

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COMMISSION ON
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

POST COMMISSION
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING



TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DATE: Thursday, June 23, 2016
PLACE: Commission on Peace Officer Standards
and Training
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, California



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

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

JETHROE MOORE II
(*Legislative Review Committee Chair*)
Public Member

RICK BRAZIEL
Educator
Humboldt State University

LAI LAI BUI
Sergeant
Sacramento Police Department

ROBERT DOYLE
Sheriff
Marin County Sheriff's Office

JOYCE DUDLEY
Santa Barbara District Attorney
Santa Barbara County

LARRY J. WALLACE
for KAMALA HARRIS
Attorney General's Office



POST STAFF PRESENT
(*participating staff*)

STEPHANIE SCOFIELD
Interim Executive Director
Executive Office

RALPH BROWN
Legislative Consultant
Executive Office

MARIE BOUVIA
Executive Assistant
Executive Office



I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
Call to Order and Welcome	5
A. Approval of the Action Summary and Minutes of the February 25, 2016, Meeting of the Legislative Review Committee Meeting	5
B. Bills of Interest:	
1. AB 86 (McCarthy) Peace officers: Department of Justice: independent Investigation	11
2. AB 1118 (Bonta) Police Officer Standards and training: procedural Justice	11
3. AB 1469 (Achadjian) Peace officers: Basic training requirements	11
4. AB 1760 (Santiago) Human trafficking .	11
5. AB 1857 (Rodriguez) Criminal history Information: medical facilities . . .	12
6. AB 1860 (Alejo) Local law enforcement: Body-worn cameras: grant program . . .	12
7. AB 1872 (Gray) Public safety	12
8. AB 1940 (Cooper) Peace officers: Body-worn cameras: policies and Procedures	12
9. AB 2224 (Achadjian) Emergency vehicles: blue warning lights	13
10. AB 2361 (Santiago) Peace officers: University of Southern California Security officers	13

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
B. Bills of Interest: <i>continued</i>	
11. AB 2533 (Santiago) Public safety Officers: recording devices: Release of recordings	14
12. AB 2624 (Cooper) Peace officers: Community policing: report	15
13. AB 2626 (Jones-Sawyer) Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training: procedural justice training	15
14. SB 1221 (Hertzog) Firefighters: Interaction with mentally disabled Persons	16
15. SB 1337 (Morrell) Peace officers: Fire departments	18
16. SB 1362 (Mendoza) Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority: Security officers	18
Adjournment	35
Reporter's Certificate	36



POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

Thursday, June 23, 2016, 8:32 a.m.

West Sacramento, California



COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: I call the Legislative meeting to order.

Marie, do you want to do roll call?

MS. BOUVIA: Okay.

Braziel?

COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Bui?

COMMISSIONER BUI: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Doyle?

COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Dudley?

COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Moore?

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Wallace?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Okay, we're all set.

Approval of the action summaries and minutes?

COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Moved. Braziel.

COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Second. Dudley.

COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All right, well, good morning, everyone. How is everyone doing?

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 *(Chorus of "good mornings.")*

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All those in favor, we're
3 going to keep going.

4 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: We're having a good day;
5 right?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Oh, we're on a roll; right?

7 So let's go over our action item summaries.

8 Ralph, will you take us there?

9 MR. BROWN: Sure. Will do.

10 Good morning, Chair, Members of the Committee.

11 A couple of things to start out with that are not on
12 that, on the bills of interest.

13 As we discussed at the last committee meeting, there
14 was a submission of a trailer bill from the Governor's
15 office. That made its way into SB 843, which is the
16 public safety trailer bill introduced by the Committee on
17 Budget and Finance.

18 *(Mr. Wallace entered the meeting room.)*

19 MR. BROWN: And under section 35, it will modify
20 13501 of the Penal Code to state that "The Governor shall
21 designate the chair of the Commission from among the
22 members of the Commission. The person designated as the
23 chair shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor. The
24 Commission shall annually select a vice chair from its
25 members. A majority of the members of the Commission

1 shall constitute a quorum."

