STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

POST COMMISSION FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

%•••ه

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

DATE: Wednesday, February 18, 2015

PLACE: Wyndham Anaheim/Garden Grove

Santa Rosa Ballroom A 12021 Harbor Boulevard Garden Grove, California

<u>ه</u>•••ه

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

~•••

Reported by:

Daniel P. Feldhaus California Certified Shorthand Reporter #6949 Registered Diplomate Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter

Daniel P. Feldhaus, C.S.R., Inc.

Certified Shorthand Reporters 8414 Yermo Way, Sacramento, California 95828 Telephone 916.682.9482 Fax 916.688.0723 FeldhausDepo@aol.com

APPEARANCES

POST COMMISSION FINANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

SYLVIA MOIR
(Finance Committee Chair)
Chief
El Cerrito Police Department

PETER KURYLOWICZ, JR.

Deputy Sheriff
Riverside County Sheriff's Department

LAREN LEICHLITER
Sheriff
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

RONALD LOWENBERG

Director

Criminal Justice Training Center

&•••

POST STAFF PRESENT

(participating staff)

ROBERT STRESAK
Executive Director
Executive Office

JANICE BULLARD
Assistant Executive Director
(Standards and Development Division)
Executive Office

STEPHANIE SCOFIELD

Assistant Executive Director
(Administrative Services Division)

Executive Office

RON CROOK

Multimedia Specialist

Learning Technology Resources Bureau

CONNIE PAOLI
Administrative Assistant to the Director
Executive Office

I N D E X

| Proceeding | <u>ds</u> | age |
|------------|---|-----|
| Call | to Order and Welcome | 6 |
| 1. | Approval of October 22, 2014, Finance Committee Minutes | 7 |
| 2. | Report on Revenues for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 | 5 7 |
| 3. | Report on Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 | 9 |
| 4. | Report on Personnel Expenses for Fiscal Year 2014-15 | 19 |
| 5. | Report on Reimbursements for Fiscal Year 2014-15 | 20 |
| 6. | Report on Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 64 |
| 7. | Review of New Expenditures on the Regular Commission Agenda | 37 |
| 8. | Report on Request to Renew Contracts for Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 44 |
| | 1. Report on Request to Renew Contract for Legal Update Video | 46 |
| | 2. Report on Request to Renew the Contract for Development of Training Videos | 46 |
| | 3. Report on Request to Contract for Learning Portal Support | 46 |
| | 4. Report on Request to Renew the Contract for Courses and Tools for Learning Portal | 46 |
| | 5. Report on Request to Renew the Contract for Presentation of the Command College Course | 48 |

I N D E X

| Proceedings | | Page |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| | eport on Request to Renew Contracts for iscal Year 2015-16 continued | |
| 6 | Report on Request to Renew the Contraction the Presentation of the Management Course | t . 48 |
| 7 | Report on Request to Renew the Contraction of the Executive Development Course | t . 49 |
| 8 | . Report on Request to Renew Contract for Presentation of the Sherman Block Supervisory Leadership Institute Course | e 49 |
| 9 | Report on Request to Renew the Contractor For Presentation of the Supervisory Course | t . 49 |
| 10 | . Report on Request to Renew the Contractor for Presentation of the Supervisory Course Facilitators' Training | |
| 11 | . Report on Request to Renew Contracts for Basic Driver Training (EVOC), Motorcycle, and Narcotic Training | . 50 |
| 12 | Report on Request to Renew Contract for Specialized Coroner Training Courses | . 50 |
| 13 | . Report on Request to Renew Contract for Crime Analysis Training | . 50 |
| 14 | . Report on Request to Renew Contract for Department of Justice Training Courses | . 50 |
| 15 | . Report on Request to Renew Contracts for Driving Simulator and Force-Option Simulator Training | |
| | | |

I N D E X

| Proceedings | | Pa | ge |
|----------------|---|----|----|
| - | ort on Request to Renew Contracts for cal Year 2015-16 continued | | |
| 16. | Report on Request to Renew Contract for the Robert Presley Institute of Criminal Investigations Program | | 52 |
| 17. | Report on Request to Renew Contract for Instructor Development Institute Program | | 52 |
| 18. | Report on Request to Renew Contract for the Course Quality Assessment Program | | 52 |
| 19. | Report on Request to Renew Contracts for Driving Simulator and Force-Option Simulator Instructor Training | | 52 |
| 20. | Report on Request to Renew Contract with the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Museum of Tolerance | | 54 |
| 21. | Report on Request to Renew Contract for Local Agency Audits | • | 62 |
| 22. | Report on Request to Renew the Contractor Infrastructure Expenditures with to Department of Technology Services | he | 62 |
| 23. | Report on Request to Renew the Testing Management and Assessment System Contract | | 62 |
| 9. Old | Business | | 66 |
| 10. New | Business | | 66 |
| Adjournme | ent | | 68 |
| Reporter's Cer | rtificate | • | 69 |

```
1
              Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 10:02 a.m.
2
                      Garden Grove, California
3
                               --000--
4
           (The gavel was sounded.)
5
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Good morning. We will call
6
     this POST Finance Committee meeting to order.
7
          May I have a roll call, please?
8
          MS. PAOLI: Yes.
9
          Hutchens?
10
           (No response)
11
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
12
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Present.
13
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
14
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Here.
15
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Here.
16
17
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
18
           (No response)
19
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
20
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Here.
21
          And "M" is at the end? That was surprising. I'm
22
     sorry.
23
          I was expecting something different. Apparently the
     Finance Committee is at the first half of the alphabet.
24
25
     I appreciate that.
```

| 1 | Our first item is the approval of the minutes of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | previous Finance Committee meeting from October 23 rd , |
| 3 | 2014. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move it. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Second. |
| 6 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you. |
| 7 | MS. PAOLI: Who was second? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I did. Leichliter, sorry. |
| 9 | MS. PAOLI: Thank you. |
| 10 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Where we stand now is, I'm |
| 11 | going to invite up Stephanie Scofield, our Assistant |
| 12 | Executive Director and an absolutely essential part of |
| 13 | the Finance Committee, to provide a report on revenues |
| 14 | for fiscal year 2014-2015. |
| 15 | MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you, Madam Chair. |
| 16 | Good morning, Committee Members. We have a full |
| 17 | agenda for you this morning. |
| 18 | As we proceed, if you have any questions of me or |
| 19 | staff that's present, we'd be more than happy to answer |
| 20 | any of your questions as we proceed. |
| 21 | So the first item of business is Item Number 2, |
| 22 | which is our report on revenues. This is reporting out |
| 23 | to you on revenues for the first six months of the |
| 24 | current fiscal year, 2014-15. |
| 25 | And the first chart we have for you is the State |

Penalty Fund revenue that is deposited into the Peace Officer Training Fund.

As you can see, most of the gold bars for this current fiscal year are lower than fiscal year 2013-14. We are seeing a 1 percent decline in revenue from the State Penalty Assessment Fund, into the Peace Officer Training Fund, which continues the trend of lowering revenues that we've been discussing for the past year.

That is reporting from July through December, as noted at the bottom right-hand corner of the page.

The second page is showing you revenue from the Driver Training Penalty Assessment Fund. POST receives \$14 million from the Driver Training Penalty Assessment Fund. And as you can see, we have had no deposits in the first six months, which is not unusual, as we normally see that towards the back half of the fiscal year.

Page 3 of our revenues. This is our "Other Sources of Revenue." This consists of our coroner's permit fees, any loans we have, interest paid on our loans.

This fiscal year, we anticipate receiving the last of the \$5 million loan from 2008. We anticipate a \$1 million last deposit of that, and so we'll see some interest this fiscal year on that.

