimum once per month and may meet more as necessary.



Minneapolis Complaint Process

Office of Police Conduct Review (OPCR)

- Complaints may be made through the OPCR or Minneapolis PD.
- Complaints internal and external are then forwarded to MPD IA.
- A preliminary investigation is conducted. This primarily consists of collecting data such as body-worn camera, CAD data etc....
- Preliminary investigation is forwarded to IA Commander and Director of OPCR (civilian) for review.
- Complaints may be either dismissed, result in non-disciplinary coaching, mediation (rare) or to an Investigation.



Minneapolis Complaint Process

Office of Police Conduct Review (OPCR)

- If the complaint is investigated then the complaint may be investigated by sworn MPD investigators or non-sworn OPCR investigators.
- OPCR will not investigate:
 - Complaints involving an officer(s) and/or civilian staff related protected class discrimination (such as harassment based on gender, race, sexuality etc....).
 - Complaints that are more than 270 days old or more.
 - Complaints only involving civilian Minneapolis Staff.
- Complaints are decided to either go to a civilian or sworn investigator based on background experience and any subject matter expertise the investigator possesses.



Minneapolis Complaint Process

Office of Police Conduct Review (OPCR)

- After an investigation is completed the following can occur:
 - Complaint may be dismissed, result in mediation or sent to the Precinct Commander for Coaching or;
 - The case may go to the OPCR review panel if the complaint involves:
 - Use of excessive force
 - Inappropriate language or attitude
 - Harassment
 - Discrimination of police services based on color, creed, religion
 - Theft
 - Failure to provide timely police protection
 - Retaliation
 - Criminal Misconduct (non-review for criminal charges)



Minneapolis Complaint Process

Office of Police Conduct Review (OPCR)

- Review panel determines merit or no merit on the complaint and forwards to the Office of the Chief of Police or the investigation may be sent back to IA for further investigation.
 - Merit- Recommendation indicating that a preponderance of the evidence supports an allegation in a complaint.
 - No Merit- Recommendation indicating that a preponderance of the evidence does not support an allegation in a complaint.
- Discipline recommendation is decided by police personnel usually at the Chief/Deputy Chief level.



Minneapolis Review Board

Board Member Selection

Seven members are appointed by the Council (4) and Mayor (3).

Training

Failure to complete the required training, by majority of City Council vote, incompetence, misconduct or neglect of duty will result in removal from the board.



Minneapolis Review Board

Training Continued...

- Attend annual training session arranged by Civil Rights Department
- Police Use of Force Training
- Data Practices Act
- Open Meeting Law
- Ethics and Conflict of interest
- Public Employee Labor Relations Act (PELRA)
- Complete portions on Minneapolis PD Citizen's Academy within two years of appointment.



City of St. Cloud

Agency Size:	111
Review Board Type:	Review-focused
Authority:	Ordinance; Ord. No. 260
Dept. Responsibility:	Police Department
Final Discipline Authority:	Chief of Police
Board Size:	9 (6 Citizens and 3 Officers)
Term:	Three years for both citizens and officers. No officer may serve more than two terms.



City of St. Cloud

Other Duties:	Annual Report
Budget:	Board members are not paid.
Meeting Frequency:	As Needed (Board met three times in 2019)



St. Cloud Complaint Process

- Civilian Review Board will review all external complaints and internal complaints related to:
 - Excessive Force
 - Inappropriate Use of Firearms
 - Discrimination
 - Other cases presented to the board at the discretion of the Chief of Police
 - The Board does not review internal complaints unless they meet the above categories.



St. Cloud Complaint Process

Complaints are filed with the police department.

- A preliminary investigation is done and then given to the Chief of Police.
- If the Chief determines more information is needed then an IA is completed.
- If the Chief determines no further information is needed then the complaint and preliminary findings go to the review board.
- The board then may concur with the Chief or send back the complaint for further investigation.



St. Cloud Complaint Process

- Review board does not recommend discipline. They only propose a complaint finding.
- Review board does not have access to the officer's file.
- In the past 5 years the review board and Chief of Police have agreed on all complaint findings.



St. Cloud Complaint Process

Board Member Selection

- Citizen members are appointed by the Mayor and approved by the Council. All officers shall be recommended to the Mayor for appointment. Two members must represent Law Enforcement Labor Services (LELS). At least one officer and one supervisor.
- Chief appoints a review coordinator to prep for meetings.