2 So this bill is currently -- a package of financial
3 bills for the budget are currently sitting on the
4 Governor's desk for signature. So you should be aware
5 of that.

6 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: So, Chair, my understanding
7 is that it's on his desk; and also that it will be signed
8 by June 27th. And it's also on the agenda today for
9 electing a chair. So it would be my suggestion, given
10 that it's allegedly going to be signed on the 27th and
11 it's presently on his desk, that perhaps you make a
12 motion, Commissioner Moore, that we take that off the
13 agenda and put it onto the October agenda. Because I
14 fully expect that somewhere between now and then, the
15 Governor is going to be making that appointment.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: That sounds good.

17 Are there any questions on that?

18 *(No response)*

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: So should the Chair accept
20 the motion, or does the Chair make the motion?

21 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: I think it was just a
22 suggestion.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: A suggestion? Well, would
24 someone make the motion?

25 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: What I'm suggesting is that

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 you make that motion while I'm chairing the next meeting.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Okay, all right. I just
3 wanted to be clear if you were going to make a motion.

4 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: It's your motion.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Okay, all right.

6 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Continue, Ralph.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

9 The next point is the marijuana initiative. And
10 this is gaining a tremendous amount of speed. It has
11 qualified for the November ballot. And this will have a
12 significant impact throughout the state, particularly
13 on POST operations, affecting the basic course, the FTO
14 program, backgrounds, and several other programs.

15 So you should be aware that we are working
16 internally to discuss these issues, meeting with other
17 stakeholders, to plan for the passage of this by the
18 voters. If it doesn't, then obviously everybody
19 throttles back and stands down. But I think it's
20 important that we need to be prepared for the passage of
21 that legislation.

22 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: What are we doing to prepare?

23 MR. BROWN: Well, right now, we just are learning --
24 I recently attended a workshop at Cal State Sheriffs,
25 and received an overview of the potential impacts to

1 California based on what's currently taking place in
2 Colorado. And it's very devastating, between the
3 increased homelessness, children -- the admissions to
4 ERs, the higher THC levels that are being produced now,
5 and causing more ER visits, et cetera, et cetera.

6 Canine: Canines no longer can sniff -- wouldn't be
7 able to sniff for marijuana. So how are we going to deal
8 with that? I mean, it's just a myriad of issues.

9 So we're just starting those discussions now, so we
10 can start developing a plan. I'm sure the executive team
11 will commence with that, but...

12 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: It's our
13 intent to bring internal stakeholders together, identify
14 the areas within POST that this is going to touch, which
15 is a lot, from the basic course, all the way to
16 in-service training -- identify the areas that this is
17 going to touch, and then pull together external
18 stakeholders to determine what the curriculum will need
19 to be, and the changes that need to be done to the
20 training curriculum throughout the state, quite honestly.

21 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Excellent.

22 MR. BROWN: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: I think some of the states
24 had said, "We didn't think it wasn't going to pass. We
25 weren't ready." So I know that CDAA is talking about

1 that, the Sheriffs' Association. So obviously it would
2 be good if we could get ahead of it; and if it didn't
3 pass, terrific from my perspective; but if it does pass,
4 we've got to be ready.

5 Thank you.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: I find it interesting. How
7 does this work at airports with people coming out of
8 Colorado?

9 MR. BROWN: Well, so we know that, federally,
10 marijuana is still illegal; and that is a federal
11 location. So I think it would still be illegal, and
12 there would be marijuana interdiction teams there, I
13 would suspect. But I don't know. I mean, it's all new
14 territory for all of us, really.

15 The short answer is, we just don't know yet.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: So I guess we should just
17 take a look at what they have on their books that's
18 already working or not working, and try to apply it to
19 us.

20 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: And I think they have been
21 speaking to the police associations, the Sheriffs'
22 Association, CDAA. Oregon has come down and Washington
23 has come down and have told us those kinds of things.
24 But, again, if it's imminent, it's going to hit
25 California, and POST is going to need to respond.

