



Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

1600 University Avenue, Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55104

(651) 643-3060 | www.mn.gov/post

Public Safety Advisory Council

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, January 15, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

This meeting will be held at the MN POST Board, 1600 University Ave, Ste 200, St. Paul, MN 55104

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of the Agenda **ACTION**.
3. Approval of Minutes from 11/13/25 Meeting **ACTION** (no quorum 12/11)
4. Selection of New Chair January Election (Chair Won) **ACTION**
5. Juvenile Justice Subcommittee **DISCUSSION, UPDATE** (Carl Crawford)
6. Citizen Review Board Outreach **DISCUSSION, UPDATE** (Carl Crawford)
7. Advisory Council Six-Month Action Plan **DISCUSSION**
8. Adjournment.

Minn. Stat. § 626.8435 PUBLIC SAFETY ADVISORY COUNCIL

(a) The purpose of the council is to assist the board in maintaining policies and regulating peace officers in a manner that ensures the protection of civil and human rights. The council shall provide for citizen involvement in policing policies, regulations, and supervision. The council shall advance policies and reforms that promote positive interactions between peace officers and the community.



Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

1600 University Avenue, Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55104

(651) 643-3060 | www.mn.gov/post

**PUBLIC SAFETY ADVISORY
COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
Thursday, November 13,**

This HYBRID meeting was held at the MN POST Board office.

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Eric Won - Chair	Anne Haines Holy Eagle	Schyler Beaty	Josh Parker
Terry Stier	Dave Titus	Sidney Bergum	
Eder Castillo	Sean Deringer		
Biiftuu Adam	Elliot Butay		
Judy Seeberger			
Carl Crawford			
Kaohly Her			
Bidal Duran			

1. **Call to order:** Chair Won called the 11/13/25 meeting to order at 9:06 am.
2. **Approval of the agenda:** Chair Won asked for approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved via unanimous voice vote.
3. **Approval of the council meeting minutes on 10/9/25:** Chair Won asked for a motion to approve the October 9, 2025, minutes.
 - **MOTION:** Representative Her made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion passed via unanimous voice vote.
4. **Juvenile Justice Subcommittee:** Carl Crawford introduced the subcommittee. There are no new updates, but they should have an update at the next meeting.
5. **Young People with Disabilities:** No discussion due to the presenter being absent.
6. **Citizen Review Board Outreach:** Carl Crawford introduced the Citizen Review Board Outreach, and the relevant materials included in the packet. Josh Parker from NYU School of Law spoke as a guest speaker; he went through the proposed policy/rule language change of the draft. Discussion ensued on the materials therein. *See appendix A.*
 - **MOTION:** Carl Crawford moved the motion for the Board address the topic and to move forward with this proposed timeline. Representative Her seconded. Motion passes via roll call vote.



Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

1600 University Avenue, Suite 200, Saint Paul, MN 55104

(651) 643-3060 | www.mn.gov/post

7. **Advisory Council Six-Month Action Plan: Getting Out into Community:** No presentation due to presenter being absent. Chair Won asked for council members to email recommendations for the next 6 months to bridge relationships between officers and citizens. Encouraged members to outreach other groups and communities for consideration. Chair Won would like suggestions within the next 2-3 weeks with potential action items at the next meeting.
8. **Selection of new chair:** Chair Won is hopeful to elect new chair at next meeting. No action was taken.
9. **Adjournment:** Chair Won adjourned the meeting at 9:39 am.

DRAFT

Attachment A: Cover Letter

Minnesota Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST Board)
Attention: Rules and Policy Division
1600 University Avenue West, Suite 200
Saint Paul, MN 55104

Re: Submission of Proposed Rule Language – Cooperation with Independent Investigations

Dear Members of the Council:

As a member of the Public Safety Advisory Council, I submit the enclosed Cooperation with Independent Investigations proposal to, above all else, demonstrate that our Council and its partners can act responsibly and in alignment with the expectations of both the enabling statute and the communities we serve. The purpose of this proposal is to strengthen professional standards by providing officers with clear, fair, and constitutionally sound guidance when participating in independent investigations of use-of-force incidents. It reflects confidence in the capacity of Minnesota law enforcement to uphold accountability from within while maintaining the trust of the public we all serve.