St. Cloud Complaint Process

Training (prior to assuming board duties)

- Topics related to police work
- Investigations
- Relevant Law
- Cultural Diversity
- Officer Ride Along



St. Cloud Complaint Process

Training Continued...

Failure to complete necessary training, violating data practices or non-attendance of three or more meetings may cause termination of appointment as recommended by the Chief of Police and concurred by the mayor.



Department Comparison

	St. Paul	Minneapolis	St. Cloud	Brooklyn Center
Agency Size	629 Officers	Est. 800	111	49
Ordinance	Yes; Ord. No. 102	Yes; Ord. No. 172	Yes; Ord. No. 260	* None as of yet
Department of Responsibility	Human Rights	Civil Rights	Police Department	Police Department
Final Discipline Authority	Chief of Police	Chief of Police	Chief of Police	Chief of Police
Size of Board	9	7 (2 Civilians and 2 Officers)	9 (3 Officers)	7 (2 officers and selection by each council member)
Term Lengths	3-Year Terms or 2 Lifetime Terms	2-4 Years	3 Years	TBD



Continued

Department Comparison

	St. Paul	Minneapolis	St. Cloud	Brooklyn Center
Frequency of Meetings	Quarterly (Min. or Twice per Month (Max.))	Once per Month or More as Necessary	As Needed	As needed
Training Required	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Other Duties	Advise on Policy and Annual Report	Prepares Annual Report	Annual Report	Annual Report (other TBD)
Budget	\$16,000 / \$50 per member per meeting	\$50 per meeting OPCR \$1,036,000	Unpaid	TBD
Type of Board	Review-focused	Investigative and Review- focused	Review-focused	Review-focused



Notable Findings

1. St. Cloud and St. Paul both require the Chief and review board chair to meet within 5 days if the Chief disagrees with the boards complaint findings. Goal of this is an attempt to understand each others concerns.
2. Approximate national citizen complaint sustain rate is about 10%. No research was found to conclude that review boards sustain complaints at a higher rate than departments do. (*Walker*)
3. The Minnesota Police Officers Discipline Procedures Act (PODPA, MN. Stat. 626.89 Subd. 17) prohibits review boards from making a finding of fact on a complaint or imposing a discipline. Review boards recommendations are not binding.

Continued...



Notable Findings

4. The complaints St. Cloud, Minneapolis and St Paul's review board look at appear consistent with what other national review boards handle.
 - If a Brooklyn Center review board were to have the same criteria. 23 complaints would have been reviewed in 5.4 years or just over 4 complaints a year (External complaints only).
 - If you were to include internal complaints the board would have reviewed 27 complaints over 5.4 years or about 5 complaints a year.
5. Actual case discussions in Minneapolis, St. Paul and St. Cloud are closed to the public (Mn. Stat. 13D.05 Subd. 2).



Board Member Selection Criteria

- Must be willing to be impartial to ensure fairness.
- Communicate effectively with others.
- Make group decisions.
- Maintain confidentiality and be trusted with sensitive data.
- Commit time to attend meetings, attend trainings and review documentation.
- No minimum education needed.
- Resident of city.
- Complete background check (necessary in order to review sensitive CJIS data).



Board Member Selection Criteria

- At least 18 years of age.
- Must be willing to handle public scrutiny when making decisions.
- Complete application and potential interview or supplemental questions.

(St Paul PCIARC, Mpls)



Anticipated Costs

Staff Time

- All cities have a board coordinator. In Minneapolis and St. Paul this person is outside the police department and prepares meetings, handles administrative tasks during meetings, prepares recommendations and finding letters and assists with outreach and the annual report. In St. Cloud this appears to be a collateral duty for a department employee.
- Officer time to attend review board meetings (Complaint investigator or an officer speaking on his/her behalf).
- Minneapolis and St. Paul pay their commissioners \$50 a meeting. Overall costs to be determined by amount of meetings and number of commissioners. St. Cloud does not pay commissioners.



Anticipated Costs

Training Costs

To be determined based on identified training criteria and training time.

Equipment

St. Paul provides commissioners with laptops and two weeks prior to the meeting. All investigative material is pre-loaded onto the laptop for commissioner review prior to the meeting. This is more efficient than printing multiple copies of a file. Cost per computer is about \$1,000-1,500 (BC IT).