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 MR. BROWN: I think at the latest legislative
2 advocate group meeting we had this month, the estimate
3 was 56 percent of those polled would be not in favor of
4 legalizing marijuana for recreational use.

5 But who knows what's going to happen by the time all
6 the advertising hits by November, so...

7 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Okay. Moving forward, bills of
9 interest:

10 AB 86: In essence, this bill would have required
11 the Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor to
12 direct an independent investigation of an officer that's
13 involved in use of force or deadly force. However, this
14 bill died in Assembly Appropriations.

15 AB 1118: This would have established a procedural
16 justice task force, which would be administered by the
17 Board of State Community Corrections. However, this bill
18 died in Assembly Appropriations.

19 AB 1469: This would have made technical and
20 non-substantive changes to PC 832. That died in Assembly
21 Appropriations -- or, correction, in Assembly.

22 AB 1760: Human trafficking bill. This would have
23 been a rather large impact on POST operations. It would
24 have required a peace officer to determine whether a
25 suspect of a crime is a minor, and if the minor was a

1 human-trafficking victim, and whether or not they were
2 suspected of a crime as a result of being human-
3 trafficked. A lot of complexities there. That bill was
4 referred to Assembly Appropriations suspense file, and is
5 not moving forward.

6 AB 1857: This bill would require a peace officer
7 to disclose to the staff of a hospital if an inmate was
8 brought in or if he was brought in to a medical facility
9 and had violent tendencies. That, the author pulled the
10 bill on March 29th.

11 AB 1860 would require the Board of State and
12 Community Corrections to develop a grant program to make
13 funding available for law-enforcement entities to
14 purchase body-worn cameras. That bill was referred to
15 Assembly Appropriations suspense file also. I think
16 there's some other activity going on behind the scenes
17 that we'll hear about later on.

18 AB 1872: This actually turned out to be a
19 gut-and-amend bill. Originally, it was for referring to
20 deputy sheriffs of Merced County; but it has since turned
21 into an Appropriations bill recently, as of, I think,
22 June 1st, for UC Merced, for \$1.3 million. So we'll take
23 that off the radar.

24 Number 8, AB 1940: This bill is getting a lot of
25 traction. The bill would require law-enforcement

1 agencies to -- if they employ peace officers that use
2 body-worn cameras, require to develop a body-worn camera
3 policy. And the significant part of this bill, is that
4 the bill would require the policy to be available to
5 peace officers and allow peace officers to review audio-
6 video recordings before making a report for an internal
7 affairs investigation statement. And that's huge. So
8 that's a big win.

9 The bill was read for the third time and ordered for
10 a third reading on May the 31st.

11 AB 2224: This bill would have authorized probation
12 officers, in the performance of their duties, to display
13 blue lights on their emergency vehicles. After some
14 extensive discussions with our partners and some
15 discussions with the author, the author pulled the bill.
16 A lot of complexities here, potentially liability issues,
17 with pursuits and that kind of thing. I mean, what's the
18 blue light for; right? A lot of concerns.

19 Conceptually, it is a good idea. You know, it was a
20 well-meaning piece of legislation; but potentially some
21 issues there.

22 AB 2361: So this is currently very actively being
23 pursued. As a matter of fact, I attended the Senate
24 Public Safety Hearing on Tuesday on this bill. So what
25 they want to do, is take the security force at UC --

1 correction, USC, which is a private university, and
2 convert them to a law-enforcement entity.

3 POST did a feasibility study back in 1991, and
4 recommended that it's not good policy to allow the
5 individual, an independent private entity, peace-officer
6 powers. And the current methodology and practice, is
7 that entities seek out an MOU with a local agency -- for
8 example, Stanford uses, for their security, they have an
9 MOU contract with Santa Clara County. So they have
10 Santa Clara County deputies there. So that's now -- this
11 is just being amended to include that kind of language.

12 And additionally -- in addition, USC has reached out
13 to us to start a feasibility study for them, a current
14 one. So we'll see where that goes.

15 AB 2533: This bill would require a public-safety
16 officer to provide a minimum three days' notice --
17 receive a three-day notice before the public safety
18 department or any agency releases Internet audio-video
19 recordings of the officer. That bill was referred to the
20 Committee on Public Safety on May the 26th.

21 The whole idea there is, is the officer noticed
22 whether or not their images or audio are going to be
23 released on the Internet by the agency. So there's some
24 POBOR issues there and privacy issues there that they're
25 trying to work through behind the scenes.

1 AB 2624: That bill would require the LAO's office,
2 in consultation with the Commission, to conduct a study
3 to determine the effectiveness of community policing
4 engagement programs. That bill was referred to Assembly
5 Appropriations suspense file. It started to get a little
6 complex, and who was going to be responsible for
7 collecting what data, and how we were going to analyze
8 that data.

9 AB 2626: This bill would require the Commission to
10 develop and disseminate training for peace officers on
11 principled policing -- whoops, lost my page, sorry -- and
12 procedural justice and implicit bias.

13 This bill was held in Committee Appropriations on
14 the 27th of May. However, we are still working with
15 DOJ to develop that course, and will make it available
16 for law enforcement in the very near future. So we've
17 been actively working on it.

18 SB 1221 --

19 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: I have a question for you.

20 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry.

21 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: If I may? And, actually, the
22 question is more for Stephanie.

23 So we know that's the direction everyone is going
24 is, POST looking at the Basic Academy, supervisor course,
25 management course, how do you develop -- knowing it's

1 going to eventually get that way, start now, developing
2 those, to take out of the DOJ, collaborative, and start
3 putting -- weave that through the academy and supervisor
4 course, management, SLI, all of it?

5 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: That's
6 correct.

7 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Okay, thank you.

8 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: We've already
9 begun conversations for the basic course. We are
10 piloting a train-the-trainer course here coming up in the
11 next month. We're going to work off the pilot, to see if
12 there's any changes that need to be made to that course
13 based on student feedback.

14 We'll take that, and then take the objectives from
15 those courses and begin to build that into the course
16 that you mentioned.

17 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Okay.

18 MR. BROWN: SB 1221: It would authorize the
19 Commission to make the Commission course on
20 law-enforcement interaction with mentally disabled
21 persons available to firefighters.

22 We had some extensive discussions with the bill's
23 author, and created some amendments to include that the
24 State Fire Marshal shall be responsible for updating the
25 curriculum. So basically, there's a piece of legislation

1 that says, we shall make available to fire -- or, you
2 know, LD-37 training. But it's up to them, it's their
3 responsibility to update the curriculum to fit the
4 firefighter environment.

5 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: So with that amendment being
6 made, why is it being held up at all?

7 MR. BROWN: It's not being held up. It was referred
8 to the Public Safety Committee on 5/12.

9 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Are any issues in it for POST?

10 MR. BROWN: No, no. There was initially.

11 Initially, it appeared a little ambiguous, in
12 that -- so that if you read the first round of the bill,
13 the question was, are we going to be responsible to
14 revise the curricula for the State Fire Marshal, right.

15 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Okay.

16 MR. BROWN: So my request to the author was, "Can
17 you please remove the requirement of POST, and replace
18 that with 'State Fire Marshal shall update the
19 curriculum'?" And they said, "Absolutely."

20 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: So all they're asking us to do
21 is to share our curriculum with them. Any amendments
22 they want to make that are more applicable to the
23 firefighters, they're going to make themselves, and any
24 updates they're going to make themselves. So it's
25 released of any liability if they come back at us and

1 say, "Your curriculum didn't include that part"?

2 MR. BROWN: Correct.

3 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Okay, good. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Correct. Spot on.

5 SB 1337: This bill would provide the members of a
6 fire department or a fire-protection agency the ability
7 to basically investigate or prevent terrorism with peace
8 officers, and carry firearms under the terms and
9 conditions of their agency. After some collaboration
10 with POST and several other law-enforcement partners, the
11 author pulled the bill.

12 I think we had a little mission creep going on there
13 and some other concerns. So that's no longer on the
14 table. However, there is a --

15 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Is that what it's called,
16 "mission creep"?