This proposal is consistent with the statutory authority and purpose of the Public Safety Advisory Council as established under Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8435, which directs the Council to advise the Board on police accountability, community relations, and the standards of conduct and training for peace officers. The statute specifically charges the Council with providing recommendations that improve transparency, build public trust, and strengthen professional standards within Minnesota law enforcement. By clarifying expectations for officer cooperation during independent investigations, this proposal directly advances those objectives. It promotes accountability while protecting due process, improves interagency transparency, and supports the Council's role in helping the POST Board ensure that the state's licensing framework reflects both the highest professional standards and the public's confidence in fair and ethical policing.

This language emerged from a seven-month process involving a consortium of legal and policy organizations committed to enhancing public safety and civil liberties. This group includes the representatives from organizations such as The Policing Project, The American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota, The Legal Rights Center, The Minnesota Board of Public Defense, The Minnesota Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, The Minnesota Justice Research Center among others.

The group examined several potential proposals and ultimately selected this one, which originated from discussions surrounding HF 2089, because it most closely aligns with Minnesota Rule 6700.1600, Subpart E(2) and 6700.1610. That rule already requires officers to report unauthorized uses of force within 24 hours. This proposal builds on that principle by providing a clear administrative process for cooperation across agencies while preserving the full legal protections afforded under *Garrity v. New Jersey* and the Fifth Amendment.

This rule is important because it supports officers who act with integrity and encourages them to report or assist in addressing misconduct when it occurs. It recognizes the difficult position officers may face when asked to provide information in sensitive investigations and gives those who are not under investigation a clear and routine process for fulfilling their professional duties as required under their license. At the same time, it safeguards due process by defining clear limits on when cooperation may be compelled. Together, these provisions promote confidence, consistency, and integrity in the investigative process.

Ultimately, this rule represents a modest, practical improvement to existing standards. It offers clarity and consistency, supports officers who act in good faith, and aligns with the POST Board's ongoing commitment to maintaining high professional standards and public confidence in Minnesota law enforcement.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Crawford

Member, Public Safety Advisory Council
Minnesota Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

Attachment B: Proposed Rule Language

6700.XXXX COOPERATION WITH INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS.

This part establishes clear expectations for interagency cooperation during independent investigations of use-of-force incidents involving peace officers, while maintaining constitutional protections and due-process rights.

Subpart 1. General requirement.

When a law enforcement agency that does not employ a peace officer conducts an investigation into an incident involving that officer's use of force, the investigating agency has the authority to require any peace officer to answer questions, produce records or evidence relevant to the investigation, and otherwise cooperate with the investigation, in addition to the licensee obligations under part 6700.1600, subpart 1E(2) and 6700.1610.

Subp. 2. Limitations.

A law enforcement agency must not compel a peace officer to answer questions, produce records or evidence, or otherwise cooperate with an investigation if:

- A. the officer is a subject of the investigation;
- B. the officer is otherwise accused of wrongdoing by the investigating agency; or
- C. the investigating agency or office determines that it is reasonably foreseeable that criminal charges may be brought against the officer arising from the matter under investigation.

The investigating agency may require a peace officer described in subpart 2 to provide records or evidence that are entirely non-testimonial in nature and that do not implicate protections afforded under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution or under *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 (1967), and its progeny.

Subp. 3. Cooperation with prosecuting agencies.

Licensees who are not exempted under subpart 2 must also answer questions, produce records or evidence relevant to the investigation, or otherwise cooperate with the investigation when requested by a prosecuting agency, in addition to the licensee obligations under part 6700.1600, subpart 1E(2) and 6700.1610.

Subp. 5. Disciplinary action.

Under parts 6700.1600 and 6700.1710, the board may impose disciplinary action on a peace officer who provides false information or testimony to an investigating or prosecuting agency, or who otherwise violates this part.

Attachment C: Draft Work Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this draft work plan is to outline a proposed process for the Public Safety Advisory Council and the POST Board to review, discuss, and consider adoption of the proposed Minnesota Rule 6700.1605: Cooperation with Independent Investigations. The intent is to create a clear yet flexible framework that ensures adequate time for review, thoughtful discussion, and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

This work plan is being submitted as a draft and is open to revision based on feedback from Council members and Board staff. The goal is to arrive at a process that reflects collective input, ensures transparency, and provides a workable timeline for all participants.