We also combine into this item, miscellaneous

services that we charge fees for, such as basic-course 1 2 waiver fees, et cetera. 3 We are currently at \$172,000 for that, for those other sources of revenue, reporting out for the first 4 5 six months. So we are trending well in that area for Other Sources of Revenue. 6 7 The final page shows you -- this is a cumulative 8 comparison of all of the three sources of revenue that 9 we just discussed from the State Penalty Assessment Fund, 10 Driver Training Fund, as well as our Other Sources. And 11 as you can see, we are trending down. 12 Currently, for the first six months of 2014-15, in 13 comparison to the first six months of 2013-14, we are at a negative 2 percent comparison rate from last fiscal 14 15 year to this fiscal year. And I attribute that to the decrease of the revenue continuing out of the State 16 17 Penalty Fund into the Peace Officer Training Fund. 18 We continue to see the negative trend, which we will 19 expand more as we get into our report for the budget 20 2015-16 report. 21 May I answer any questions for the revenue report 22 for the first six months of this fiscal year? 23 (No response) 24 MS. SCOFFIELD: Okay, moving on to Item 3, this is 25 going to be our report on expenditures.

Again, this is reporting for the first six months of the fiscal year. And as you can see, our allocated budget, at the very top, is \$56.8 million.

And we'll move down per our highlighted areas.

Our administration budget, we're allocated \$16.8 million. And to date, we have spent \$9.9 million of that.

We are north of 50 percent for the first six months. And I attribute that to our one-time costs associated with our move, which will ultimately result in future cost savings for us. But we did have some one-time costs associated with our move to West Sacramento. So that's equating to north of 50 percent for the administration budget.

Our training contracts, we're allocated 19.3. We've encumbered 16.5 of that in our training contracts. Also, it includes our room rentals, which we're at \$133,000. And we hope to see that continuing to decline next fiscal year due to our excellent training room space we have in our new building.

This also includes our letters of agreement, which is how we pay our subject-matter experts to assist us in many curriculum development or test panel meetings.

And then our contracts are 15 point -- our training contracts are a 15.8 allocation.

The next category is training reimbursements. We are allocated this year \$15.4 million. That was a decrease with our cost-savings reduction plan. And we have spent, in the first six months, 8.3 percent -- excuse me, \$8.3 million. And that's expending 54 percent. So we're in line with our expenditures for the first six months.

I'm going to expand further in this area on Item 5.

One thing that is new in the training

reimbursements, you'll see on the last bullet point, it

says, "Presenter's Costs." In 2013, the Commission

approved Plan V, which is reimbursing our presenters for

costs of each course presentation that they put on. And

we've expended \$49,000 to date.

Our final category is the Museum of Tolerance, which is our cultural diversity training in Los Angeles. Each year, we're allocated \$1.5 million. And of that, \$444,000 is earmarked for reimbursements for the field to attend the Museum of Tolerance.

The final item of note is, we did receive the one-time allocation this fiscal year of \$3.2 million from the General Fund. And last commission meeting, the Commission approved that to go to allocations for mental-health training reimbursements. Unfortunately, we've only expended to date \$13,842 of that.

| 1 | When staff did an analysis, what we're finding is, |
|----|--|
| 2 | officers are attending mental-health training courses, |
| 3 | but they're not submitting for reimbursement. So that's |
| 4 | not unusual because a lot of times, there is a delay in |
| 5 | POST getting training reimbursements from the field. |
| 6 | So I do anticipate that number going up in the next |
| 7 | six months. But we'll have further discussions with the |
| 8 | Department of Finance; if \$3.2 million is not used for |
| 9 | mental-health reimbursements, could we allocate that for |
| 10 | other training reimbursements. So that would be further |
| 11 | discussion we'll have with the Museum of Tolerance. |
| 12 | So for the last six months, we have \$20.3 million |
| 13 | balance available for the next six months of this fiscal |
| 14 | year. |
| 15 | Any questions on our expenditures for the first six |
| 16 | months? |
| 17 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes, I have two. |
| 18 | MS. SCOFIELD: Yes? |
| 19 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Ms. Scofield, so that we all |
| 20 | understand, the very valuable training that we receive |
| 21 | at the Museum of Tolerance, is it accurate to say that |
| 22 | that Museum of Tolerance is funded from the POTF? |
| 23 | MS. SCOFIELD: That is correct. Our entire budget |
| 24 | comes out of the Peace Officer Training Fund, and the |
| 25 | Museum of Tolerance is part of that. |

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you. 1 2 And the other is, you said regarding the "Other" on 3 this sheet before us, the one-time allocation from General Fund authorized for reimbursements. And that 4 5 was done -- or specifically earmarked for mental-health training --6 7 MS. SCOFIELD: Correct. 8 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: -- by action of this 9 Commission and the really insightful work of POST. 10 By looking at this, it appears that the 11 reimbursements are a bit lethargic, for whatever reason, whether agencies are not seeking the training or they're 12 13 not up-to-date with requesting reimbursement. Is it appropriate then to reallocate some of that 14 15 for other training reimbursements? And if so, how would we identify which courses we would reimburse? 16 17 MS. SCOFIELD: It is very appropriate to reallocate that. And that is some discussions we've had with the 18 19 Department of Finance in the last several months, to 20 reallocate that. 21 We would look to our courses, potentially some of 22 our Plan IV courses that are suspended, bringing back 23 some of those for the last half of the fiscal year. But 24 that's going to be further discussion with the Department 25 of Finance.

| 1 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So that I understand, that |
|----|---|
| 2 | discussion with the Department of Finance would take |
| 3 | place, and then staff would identify those courses that |
| 4 | would be reimbursed? |
| 5 | MS. SCOFIELD: Yes. |
| 6 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Or is there a different |
| 7 | process than that? |
| 8 | MS. SCOFIELD: That would be the process. |
| 9 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So request permission, then |
| 10 | come back? |
| 11 | MS. SCOFIELD: Yes. |
| 12 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Okay. What is the typical |
| 13 | timing of such an action? |
| 14 | MS. SCOFIELD: Well, that would be in our |
| 15 | discussions with the Legislature, starting in April, with |
| 16 | our budget subcommittees, with the Assembly and the |
| 17 | Senate, to see if they are willing to look at that. But |
| 18 | then we would probably see as we have discussed here |
| 19 | before, we have some delays in our reimbursements. So |
| 20 | potentially, reimbursing from the previous two fiscal |
| 21 | years, if that 3.2 is reallocated. |
| 22 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So urging Department of |
| 23 | Finance to recognize, in the complex world of modern |
| 24 | policing, that mental-health training is one of the many |
| 25 | complex issues we deal with; right? And then saying that |

| 1 | this money should more appropriately be applied across an |
|----|---|
| 2 | array of very essential training, is what you're arguing |
| 3 | for? |
| 4 | MS. SCOFIELD: That's correct. |
| 5 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Okay, thank you very much. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I guess my only question |
| 7 | would be about the reimbursements. |
| 8 | Is it just, we don't have that many because they |
| 9 | don't know they can be reimbursed? Is it just is it |
| 10 | normal for them to come in late? |
| 11 | MS. SCOFIELD: It actually is normal for there to |
| 12 | be a delay in getting training reimbursements. |
| 13 | What we have done, as soon as we did this analysis |
| 14 | and saw that the funding isn't being used, we have met |
| 15 | with our training managers, our regional consultants |
| 16 | are meeting with the training managers and the chiefs' |
| 17 | and sheriffs' associations to remind them. |
| 18 | We did put a bulletin out on this, but sometimes |
| 19 | that can get buried. And we're just trying to encourage |
| 20 | the field to use this money for mental-health training |
| 21 | reimbursement. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Okay. |
| 23 | MS. SCOFIELD: It is available. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: I think part of the issue |
| 25 | might be and I'll just use I apologize in advance; |

but I'll use the Orange County example because I'm most familiar with it. In offering the crisis intervention training locally, it's being funded by a grant through the health-care agencies. And so maybe the agencies -- I'm just thinking out loud -- maybe the agencies are figuring that since the training is really not -- there is no tuition involved with it, maybe they're not consciously thinking about reimbursement as it relates to backfill -- or, you know, time of officers away and that kind of thing. So maybe part of it, as was pointed out by my fellow commissioner, is that maybe it's an issue of education.