17 MR. BROWN: Well, it would --

18 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I'm just kidding.

19 MR. BROWN: Sir, yes, sir.

20 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I think others call it a little
21 bit stronger.

22 MR. BROWN: This is a matter of public record.
23 Thank you.

24 SB 1362 would authorize persons employed -- security
25 officers of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan

1 Transportation Authority to detain individuals on
2 properties controlled and operated by the Authority. And
3 it would also allow them to carry shotguns and batons.
4 However, after some discussion with POST and
5 collaborators, collaboration with other agencies, the
6 author pulled the bill.

7 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: You started to say something
8 a few minutes ago about 1337. You said, "There's been
9 some..." and then you got interrupted.

10 Were you going to say something else about 1337?
11 Some movement in some direction?

12 MR. BROWN: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. Yes.

13 So there has been some discussion with some of the
14 other -- there's several groups of firefighting entities
15 out there. There's the California Department of Fire --
16 or California Association of Firefighters, and Fire
17 Investigators, and Arson Investigators, and Fire Chiefs
18 Association. So a couple of those entities are
19 interested in using this kind of bill language moving,
20 going forward.

21 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Right.

22 MR. BROWN: And the visualization I received was the
23 following: "Gee, Ralph, in a case, à la San Bernardino,
24 wouldn't it be great if fire could work lockstep with law
25 enforcement, arrive at the scene, and work side by side

1 in the initial stage of the scene?" That was the
2 picture-thinking.

3 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: It is a big issue for arson
4 investigators whether they get to carry weapons or not,
5 throughout California.

6 MR. BROWN: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: And some jurisdictions allow
8 it and some don't.

9 MR. BROWN: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: And those that don't, there
11 are some investigators that are unhappy with that.

12 MR. BROWN: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Ralph --

14 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir?

15 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: I can brief the Commission
16 once the San Bernardino report is made public -- so, in
17 fact, I was working on it late last night since I'm on
18 the review team -- to educate the Commission more on the
19 appropriate uses and the reviews of firefighters being
20 armed versus not armed. And particularly, it's meant for
21 the paramedics going in, who goes in a hot zone versus a
22 warm zone, and who is armed and who is not; and can you
23 actually provide medical care when you're carrying a
24 machine gun versus not.

25 MR. BROWN: Right.

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: So there's a lot of that
2 debate; versus the arson investigators, it's a totally
3 different scenario, with arrest powers and that. This is
4 about the "Can I dress like a SWAT guy, be a SWAT guy,
5 but be a firefighter?" -- knowing that you can't tend to
6 someone when you're carrying all that gear.

7 MR. BROWN: Correct.

8 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: But once the U.S. Attorney
9 General releases the report, then we can talk more about
10 that in detail.

11 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: You also addressed the issue
12 of safety vests for the firefighters.

13 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: For all first responders.
14 Ballistic equipment is the recommendation.

15 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: And I think there's a lot of
16 agencies -- what we're doing in the county is, because
17 there's an interest by firefighters to be prepared --
18 not to carry machine guns, but to be able to be there
19 quickly and clear. But weapons were not part of that
20 training preparation.

21 MR. BROWN: Yes, the camps used to be kind of split
22 in that area. There are some that are saying,
23 "Absolutely, we don't want to. It's definitely mission
24 drift, and we don't want to have any part of that. We'll
25 just carry the hoses. We'll come in after you guys

1 secure it, and we're all good."

2 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: True.

3 MR. BROWN: And there's another camp that says,
4 "Absolutely, we can walk in there lockstep with you guys.
5 And, you know, kick the door," and it's like, okay.
6 That's another discussion.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Ralph, how many other
8 departments, fire departments, are cross-trained or have
9 police departments who serve as police officers and
10 firefighters? How many departments do we have like that?

11 MR. BROWN: I believe we only have one, which is
12 Sunnyvale, I believe. However, I think Riverside or
13 San Bernardino, I think, is discussing that, or reviewing
14 that model.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: And also I just had another
16 question on AB 1940, the policy for BWC review.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Did that die, or...?