Proposed Process and Timeline

Phase 1: Initial Presentation to the POST Board

Target Date: Mid-November 2025 (at least two weeks after initial circulation)

The proposed rule language will be presented to the POST Board for initial review and discussion. Representatives from The Policing Project will provide an in-depth explanation of the language and respond to questions. Up to two testifiers may be invited to offer statements of support. Following discussion, no vote will be taken to allow members and stakeholders time to review the proposal and prepare written input.

Phase 2: Circulation of Amendment Requests

Target Date: Prior to Thanksgiving 2025

Following the initial presentation, Council staff will circulate an email inviting members and stakeholders to submit proposed amendments or feedback. Submissions will be compiled and shared in advance of the next meeting to allow for review and consideration.

Phase 3: Presentation and Discussion of Amendments

Target Date: December 2025 (prior to the Christmas holiday)

All proposed amendments and feedback will be presented for open discussion. The Council will focus on clarifying language, identifying consensus, and refining the rule where appropriate. No vote will be taken at this stage to allow additional time for coordination with stakeholders.

Phase 4: Circulation of Final Draft and Agenda for Vote

Target Date: Early January 2026

A revised draft of the rule, incorporating Council feedback and agreed-upon changes, will be circulated with an agenda outlining items for final action. Members will receive all materials at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled meeting.

Phase 5: Final Vote on Proposed Rule Language

Target Date: By the end of January 2026

The POST Board will conduct a formal vote on the adoption of Minnesota Rule 6700.1605, incorporating any approved amendments.

Note on Flexibility

This attachment is a draft intended to guide discussion and planning. The sequence, timing, and content of each phase may be adjusted based on member input, Board scheduling, or stakeholder availability. All members are encouraged to propose edits, additions, or adjustments to ensure that the final work plan reflects the collective judgment and priorities of the Public Safety Advisory Council.

Attachment A: Cover Letter

Minnesota Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST Board)
Attention: Rules and Policy Division
1600 University Avenue West, Suite 200
Saint Paul, MN 55104

Re: Submission of Proposed Rule Language – Cooperation with Independent Investigations

Dear Members of the Council:

As a member of the Public Safety Advisory Council, I submit the enclosed Cooperation with Independent Investigations proposal to, above all else, demonstrate that our Council and its partners can act responsibly and in alignment with the expectations of both the enabling statute and the communities we serve. The purpose of this proposal is to strengthen professional standards by providing officers with clear, fair, and constitutionally sound guidance when participating in independent investigations of use-of-force incidents. It reflects confidence in the capacity of Minnesota law enforcement to uphold accountability from within while maintaining the trust of the public we all serve.

This proposal is consistent with the statutory authority and purpose of the Public Safety Advisory Council as established under Minnesota Statutes, section 626.8435, which directs the Council to advise the Board on police accountability, community relations, and the standards of conduct and training for peace officers. The statute specifically charges the Council with providing recommendations that improve transparency, build public trust, and strengthen professional standards within Minnesota law enforcement. By clarifying expectations for officer cooperation during independent investigations, this proposal directly advances those objectives. It promotes accountability while protecting due process, improves interagency transparency, and supports the Council's role in helping the POST Board ensure that the state's licensing framework reflects both the highest professional standards and the public's confidence in fair and ethical policing.

This language emerged from a seven-month process involving a consortium of legal and policy organizations committed to enhancing public safety and civil liberties. This group includes the representatives from organizations such as The Policing Project, The American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota, The Legal Rights Center, The Minnesota Board of Public Defense, The Minnesota Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, The Minnesota Justice Research Center among others.

The group examined several potential proposals and ultimately selected this one, which originated from discussions surrounding HF 2089, because it most closely aligns with Minnesota Rule 6700.1600, Subpart E(2) and 6700.1610. That rule already requires officers to report unauthorized uses of force within 24 hours. This proposal builds on that principle by providing a clear administrative process for cooperation across agencies while preserving the full legal protections afforded under *Garrity v. New Jersey* and the Fifth Amendment.

This rule is important because it supports officers who act with integrity and encourages them to report or assist in addressing misconduct when it occurs. It recognizes the difficult position officers may face when asked to provide information in sensitive investigations and gives those who are not under investigation a clear and routine process for fulfilling their professional duties as required under their license. At the same time, it safeguards due process by defining clear limits on when cooperation may be compelled. Together, these provisions promote confidence, consistency, and integrity in the investigative process.