And then to follow up with Sylvia's comment, it seems to me that we -- and I agree with everything that was said, and the questions were asked, very insightful questions. But I would be a little bit concerned. We'd want to do it thoughtfully when we go back to request to have the funds redirected, if we choose to do that, because we wouldn't want to raise a red flag with the Legislature because it was their direction, you know, that it would be mental-health training. So maybe we would be thoughtful -- just a suggestion -- in making sure that the training to take place of the mental-health training, would be something as almost as sensitive as, you know, mental-health training; and maybe something --

| 1 | and I admit my bias in advance, pardon the pun but |
|----|--|
| 2 | fair and impartial policing, or that kind of training |
| 3 | might be high on our list of considerations. |
| 4 | So just some observations. |
| 5 | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Commissioner, thank |
| 6 | you. That was well-stated. |
| 7 | As you are fully aware, there are multiple |
| 8 | conflicting high-priority issues today. |
| 9 | What Stephanie didn't point out, is that we have |
| 10 | about I believe, 3,000 pending reimbursements? |
| 11 | MS. SCOFIELD: Yes. |
| 12 | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: that would still |
| 13 | have to pan out. |
| 14 | Point number two is that communicating this message |
| 15 | to the boards. We're out reinforcing them, once again, |
| 16 | to remind them. |
| 17 | And there are outside training resources, |
| 18 | non-POST-certified training resources that are being |
| 19 | utilized also. So there's kind of this conglomerate of |
| 20 | issues. |
| 21 | But your point is well-taken; and we'll continue to |
| 22 | look at this issue at this point. |
| 23 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: And just for clarity, I |
| 24 | wasn't suggesting that we abandon reimbursements for |
| 25 | mental health. I think we all recognize that there are |

so many other issues when interacting with someone in a mental-health crisis. And we may be well-served by looking at that array of training.

And the final comment that I'll make to this point and to the point about reimbursements and "Does the field know?": POST has been extraordinary in pushing out the message, saw that mental-health issues and interactions was prevalent and emerging, and took a very courageous step to put this entire \$3.2 million toward mental-health training. So kudos to POST staff.

And they reflected their agility in doing that.

And this next pivot will then require us to say, okay, not only are we pressed by examining how our officers in the field interact with those mental-health crises or with intellectual disabilities and the like, but say that we also have some ancillary issues to deal with, and we'd like to reallocate some of those funds.

So this was a long way of saying, a huge credit to POST for doing that. We just, in the field, need to now act on the reimbursement and the training.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: And one more comment -- thank you, Madam Chair.

And one more comment I wanted to mention on this issue is that we still have the unknown variable of at least three or four unfunded training mandates currently

```
percolating in the Legislature.
1
2
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
3
          MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you.
          Any further questions or comments?
4
5
           (No response)
          MS. SCOFFIELD: Okay, we'll move on to Item 4, which
6
7
     is our report on personnel expenses for fiscal year
8
     2014-15.
9
          What this graphic depicts is all of POST bureaus and
10
     the staffing assigned to each bureau.
11
           Staff, we total 123 authorized positions. And the
12
     percentages per bureau are listed there for you around
13
     the circle.
14
          What I'd like to note is down in the bottom
15
     left-hand corner of the Commission's administration
     budget, personnel services, which includes salary,
16
17
     wages, and benefits, total $12.6 million, which is
18
     75 percent of our administration budget. The rest of
19
     the administration budget is operating expenses and
20
     equipment. So the majority of that is our staff
21
     salaries, wages, and benefits.
22
          And to date, due to some of our vacancies, we have
23
     approximately $307,000 in unspent salaries and wages
     due to some of our vacancies that we have.
24
25
           And this is as of 2014-15, current authorized
```

positions are 123. 1 2 May I answer any questions on our authorized 3 personnel expenses? (No response) 4 5 MS. SCOFFIELD: Okay, moving on to Item 5. This will be our report on our reimbursements, which I will 6 7 expand upon from our expenditure report. 8 So this graphic is depicting, in a little bit more 9 detail, what we just previously reported in Item 3 on our 10 expenditures. 11 What's interesting to note here is if you look in the gold box in the top right-hand corner, our actual 12 13 number of trainees has decreased from the same time last 14 year. So in 2013-14, from July through December, we had 15 17,000 reimbursable trainees. And to date, for 2014-15, we have 15,000 reimbursable trainees. So that's a 16 17 decrease of 9 percent -- a decrease of 1,344 students. 18 However, our reimbursements have gone up. So from 19 July through December of 2013-14, we spent \$8.0 million, 20 while to date, for 2014-15, we're at 8.3. 21 And what you can see trending here is if you look 22 at the gold bars, students are attending courses where we 23 reimburse resident subsistence, which is our lodging -that is higher than it was last fiscal year -- as well as 24 25 our tuition. The tuition, our students are attending

1 courses that have tuition reimbursement. That has 2 increased as well. 3 The other -- the commuter subsistence, the resident travel, and the commuter travel, which is airfare and 4 5 mileage, that is trending pretty similar for comparison for last fiscal year and this current fiscal year. 6 7 Backfill, as we note, is still currently suspended. 8 However, we have paid out \$336,000 in the first six 9 months. And, again, that is for those reimbursements 10 that are coming in from the last two previous fiscal 11 years, which was still eligible prior to our Expenditure 12 Reduction Plan going into effect. 13 And then the presenter's costs, which we discussed, was still \$49,000. 14 15 So we are about 39 percent of our projections for the year. We did anticipate -- we did project a 16 17 9 percent increase in student reimbursements -- or 18 excuse me, for student -- reimbursable students. We 19 increased from 37,000 to 40,000. And that's based on 20 some projected increase in the basic academy students, as 21 well as our supervisory and our management reimbursable 22 students. We did see an increase in that area. 23 May I answer any questions on our trainees or 24 reimbursements? 25 (No response)

MS. SCOFFIELD: Okay, thank you. 1 2 Moving on to --3 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Go ahead. MS. SCOFIELD: Moving on to Item 6, this is our 4 5 report on the proposed budget for 2015-16. 6 As you are aware, in October 2013, the Commission 7 approved an 18-month Expenditure Reduction Plan to 8 mitigate the declining revenue into the Peace Officer 9 Training Fund. The Reduction Plan began in January of 10 2014, which as we are aware, the suspension of backfill, 11 some Plan IV reimbursements, with the exception of contract courses, reduction of contracts, and a 12 13 suspension of some POST symposiums. 14 To date, the Reduction Plan is on target to attain 15 the projected cost savings of \$8.6 million. And that will result in the Commission's reserve projected at the 16 17 end of 2014-15 to be approximately \$7.8 million. 18 In late 2014, the Department of Finance initially 19 projected the revenue into the Peace Officer Training 20 Fund to continue to decline for 2015-16. With this information, in the last quarter of 2014, staff 21 22 analyzed all budget areas for potential cost savings, 23 as the Department of Finance worked to define a 24 revenue-generating plan for the State Penalty Assessment 25 Fund. This is the source of the Peace Officer Training

Fund, which is the Commission's budget.

A draft cost-savings proposal was submitted to the Department of Finance in November of 2014, in proactive efforts to reduce projected expenditures.

Staff was told this plan may not be needed due to the larger efforts to address the continuing decline into the State Penalty Assessment Fund.

Our partners in the Department of Finance are working to attain the larger goal of shoring up the State Penalty Assessment Fund.

On January 9^{th} , 2015, the Governor released the state proposed budget for 2015-16.

For the Commission, the administration is proposing an 18-month outstanding debt-amnesty program to address the declining revenue into the Peace Officer Training Fund. This program would authorize individuals with past-due court-ordered debt prior to January 1 of 2013, to pay a delinquent debt at a 50 percent reduction. The Administration is projecting revenue from this program into the Peace Officer Training Fund to increase by \$10 million.

Even with the increased projections, the proposed budget decreases the Commission's administration support budget by \$5.3 million, in efforts to end 2015-16 with a projected \$3.6 million reserve.

And the administration budget, as we just previously discussed, contains staff salary and benefits, as well as our operating expenditures.

The decrease of \$5.3 million includes a 30 percent decrease in POST authorized positions. Currently, as we just reported, POST has 123 authorized positions.

The fiscal year 2015-16 proposed budget decreases these positions to 86, which is a cut of POST staff of 37 positions.

While POST staffing decreases both programmatic areas, the training contracts and local assistance are fully funded to \$20 million, respectively.

Attachment A refers to the Governor's budget summary that states the reduction of staffing is necessary to maintain critical training programs and reimbursements to local agency, and promote a more efficient state government.

After the budget was released, staff conducted an analysis of all POST services to California law enforcement.