19 MR. BROWN: Okay, let me look at that.

20 1940. That bill was read for the third time and
21 amended, ordered for a third hearing -- a reading. So
22 it was amended to include some of the language that I
23 pointed out, which was that officers would want to be
24 able to review video prior to -- have the right to review
25 video prior to writing a report and doing an

1 investigation. That was the language that was recently
2 added.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Prior to writing a report?

4 MR. BROWN: Correct, correct.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Did POST have any
6 recommendations on that?

7 MR. BROWN: I don't know if we officially do or not.
8 Stephanie?

9 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: We -- in late
10 2015, we pushed out an information video on body-worn
11 cameras. Because this is equipment, the Commission's
12 usual position is not to get involved in local equipment
13 agency policy. However, this information on video pulled
14 stakeholders together to talk about what's worked, what
15 hasn't. Everywhere from CPRA requests, to viewing the
16 video, to not viewing the video. So it's more of an
17 informational video that's available to our clients. But
18 as far as its specific position, unless the Commission
19 wants to take a position, we normally don't do that.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: If you get a chance to look
21 at what we did down in San José, we have the officers --
22 because we want to have the officers make sure that
23 whatever they see, and they give the reason why they
24 shot, versus -- or why they did what they did, versus
25 getting a chance to look at it and then to determine what

1 they did. So we can have an understand- -- if there's a
2 problem involved in a shooting.

3 So if you could get a chance to take a look at the
4 San José Police.

5 MR. BROWN: Sure. I will.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: And the next one will be, I
7 think, 2533, three-day notice on release of information.

8 That's just from the department's perspective?

9 MR. BROWN: Yes. And there's some discussion going
10 on back and forth between labor and management. That's
11 really what that is, between Cal Chiefs and CPOA and
12 PORAC. And that's whether or not -- if the officer
13 should have the ability to, I guess, recommend that they
14 file an injunction to prohibit the agency from posting
15 that information on the Internet. So there is a lot of
16 background discussion taking place on that.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: That's interesting, because
18 I believe that most officers should operate under the
19 guise or understanding that the cameras are on them,
20 anyway; and that someone, some place, is recording them.
21 And that stuff is going to go up on Facebook, regardless
22 if the industry releases it or not.

23 So I don't know how we handled it here, but that
24 should be their understanding, was when I talked with the
25 San José police, that whatever you do, assume it's being

1 recorded. Because today, instead of people helping, they
2 pull out cameras and record. And so I don't know how
3 that is a real concern. Maybe I'm not understanding
4 something.

5 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: There would be a Public
6 Records request from the media, and they'd say, "We want
7 this recording. We want this document. We want
8 something." And then law enforcement would have ten
9 days -- or anybody would have ten days to respond to that
10 or ask for an extension. And I think when it becomes an
11 issue in terms of law-enforcement safety or it becomes
12 an issue in terms of victim identification or things like
13 that, that some process -- some review process should
14 occur.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Should occur?

16 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: We can never legislate what
17 civilians are going to do; but I think we are in a
18 position to legislate law enforcement's response to a
19 public-records request and the posting. I think that's
20 where the area is, as best as I can see.

21 Stephanie, your thoughts?

22 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: I agree.

23 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: And I totally appreciate
24 where you're coming from; because the reviews we're doing
25 now, whether it's Ferguson or Stockton or San Bernardino,

1 we're finding that not only are people posting it on
2 YouTube, but they're streaming it live. So the story is
3 being told from one perspective; but law enforcement
4 tends to wait weeks, if not months, to share their
5 perspective. And you can't control the story if you
6 don't tell the story.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Right, right.

8 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: So the world is changing as
9 far as the immediate release of video versus not
10 releasing it at all. So those are the conversations
11 being added.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All right.