Additional Consideration

- Ordinance should be well defined to explain role of review board and what complaints they will review. This has been an issue in other cities.
- Given the low volume of complaints what other tasks would a review board perform?
 - Policy Recommendations (non-binding)?
 - Community Outreach?
 - Public reading of Annual Report and overview/explanation of complaint process?



Additional Consideration

- Trust is Paramount
 - Officers, even in a minority role, should be on the panel in order to ensure buy-in with this process. Without officers on the panel increased police-community relations and cross dialogue becomes difficult to achieve. (21st Century Policing)
- Current Brooklyn Center Policy requires all complaint investigations be completed within three months of the department becoming aware of the allegation. Extensions may be granted by the Chief of Police (Personnel Complaints, 1010.6.5).
 - Does the added step of a review board give a perception of a delay in accountability?
 - Does the delay in complaint resolution adversely impact complainant/officer satisfaction?



Resources

NACOLE Website

https://www.nacole.org/about_us

Recommended Training Criteria

https://www.nacole.org/recommended_training_for_board_and_commission_members



Resources

Review Board Agency Websites

- Albany, NY
<https://www.albanycprb.org/>
- Indianapolis, IN
<https://www.indy.gov/agency/citizens-police-complaint-office>
- Los Angeles, CA
<https://www.oig.lacity.org/>
- New Orleans, LA
<http://nolaipm.gov/main/?page=home>
- San Diego County, CA
<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/clerb/>
- San Francisco, CA
<https://sfgov.org/dpa>
- San Jose, CA
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/appointees/independent-police-auditor>
- St. Paul, MN
<https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/human-rights-equal-economic-opportunity/police-civilian-internal-affairs-review-3>
- Washington, D.C.
<https://policecomplaints.dc.gov/>



Resources

Ordinances

- St. Paul
https://library.municode.com/mn/st._paul/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIIIADCO_TITVCOCO_CH102POVIINAFRECO
- Minneapolis
http://minneapolis-mn.elaws.us/code/coord_title9_ch172
- St Cloud
<https://ci.stcloud.mn.us/DocumentCenter/View/367/260-St-Cloud-Police-Citizens-Review-Board?bidId=>

Statutes

- PELRA
<https://npelra.org/>
- PODPA
<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/626.89>



Scope of the Brooklyn Center Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission

Purpose:

The Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission (CSVPC) will serve as a community-driven advisory body to the City of Brooklyn Center, providing recommendations on public safety initiatives, policies, and practices. Grounded in national best practices and metrics, the commission will promote holistic approaches to community safety, violence prevention, and justice, while advancing equitable and sustainable outcomes for all residents.

Objectives:

The Commission's primary objectives should include:

1. **Review and Recommend Public Safety Policies:** Assess and make recommendations regarding existing public safety policies, programs, and practices in the City of Brooklyn Center. This includes evaluating the effectiveness of current law enforcement approaches and proposing alternatives where applicable, with a focus on non-violent crisis intervention, prevention, and community-based strategies.
2. **Community Engagement and Collaboration:** Foster transparent, ongoing dialogue between city leaders, law enforcement, community members, and stakeholders to build trust, enhance community-led safety initiatives, and ensure that community voices are at the center of decision-making processes.
3. **Promote Equity in Public Safety:** Ensure that public safety policies and practices are equitable and do not disproportionately impact marginalized or underserved populations. This includes providing recommendations for addressing racial disparities in public safety outcomes, particularly as they relate to law enforcement interactions, incarceration, and the justice system.
4. **Violence Prevention Strategies:** Develop and recommend community-based violence prevention strategies that focus on addressing the root causes of violence, including poverty, mental health, substance use, housing instability, and lack of access to social services.
5. **Monitor Public Safety Metrics:** Work in alignment with national metrics and best practices to measure the effectiveness of public safety policies and initiatives. Regularly review and report on public safety data, including crime rates, use of force incidents, community satisfaction with law enforcement, and other relevant indicators in collaboration with the City's public safety departments.
6. **Support the Development of Expanded Response Models:** Explore and support the implementation of non-law enforcement response models, including but not limited to mental health crisis intervention teams, violence interveners, and social service programs designed to provide holistic responses to non-violent incidents.