Attachments C through J describe each POST bureau, program responsibilities, and staffing associated with each of the programs, and the overall impact to California law enforcement, should we receive a 30 percent staffing decrease.

In summary, of all of these attachments, the impact of a 30 percent decrease in staffing would result in the overall lowering of selection and training standards for California law enforcement, in an environment that is currently demanding more training for law enforcement in such areas as interacting with persons with mental illness, use of force, bias, and community relations.

According to the Department of Finance, details are limited on this \$5.3 million reduction. The reductions that were publicized in the Governor's budget are preliminary at this time. POST staff has had several productive meetings with the Department of Finance.

At this time, staff feels that there are other areas of the Commission's budget for consideration to attain this \$5.3 million savings without a 30 percent staffing cut.

Referring to the agenda items you are presented, the Commission is presented with three options to realize this \$5.3 million savings.

Option A would be to decrease training contracts by \$5.3 million. As you are aware, POST contracts with multiple presenters throughout the state to present mandated and optional training courses.

POST executes approximately 85 training contracts each year. We will be reviewing our recurring contracts

in this meeting.

The number of training-course presentations for each contract could be reviewed with stakeholder input to assess the number of presentations -- to assess the number of presentations to look at decreases, without fully cutting critical training programs to California law enforcement, such as Supervisory Leadership Institute and Command College.

Option B for the Commission consideration is looking at our local assistance and our reimbursement funding.

We could look to decrease that by \$5.3 million. Some options to look at, we currently have backfill suspended, which gives us a \$2.2 million savings. We could look to continue the backfill suspension, as well as other areas in our plans, such as suspending tuition or commuter lunches to attain the \$5.3 million.

Option C would be looking at a hybrid of cuts in training contracts and local assistance. For example, backfill could remain suspended at a cost of -- for \$2 million savings; and other components of the training contracts could be reviewed to attain the additional \$3.2 million, for the overall \$5.3 million savings.

These are options staff is asking for your consideration. As we continue our budget talks with the Department of Finance and the Legislature, we're

| 1 | asking for some guidance into how we can attain the |
|----|---|
| 2 | \$5.3 million without losing 37 positions for POST staff. |
| 3 | What we also need to be aware of is the one-time |
| 4 | debt-amnesty program that is being proposed to attain |
| 5 | a \$10 million increase of revenue, probably won't be |
| 6 | realized until end of 2015-16, more likely into 2016-17. |
| 7 | So if that revenue isn't realized, we're potentially |
| 8 | looking at further cuts to the Commission's budget if |
| 9 | the revenue isn't realized as quickly as is being |
| 10 | proposed. |
| 11 | I would be more than happy to answer any questions. |
| 12 | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Madam Chair, may I? |
| 13 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Please, sir, yes. |
| 14 | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Okay, thank you. |
| 15 | A couple quick things. |
| 16 | On point number one, with the impending \$5.3 million |
| 17 | cut, we have no choice but to consider these options. |
| 18 | As an alternative, our option at this point is to |
| 19 | continue to argue, obviously, not to have a \$5.3 million |
| 20 | cut in our budget. |
| 21 | And as Stephanie has alluded to, that we are making |
| 22 | progress with the Department of Finance. We've had a |
| 23 | couple productive talks. |
| 24 | With the fact that California is down 4,000 police |
| 25 | officers; that California's population is up one million, |

based on the last census in 2010. In light of the Presidential Commission on American Policing and the genre of training issues generated there. In light of the California State Attorney General's convocation on procedural justice, police community relations, and fair and impartial policing that's recently occurred. In light of at least two unfunded mental-health training mandates pending in the Legislature. In light of body cameras and the uptick in hiring that has increased our management of the academies, this proposal is incongruent. And we'll continue to argue those points. So we'll continue to fight.

One of our points that we make is that POST does a lot with 123 positions. But I would call upon every member in this room, everybody in this room to realize that we have to take that to a lower level of granularity. It's not 123 positions that maintain quite a bit of services in the state of California.

Let me give you a couple of examples. For example, when you look at the number of people that manage the entire basic course network in the state of California, it's four. Four people that do that. They manage 5,000 pages of text, 42 learning domains, 39 academies, and annual BCCR reviews, and updates on training testing specifications. And I can go on, but you get the point.

When you look at who manages our Institute of 1 2 Criminal Investigation, we have one person managing about 3 104 courses. So when you take that to a lower level of 4 5 granularity, the workload is disproportionate to the number of employees that we have. And we'll have to 6 7 continue to argue that point and see where we go. 8 And then lastly, as Stephanie has already alluded 9 to, is that the debt-amnesty program, if it began today, 10 it would probably not effectively gain any kind of traction until FY16/17. And we wouldn't realize any kind 11 12 of savings. 13 And also realize that those are based on projections of those people that would come forward at a 50 percent 14 15 discount to pay delinquent fines. With that, I'll give it back to you, Madam Chair. 16 17 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you very much, 18 Executive Director Stresak. 19 I will take a moment, actually, to make a statement 20 prior to asking a question. We all know that November 10th is the Marine Corps 21 birthday. But on November 10th, 2014, the Legislative 22 23 Analyst, Mac Taylor, distributed restructuring the court-ordered debt-collection process. 24 25 I would ask you all to go to www.LAO.ca.gov to take

a look at this. This was really the flag that went up, that said, "This is a problem." Weaknesses were identified in the court-ordered debt-collection process because of this, that is calling for restructuring the court-ordered debt-collection process.

And why is this important? Because the Penalty

Assessment Fund, 23.99 percent of that goes to the

Peace Officer Training Fund. The rest goes to seven -
I believe seven other entities that I cannot believe

they're not up in arms, saying, "What are we doing at

the courts to collect the debts to fund the funds under

the structure that we've been given to provide essential

service to Californians?" And we're just now saying,

"This is broken"?

Well, it's late because it's broken. It also describes how they're going to try to fix it.

But I agree with our Executive Director and our Assistant Executive Director, to say it's late. We have to do something now. And with that, I think we are in a position to examine the way that POST is funded. Not today, not in this room; but we are at a point where our society is clamoring, as our Executive Director said, we have a whole host of issues we are dealing with. And this is just one part of the issue, is that the funding is compromised.

That being said, I do have a question for the 1 2 Assistant Executive Director, and that is, what would the 3 financial benefit be to suspend backfill indefinitely? MS. SCOFIELD: The reimbursement of backfill costs 4 5 the Commission approximately \$2.3 million per year. Those are associated -- backfill is associated with our 6 7 Plan I and Plan II courses. If we were to suspend 8 backfill indefinitely, the Commission would realize that 9 cost savings of \$2.2 million each year, while still 10 maintaining reimbursements in the areas of tuition, 11 lodging, and travel and per diem. Those could still 12 be realized, with the exception of the backfill 13 reimbursement. That we would realize a permanent cost savings at the end of the day. 14 15 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you. COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: And might I be so bold as 16 17 to ask staff, of the three options -- I mean, I've got 18 my choice. But I'd like to know what staff, if you had 19 to choose, which one would you choose? 20 Mr. Director? 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Commissioner, that would be a Hobson's choice. Each one has some benefit 22 23 in terms of keeping us fiscally viable. But our mission