13 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Cal Chiefs, Cal Sheriffs,
14 Cal DAs, says how do we deal with this new paradigm of --
15 in fact, with Stockton, some of the stuff was on the Web
16 before the pursuit was over, with the bank robbery. So
17 the chiefs and sheriffs are dealing with something the
18 media knows something about, and they haven't seen it
19 yet, and they're responding to it in the middle of the
20 action. So the world has changed when it comes to video.

21 MR. BROWN: Yes.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: And I was just saying that
23 because it's easier to help quell the storm if there is
24 another side being released, instead of having to deal
25 with the storm, and 20 days or next month it's finally

1 released, and then we've got an "aha" moment. But if we
2 could stop those "aha" moments beforehand.

3 And some of the San José policy, if you look at it,
4 is the command officer on-site has the chance to look
5 at it and determine if he'll let people in the community
6 look at it at that time to stop whatever could be
7 boiling. And it really helps, from a community
8 perspective, that we're able to keep down a lot of the
9 unrest.

10 And a part of what I'll be doing -- you guys heard
11 that Trump came to San José, and we had a great time.
12 And so the review process is ongoing, and the arrests are
13 made after they reviewed the cameras. And we were able
14 to look at and see who had weapons and who did what.
15 And then when the community comes out and we're making
16 these steps to do X, Y, and Z, there is less community
17 pushback, because the community felt that they were part
18 of the actual review process.

19 So, again, I just wanted to recommend that you get a
20 chance to look at San José's policy and what we're doing
21 in San José.

22 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, I mean, on that issue,
23 about whether officers should review or not, I think what
24 POST has done is appropriate. I don't think POST's role
25 is to make a recommendation, because those are really

1 local issues.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: And I agree with you,
3 Commissioner Doyle.

4 MR. BROWN: Agreed.

5 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: The other problem is if law
6 enforcement releases it, then they're going to come to
7 the District Attorney's office and say that we're trying
8 to contaminate the jury pool: "This is what the Sheriff
9 put out, this is what all your potential jury members
10 are going to see, and you condoned that." So that
11 becomes yet another issue for us.

12 MR. BROWN: Correct.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: See, it's multifaceted, like
14 you said.

15 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: It is.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Is there anything else right
17 now?

18 MR. BROWN: No, sir.

19 That's the end of my report.

20 Does anybody have any questions?

21 *(No response)*

22 MR. BROWN: Great.

23 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: Before we adjourn, I have a
24 couple comments --

25 MR. BROWN: Sure.

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: -- and potentially a motion,
2 if I could make one.

3 Mr. Brown and I have had this conversation before.
4 So before the Leg. Committee was put together, because
5 there were positions taken on bills and votes and things
6 like that; now, it's more informative. So we're just
7 taking what we do here and then re-reporting it out to
8 the rest of the Commission.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: I think there are important
11 conversations to have with the whole Commission.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: So I don't know if it's a
14 "recommends to the full Commission," a motion, a vote,
15 then a recommendation. But my thought is to basically
16 disband this subcommittee, and the report be presented in
17 a structure for the whole Commission so we can have these
18 conversations with everybody; but that this committee
19 either be restructured or brought back as a committee
20 that looks at organizational change within POST, so it's
21 a subcommittee that's looking at organizational change.

22 We've been talking about strategic planning, hiring
23 a new executive director. That a subcommittee on
24 organizational change be created; and it could be this
25 committee -- I'm just throwing it out for thought -- just

1 renamed, retasked, repurposed. Or completely done, and
2 then form a new one. I'm not sure how it is. But I
3 think these are important conversations for the whole
4 Commission to participate in, not just the subcommittee.

5 But we also -- I think we also need another
6 subcommittee on organizational change and development,
7 that helps guide the strategic planning process, the
8 executive director, all of that.

9 So I throw that there for thought.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: I like it.

11 COMMISSIONER BUI: Mr. Chair, I completely agree
12 with you. And years ago, we had a subcommittee called
13 the Long-Range Planning Committee, and that was disbanded
14 due to budget cuts.

15 I mean, we met, I think, probably two or three times
16 a year to talk about such issues. And I think it's a
17 great idea to maybe swap -- change this committee out
18 for the Long-Range Planning, since we did away with that
19 one years ago.

20 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: I also agree with Commissioner
21 Braziel, especially because there is really no reason to
22 have this committee anymore because we're not taking a
23 position. When we could take a position a year ago, then
24 we would really carefully discuss these bills and decide
25 what position we would take. Since it is just

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 information, it should be something that's presented to
2 the entire Commission.

3 And I think keeping the renaming fluid -- because
4 right now, it's those issues; but a year from now, it
5 could be something else -- is also important. But for
6 now, I agree those are the issues.

7 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: A motion?

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Do we need to make a motion
9 or take it back as a recommendation?

10 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Yes.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Which one is it?

12 COMMISSIONER BUI: Is that your motion?

13 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: If that's your motion, I'll
14 second it.

15 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: I'll move what I just said.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: I'll second that.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: Moved and second.

19 MS. BOUVIA: Who was second? Excuse me.

20 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Doyle. I'm sorry.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All those in favor, say
22 "aye."

23 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: The motion passes.

25 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: May I make a

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 recommendation to the full Commission when you discuss
2 this to the full commission, perhaps direct staff to
3 agendize this in the October meeting for further
4 discussion in terms of where you want -- where the full
5 Commission wants to go in terms of direction for this
6 subcommittee. We can absolutely do that.

7 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: But when Jethroe does his
8 update, he can obviously tell the full board.

9 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: Absolutely.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All right.

11 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Unless we're missing
12 something -- unless us commissioners are missing
13 something about why we have this meeting.

14 Is there any other purpose besides information?

15 MR. BROWN: No, ma'am. It's to keep you in the
16 loop, because it's very important that you know what's
17 out there on the horizon and how that legislation is
18 going to impact our operations. It's mission-critical
19 for you guys to know that.

20 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: And I again agree with
21 Commissioner Braziel that the entire Commission should
22 hear this because this does affect what we do and how we
23 do it.

24 MR. BROWN: I agree, yes.

25 COMMISSIONER BUI: And if there's any direction that

1 the Commission wants to take on either one of these
2 bills, we can just make that during the actual Commission
3 meeting.

4 MR. BROWN: Absolutely.

5 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Except we're not allowed to
6 take any positions anymore; right?

7 MR. BROWN: Correct.

8 COMMISSIONER BUI: That's right.

9 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: No positions.

10 COMMISSIONER BUI: That's right. Never mind.

11 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: But we could direct staff to
12 anticipate training needs --

13 COMMISSIONER BUI: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER BRAZIEL: -- and things like that
15 based on potential legislation. And also hear from
16 representatives from Cal Chiefs, Cal Sheriffs, and the
17 D.A.s, as to what their position may or may not be, so it
18 helps impact and directs POST.

19 MR. BROWN: Correct.

20 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: I just want
21 to say that although we can no longer take positions on
22 bills, I want to credit Ralph and his ability to work
23 with the Legislature. He has done an excellent job of
24 partnering with the Legislature in terms of what you see
25 today on this agenda, whether language has been changed

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1 or bills have been pulled. So he's doing an excellent
2 job.

3 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: I quite agree.

4 I think you should keep doing your job because you
5 are there when we're not.

6 MR. BROWN: Stop it. You're...

7 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: That's it. Done.

8 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Well, and I think it goes
9 without saying, that you work with associations that can
10 and help support. Because I know when our leg. committee
11 looks at stuff and the impact on POST, I mean, we can
12 weigh in as Cal Chiefs can.

13 MR. BROWN: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER DOYLE: Especially if it's going to
15 impact POST negatively.

16 MR. BROWN: Yes, okay.

17 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SCOFIELD: Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Very good.

19 Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: All right, is that it?

21 MR. BROWN: That was it.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: That was it?

23 I will move to adjourn.

24 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Second.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR MOORE: The meeting is adjourned.

POST Legislative Review Committee Meeting, June 23, 2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Gavel sounded)

*(The Legislative Review Committee meeting
concluded at 9:04 a.m.)*



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 July 11th, 2016.

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