Roles and Responsibilities:

- **Provide Recommendations to the City Council:** The Commission will submit regular recommendations to the Brooklyn Center City Council on policies and practices related to public safety and violence prevention. These recommendations will be evidence-based, considering national best practices and community input.
- **Facilitate Community Forums and Workshops:** Organize public forums, listening sessions, and workshops to engage community members, gather feedback, and foster ongoing conversations about public safety. The Commission will actively work to ensure diverse voices, particularly from underrepresented communities, are included in these dialogues.
- **Collaborate with Other City Departments and Agencies:** The Commission will collaborate with relevant city departments, local law enforcement, public health agencies, and community-based organizations to support the implementation of recommended policies and programs.
- **Develop an Annual Report:** The Commission will produce an annual report detailing its recommendations, the status of implemented changes, and an evaluation of public safety metrics. This report will be made available to the public and shared with the City Council.

Membership:

- The Commission will be composed of **9 members**, appointed by the Mayor (utilizing council input as desired). Membership will reflect a broad cross-section of the Brooklyn Center community, including residents, business owners, faith-based leaders, educators, youth representatives, and experts in public safety, mental health, social services and related fields. The majority of Commissioners must be City residents. (Consideration for “at large representation and city staff representation as “non-voting members”). City staff (OCPHS, BCPD, BCFD, Recreation) will review applications and forward recommendations to City Clerk for Mayor/Council review and appointment (recommend interview and application edits)
- **Qualifications:** Members should have demonstrated interest or have direct experience in public safety, the criminal justice system, community engagement, public health, violence prevention, and/or social justice. The Commission will prioritize members who represent communities most affected by public safety issues and/or hold public safety or public health credentials.
- **Term Length:** Members will serve two-year terms, with the option for reappointment for an additional term. To ensure continuity, initial appointments will be staggered so that approximately half of the members’ terms expire in alternating years.

Meetings:

- The Commission will meet **quarterly** or as needed, depending on the urgency and scope of issues under review.
 - Special meetings or subcommittees may be formed to focus on specific areas such as youth engagement, mental health crisis response, or community-police relations.
-

National Examples of Similar Commissions:

Eugene, Oregon’s Civilian Review Board (CRB): This board reviews police department actions and policies, especially focusing on equity, transparency, and the handling of complaints. They emphasize civilian oversight and foster ongoing dialogue between law enforcement and the community, similar to the objectives of Brooklyn Center’s CSVPC.

Eugene, Oregon’s Civilian Review Board (CRB)

- **Commission Make-Up:**
 - The CRB consists of **5–7 volunteer members** appointed by the City Council, representing a diverse range of community perspectives. Members are typically residents who demonstrate a commitment to public safety, accountability, and transparency.
 - The board includes individuals with experience or expertise in fields such as law, social work, public safety, or community advocacy.
 - **Key Outcomes:**
 - **Transparency and Accountability:** The CRB reviews internal police investigations, especially cases involving use of force and misconduct complaints. This board has increased transparency by providing independent oversight and reporting findings to the public.
 - **Enhanced Public Trust:** The CRB’s reviews have resulted in increased community confidence in how complaints against police officers are handled. By reviewing both the investigation process and outcomes, they promote community trust in law enforcement’s accountability.
 - **Policy Recommendations:** The CRB provides recommendations to the police department for policy changes, including those focused on reducing racial disparities, increasing de-escalation tactics, and improving community relations.
-

Minneapolis, Minnesota’s Office of Violence Prevention: Minneapolis has implemented a community-led violence prevention strategy that includes initiatives such as community-based outreach, mental health support, and violence interrupters. The initiative focuses on addressing the root causes of violence and fostering community resilience, aligning closely with the goals of Brooklyn Center’s CSVPC.

Minneapolis, Minnesota’s Office of Violence Prevention (OVP)

- **Commission Make-Up:**
 - The OVP is staffed by professionals with expertise in public health, social services, violence prevention, and community engagement.
 - It works closely with a **Community Advisory Board** made up of community leaders, service providers, and individuals with lived experience related to violence, with the aim to ensure the program remains community-centered.
- **Key Outcomes:**
 - **Group Violence Intervention (GVI) Strategy:** A data-driven strategy focusing on individuals most at risk for involvement in violence. The program offers social services, mentorship, and opportunities for personal development, which has been credited with helping reduce gang-related shootings and homicides.
 - **Next Step Hospital-based Intervention:** This initiative provides immediate support and resources to individuals who have been injured due to violence. It helps survivors transition to non-violent lifestyles and prevents retaliation.
 - **Youth Violence Prevention:** The OVP runs youth-focused initiatives that aim to stop violence before it starts by providing young people with mentorship, education, and employment opportunities.
 - **Community Empowerment:** The office has successfully mobilized neighborhood-based organizations and residents to take an active role in reducing violence in their communities.