is to serve the field. Our mission is to provide a level

of professionalism to the state of California. Our

24

25

1 mission is to keep officers safe. That is a difficult 2 decision. 3 It further highlights and emphasizes the cataclysmic impact this \$5.3 million proposed cut would have, not 4 only on POST, but on the entire state of California. 5 It's a difficult question to answer. 6 7 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: And probably unfair. 8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Not unfair. A fair 9 question. 10 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Thank you. 11 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Other commissioners, questions? 12 13 MS. SCOFIELD: What staff is asking of this committee is to bring forth a recommendation to the full 14 15 commission as to what your recommendation would be out of these options to guide staff in our upcoming spring 16 17 discussions with the Administration and the Legislature. COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So what we have before us, 18 19 if there are no other questions -- what we have before 20 us is, we would have a motion to approve one of the 21 options in the agenda for the Commission to consider. 22 However, I would like to pause, because this is 23 Item Number 6; and let the option consideration kind of 24 ripen for the moment while we do some other business on 25 2, 3, 4 and 5, with your permission, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I've got a question. 1 2 How many training contracts do we have out right 3 now, are we dealing with? MS. SCOFIELD: We have 85 training contracts. 4 5 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: 85 contracts? And we're dealing with how many different academies 6 7 and companies that put on training? 8 MS. SCOFIELD: Multiple. When we review our 9 recurring contracts for this meeting, you'll be able to 10 see the breakdown of the presenters and the number of 11 courses. So the idea, if we were to assess training contracts, is to work with the stakeholders, the program 12 13 managers, work with the stakeholders of those presentations, to see where we could incur a cost savings 14 15 without fully cutting the entire program. COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Okay, thank you. 16 17 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So building on that, would it 18 be possible then, while we're letting the options ripen, 19 if we said Option C may be the one we vote for; but as a 20 hybrid to direct staff to continue to suspend backfill, 21 as our Assistant Executive Director reported, that would 22 result in a realized \$2.2 million savings; and then staff 23 can analyze training contracts to identify that remaining savings of about \$3.2 million? 24 25 COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes. And it looks to me

like no matter what option we take, the backfill is just -- that's an obvious thing; it's not going to get brought back up. So I think that is -- on all three of these things, it looks to me, if I'm reading it right, all three options have the same thing, to keep suspending backfill, which is why I think his question was -- or your question was to do it indefinitely, so...

What we're talking about is, as you guys look at training and stuff, my concern would be, if it comes down to where you say cut certain training issues and only offer it in certain places, at certain times, would that incur a different cost with travel and all that, that we would have to realize?

MS. SCOFIELD: Exactly. That would be part of our analysis in looking at the cuts is, you want to incur a cost savings while having the presentations available regionally. You don't want to increase staff travel -- or increase instructor travel as well as student travel. So that would be part of the analysis.

COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: This kind of reminds me of earlier times, when the last time, you know, if you've been in this business long enough, most of this stuff goes full circle. So I'm admitting my age.

But part of it, it seems to me, is when we find

ourselves in crisis, we react to the crisis. And then things get a little better, and then we get a little more comfortable. And we don't, just out of habit and being human beings, don't like to maintain the crisis mode of management for an extended period of time. And I'm not picking on the folks in the rural areas, and I'll just use that as an example.

So we talk about bringing the training to them, so as to avoid as much reimbursement for travel and subsistence; and then things get better. And my suspicion is that we get away from those strategies because they're not as critical.

So I guess part of my point is that maybe we should learn from history; and our cost-saving strategies should be long-term and sustained. And as our good chairperson indicated, which I agree with, that backfill suspension should become permanent, at least for the time being, until I'm no longer on the Commission, and you'll have this discussion of about sustained activities.

So just an observation to add to our -- thank you -- ripening process, Madam Chair.

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you.

It's obvious to me, and I'm sure it's obvious to everyone in this room, that this is not a light or easy decision.

| 1 | What POST staff has done is they've provided us with |
|----|---|
| 2 | some options that are well thought out, that recognize |
| 3 | the complexity of modern policing, and our necessity to |
| 4 | keep things going forward. |
| 5 | I think at this point, with the permission of this |
| 6 | group, we will pause, and call for motions on 2 , 3 , 4 , |
| 7 | and 5, and return to 6 for anything that comes up in the |
| 8 | time that we are making motions and voting on these other |
| 9 | issues; and then we will move forward with discussing the |
| 10 | option to send to the greater commission. |
| 11 | Is there any opposition to that? |
| 12 | (No response) |
| 13 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Okay, so if you recall, |
| 14 | Number 2, was report on revenues for fiscal year 2014-15. |
| 15 | I'll call for a motion to approve. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I'll make a motion to |
| 17 | approve. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Do you want to do them |
| 19 | all? I was going to say, do we want to do the whole |
| 20 | all except for 6? |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I make a motion to do 2, |
| 22 | 3, 4, and 5 as a block, to accept them. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I'll second that. |
| 24 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: And with that, approving them |
| 25 | as a block, we have a motion to approve all, and a |

| 1 | second. |
|----|---|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: That's correct. |
| 3 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you very much. |
| 4 | There wasn't much time to marinate on Number 6 and |
| 5 | the very weighty decision we have; but thank you very |
| 6 | much for being so efficient. |
| 7 | MS. SCOFIELD: Madam Chair, we can proceed with the |
| 8 | rest of the agenda and come back to it. |
| 9 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Then I would propose that |
| 10 | we do proceed with the rest of the agenda. We will have |
| 11 | the Assistant Executive Director recap, and then we will |
| 12 | make a motion for the specific option that we're going to |
| 13 | take before the greater commission. |
| 14 | Thank you. |
| 15 | So we are pausing, and moving on to Number 7. |
| 16 | Stephanie Scofield will summarize the item. |
| 17 | MS. SCOFIELD: So Item 7 is some new expenditures |
| 18 | for the Commission approval on your agenda. |
| 19 | We have Item 7-G, -I, and -J. And that's not a |
| 20 | typo. Those are corresponding to the Commission agenda |
| 21 | items. |
| 22 | So the first one we're asking for Commission |
| 23 | approval on, a request to contract for the development |
| 24 | and implementation of a computer-based testing system to |
| 25 | replace the test-management and assessment system, which |

is our TMAS system.

On June 28th of 2012, the Commission originally approved this request for contract development to replace the TMAS -- our current TMAS system. This is the software that delivers online cognitive testing to the 39 basic academies. We've had this system for a while. It has become antiquated, and some risk is involved with test security.

POST staff did receive approval in 2012; and the total cost for approval in 2012 was \$2.8 million.

This project is progressing more slowly than originally planned. Under the California State

Information and Technology Procurement Rules, this is what's called a "reportable project." And we are under the California Department of Technology. They dictate all the process for procurement and project management of this software procurement.

So what we've done to date, staff has developed detailed business requirements and technical specifications for this proposed replacement testing system. And these requirements were released to the vendor community through a request for information.

And we developed -- POST identified two vendors with this RFI process who are interested in delivering a replacement system for POST.

| 1 | However, this number of potential bidders was |
|----|--|
| 2 | determined to be lower than acceptable by our control |
| 3 | agency. And we are currently in the process of working |
| 4 | with them to address these project requirements. And |
| 5 | we have been told that our requirements are a little too |
| 6 | prescriptive, and we are working with them to mitigate |
| 7 | that right now; that is some of the delays involved in |
| 8 | this project. |
| 9 | So what we are doing is, we are again asking for the |
| 10 | Commission to approve this funding. We are not asking |
| 11 | for any increase in funding from the original 2012 |
| 12 | approval. And we have attachments that show the project |
| 13 | time-line to date, as well as the financial picture for |
| 14 | the next four fiscal years. |
| 15 | May I answer any questions on that? |
| 16 | (No response) |
| 17 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: For this, the rules will call |
| 18 | for a motion to approve and roll-call vote. |
| 19 | I'd like to pause and do that now. |
| 20 | Motion? |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move it. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second. |
| 23 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Roll-call vote, please. |
| 24 | MS. PAOLI: Hutchens? |
| 25 | (No response) |

```
MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
1
2
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Aye.
3
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
4
5
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
6
7
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
8
           (No response)
9
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
10
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
11
          Thank you.
12
          We're on to Item I.
          MS. SCOFIELD: This is a report to request and
13
     accept -- for accepting Cal EPA grant funds to develop
14
15
     an ICI foundation course.
          Penal Code section 1400 -- excuse me, I need
16
17
     bifocals -- 14300 was enacted to allow the California
18
     Environmental Protection Agency to provide the Commission
19
     funding from the environmental enforcement training
20
     account.
21
          Each year, Cal EPA offers us this funding. And this
22
     fiscal year, for 2015-16, we would like to accept
     $72,698. And staff will work with subject-matter experts
23
24
     to develop a course in the area of environmental crimes,
25
     which will be included in our Institute of Criminal
```

```
1
     Investigation courses.
2
          May I answer any questions?
3
           (No response)
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: No questions.
4
5
          I see they've read it thoroughly.
6
          Motion to approve and a roll-call vote, please.
7
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I'll make a motion.
8
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second.
9
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
10
           (No response)
11
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
12
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
13
14
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
15
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
16
17
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
18
           (No response)
19
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
20
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
21
          Item J.
22
          MS. SCOFIELD: Item J is our report to request to
23
     purchase a law-enforcement driving simulator system
24
     warranty. As you are aware, POST has procured 30
25
     law-enforcement driving simulators that are throughout
```

the state in our regional skills training centers.