Ultimately, this rule represents a modest, practical improvement to existing standards. It offers clarity and consistency, supports officers who act in good faith, and aligns with the POST Board's ongoing commitment to maintaining high professional standards and public confidence in Minnesota law enforcement.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Crawford

Member, Public Safety Advisory Council
Minnesota Board of Peace Officer Standards and Training

Attachment B: Proposed Rule Language

6700.XXXX COOPERATION WITH INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS.

This part establishes clear expectations for interagency cooperation during independent investigations of use-of-force incidents involving peace officers, while maintaining constitutional protections and due-process rights.

Subpart 1. General requirement.

When a law enforcement agency that does not employ a peace officer conducts an investigation into an incident involving that officer's use of force, the investigating agency has the authority to require any peace officer to answer questions, produce records or evidence relevant to the investigation, and otherwise cooperate with the investigation, in addition to the licensee obligations under part 6700.1600, subpart 1E(2) and 6700.1610.

Subp. 2. Limitations.

A law enforcement agency must not compel a peace officer to answer questions, produce records or evidence, or otherwise cooperate with an investigation if:

- A. the officer is a subject of the investigation;
- B. the officer is otherwise accused of wrongdoing by the investigating agency; or
- C. the investigating agency or office determines that it is reasonably foreseeable that criminal charges may be brought against the officer arising from the matter under investigation.

The investigating agency may require a peace officer described in subpart 2 to provide records or evidence that are entirely non-testimonial in nature and that do not implicate protections afforded under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution or under *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 (1967), and its progeny.

Subp. 3. Cooperation with prosecuting agencies.

Licensees who are not exempted under subpart 2 must also answer questions, produce records or evidence relevant to the investigation, or otherwise cooperate with the investigation when requested by a prosecuting agency, in addition to the licensee obligations under part 6700.1600, subpart 1E(2) and 6700.1610.

Subp. 5. Disciplinary action.

Under parts 6700.1600 and 6700.1710, the board may impose disciplinary action on a peace officer who provides false information or testimony to an investigating or prosecuting agency, or who otherwise violates this part.

Attachment C: Draft Work Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this draft work plan is to outline a proposed process for the Public Safety Advisory Council and the POST Board to review, discuss, and consider adoption of the proposed Minnesota Rule 6700.1605: Cooperation with Independent Investigations. The intent is to create a clear yet flexible framework that ensures adequate time for review, thoughtful discussion, and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

This work plan is being submitted as a draft and is open to revision based on feedback from Council members and Board staff. The goal is to arrive at a process that reflects collective input, ensures transparency, and provides a workable timeline for all participants.

Proposed Process and Timeline

Phase 1: Initial Presentation to the POST Board

Target Date: Mid-November 2025 (at least two weeks after initial circulation)

The proposed rule language will be presented to the POST Board for initial review and discussion. Representatives from The Policing Project will provide an in-depth explanation of the language and respond to questions. Up to two testifiers may be invited to offer statements of support. Following discussion, no vote will be taken to allow members and stakeholders time to review the proposal and prepare written input.

Phase 2: Circulation of Amendment Requests

Target Date: Prior to Thanksgiving 2025

Following the initial presentation, Council staff will circulate an email inviting members and stakeholders to submit proposed amendments or feedback. Submissions will be compiled and shared in advance of the next meeting to allow for review and consideration.

Phase 3: Presentation and Discussion of Amendments

Target Date: December 2025 (prior to the Christmas holiday)

All proposed amendments and feedback will be presented for open discussion. The Council will focus on clarifying language, identifying consensus, and refining the rule where appropriate. No vote will be taken at this stage to allow additional time for coordination with stakeholders.

Phase 4: Circulation of Final Draft and Agenda for Vote

Target Date: Early January 2026

A revised draft of the rule, incorporating Council feedback and agreed-upon changes, will be circulated with an agenda outlining items for final action. Members will receive all materials at least two weeks in advance of the scheduled meeting.

Phase 5: Final Vote on Proposed Rule Language

Target Date: By the end of January 2026

The POST Board will conduct a formal vote on the adoption of Minnesota Rule 6700.1605, incorporating any approved amendments.

Note on Flexibility

This attachment is a draft intended to guide discussion and planning. The sequence, timing, and content of each phase may be adjusted based on member input, Board scheduling, or stakeholder availability. All members are encouraged to propose edits, additions, or adjustments to ensure that the final work plan reflects the collective judgment and priorities of the Public Safety Advisory Council.