Los Angeles, California’s Civilian Oversight Commission: This commission provides oversight of the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, with a focus on transparency, public engagement, and addressing inequities in law enforcement practices. The commission reviews and recommends policies, fostering a model of accountability and community involvement.

Los Angeles, California’s Civilian Oversight Commission (COC)

- **Commission Make-Up:**
 - The COC is made up of **nine commissioners**, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The commissioners represent a cross-section of the community, including civil rights

attorneys, criminal justice advocates, public health professionals, and retired law enforcement officers.

- The commission has the support of an Inspector General's office, which conducts investigations and audits of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD).

- **Key Outcomes:**

- **Policy and Practice Reviews:** The commission has reviewed and recommended changes to LASD policies on the use of force, mental health response, and training programs. For instance, it has advocated for improved de-escalation tactics and trauma-informed care approaches for dealing with vulnerable populations.
- **Public Transparency:** Through public meetings, the COC has increased transparency between the sheriff's department and the community. These meetings allow for public input on key issues, such as police accountability, use of force, and misconduct cases.
- **Independent Investigations:** The COC, in collaboration with the Inspector General, has played a critical role in pushing for independent investigations into high-profile incidents, including officer-involved shootings and allegations of excessive force.
- **Focus on Mental Health:** The commission has pushed for greater investment in mental health resources and non-police responses to mental health crises.

Richmond, California's Office of Neighborhood Safety (ONS): The ONS is a violence prevention program that works directly with individuals most at risk for involvement in violence. They focus on holistic support, such as mentoring, employment assistance, and crisis intervention, which is in line with Brooklyn Center's aim to develop community-based, non-law enforcement safety strategies.

Richmond, California's Office of Neighborhood Safety (ONS)

- **Commission Make-Up:**

- The ONS is a division within the city's government, staffed by professionals in public health, violence prevention, and community engagement. It collaborates with **violence interrupters**, known as "Neighborhood Change Agents," who are community members trained to mediate conflicts and prevent violence.
- The ONS also works with other city departments and nonprofit organizations to coordinate services for at-risk individuals.

- **Key Outcomes:**

- **Reduction in Gun Violence:** Since its inception, the ONS has contributed to a significant decrease in gun violence and homicides in Richmond, particularly among young men at high risk of being involved in shootings.
- **Operation Peacemaker Fellowship:** This innovative mentorship program targets individuals most at risk of engaging in violent crime. Participants, called "fellows,"

receive mentorship, life coaching, and financial incentives for achieving personal and community goals.

- **Crisis Intervention:** ONS has successfully implemented conflict mediation and crisis intervention strategies to prevent retaliatory violence following violent incidents.
- **Employment and Education Opportunities:** By providing access to job training, education, and mental health services, ONS has helped participants reintegrate into society and reduce their involvement in violent crime.

These examples demonstrate a range of successful outcomes and structures that align with the objectives of Brooklyn Center’s Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission. They emphasize the importance of community engagement, transparency, and holistic approaches to violence prevention and public safety.

National Metrics for Success:

The Commission will measure its impact based on national public safety and community wellness indicators, including:

1. **Reduction in violent crime rates and use of force incidents** in the city.
2. **Increased community trust and satisfaction** with public safety services.
3. **Successful implementation of alternative response models**, such as mental health crisis teams.
4. **Improvement in racial and socioeconomic equity** in public safety outcomes.
5. **Community engagement levels** in forums, workshops, and decision-making processes.

Reporting and Accountability:

- The Commission will submit **annual updates** to the City Council, including progress on key initiatives and any emerging challenges.
- **Annual reports** will provide a detailed analysis of the year’s work, highlighting achievements, areas for improvement, and recommendations for the following year.

Conclusion:

The Community Safety and Violence Prevention Commission will be a key driver in public safety in Brooklyn Center. By centering community voices and focusing on prevention, equity, and innovation, the

Commission will ensure that Brooklyn Center’s approach to public safety is responsive to the needs of its residents and reflective of national best practices.