This provides the field options to meet perishable-skills requirements in the area of driving. And warranties for these are going to expire between March 2015 and October 2015.

We are requesting \$321,000 for a one-year, all-inclusive warranty for a systemwide upgrade of all the hardware, software, and firmware for current specifications. And this actually is a decrease. The software provider had given us a decrease of approximately \$8,000 per system for this one-year warranty. And staff is requesting approval of \$321,264.

COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move it.

COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: A quick comment before we vote on this issue is that I know that you recognize that this is a critical component to perishable-skills training, and it's much-needed throughout the state.

We looked at the \$321,000 as a significant expense; but I think it's important for this committee to be aware of the fact that based on the excellent auditing and fiscal responsibility of staff, specifically Jan Bullard, we were able to accrue some savings to cover a major portion of this, in looking at some of our other contracts.

```
COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I was going to say, it
1
2
     looks like staff has put together, based on the calls
3
     for service, it looks like it would have cost almost
     $900,000 if we don't do it, should we run across any of
4
5
     these problems.
          EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Correct.
6
7
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: At $6,600 per call.
8
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes, 300,000 versus
9
     900,000. I'm not really good at math, but...
10
          EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: You did good on that
11
     one.
12
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: You're a credit to the public
13
     school system.
14
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Thank you.
15
          Do we have one of those?
16
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you.
17
          We're at the point, Ms. Paoli, for a roll-call vote.
18
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
19
           (No response)
20
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
21
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
22
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
23
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
24
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
25
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
```

MS. PAOLI: McDonnell? 1 2 (No response) 3 MS. PAOLI: Moir? 4 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes. 5 Thank you very much. We are moving on to Item 8. 6 7 The plan for all of us is that we are going to move 8 through this item. We are going to take a short recess, 9 and then we are going to reconvene to return to 10 Item Number 6, to weigh in on and vote on that very, very 11 important item. Ms. Scofield? 12 13 MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. 14 Each February, we bring to the Commission our 15 recurring training contracts. This affords POST and the Commission the opportunity to get valuable training 16 17 in the areas of our legacy courses out to California 18 law enforcement. 19 This summary sheet for you, summarizes 23 of our 20 training contracts. And what I'd like to do, with your 21 permission, is go through each section -- colored section 22 by bureau, do a summary for you; and should you have any 23 questions on any of the contracts, the backup material 24 is in your Finance Committee agenda items. And staff 25 would be willing to provide you with a report, should you

1 ask for one. The first area we have of our training contracts is 2 3 the Learning Technology Resources Bureau. And before I begin, it's important to understand 4 5 that we're seeking approval not to exceed these amounts. What staff is currently doing, obviously, to attain 6 7 cost savings throughout all of our training contracts, 8 is we're assessing any cost savings as we proceed. So 9 the amounts you see here, are the amounts-not-to-exceed. 10 More than likely, as we report next October on these 11 contracts, they will be below this amount; but this is 12 not-exceed-these-amounts. 13 What our program managers are doing is trying to align all of our presenter budgets to be in line with 14 15 each other. We do have some areas where presenters may experience higher material fees or higher lodging 16 17 fees, depending on the areas. So that's some of the 18 discrepancies that we're trying to -- our program 19 managers are trying to align at this point. 20 So the first --21 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Excuse me for the 22 interruption. 23 MS. SCOFIELD: Yes? 24 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Could I, please, for the 25 record, note that I will not -- I would appreciate the

1 fact that I will sustain -- excuse me. I will excuse 2 myself from any discussions due to the potential conflict 3 of interest under Learning Technology Resources, under Golden West College, "Legal Update" video production; the 4 5 management course, under Management Counseling; and Number 9, the supervisor's course. 6 7 MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you. 8 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Thank you. 9 MS. SCOFIELD: So in our Learning Technology 10 Resources Bureau, we have several contracts here. 11 The first one is our "Legal Update" video production. To attain cost savings, this is a video that 12 13 we produced every month in the case-law update arena. We have discontinued a monthly update. And we will 14 15 continue one year review of a case-law update. So it will be one video for the year, as opposed to a monthly 16 17 update on case-law videos. 18 The training videos. This is, we're going to be 19 entering into a two-year contract with this video. And 20 this will be four topic-specific videos, as well as 21 three officer-safety "Did You Know?" videos. 22 The Learning Portal Support is asking to enter into a three-year contract. This is the hosting maintenance 23 24 of our Learning Portal. 25 And Number 4 is the courses and tools for our

1 Learning Portal, which is a two-year contract, in which 2 staff would like to develop two self-paced courses. 3 And the numbers you see on the right-hand side for Numbers 2, 3, and 4, because we're entering into two-4 5 and three-year contracts on these, we will encumber that over two and three fiscal years. So, for instance, in 6 7 Number 2, the training videos, you see is 1.9. For 8 2015-16, we'll encumber \$970,000; and the next fiscal 9 year, we'll encumber the additional \$970,000. So the 10 subtotal for the Learning Portal is \$3,897,300. 11 We need a motion to approve. 12 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We need a motion to approve 13 at this point. 14 MS. SCOFIELD: I thought we were going to do it per 15 bureau. 16 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We are going to do this per 17 bureau. 18 So I'd ask for a motion to approve the section for 19 Learning Technology Resources that has been presented. 20 COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: I think just to clarify, 21 so when we look at the 3.8, you're still saying half of 22 that -- part of that would be paid in the following 23 fiscal year as well? So that is the total for two years? 24 MS. SCOFIELD: Right. So we're actually 25 encumbering, in 2015-16, \$1.8 million.

```
1
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER:
                                     Okay.
2
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: And for the record, this is
     another example of the indispensable nature of our
3
4
     Assistant Executive Director, because she did cue me to
5
     summarize contracts by bureau, so...
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I'll make a motion to
6
7
     accept.
8
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: And I'll second it.
9
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
           (No response)
10
11
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
12
13
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
14
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
15
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Abstain.
16
17
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
18
           (No response)
19
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
20
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
21
          Moving on. And I will do much better next time,
     after this next bureau.
22
23
          MS. SCOFIELD: The next area is our Management
24
     Counseling, Leadership Development Bureau. And these
25
     are our contracts for Command College, our management
```

```
1
     course, executive development, Sherman Block Supervisory
2
     Leadership Institute, as well as our supervisory course
3
     and our supervisory course facilitators training
4
     workshops.
5
          If you would like to teach in a supervisory course,
     you have to take our facilitator training workshops.
6
7
     So this is -- this bureau totals $3,586,404 for recurring
     contracts for 2015-16. And that is a small -- actually,
8
9
     a small increase. But, again, the program managers are
10
     looking at all of the cost-savings areas of all of the
11
     budgets.
12
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Any questions?
13
           (No response)
14
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: I'll ask for a motion to
15
     approve the Management Counseling, Leadership Development
     contracts as presented.
16
17
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Motion.
18
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second.
19
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
20
           (No response)
21
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
22
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
23
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
24
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
25
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
```

```
1
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Abstain.
2
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
3
           (No response)
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
4
5
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
          MS. SCOFIELD: The next category is our Training,
6
7
     Delivery, and Compliance Bureau.
8
          Number 11 is our EVOC courses. And this is the
9
     EVOC training that is done within the basic academy
10
     training.
11
          We have also Number 12 is our coroner training
     contracts, and our crime analysis training out of
12
13
     Sacramento State, as well as our courses with the
     Department of Justice, which include extremely
14
15
     high-profile computer forensic courses that aren't
     available throughout the state. And the Department of
16
17
     Justice presents those. And we're asking for $3,561,272.
18
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Any questions?
19
           (No response)
20
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Again, a motion to approve?
21
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move to approve.
22
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second.
23
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We are a quick-learning
24
     group, aren't we?
25
          Roll call, please.
```

```
1
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: All four of us, yes.
2
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Small, but mighty.
3
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
4
           (No response)
5
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
6
7
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
8
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
9
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
10
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
11
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
12
           (No response)
13
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
14
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
15
          At this point, we have three other items. There
     is a report on proposed budget, Number 6, to look at the
16
17
     options, old business, and new business.
18
          Actually, if we add "adjournment," there are four.
19
     But what I would ask is for a quick ten-minute recess,
20
     so we can take care of our biological needs, and return
21
     with fresh minds to discuss this very important decision.
22
          Thank you.
23
           (Recess from 11:00 a.m. to 11:19 a.m.)
24
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Okay, we will resume the
25
     Finance Committee meeting.
```

And we are going back to the contracts. 1 2 In my haste to have a quick recess and running out 3 of the room, I failed to finish this item. And I appreciate POST staff for not tripping me or making me 4 5 sit back down. So thank you very much. It was very graceful. 6 7 So, Ms. Scofield? 8 MS. SCOFIELD: So, this is page 2 of 2 on our 9 summary sheet. And this is for our Training Program 10 Services Bureau. 11 Our Training Program Services Bureau has the majority of our training contracts. 12 13 We have our driving and force-options simulator training. This is our Institute of Criminal 14 15 Investigation, and multiple courses involved with that, multiple presenters, which are notated in your agenda 16 17 item. 18 This is our Instructor Development Program, ensuring 19 instructor quality in the classroom. And our quality 20 assessment program, as well as simulator instructor 21 training. 22 The simulator instructor training did increase 23 approximately \$30,000 due to the fact that we are 24 training more instructors to teach the simulator to the 25 students throughout the Regional Skills Training Centers.

```
So for this particular area, we're requesting
1
2
      $6,042,202.
3
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Motion to approve by bureau,
     with a roll-call vote.
4
5
          Do I have one?
6
           COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Motion.
7
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second.
8
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Roll-call vote, please.
9
          MS. PAOLI: Excuse me, was that second by
10
     Leichliter or Kurylowicz?
11
           COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: First by Leichliter,
      second by Kurylowicz.
12
13
           We just flip a coin over here.
14
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We already took our break,
15
      SO...
          MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
16
17
           (No response)
18
          MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
19
           COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
20
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
21
           COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
22
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
23
           COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
24
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
25
           (No response)
```

1 MS. PAOLI: Moir? 2 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes. 3 Thank you. 4 MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you. 5 Moving on to Number 20, this is our Museum of Tolerance contract. This is a contract for \$1.5 million, 6 7 which is a line item within our budget for 2015-16. 8 And for the Museum of Tolerance, we're requesting 9 \$1,556,000. 10 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Do I have a motion? 11 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Madam Chair, could we have a brief discussion? 12 13 I'm searching for words because I don't want to offend anyone, nor get myself in trouble. And maybe 14 15 this is not the right time and place. But maybe alert staff to the fact that as one member of the Commission, 16 17 I would like to maybe suggest that we have a serious 18 discussion -- I mean, I don't want it to sound like 19 heresy, but this is a lot of money. And I know the 20 program is important. But I would just like all of us 21 to realize, and in balance with everything else we're 22 doing, maybe it's time to reexamine this again. Because 23 in my recollection, it's been a long time. And I, as 24 one commissioner, would like to know, you know, what the 25 field thinks about it.

I mean, we continue to send our recruits; but I know there's other academies that have suspended sending their recruits. And I know there's a supervisory component and an executive-level component. And maybe part of it is speaking out of ignorance.

I would just like to suggest that we have maybe at the next commission meeting an update report on this program.

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: For clarity -- my clarity, everyone else likely gets it -- Commissioner Lowenberg, for clarity, you're calling for a review of the content and the evaluation of MOT?

COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes. But I wouldn't want the word to get back to our presenters or to any of our stakeholders, that in any way, shape, or form am I being critical. I just think that in today's environment, from time to time, we just need to reexamine some of the stuff we've been doing for a while. So that's my point.

and I don't think it's saying that you're condemning the content -- we've recognized that the objective quality of policing has improved. However, we still struggle with -- and the national narrative is reflecting that -- we still struggle with, how do we more effectively establish relationships and bolster the trust between

1 the public and the police. 2 And so this, in your question, really calls upon 3 the MOT to say, how are we addressing that within the confines of their training. 4 5 Is that what I'm hearing? COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes. Thank you, 6 7 Madam Chair. And it seems to me that maybe there's an 8 opportunity, you know, as things change and things 9 evolve, that maybe MOT is in a position to help us in 10 other areas, maybe as it relates to fair and impartial 11 policing. Maybe there is an opportunity for us to have a more -- and maybe we already do, but I don't think 12 13 so -- a more direct relationship or partnership between other presenters and the MOT, for example. 14 15 So, again, I don't want anyone -- I don't want anything to get lost in translation as it relates to 16 17 my concerns or my observations, because it's really not 18 concerns at this point in time, for us to do an analysis. 19 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you very much. 20 MS. SCOFIELD: Staff will conduct that analysis and 21 will report back to you at the June commission. 22 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Thank you. 23 Does this relate to the same...? 24 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: I'll pause for just a moment, 25 gentlemen, and see if -- Mr. Feldhaus, can you hear what

| 1 | the commissioners are saying? Or are you having a side |
|----|--|
| | |
| 2 | conversation? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: We're having a side |
| 4 | conversation. |
| 5 | We missed something we wanted to question in the |
| 6 | last group that we did, so I think we have to get out |
| 7 | of this first before we talk about that. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: We're going to have to |
| 9 | separate you two. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: You might have to. |
| 11 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: So it is not under training |
| 12 | contracts. |
| 13 | Can we review, do we have a motion to approve under |
| 14 | the MOT training contracts? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes, please, allow me to |
| 16 | make the motion. |
| 17 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Do we have a second? |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: And I'll second that. |
| 19 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We'll do a roll-call vote |
| 20 | and then return to where you wanted to return to. |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Thank you. |
| 22 | COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Certainly. |
| 23 | MS. PAOLI: Hutchens? |
| 24 | (No response) |
| 25 | MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz? |

```
1
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
2
          MS. PAOLI: Leichliter?
3
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes.
4
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
5
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
6
7
           (No response)
8
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
9
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
10
          So let's return to training contracts.
          Ms. Scofield, can we do that? The training -- TPS,
11
     Training Program Services.
12
13
          Is that where you wanted to return to, gentlemen?
     Did you have a question on that?
14
15
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes. This may have been
     brought up on a side note during the break over there;
16
17
     but looking at the budgets for the South Bay Regional
18
     Public Safety Training, I just had a question about
19
     some officer-involved shootings classes in the South Bay,
20
     five of those; and then there is one in the Sacramento
21
     area.
22
          Is there a way that staff can give us a breakdown
23
     of the training, the budget, and how many classes -- how
     many day classes, and stuff like that?
24
25
          MS. SCOFIELD: So you're referring to Item 16, the
```

```
Institute of Criminal Investigation budget?
1
2
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
3
          MS. SCOFIELD: So looking at the agenda item on
     Attachment A, you're referring to South Bay?
4
5
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
          MS. SCOFIELD: If we can pull up that attachment.
6
7
          MS. BULLARD: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.
8
          What was the question?
9
          MS. SCOFIELD: So we are pulling up Item 16.
10
          MS. BULLARD: Oh, ICI?
11
          MS. SCOFIELD: Yes.
12
          MS. BULLARD: I just wanted to confirm that.
13
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: And I'm not sure if --
          MS. SCOFIELD: If we can, we're also pulling --
14
15
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes, I think the question
     is, is it substantially more expensive up in South Bay
16
17
     than it seems to be in LA? Or are they different
18
     classes?
19
          I mean, there's a homicide-investigation class.
20
     I'm just looking at some of them. There's homicide
21
     investigation in South Bay at $58,000 a class; and then
22
     there is one in LA, at $20,000 a class. I think my
23
     question is, is it that much more expensive up there,
     I think this is where we're generating our question to.
24
25
          MS. BULLARD: Yes, there are some differences in
```

1 where the costs are incurred, which is their lodging. 2 However, I would say that what we are doing, is going 3 through a process to analyze every individual budget at this time. And we believe that there were times where 5 there were development costs that were in when courses were updated; and so the development costs got folded 6 7 into that when a course was updated in a certain area. 8 We will be reviewing every budget that is up there. 9 We believe that when they are completed, they will be 10 fair and equitable, across the board, and reflect more 11 of an evenness in the cost. Again, as Assistant Executive Director Scofield 12 13 said, this is the amounts that we put in in order to not deter the recurring contract process. When the final 14 15 contracts are made with every presenter, we expect for them to be more evenly distributed and reflect probably 16 17 more evenness in the course costs. We will guarantee you 18 that. 19 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Okay, and the two 20 officer-involved shooting classes, are those new classes, 21 or...? 22 MS. BULLARD: Those are new classes. And there is 23 some development costs that was involved in that as a 24 new course, that were folded into it.

COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Okay, that answered my

25

```
1
     questions.
2
          Great. Thank you.
3
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Thank you.
4
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you.
5
          EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Commissioner, if I
     could just reinforce that some of the efforts that Jan
6
     has alluded to have resulted in hundreds of thousands
7
8
     of dollars of savings and some of the contract
9
     management, just looking at some of these disparities.
10
     And that is an ongoing effort that we have been engaged
11
     in.
12
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: It also reflects, in my
13
     humble opinion, the necessity of having the quality
     staff that we have in POST, with their ability to
14
15
     analyze and scrutinize, to maintain the integrity of
     the class, the financial sustainability of the class,
16
17
     and to evaluate the content and delivery of the class.
18
          So thank you very much to POST staff.
19
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Thank you.
20
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Thank you.
21
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: You're satisfied, gentlemen?
22
          COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
23
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Yes, ma'am.
24
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: We will be moving on then to
25
     administrative contracts.
```

| MS. SCOFIELD: In this area, we have three |
|---|
| administrative contracts. |
| Number 21 is, we contract with the State |
| Controller's Office for auditing service. Auditors from |
| the State Controller's Office go out and randomly audit |
| reimbursement funding at local agencies to ensure State |
| funding is being used equitably. |
| We also have, Number 22, which is our network |
| services support from the Department of Technology, as |
| well as our with the Department of Technology for our |
| Test Management and Assessment System. These are all |
| maintaining our functionality of our network systems. |
| In this area, we are asking for \$534,755. |
| COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I'll make a motion. |
| COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: No, I'll make a motion. |
| COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes, we're going to have to |
| separate the two of them. |
| MS. PAOLI: Motion, Leichliter? |
| COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second. Kurylowicz. |
| COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Roll-call vote? |
| MS. PAOLI: Hutchens? |
| (No response) |
| MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz? |
| COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes. |
| MS. PAOLI: Leichliter? |
| |

```
1
          COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER:
                                     Yes.
2
          MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
3
          COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
          MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
4
5
           (No response)
          MS. PAOLI: Moir?
6
7
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes.
8
          EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Madam Chair, could I
9
     make a comment on TMAS?
10
          COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Yes, sir.
11
          EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: I think most of you are
     aware and can reflect back to 2010, when the topic of our
12
13
     test security was raised and the efforts we had expended
     to move forward with a new testing program system. And
14
15
     we didn't move forward with quite the amount of vigor.
          I think it's important for those here to be aware
16
17
     that this has not been due to a lack of POST personnel
18
     effort to try and move this forward. We are now into
19
     year four-plus on this project. And we have met -- been
20
     met with a modicum of bureaucratic challenges trying to
21
     advance this issue.
22
          So we continue to try, we continue to make an
23
     effort. But I just want you to be aware that we are
24
     continually pressing on this issue. It's just navigating
25
     the system and advancing technological projects can be a
```

little complex and frustrating at times.

So I'd like to make that point for the record.

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you.

So we find ourselves at an interesting place. We are returning back to Item Number 6, and asking that we consider, as the Finance Committee, which of the options in this agenda item we are going to move to the Commission for considering.

I think what this reflects, this entire committee report, it reflects a lot of very difficult analytic work by our Assistant Executive Director. It reflects that each of us that are assigned to this committee have — we dove into the material, and we examined the very thoughtful options that were before us. We did have the consideration of adding to Option C as a hybrid to direct staff to continue to suspend backfill indefinitely for a result of \$2.2 million in savings. And then we've asked staff to further analyze the contracts that are in existence, to identify savings for the remaining \$3.2 million.

Then, with the vote that we are going to make, the conversations we're going to have, there's a lot of very difficult work ahead of us. And one of the things that I am reminded of, before we move to approve one of these options, is that this entire process created some

significant disequilibrium within POST. 123 people have committed themselves to working on behalf of the 90,000 people in California that are governed under POST. And I use "governed" just because another word eludes me.

But it's serious work. And at a time when the national narrative is eroding or speaking to the erosion of trust between the public and the police, but at the same time, all the metrics say that we're more effective, we're at a very interesting intersection. So, I have a lot more to say, but I will keep it to myself.

And I would ask any of the Committee members that are present, to ask any questions that they have of staff; and then at the point where we feel we are ready to come up with the best option to present to the greater commission for consideration, we'll move to that.

But the floor is yours, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Madam Chair, I would suggest that as difficult as this is, that we consider embracing the principle of spreading the pain as widely as possible.

So I would suggest that we seriously consider

Option C. And I hadn't thought about it before, but

I like your recommendation of suspending backfill

reimbursement indefinitely as part of it.

So let me take a stab at a motion, if you don't

```
mind -- if you don't mind.
1
2
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Please.
3
           COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: I would suggest that we
     recommend to the full Commission that the Finance
4
5
     Committee supports Option C, with the modification in
     the language to include that backfill suspension be
6
7
     indefinite.
8
           That will be my motion.
9
           COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Kurylowicz. Second.
10
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: This does not require a
11
     roll-call vote, but we have a very thoughtful motion and
12
     a second. Thank you.
13
          We will present this to the Commission tomorrow.
          We have three more items before us. They are swift.
14
15
           Old business. Any old business?
           (No response)
16
17
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Hearing none, we move on,
18
     and reflecting the swift nature, new business.
19
           Any new business for this committee?
20
           (No response)
21
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Hearing none, I want to thank
22
     not only staff, but the members of this committee for
23
     doing some very important work.
           And before we adjourn, is there anything that the
24
25
     Executive Director would like to say?
```

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Madam Chair. 2 I would. 3 It's kind of funny how a competent staff can make you feel useless. And that's good news and that's bad 4 5 news. So I wanted to point out that I've been blessed to 6 7 have a very competent staff to work with. And that has 8 no less been reflected in today's presentation by 9 Stephanie and her work. 10 But I want to put this into context. In addition 11 to dealing with the budgetary issues and the budgetary crisis and the management of our money, she has 12 13 facilitated our move over the last -- what was that, 30, 40 years now that you've been working on that move? 14 MS. SCOFIELD: Roughly. 15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: And that move is --16 17 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: She was still in a crib 18 when she started on it, yes. 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: And that move has come 20 off flawlessly, when you talk about moving 123 people, 21 an organization across town. 22 And so she has had no less than a full plate, an 23 extremely full plate. So I wanted you to be aware of everything that she has done, all the plates she has been 24 25 spinning, and all the plates she has been successfully

```
1
      spinning, and the excellent work that has been completed
2
     here.
3
           So thank you, Stephanie, for that.
          MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you.
4
5
           COMMITTEE CHAIR MOIR: Thank you.
           So before we adjourn, I would like to say that we
6
7
     are committed to decreasing this disequilibrium that has
     been caused quite unexpectedly; and we remain committed
8
9
     to doing the very difficult work in supporting the staff
10
     of POST as we move forward in providing outstanding
11
     public safety to our state.
12
           That adjourns our meeting.
13
           Thank you.
14
           COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Thank you.
15
           COMMISSIONER LEICHLITER: Thank you.
           COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Thank you.
16
17
           (The Finance Committee meeting concluded
18
           at 11:39 a.m.)
19
                              &****
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were duly reported by me at the time and place herein specified; and

That the proceedings were reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand on March 9, 2015.

Daniel P. Feldhaus California CSR #6949 Registered Diplomate Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter