

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

POST COMMISSION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING



TIME: 1:00 p.m.

DATE: Wednesday, October 21, 2015

PLACE: Double Tree Hotel - Mission Valley
7450 Hazard Center Drive
San Diego, 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 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

GEORGE BEITEY
(Committee Chair)
California Community Colleges

MARIO A. CASAS
(Committee Vice Chair)
California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations

ELMO BANNING
Public Member

ALEX BERNARD
Public Member

MARCELO A. BLANCO
Peace Officers' Research Association of California

JAMES BOCK
California Specialized Law Enforcement

ED BONNER
California State Sheriffs' Association

MARK BRUNET
Chief
California Highway Patrol

JAMES DAVIS
California Academy Directors' Association

GREG GARNER
California Police Chiefs Association

ALAN McFADON
Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Council

SANDRA SPAGNOLI
California Peace Officers' Association

RANDALL WALTZ
California Association of Police Training Officers

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

BRADLEY YOUNG
California Association of Administration
of Justice Educators



POST COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

SANDRA HUTCHENS
(Commission Chair)
Sheriff-Coroner
Orange County

RICHARD DELAROSA
Mayor
City of Colton

JOYCE DUDLEY
Santa Barbara District Attorney
Santa Barbara County

PETER KURYLOWICZ, JR.
Deputy Sheriff
Riverside County Sheriff's Department

JETHROE MOORE II
Public Member

BATINE RAMIREZ
Deputy Sheriff
Placer County Sheriff's Department



A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

per participation and sign-in sheet

ROBERT STRESAK
Executive Director
Executive Office

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

DAVID CORNEJO
Assistant Executive Director
(Administrative Services Division)
Executive Office

ALAN DEAL
Assistant Executive Director
(Field Services Division)
Executive Office

RALPH BROWN
Legislative Consultant
Executive Office

MARIE BOUVIA
Executive Assistant
Executive Office

FRANK DECKER
Bureau Chief
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

SCOTT LOGGINS
Bureau Chief
Basic Training Bureau

CONNIE PAOLI
Administrative Assistant II
Executive Office

STEPHANIE SCOFIELD
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

*per participation and sign-in sheet
continued*

KATE SINGER
Bureau Chief
Standards, Evaluation, and Research Bureau

VALERIE TANGUAY
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

ROBERT ZIGLAR
Bureau Chief
Training Program Services Bureau



ALSO PRESENT

per participation and sign-in sheet

PAUL BROWN
Sacramento Police Department

GEORGE McCLANE, M.D.

MICHAEL PARKER
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department



POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
A. Call to Order and Welcome	9
B. Flag Salute and Pledge of Allegiance. . . .	9
C. Moment of Silence	9
Officer David Nelson Bakersfield Police Department	
Sergeant Scott Lunger Hayward Police Department	
D. Introductions	9
Advisory Committee, POST Commissioners, and Members of Audience	
E. Roll Call	13
F. Announcements and Correspondence	14
G. Approval of Action Summary and Meeting Minutes of June 24, 2015	15
H. Review of Commission Meeting Agenda	16
I. Presentation	
Did You Know? "Complacency"	69
J. Advisory Committee Member Reports	
- Public member, Banning	73

I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

J.	Advisory Committee Member Reports <i>continued</i>	
-	Public member, Bernard	73
-	Peace Officers' Research Association of California (PORAC), Blanco	74
-	California Specialized Law Enforcement, (CSLE), Bock	74
-	California State Sheriffs' Association (CSSA), Bonner	74
-	California Highway Patrol (CHP), Brunet .	81
-	California Academy Directors' Association (CADA), Davis	81
-	California Police Chiefs' Association (CPCA), Garner	81
-	Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Council (PSDAC), McFadon	81
-	California Peace Officers' Association (CPOA), Spagnoli	82
-	California Association of Administration of Justice Educators (CAAJE), Young . . .	83
-	California Association of Police Training Officers (CAPTO), Waltz	83
-	California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations (CCLEA), Casas	83
-	California Community College, Beitey . .	84
K.	Commissioner Comments	87

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
L. Old and New Business	87
Nominations for the 2015 POST Excellence in Training Awards	87
Election of Advisory Committee Chair and Vice Chair	88
M. Next Meetings	90
N. Adjournment	91
Reporter's Certificate	92



POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

Wednesday, October 21, 2015, 1:03 p.m.

San Diego, California



COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Good afternoon.

Let's call the meeting to order.

I'm going to have you all please rise and recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Please have a moment of silence honoring the peace officers killed in the line of duty since the last meeting.

Officer David Nelson of the Bakersfield Police Department.

Sergeant Scott Lunger of the Hayward Police Department.

(Moment of silence was observed.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you. Please take your seats.

All right, let's start with the introduction of the Advisory Committee members.

I'm George Beitey, representing the California Community Colleges.

MS. BULLARD: Jan Bullard, POST staff.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Bob Stresak, POST.

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Mario Casas,

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 representing California Coalition of Law Enforcement
2 Associations.

3 MEMBER WALTZ: Randy Waltz, California Association
4 of Police Training Officers.

5 MEMBER YOUNG: Bradley Young, representing
6 California Association of Administration Justice
7 Educators.

8 MR. FELDHAUS: Dan Feldhaus, the hearing reporter.

9 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Sandra Spagnoli, representing
10 California Peace Officers' Association.

11 MEMBER McFADON: Alan McFadon with Dispatchers.

12 MEMBER GARNER: Greg Garner, representing
13 California Police Chiefs Association.

14 MEMBER DAVIS: James Davis, Academy Directors.

15 MEMBER BRUNET: Mark Brunet, Highway Patrol.

16 MEMBER BONNER: Ed Bonner, California State
17 Sheriffs' Association.

18 MEMBER BOCK: Jim Bock, Specialized Law Enforcement.

19 MEMBER BLANCO: Marcelo Blanco, Peace Officers'
20 Research Association of California.

21 MEMBER BERNARD: Alex Bernard, public member.

22 MEMBER BANNING: Elmo Banning, public member.

23 MS. BOUVIA: Marie Bouvia, POST.

24 MS. PAOLI: Connie Paoli, POST staff.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 And a reminder to please speak into the microphones,
2 so they can record everything you say.

3 Bob?

4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, George.

5 I'd like to take a moment to introduce to you our
6 latest appointment, Assistant Executive Director,
7 Mr. David Cornejo.

8 Dave comes to POST with over 20 years of State
9 executive and managerial experience, overseeing
10 financial, information technology, and administrative
11 programs.

12 He has served as the chief financial officer for
13 the California Department of Public Health, and the
14 fiscal chief for the California Public Employees'
15 Retirement System.

16 He has administrative experience with State law
17 enforcement and emergency response programs, including
18 CDCR, CAL FIRE, Department of Fish and Wildlife. And
19 prior to becoming a State manager, Dave was a college
20 professor at Cosumnes River College in Sacramento, and
21 taught both computer information science and business
22 administration. He has an MBA from the California State
23 University Sacramento.

24 Dave, would you please stand?

25 Dave has brought just an incredible wealth of

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 knowledge and fiscal depth and insight to the
2 organization, much-needed skills, and lots of energy.
3 He's working on our current budget issues with fervor.

4 And so we're very happy and thrilled to have you,
5 Dave. So if you wouldn't mind just saying a couple words
6 to the group, I'd appreciate it.

7 MR. CORNEJO: Thank you, Bob.

8 Good afternoon, Advisory Committee Members.

9 Can you hear me okay?

10 CHORUS: No.

11 MR. CORNEJO: Okay, let's try that.

12 Good afternoon, everybody.

13 And Bob mentioned, I've been here two months. I'm
14 flattered, honored to be working with a professional
15 organization. I am looking forward to meeting all of
16 you, and discussing what I can do to assist the
17 Commission, assist the Department.

18 My background is administrative and fiscal. I've
19 worked in local government. I am going to be focused
20 the first couple of months in looking at the
21 administration, looking at new revenue streams, new
22 funding sources. But please take time to come by. I
23 would like to get to talk with everyone, and get to
24 better know you.

25 Thank you.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Dave.

2 Mr. Chair?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

4 If we have any commissioners in the room, could you
5 please stand up and introduce yourself?

6 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Commissioner Sandra
7 Hutchens.

8 COMMISSIONER MOORE: Commissioner Jethroe Moore.

9 COMMISSIONER DELAROSA: Commissioner Richard
10 DelaRosa.

11 COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Commissioner Joyce Dudley.

12 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Commissioner Pete
13 Kurylowicz.

14 COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ: Commissioner Batine Ramirez.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Good turn-out.

16 Thank you.

17 Let's have roll call of the members.

18 MS. BOUVIA: Banning?

19 MEMBER BANNING: Here.

20 MS. BOUVIA: Beitey?

21 MEMBER BEITEY: Here.

22 MS. BOUVIA: Bernard?

23 MEMBER BERNARD: Here.

24 MS. BOUVIA: Blanco?

25 MEMBER BLANCO: Here.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MS. BOUVIA: Bock?
2 MEMBER BOCK: Here.
3 MS. BOUVIA: Bonner?
4 MEMBER BONNER: Here.
5 MS. BOUVIA: Brunet?
6 MEMBER BRUNET: Here.
7 MS. BOUVIA: Casas?
8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Here.
9 MS. BOUVIA: Davis?
10 MEMBER DAVIS: Here.
11 MS. BOUVIA: Garner?
12 MEMBER GARNER: Here.
13 MS. BOUVIA: McFadon?
14 MEMBER McFADON: Here.
15 MS. BOUVIA: Spagnoli?
16 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Here.
17 MS. BOUVIA: Waltz?
18 MEMBER WALTZ: Here.
19 MS. BOUVIA: Young?
20 MEMBER YOUNG: Here.
21 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.
22 Announcements and Correspondence.
23 Jan?
24 MS. BULLARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Members of
25 the Committee. You'll find correspondence located under

1 Tab L.

2 It includes: A letter from the Executive Director
3 to Chief Greg Williamson of Bakersfield Police
4 Department, expressing our deepest sympathy over the
5 tragic on-duty death of Officer David Nelson; a letter
6 from the Executive Director to Chief Diane Urban of
7 Hayward Police Department, expressing our deepest
8 sympathy over the tragic on-duty death of Sergeant Scott
9 Lunger; and we received a letter from Sheriff Greg Ahern,
10 Alameda County Sheriff's, thanking the Executive Director
11 for participating in their latest presentation of Urban
12 Shield, and for allowing Alameda to participate in the
13 POST-directed research on Cognitive Task Analysis.

14 And we'll provide you with a report on Cognitive
15 Task Analysis research when we get to the consent
16 calendar review.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

18 Approval of the minutes from the June 24th meeting,
19 for the action summary, the meeting minutes from
20 June 24th, and the amended meeting minutes from the
21 February 18th.

22 MEMBER BERNARD: So moved. Bernard.

23 MEMBER BOCK: Second. Bock.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any discussion?

25 *(No response)*

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All in favor?

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

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

4 (*No response*)

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: The motion carries.

6 All right, Review of the Commission Meeting Agenda.

7 Jan?

8 MS. BULLARD: You have before you the Commission
9 agenda for tomorrow. And I know you've had an
10 opportunity to review it; and some of you have requested
11 presentations on certain items. Staff has also selected
12 some items that they felt were of particular interest.

13 We are going to be starting with the consent
14 calendar.

15 Item B.4 is the reinstitution of Law-Enforcement
16 Officers Killed or Assaulted, or the LEOKA Program. And
17 since 1986, we have examined the circumstances that have
18 led up to every accidental death or felonious murder of
19 a California peace officer; and we have printed those
20 results in the LEOKA report every five years.

21 After the publication of the 2004 report, we put the
22 LEOKA program on hold due to staffing constraints. And
23 it is unfortunate because there's been such an increase
24 in assaults and in deaths, we felt that it is imperative
25 for us to reinstitute the LEOKA program.

1 We are going to start working with our
2 subject-matter experts; and it is our intent to complete
3 a ten-year study which will bring us current. And we
4 hope that we will bring aboard our subject-matter experts
5 to join us from our SAFE Driving Campaign and also from
6 our motors group; because they're going to be able to
7 lend their expertise to those incidents that we review
8 that involve a vehicle or motorcycle fatality.

9 The purpose of us looking at all of these incidents
10 are to allow us to identify emerging trends that are
11 happening. And also, it gives us actual data which
12 supports the development of our tactics, our training,
13 and policies that we really believe will help save
14 additional lives.

15 The Executive Director has approved the allocation
16 of \$102,000; and that will allow us to complete all of
17 the incident investigations and to edit and to publish
18 the ten-year LEOKA program. A breakdown of those costs
19 are Attachment A to your agenda item.

20 The reinstitution of this program is supported by
21 our Strategic Plan Objective A.1.1, which is to identify
22 and convey information on emerging trends to the field;
23 and also by A.1.4, which is to continue this study of
24 driver-training methods, vehicle-related high-risk
25 activities, and to improve training and enhance our

1 safety. And we are hoping that we will have our ten-year
2 LEOKA report ready and published by June of 2016.

3 Are there any questions regarding the LEOKA program?

4 *(No response)*

5 MS. BULLARD: Moving on then to Item B.5, which is
6 a report on the Cognitive Task Analysis. And I will ask
7 Bureau Chief Bob Ziglar to step forward and report on
8 that.

9 MR. ZIGLAR: Good morning.

10 So we have started the project working with
11 Dr. Klein on recognition crime decision-making model of
12 decision-making. Basically, we're looking at, can we
13 identify those cognitive skills, those tasks that veteran
14 officers, experienced officers have developed through
15 consistent exposure to critical events; something that
16 you get by actually dealing with those critical events.
17 How can we identify those tasks, how can we then develop
18 training so that we can bring those forth to the newer
19 officers that haven't had the opportunity to get those
20 types of work examples, work experiences? The goal
21 being, down the road, to hopefully identify those types
22 of tasks, and then implement those types of criteria
23 throughout the various functions, from Regular Basic
24 Course, on into in-service training, and hopefully, into
25 management counseling also.

1 So there has never been a process that I know of
2 where we have had a real study where we've looked at
3 these types of skills that are developed in this way.

4 Given the new atmosphere in law enforcement, where
5 officers are responding to critical events and a myriad
6 of types of events that they may not have had exposure
7 to, this type of training will allow those officers an
8 experiential-based course to develop mind maps that they
9 can hopefully utilize later when they are confronted
10 with an unusual incident that they run into on the
11 street.

12 So Dr. Klein has two basic areas that he fuses
13 together: Situational assessment and also mental
14 simulation.

15 His vast amount of study has been with firefighters.
16 We started a process where he interviewed -- we
17 identified, through various agencies, and being
18 reflective of POST, large agencies, small agencies,
19 college, sheriff's departments, PDs -- that when we asked
20 for the kinds of officers that if everything is going
21 wrong, who do you want there? Who would you want to have
22 respond to that call? Who has those types of skills?

23 And then he brought his research team in and
24 interviewed those groups of officers. It was a first
25 step.

1 Then we were lucky enough to be invited to
2 participate with Urban Shield; and we were a part of --
3 the Sheriff allowed POST to be a part -- and Dr. Klein
4 to be a part of developing two of the scenarios that the
5 SWAT teams went through over a 40-hour period of time.

6 Then we were able to take -- once we identified
7 those scenarios for an elite level SWAT-type team, we
8 developed scenarios that were for what would happen
9 before you got to the SWAT simulation. And that, we
10 requested senior officers, experienced officers to
11 respond to those, those situations. And then once they
12 responded, did what they did, then Dr. Klein's team of
13 researchers brought them in to about a 30- to 40-minute
14 interview process, where they start to identify those
15 critical skills, those critical knowledge points that
16 they have. The why's that they did what they did.

17 From that, we did the same thing at Urban Shield.
18 We were able to take the SWAT teams -- and this was
19 throughout the state and one Korean team, where they
20 debriefed for about -- we were given not only the two
21 hours for the scenarios, but a third hour for a debrief
22 of these teams. And then this was, again, through his
23 experts, an extensive debrief of why they did what they
24 did, what they did that made them successful; and we also
25 looked at the things that might have made them not as

1 successful as they could be.

2 And right now, Dr. Klein's team is in the process
3 of tabulating all of that information. And we should
4 start to get the similar kinds of traits of these types
5 of skills that experienced officers have, that we can
6 then start to develop and put into a training program.

7 That's where we are at this point.

8 Does anybody have any questions?

9 Yes, sir.

10 MEMBER DAVIS: Would the event analysis that
11 preceded this with other -- with the military or with
12 other countries?

13 MR. ZIGLAR: He has worked with the military. He
14 has worked with mostly Fire. My understanding is, there
15 is some other countries that are involved; but primarily
16 Fire and the military.

17 His dealings -- the difference that he's found with
18 the law enforcement -- and he's very excited about what
19 we do -- is that Fire is often predictable in the way
20 that a fire would react; and so there's a procedural
21 process.

22 Well, in law enforcement, there is not as much
23 predictability. And so they're very excited about what
24 they're learning.

25 And having the access, like I said, with the

1 agencies that provided us the folks for the interviews
2 and then the scenario testing and now the Urban Shield,
3 is just incredible data for them to go through.

4 I hope that answered your question.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Robert, is this a
6 similar study, similar to what Force Science does on
7 the tactical end, where the -- actually, it goes beyond
8 tactical --

9 MR. ZIGLAR: Force Science, it's different in that
10 Force Science, we're talking about how the brain works,
11 and then why you may perceive things and react a certain
12 way.

13 In this research, we are looking at understanding
14 that through experience, we gain knowledge that is
15 sometimes not utilized in a thoughtful pattern. It is
16 something you recognize and then because of all of your
17 experience that you've had before, you're then able to
18 come up with some reasonable solutions to that problem
19 based off of experience.

20 And so what we're going to try to do is develop
21 coursework, where we put those younger officers in a
22 position where they, through scenario-based, video-based
23 instruction, are dealing with these kinds of issues, so
24 that hopefully when they do go to a call like this on
25 the street, they have information that they've gone

1 through, at least in a setting -- in an academic setting,
2 that should help them with that decision-making.

3 So it is how the brain works, but it is not the same
4 as --

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: So this is largely
6 based on harnessing that sixth-sense experience that a
7 veteran has to try to develop a curriculum, or a way for
8 us to teach that to the younger officers without having
9 them wait out that time; is that kind of...?

10 MR. ZIGLAR: That's exactly what it is. And it's
11 interesting you say "sixth sense," because one of the
12 first firefighters that Dr. Klein interviewed in this
13 process, he attributed his successfully pulling his team
14 out of a burning house, through ESP. And he felt that
15 he had ESP; and he was able to -- he doesn't know why,
16 but he was able to identify, "I need to get my folks out
17 now."

18 And when Dr. Klein and his team sat and talked to
19 him, they went over all of the process that he knew where
20 fires were -- it was a kitchen fire. And it wasn't
21 reacting like a kitchen fire was.

22 Well, the fire was actually in the basement. And
23 because it was not reacting as a traditional fire would
24 react in a kitchen, his mind, without even knowing it,
25 was saying "Something's not right here, and I need to

1 address a solution to it, and basically get out."

2 The only bad part of the whole interview process for
3 them was that Dr. Klein had to tell him, it wasn't ESP,
4 it was your experience that you had prior to this event.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Interesting.

6 MEMBER DAVIS: I guess that was the example used in
7 Malcolm Gladwell's book; yes?

8 MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

9 MEMBER BANNING: Bob, is there any thought -- once
10 we get all this data, is there some process that you
11 think that will be ultimately put in place where you
12 could weed out that people aren't wired that way?

13 I mean, some people just can't multi-task. They're
14 just -- their mind, they can't partition some of these
15 horrific events in a cognitive fashion where they can
16 respond properly. It's a condensed reasoning, I guess,
17 the gut instinct. They are, I call them "one-ball
18 jugglers."

19 But what happens if, in that process, when we're
20 hiring officers or they're hiring law enforcement, I
21 mean, is there a possibility that some of this could be
22 put into that? And when you look at that, I wouldn't say
23 it would be a disqualification, but it would certainly
24 be something that you would have to look at as far as in
25 the hiring process, during the background.

1 I mean, they go through a psychological, the
2 four-hour standard test. But what happens if this is
3 identified as a result of this; and we say, "Look, you're
4 probably very, very good at a single task, but you're not
5 going to make it here, and your success rate might be
6 really imperiled" or -- I mean, it puts other people in
7 jeopardy if they can't -- they freeze because of that.

8 MR. ZIGLAR: Sure. There is a chance, down the road
9 with further research -- and we're applying through a
10 BCP to continue our research and move forward with that.
11 That's one of the reasons -- the reason that you bring
12 forward is why we also look at those that Urban Shield
13 maybe did not do as well as they had wanted to do. And
14 we identify, through those interviews, what were those
15 issues that they failed to do. A lot of it was
16 miscommunication, failure to think through the process
17 effectively. But that's what we're looking at also, is
18 we really want those high achievers, how can we develop
19 training for them, and then implement that hopefully
20 throughout our process at some point. But also, we would
21 identify, what are the consistent problems that some
22 folks have.

23 MEMBER BANNING: I'm just curious, were any of the
24 scenarios based on a single officer or law-enforcement
25 responder that they are there by themselves for five or

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 ten, 15 minutes, maybe?

2 MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

3 MEMBER BANNING: I don't -- I mean, I deal with a
4 lot of these folks, and it feels like two people there.
5 You know, one guy is 20 minutes away, and the other
6 officer is already engaged.

7 MR. ZIGLAR: And that's exactly why, when we started
8 the process of the Urban Shield, knowing that we were
9 going to have a modified SWAT team, that we brought back,
10 with Dr. Klein's request and approval, we brought back
11 to: What would have happened? How can we set this
12 scenario up before a SWAT team got there? And those were
13 single officers responding.

14 MEMBER BANNING: Right.

15 MR. ZIGLAR: And there is an extensive end review
16 of each of those officers that, again, were senior
17 officers who were well-respected in their agencies. And
18 we identified, through -- and it coincided with the next
19 part, which would be the Urban Shield scenario.

20 MEMBER BANNING: Okay, I just can't help but think
21 what's going to happen the very first time an officer
22 engages, say, a terrorist takeover event, I mean,
23 singularly. You know, we're really good at the active
24 shooter in a school; and we know we may know we have to
25 go in by ourselves, but LAPD's MACTAC, I mean, is a prime

1 example. What are we going to do when we only have four
2 officers there and everybody else is a half hour away?

3 MR. ZIGLAR: And that's our focus on this.

4 MEMBER BANNING: Okay. Good.

5 MR. ZIGLAR: We're really trying to find ways to
6 train those officers in initial contact.

7 MEMBER BANNING: Yes, great. Thank you.

8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: This is exactly what
9 that is about, is that the first person at the scene has
10 got it, no matter how messy it is.

11 And so the issue is how well can we integrate those
12 things that we draw from officers with a high skill-set
13 and introduce them to the line-level, if you will, that
14 don't have the opportunity for that type of training.

15 It's a very interesting project.

16 Hats off to Bob Ziglar and his team for taking this
17 on.

18 We owe a debt of gratitude to Sheriff Ahern for
19 allowing us to interact with Urban Shield. It was, at
20 the very least, a target-rich environment for us to
21 interview multiple SWAT teams. And there was kind of --
22 it was interesting to watch some of the interviews go on.

23 But I think they spent 30 or 40 straight hours --

24 MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: -- interviewing people,

1 right through the night.

2 MEMBER BANNING: Outstanding.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Did a great job.

4 So I'm looking forward to this. I think this is
5 very exciting. I think it does have a value with the
6 uptick of mass-casualty incidents; and the fact that,
7 as you said, sometimes your nearest backup might be
8 20 minutes away.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Bob, when are we
10 looking to complete this?

11 MR. ZIGLAR: We are tabulating from the three
12 processes that we have now, and we should have
13 information on that within the next month or so. And
14 then we hope to move on to completing the course. So
15 I'm hoping, by the beginning of the year, that we can
16 really be close to developing that course and have that
17 course developed.

18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: And, Elmo, your
19 question was spot-on in terms of who knows where this
20 will go. But in terms of perhaps selection standards or
21 background investigations or personality evaluations,
22 this could be helpful.

23 MEMBER BANNING: Yes, and, really, my bad for not
24 getting involved or at least making inquiries earlier.
25 I talked to, literally, hundreds and thousands of

1 supervisors at the line level throughout the United
2 States; and there's some very, very systemic issues that
3 I get over and over and over again.

4 I was just in Laredo last week -- Texas -- and in
5 New Hampshire a couple weeks prior, and even in
6 California.

7 And, I mean, hats off to us. You know, you always
8 hear it said that we're the best trained in the United
9 States. That's hands-down. And you see some of these
10 things, some of the concerns that some of these
11 supervisors have. And, you know, highly skilled Marines,
12 former Marines becoming law-enforcement officers and
13 going places, and they're looking around for a team that
14 doesn't exist, and they're all by themselves, and they
15 are -- you know, they freeze.

16 And bad things can happen. I don't care if we go
17 left, right, or down the middle; but you've got to make
18 a move. And that's one of the bigger issues that they
19 talk about. They don't have that team concept. Like --
20 well, firefighters are like pack animals. They do
21 everything together. Oftentimes, law-enforcement
22 officers are out there by themselves.

23 Good. I'm very anxious to see that.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. ZIGLAR: You're welcome.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MS. BULLARD: Thank you, Bob, very much.

2 MEMBER BANNING: Yes, that's excellent.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Bob.

4 MS. BULLARD: Are there requests for any other
5 reports on the consent calendar?

6 *(No response)*

7 MS. BULLARD: If not, we will move on to the regular
8 agenda. And Item D is the report on the revision of the
9 Commission Regulation 1070 and 1082 in relationship to
10 first-aid/CPR and AED.

11 And I have Bureau Chief Scott Loggins, who will be
12 reporting on that.

13 MR. LOGGINS: Thank you, Jan.

14 Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Committee Members. My
15 name is Scott Loggins. I'm the bureau chief of the
16 Basic Training Bureau.

17 California Penal Code 13518 mandates that every
18 law-enforcement officer who is not predominantly working
19 in an administrative setting has to have training in
20 first-aid/CPR, and now AED.

21 That particular content is unique in that it's not
22 driven by POST itself internally through subject-matter
23 experts, nor is it driven by legislative mandates.

24 Instead, the content of the curriculum is driven by our
25 sister board, which is the California Emergency Standards

1 Authority, or as we call it, EMSA.

2 Back in early 2014, EMSA took a look at the
3 existing first-aid/CPR standards for our front-line
4 law-enforcement officers and determined that it was
5 somewhat lacking. And in an attempt to bring up their
6 standards to meet the contemporary needs of those
7 front-line officers on the streets, while also
8 capitalizing on the experiences of the military in the
9 Middle East and even capitalizing on some of the
10 incidents that happened throughout the country --
11 specifically, active shooter -- they took the initiative
12 to modify some of those entry-level standards, which
13 brings us to where we are now.

14 Once that endeavor started, POST collaborated with
15 our EMSA counterparts and started working on the
16 curriculum development in order to ensure that the first
17 responders of tomorrow have absolutely the best possible
18 training to serve their respective communities.

19 At this point in the endeavor, we're in a two-year
20 transition process. The EMSA regulations that are part
21 of the Title 22 actually went into effect April 1 of this
22 year, and they afford us a two-year transition period, by
23 which point every law enforcement officer, in effect,
24 all 90,000 of them, with the exception of those who are
25 primarily administrative, will have had to be exposed to

1 this new level of training.

2 The specific additions to the entry-level training,
3 we're now going to allow officers to assist in the
4 administration of nalaxone, or as many of you would know
5 as Narcan; assist patients with the administration of
6 epinephrine; and then, of course, they'll also be going
7 to start looking at allowing officers to apply certain
8 levels of hemostatic dressings; and, of course, they're
9 also incorporating some active-shooter response protocol
10 under that specific training.

11 The new authority that is allowed officers -- well,
12 it's going to provide some optional skills that will have
13 to be allowed by the respective local emergency medical
14 responder authorities, and with that specific permission
15 of your local medical authority, your officers or the
16 officers will now be able to administer epinephrine,
17 administer nerve-agent antidotes, administer Narcan on
18 their own, and a few other minor issues.

19 As we stand right now, POST is feveredly developing
20 five new courses in order to meet that specific
21 time-line. As we speak, there is a group of
22 subject-matter experts meeting in Orange County. They
23 are finalizing the content of the Learning Domain
24 workbook, LD-34 for the basic course, as well as the
25 in-service training components. They just finished

1 working on training and testing specifications
2 components. What we have before you today, is the
3 authorization for this committee and ultimately the
4 Commission, to move forward with the specific instructor
5 training standards; specifically, POST Administrative
6 Regulation 1070 and 1082.

7 With the blessing of this group, as well as the
8 Commission tomorrow, we're hoping that we can now take
9 the first step to generate the specific curriculum for
10 our instructors so that they can conduct the necessary
11 training for all the respective officers; specifically,
12 a transition course. The transition course will be
13 for those current peace officers who had the prior level
14 of training, and they're also developing the training
15 curriculum for instructors who are going to be providing
16 the new level of training.

17 After this endeavor, we're going to work on the
18 specific training for the optional skills program. And
19 then hopefully, by this time -- actually I take it, by
20 April 1st of 2017, we'll have changed the regulations,
21 removed all the contents from the prior courses, and then
22 simply move forward with the content of the new courses.

23 With that, I'd be more than happy to entertain any
24 questions that any of you may have.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Scott, what kind of

1 time commitment are we looking at for each individual
2 officer to be brought up to date with this new training?
3 Are we looking at 16 hours, 24 hours? I mean, I'm
4 curious as to what the initial analysis --

5 MR. LOGGINS: The specific content has not yet been
6 developed. Having said that, in collaboration with our
7 subject-matter experts with medical expertise, I'd
8 venture to say that it would probably be a single day or
9 an eight-hour course. And that would be simply a
10 transition for the officer of today, who has had the
11 prior first-aid/CPR training, to go through the necessary
12 AED component and learn some of the other corollary
13 skills.

14 Having said that, one of the things we're very big
15 on at POST is stay away from specific hourly mandate, and
16 it would be driven exclusively by the content. But the
17 specific length of that course is yet to be determined.

18 I would venture to say, it probably would be no
19 longer than 16 hours, and that is based on the
20 information we've gotten from our medical subject-matter
21 experts.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: So is this going to be
23 mandatorily imposed on all officers to know, or are you
24 still going to have the basic first-aid/CPR and AED?

25 MR. LOGGINS: It will be mandatory on all officers

1 to know.

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Okay.

3 MR. LOGGINS: From this point forward, once we reach
4 that specific date in 2017, all students in the Regular
5 Basic Course will get the new content. And from that
6 point forward, they will go through the every-two-year
7 refresher courses that officers are used to taking a
8 current refresher course.

9 During this particular two-year period, there will
10 be a transition, where there will be those who have had
11 the new curriculum will follow a certain path, those who
12 have had the old curriculum will follow a different
13 transition path. And ultimately, several years from now,
14 they'll all be on that same pathway.

15 MEMBER BLANCO: Scott, is this going to be a
16 face-to-face instruction or is this a portal-driven type
17 of training that you guys are talking about?

18 MR. LOGGINS: It will probably be both. We're
19 working on a face-to-face instruction component as well,
20 as well as an addition to the Learning Portal.

21 Having said that, there is a skills assessment
22 component. So even if an officer, after briefing, or if
23 he were to spend a day in the office taking the online
24 portion, there will still be a skills-competency
25 verification that will have to be verified and personally

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 attested to by a 1070 class instructor.

2 MEMBER BLANCO: Okay.

3 MEMBER DAVIS: Is the re-certification course going
4 to affect that?

5 MR. LOGGINS: Yes, it will. As it stood before the
6 regulation went into effect, every peace officer had to
7 have 12 hours of retraining every three years.

8 They've modified it, I think, to be more amenable to
9 conventional business hours. It's no longer every three
10 years with a 12-hour component. It's every two years now
11 with an eight-hour component.

12 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: I might add that this
13 is in line with POST Strategic Plan, to maintain
14 leadership in emerging issues in law enforcement.

15 MR. LOGGINS: Correct.

16 MS. BULLARD: Thank you, Scott.

17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Scott. Good
18 report.

19 MR. LOGGINS: Thank you.

20 MS. BULLARD: Moving on to Item E, which is a report
21 on a request to delete, as completed, Strategic Plan
22 Strategy D.1.2, which is to Provide Online Resources
23 on Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy. And
24 procedural justice and police legitimacy have certainly
25 been in the forefront of discussions for law enforcement;

1 and it was highlighted in the President's Task Force
2 Report on Policing in the 21st Century.

3 One of the four main goals that we determined in
4 our strategic plan was to enhance law enforcement's
5 ability to serve its communities. And under that goal,
6 we developed Strategic Plan Strategy D.1.2, which was to
7 provide online resources for the law-enforcement agencies
8 in procedural justice and police legitimacy.

9 So our staff has worked very hard with some very
10 renowned experts in this field, and compiled a remarkable
11 page which contains resources from periodicals, articles,
12 videos where training is located, all things that
13 agencies are going to need to be able to develop or to
14 find training and policies in this topic. It is all
15 together on one procedural Justice Web site, which is
16 linked to our POST homepage.

17 And you have the link to it in your agenda item.
18 And I would certainly invite you to go to it at your
19 leisure and see what a remarkable page that it is, and
20 all of the resources that are available.

21 So we are going to ask that the Commission approve
22 that Strategic Plan Strategy D.1.2 be completed -- or
23 deleted as completed.

24 Are there any questions regarding the procedural
25 Justice Web page?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BLANCO: Jan, just a quick question for you.

2 I know, when we were doing the meetings with
3 Attorney General Harris on 21st Century Policing, there
4 was a little bit of discussion as far as the term
5 "police legitimacy" around, obviously, with most
6 law-enforcement officers. We are a legitimate
7 institution, and trying to say that we're legitimizing
8 police became kind of one of those difficult points that
9 we're going to have to try to get our staff to wrap their
10 heads around. And I think the group at that point looked
11 at more of a principle-based policing.

12 Is there -- or was there any discussion on POST's
13 part to look at it from that perspective, as opposed to
14 the -- I think most law-enforcement officials look at
15 "We're legitimate," I mean, "We're there to protect the
16 public. What are we talking about having to legitimize
17 what we do," and maybe change that concept from police
18 legitimacy to either principle-based or something of that
19 nature. Was that ever looked at?

20 MS. BULLARD: Yes, I think what you'll notice is
21 that what we did was we took our resources from the AG's
22 office, from Stanford, from all of these, and we put them
23 together so that where POST is not saying this is what
24 we're going to define legitimacy as, we are giving them
25 access as to what all of the experts, all over the

1 nation, are looking at from the perspective of legitimacy
2 and procedural justice. And we're giving agencies the
3 ability to go find that, adopt that, define it as they
4 are.

5 But I think that you'll find that most of these
6 links are to material that are in alignment with those
7 discussions that took place at the Department of Justice
8 and AG's office.

9 MEMBER BLANCO: Okay. If there isn't anything
10 further with the Chair, I'll make a motion that we
11 approve.

12 MS. BULLARD: That will be probably at the end.

13 MEMBER BLANCO: At the end, my bad.

14 MS. BULLARD: Yes, what we're going to do, is finish
15 out the rest of the items; and then you'll be given an
16 opportunity to support the agenda for the Commission.

17 MEMBER BLANCO: Okay, thank you.

18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Marcelo, your point is
19 well-taken.

20 In some of these newer terms, there is an implied
21 corrective element to it, that we've had significant
22 dialogue on that issue. Just the term "racial profiling"
23 has an implied corrective element to it. And these all
24 kind of fall in a similar bucket.

25 And Jan, as she appropriately answered, is that we

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 will allow agencies to make their own determination, and
2 just primarily be the pointer system for some of this
3 information.

4 MEMBER BLANCO: Got it. Thank you.

5 MS. BULLARD: Moving on to Item F, which is a Report
6 on the Proposed Changes to Peace Officer Selection
7 Requirements; and Bureau Chief Kate Singer will be
8 reporting on this item.

9 MS. SINGER: Good afternoon.

10 I'm not sure how we're doing over here, so I'll
11 speak up.

12 The report you have before you supports the change,
13 Senate Bill 795 was just signed and filed October 5th.
14 It goes into effect January 1st of 2016. And it
15 generally addresses GED and the other appropriate avenues
16 that students and the applicants to the police service
17 can supply to be considered as successful completion of
18 a high-school diploma.

19 Additionally, your Attachment A includes an
20 underlined/strike-out version of a few more updates
21 relative to preemployment, psychological evaluations,
22 and some of the continuing professional education for
23 POST-approved psychologist. Most notable is the current
24 regulations say that it's permissive to share that
25 information back and forth between a background

1 investigator and a police psychologist. The rules now,
2 based on input from SMEs, including background
3 investigators and psychologists, now require that that
4 shared information actually go both ways. As an example,
5 if the psychologist receives information that's not
6 medically related to an applicant, they're able to share
7 that information back to the background investigators,
8 so that the employer may ask for them to pursue that
9 information a little more fully before completing the
10 full background.

11 That is pretty much what's in front of you in
12 Attachment A.

13 I'm happy to answer any questions.

14 Just as an aside, we are pushing this information
15 out. We're hoping to participate in the Cal Chiefs
16 conference in March, to have a workshop for chiefs and
17 command staff so that they're aware of this regulation;
18 and we'll be sharing that with Cal Sheriffs as well.

19 Any questions?

20 *(No response)*

21 MS. BULLARD: Thank you, Kate.

22 MS. SINGER: Thanks.

23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: This is -- before I
24 forget, this is Kate's first appearance as a bureau chief
25 with POST.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 Kate was with us years before as a management
2 fellow; and then left to assume the position of the chief
3 of police for Desert Hot Springs. And then returned
4 recently back to POST, and was appointed -- that's not
5 the right word, not "appointed" -- "promoted" -- promoted
6 to bureau chief recently.

7 We're thrilled to have her, we're thrilled to have
8 her expertise at the table; and she brings a lot to POST,
9 and to the services for California law enforcement.

10 Thank you, Kate.

11 MS. BULLARD: Moving on to Items H and I, which is
12 the Report on the Commission Regulation 1081 in Relation
13 to Rifle and Shotgun Training, and the Report on Revision
14 of Commission Regulations 1005 and 1081 in Relation to
15 Rifle and Shotgun Training.

16 And Frank Decker, Bureau Chief, and Stephanie
17 Scofield will be reporting on this item for you.

18 MS. SCOFIELD: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Committee
19 Members.

20 Can you hear me now?

21 MS. BULLARD: It's Verizon.

22 MS. SCOFIELD: Good afternoon.

23 Peace officers that possess short-barrel rifles and
24 shotguns in the course and scope of their duties are
25 required by the Penal Code to complete POST-certified

1 courses in the training and the use of these weapons.

2 The training requirement was enacted by the
3 Legislature as part of Senate Bill 359, which became
4 effective on July 13th, 1999. This bill included a
5 provision that peace officers complete a training course
6 in the use of these weapons certified by the Commission
7 in order to possess them.

8 It was signed by the Governor and became effective
9 immediately.

10 When the bill was enacted, a review of available
11 courses at the time determined there were no standardized
12 courses that met this requirement. The shotgun-training
13 requirement could be satisfied by completion of specified
14 basic courses. However, rifle training was not included
15 in any of the basic-course formats.

16 In response to the training mandate, POST assembled
17 a committee of subject-matter experts to assist in the
18 development of the necessary course. Although the
19 legislation only applied to short-barrel rifles and
20 shotguns, it was the recommendation of the subject-matter
21 expert committee that the training requirements should
22 also include long-barrel rifles and shotguns. The
23 rationale was that the competencies and safety factors
24 addressed in the training would be the same regardless
25 of the barrel length.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 The committee's work led to the development of a
2 two-part course: Part I was for long- and short-barrel
3 shotgun training; and Part II was for long- and
4 short-barrel rifle training, both requiring a minimum
5 of 16 hours.

6 The committee also recommended that the completion
7 of specified basic courses should be a prerequisite to
8 attend the Part II rifle course. A staff report was
9 developed and approved by the Commission on October 28th,
10 1999. A notice of regulatory action was published for
11 public comment, during which there were no comments
12 received. Your Attachment B in your agenda item is the
13 original 1999 staff report.

14 After approval by the Office of Administrative Law,
15 it became effective immediately.

16 This Commission action resulted in a bifurcated
17 training requirement.

18 Number 1: The training requirement for short-barrel
19 rifles and shotguns is a legislative mandate as
20 delineated in Penal Code section 33220(b), and applies
21 to peace officer members of a police department,
22 sheriff's office, marshal's office, CHP, DOJ, and CDCR.

23 Number 2: The training requirement for long-barrel
24 rifles and shotguns is a Commission requirement as
25 delineated in Commission Regulation 1081, and applies to

1 peace-officer members of an agency that participate in
2 the POST program.

3 Your Attachment D in your agenda item is the current
4 Commission Regulation 1081.

5 It should be noted that completion of the Part I
6 course meets the training requirement to possess both
7 long- and short-barrel shotguns, and completion of the
8 Part II course meets the training requirement to possess
9 both long- and short-barrel rifles.

10 Recent inquiries from the field have shown that,
11 among some agencies, there is a misunderstanding or
12 lack of knowledge of the training requirement to possess
13 rifles. Members of staff have attended numerous
14 executive-level meetings and met with training managers
15 throughout the state in an attempt to clarify this
16 training requirement.

17 Feedbacks from these meetings have brought up issues
18 that can be categorized in five areas of concern:

19 Number 1: Agencies have only provided training to
20 personnel that carry short-barrel rifles.

21 Number 2: Agencies have deployed rifles in patrol
22 units without providing training for the personnel.

23 Number 3: Agencies have provided rifle training to
24 their personnel but did not request POST certification
25 for the courses.

1 Number 4: Agencies have provided rifle training but
2 did not document it.

3 And number 5: Agencies have provided rifle training
4 with a course length of less than the mandated 16 hours.

5 The two-part course, approved by the Commission, is
6 listed in Regulation 1081 under the titles of: Shotgun
7 Course, Part I, 16 hours, both long- and short-barrel,
8 under Penal Code section 33220(b); and Rifle Course,
9 Part II, 16 hours, long- and short-barrel, Penal Code
10 section 33320(b).

11 Though the course titles specify long- and
12 short-barrel, there is apparently some confusion in the
13 field because the Penal Code section in the title only
14 covered short-barrel rifles and shotguns, and there was
15 no reference to the Commission requirement.

16 Although training to possess short-barrel rifles and
17 shotguns is required in the Penal Code, and the training
18 to possess long-barrel rifles and shotguns is required
19 by Commission regulation, the deployment of rifles is an
20 agency decision and, as such, is not subject to review by
21 the Commission.

22 Because the training is not a compliance issue
23 tracked by POST staff in the annual compliance reviews,
24 it should be thought of in the same context as other
25 similar mandates, such as first-aid and CPR, domestic

1 violence, and racial profiling.

2 In all of these cases, unlike continual professional
3 training and the perishable skills program, there are no
4 annual reminders by an area consultant.

5 Because the requirement dates from 1999 and due
6 to frequent turnover in staff at many agencies,
7 particularly training managers, the resulting loss of
8 corporate knowledge may have caused some of them to lose
9 track of these mandates.

10 As a resource for agencies to maintain awareness of
11 these requirements, the POST Web site provides a complete
12 list of legislative training requirements.

13 Another possible reason for the apparent lack of
14 confusion about rifle-training requirements is that
15 after a period of time, the mandates I just previously
16 discussed were included in the Regular Basic Course, or
17 the RBC, thus allowing newly appointed peace officers to
18 meet the mandate during their basic training. However,
19 unlike aforementioned mandates, the rifle training has
20 not been integrated into the Regular Basic Course. The
21 primary reason for not including rifle training is that
22 current regulation requires completion of the RBC as a
23 prerequisite to take the course.

24 In this case, there are additional factors that
25 could preclude the mandatory inclusion of rifle training

1 in the Regular Basic Course.

2 Number 1: The inclusion of rifle training would
3 require an addition of at least two days of training to
4 the minimum hourly requirement for the RBC, which could
5 increase the cost of presenting the course for both POST
6 and the academies.

7 Number 2: A survey of academies indicates that only
8 25 percent of them have received requests from local
9 agencies to include rifle training in the Regular Basic
10 Course.

11 Number 3: Some academies have stated the costs of
12 obtaining rifles for training is prohibitive.

13 And finally, Number 4, community college basic
14 academies have stated that they are prohibited from
15 purchasing rifles due to legal restrictions.

16 MR. DECKER: Staff has taken a number of steps in
17 an effort to enhance awareness of the legislative mandate
18 and the Commission action to clarify the training
19 requirements.

20 Number 1: The specialized training requirements
21 segment of the legislative mandated training requirements
22 listed on the POST Web site has been revised as shown
23 under Attachment E.

24 Number 2: The list of POST-certified rifle courses
25 was reviewed to determine which of them meets the

1 training mandate. The list included 236 courses, and
2 33 met the minimum requirements for the mandate. Staff
3 is working with the presenters of those courses that do
4 not meet the mandate, to bring them into compliance.

5 Number 3: POST Bulletin 2015-16 was published on
6 August 4th of 2015, shown under Attachment F, as a
7 supplement to the 1999 bulletin that, when published,
8 provided notice to the field of the additional training
9 requirement.

10 Number 4: A standard statement that better defines
11 the rifle-training requirement will be added to the
12 course description for all rifle courses that meet the
13 mandate.

14 Number 5: A standardized outline and hourly
15 distribution are available to agencies requesting to
16 certify a 16-hour rifle training course as shown under
17 Attachment G.

18 Additionally, an agenda item entitled "Report on
19 Revision to Commission Regulations 1005 and 1081 in
20 Relation to Rifle and Shotgun Training," requests
21 approval of a revision that will mark clearly and define
22 the training required to possess both long- and
23 short-barrel rifles and shotguns and eliminate the
24 prerequisite of completing the Regular Basic Course prior
25 to taking the rifle course. This will allow academies

1 to include rifle training in the Regular Basic Course if
2 they choose to do so.

3 Agencies have expressed a number of concerns related
4 to the training requirement for rifles. Some of the
5 comments have been critical of actions taken by the
6 Commission in response to the legislative mandate.

7 Recurring themes of the comments are:

8 Number 1: The Commission made a mistake and/or
9 exceeded its authority by extending the training
10 requirement to include long-barrel firearms, and that
11 agencies were not properly notified of the training
12 mandate and the requirement that the training must be
13 POST-certified.

14 Number two: The training or retraining of their
15 personnel to meet the requirement could result in an
16 unanticipated expense.

17 Number 3: Alternatives to completing the rifle
18 course should be allowed.

19 And Number 4: The Commission should consider
20 rescinding the action taken in 1999 that includes
21 long-barrel rifles in the training requirement.

22 Staff is working with agencies in an effort to
23 assist them in meeting the training mandate, and will
24 continue to review all currently certified courses to
25 include analysis of the course outline, instructor

1 resumés, hourly distribution, and other documentation to
2 bring them into compliance with Regulation 1081.

3 Priority will be given to requests for the
4 certification of new rifle courses from agencies and
5 training presenters.

6 Staff has also made recommendations to mitigate the
7 cost of training.

8 In order to provide additional clarity, staff
9 intends to request authorization from the administration
10 to seek an amendment to the Penal Code that would extend
11 the existing training requirement to possess short-barrel
12 rifles and shotguns, to include long-barrel rifles and
13 shotguns.

14 In summary, the Commission's action in 1999 enhanced
15 the legislative mandate by including long-barrel rifles
16 and shotguns in the training requirement, and was based
17 on the recommendation of firearms subject-matter experts.
18 The action resulted in a longstanding competency-based
19 training requirement to possess long-barrel rifles and
20 shotguns.

21 It is the staff's recommendation that the current
22 regulatory training requirement for peace officers to
23 possess both long- and short-barrel rifles and shotguns
24 in the course and scope of their duties remain unchanged.

25 Thank you.

1 And we'll be happy to answer any questions.

2 MEMBER DAVIS: I'm almost tempted with, where do we
3 begin?

4 But the -- and I don't say that in any way to make
5 light of what you all have done because this is a huge
6 task and there's a lot of parts to this. So let me just
7 go back and I'll ask kind of one at a time, leaving room
8 for somebody else to interject if they wish.

9 From the regular basic academy standpoint, I think
10 there are additional issues that we need to consider as
11 well.

12 You mentioned in -- I think in one of the
13 presentations, that one of the issues was the inability
14 of the academies that are associated with community
15 colleges in purchasing these rifles; and that is, of
16 course, one of the things that CADA is currently working
17 on. Because it not only applies to rifles, but it
18 applies to high-capacity magazine handguns and several
19 things across the board. So that would be -- any help
20 you could give us in that is certainly appreciated.

21 The other has to do with the variety of platforms
22 that are available or that are being used by
23 law-enforcement agencies. That it's -- in discussions
24 with our firearms trainers, that was one of the
25 impediments, is you couldn't necessarily -- there are

1 so many issues dealing with small-muscle motor memory as
2 to the different types of weapons that one agency may use
3 one kind of rifle, one agency may use a different kind
4 of rifle and/or platform, depending on which way you want
5 to describe that; so that unless it's an agency-specific
6 academy, we have some issues with the rifle training in
7 that.

8 Well, I'll stop there and let anybody jump in; but
9 I have another question as well.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: The regional academies,
11 though, are pretty much operated on -- when it comes to
12 weapons, using kind of -- the majority of the agencies
13 they serve, is that the case where they -- because the
14 agencies all have different weapons may be the case. But
15 the academy -- the regional academies have always used
16 one specific weapon because the operation of it is
17 similar to what other rifles are out there. I mean,
18 there's no expectation to purchase specific rifles that
19 each agency uses; correct?

20 MEMBER DAVIS: I don't know about the rifle aspect
21 because we haven't even gotten into that part yet.

22 With regard to handguns, generally, yes, there is a
23 single-type of handgun. And then agencies are free to
24 develop from there.

25 But we were -- with regard to rifles, one of the

1 issues was, rifles and -- well, the legitimacy of
2 continuing shotgun training when most people have
3 abandoned that, and looking at rifle training, since that
4 is a more common tool that's used in the profession now.
5 But then it got to the aspect of, when you're training
6 with shotguns, it's pretty clear -- or most agencies are
7 using the same style of shotgun. But rifles, it's a
8 different story.

9 So I'm told by the experts that it's a more
10 difficult training process. And the agencies would have
11 to go back and retrain, anyway. So what would be the
12 point of doing the training initially, unless you could
13 do some sort of initial generic training.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Stephanie, if that's
15 the case, is that going to hinder the process even that
16 much more if there's nothing -- unlike the shotguns,
17 where there's really just like one platform, generically,
18 you can train to? Is the rifles a whole different ball
19 game?

20 MS. SCOFIELD: Well, that's part of our discussions
21 we're having with the training managers and our academies
22 as well, is: Do you regionalize this course or not? And
23 that's what we're working with up and down the state. We
24 were working with some academies.

25 But our recommendation is, at this time, that the

1 rifle course remain a separately certified course from
2 the academy, and maybe do it at the end of your academy.
3 But, again, part of the 1081 minimum content is to
4 discuss agency policy, so that opens up a whole another
5 can in terms of various agency policies on the use of
6 rifles.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: You know, I'm not aware
8 of the holdup with the colleges.

9 I thought if you have a police academy component to
10 your community college, does that not give you some
11 waiver to --

12 MEMBER DAVIS: *(Shaking head.)*

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: No?

14 MEMBER DAVIS: No. And it's an involved process,
15 and would probably be better discussed offline. But
16 I'd be happy to do that with you. But it is an issue
17 for us that I was not aware of until about three years
18 ago, and we've started the process then.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Sandra?

20 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Thank you.

21 First of all, thank you for the amount of work. I
22 know Frank and I have spoke on this issue. And
23 reflecting back and seeing the staff work that was done,
24 I feel strongly that when you think about 16 hours, a
25 minimum of 16 hours is really a small amount, especially

1 when you're talking about the type of equipment that's
2 being deployed.

3 But from a practical agency standpoint, I'm very
4 interested in hearing a little bit more about how to
5 shore up with agencies who have met the minimum 16 hours'
6 requirement, have done an expanded outline, and have
7 tried for many, many years to get a POST certification
8 on an agency-specific training. And how this impacts
9 many agencies of my size is that we, again, have the
10 expanded outline; we meet the 16 hours; we are unable to
11 get course certification because the courses that are
12 offered in our area. And it's really impractical when
13 you look at firearms-related training to send 90 officers
14 outside for two days to do something that really is
15 in-house training.

16 And when you look at rifle training for us, it's
17 really in-house training. And how do we shore up, if
18 we've met the training requirement, we've met the
19 16 hours, we have the expanded outline; but we have, over
20 time, in the last three or four or five years in my
21 agency have not been able to get the POST certification?
22 And it all has to do with the amount of agencies and
23 other agencies that are offering that course.

24 And so I'd be interested, from a money issue, it
25 would be impractical to send that amount of officers to

1 that amount of training over a short period of time.

2 We don't want to take the equipment away because it's
3 important equipment, they've been trained. But from a
4 liability aspect, that if something happens and we are
5 exposed as an agency for not having POST certification,
6 deploying this equipment, meeting the standards, and then
7 having to argue that we met the standard but couldn't get
8 the certification.

9 So I would request that through the issue and
10 that through shoring it up, agencies that have met the
11 requirement, how do we go back and sort of retro-ly
12 correct this issue? Because, for me, it's not the
13 16 hours. I think that's really a minimum amount of
14 training. It's agencies that have the training, deployed
15 it the way POST intended, but can't get the
16 certification.

17 MR. DECKER: Generally, we don't retroactively
18 certify courses. However, in a situation such as you've
19 described, that's something we'd have to take a look at,
20 as you and I have talked about.

21 The situation we have is that the courses are all
22 over the map. Some entities say they've done training;
23 they have absolutely no documentation whatsoever. Some
24 have done the training and opted not to seek any type of
25 certification. So we're going to have to look at each

1 of these issues pretty much on a case-by-case basis to
2 see what we can do.

3 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: And in speaking for my agency
4 and agencies in our area is, rifle training is part of
5 in-house training, versus a training that you would send
6 somebody to another agency, even a sheriff's office, our
7 local Sheriff's office, it's very impractical and more
8 costly. So we would ask for that to be considered
9 through this process.

10 MR. DECKER: Well, what we've done in our contacts
11 around the state, we have found that there have been
12 some issues with particularly urban versus rural
13 departments as to, you know, the manner in which they
14 deploy the firearms.

15 What we have done is, we've taken the original
16 standardized course outline that was part of the agenda
17 item in 1999, and we've updated that, along with a
18 standardized hourly distribution. And that's a
19 ready-made kit that somebody can take and look at that,
20 and turn around and get it back to us; and we prioritize
21 any request for rifle certification, particularly if you
22 use the standardized content.

23 From this point on, you shouldn't be having the
24 types of issues that you've described in the past.

25 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: So you would consider expanding

1 the POST certification for agencies specifically to
2 deliver their own services, versus in-house? Because,
3 again, delivering that service is really critical
4 internally, because you're deploying it in a way that
5 you're using, you know, a multitude of expertise that is
6 in the agency-specific training.

7 MR. DECKER: Yes. Keeping in mind, generally, the
8 first criteria for course certification is demonstration
9 of the ongoing unmet training need. However, when we
10 look at that and we get to situations such as this, we
11 are finding more and more that agencies are getting
12 pretty much agency-specific on deployment and application
13 of the rifles. We think that we will defer and readily
14 certify any request for rifle courses from this point on.

15 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: And then I would just go back
16 retro -- retro, we just deployed all new rifles, all
17 new training. And so, again, I just would say that many
18 agencies are similar to ours, where we've met that
19 training requirement, we've met the 16 hours. And it
20 would just be impractical and really negligent as an
21 agency, as far as costs, to resend someone -- the
22 guys would love to go through that training again, I'm
23 sure. So they wouldn't argue. But it's really a
24 dollars-and-cents, it's a cost. And I would ask for that
25 to be considered as you move this forward.

1 MR. DECKER: Yes, we do understand that, and that's
2 one of the things as we work our way through this
3 process.

4 MEMBER GARNER: I just want to, if I could, add
5 something.

6 First, the Police Chiefs' Association echoes those
7 exact sentiments.

8 And did I hear you correctly, you are now going to
9 reconsider and possibly certify some of these courses
10 that have been --

11 MR. DECKER: We're talking about new courses --
12 new applications, first of all.

13 As a new course, any application we receive for a
14 rifle course, we will expedite the certification, and
15 not take into consideration, as we normally do, the
16 demonstration of an ongoing unmet training need.

17 Generally, what that is, is we don't want to have,
18 you know, three presenters, or three McDonalds on the
19 same intersection, all doing the same course, all
20 competing with each other.

21 This is kind of a different situation, the general
22 standard for that, the unmet training need.

23 MEMBER GARNER: So that it would have to be a new
24 application?

25 MR. DECKER: I'm talking about from this point on.

1 And we would have to go back and look at pretty much
2 individually what we've found so far under these five
3 different issues that have come up and the different
4 aspects of what has and has not been done in training.

5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Chief, you've
6 articulated some real-life challenges to implement this
7 training program, and you've raised some good, practical
8 issues. So we'll take a look at this, and see what
9 solutions we can afford that can perhaps alleviate some
10 of the realities of implementing this training out at the
11 field level.

12 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Thank you. And if I could just
13 add, there is really a timeliness on this. Because for
14 every hour that that equipment is out in the field and
15 agencies aren't covered with POST-certified training,
16 we really are exposed. Because I would say not the first
17 thing, but the second thing in a litigation is where
18 are the training records, what were they supposed to be
19 doing, and what did they do? And it really exposes
20 cities who met the need but didn't get POST certification
21 to, you know, paying out money in the long run, so...

22 MEMBER DAVIS: Yes, so this actually sort of brings
23 me back to the other question that I have with regard to
24 this. It seems that in an area that is so critical as
25 this one is -- as you implied, as there are all kinds of

1 civil liability attached -- that we would be able to have
2 courses certified as we -- I had an agency, a large
3 sheriff's department representative contact me prior to
4 this meeting and outline several years' worth of POST
5 certification for their eight-hour rifle course.

6 I would think that maybe one of the things we ought
7 to be looking at is a mechanism by way of identifying
8 more closely who is doing the training, how much is
9 required; and if they're giving a course that is less
10 than what is required, that there be almost like a
11 checklist or something that would be able to send up a
12 red flag and say, "What you're doing isn't appropriate,"
13 or --

14 MEMBER GARNER: Insufficient.

15 MEMBER DAVIS: Yes, "isn't sufficient." Yes, a
16 better term, thank you.

17 Isn't sufficient, doesn't meet the needs. Just so
18 you know, this may meet your department needs; but it
19 doesn't meet the needs of current legislation. You need
20 to be doing something different as sort of a heads-up.

21 Does that make sense?

22 MR. DECKER: It does make sense.

23 The original requirement, and the requirement that
24 is in regulation, specifies certain content that has to
25 be there.

1 MEMBER DAVIS: Right.

2 MR. DECKER: Our survey of the 236 courses --
3 so we have approximately 160 of those that do not meet
4 the minimum content, for one reason or another. We have
5 to go through and take a look at those and see what the
6 situation is. If it's an already-certified course,
7 that's one issue. If the course has never been certified
8 in the first place, there's never any documentation, it's
9 going to be kind of hard to deal with.

10 MEMBER DAVIS: And I understand that. And I guess
11 one of the things that I look at is if we're auditing a
12 department's training records, it means we're looking at
13 those things that are critical to the department's
14 operation. And this is obviously one of those.

15 Shouldn't that be part of the audit?

16 MR. DECKER: Well, the annual compliance review
17 deals with selection and deals with training.

18 The things that are flagged in relation to the
19 compliance report that comes out of the electronic data
20 interchange deals with basic training, continuing
21 professional training, perishable skills, things such
22 as supervisory management training, whether or not the
23 individuals obtain a basic certificate.

24 And as we said in the report, the rifle training
25 can be thought of such as mandates for domestic violence,

1 sudden-death syndrome, and so on, as they have been
2 promulgated by the Legislature and training developed.
3 It has evolved into the basic course. Those are
4 generally not tracked as part of the annual compliance
5 review.

6 In this case, well, we think some of the issue is
7 that people lost track of the fact that rifle training
8 is out there. They may have had their courses originally
9 certified. We found some that were certified and then
10 lapsed for lack of use.

11 MEMBER DAVIS: And that's the difficulty, because
12 from the regular basic academy side, we go through this
13 all the time. And so it's not an issue. We're not going
14 to lose it just because we change the people in charge.

15 But from a police chief's point of view, you have
16 people going through training divisions fairly
17 frequently. And as a former chief, I seem to remember,
18 when POST came to audit us, they were also looking at
19 our firearms records and our qualification records. At
20 least we trotted those out. Maybe that just happened to
21 be our particular person.

22 MR. DECKER: No, we're looking at perishable skills.
23 Perishable skills is not qualification. It is training
24 and hands-on use of firearms, and whether or not that
25 training has been conducted. That's part of perishable

1 skills, which is a Commission requirement; and that is
2 set in the annual compliance review. But as I say, this
3 is an area that is not normally tracked in that review.

4 MEMBER DAVIS: Well, that may be -- I understand
5 what you're saying, with something that is at this level
6 of importance, especially this new.

7 MR. DECKER: Now, what we are doing, with the area
8 consultants, when we go to the training officers or
9 training managers' meetings and to the chiefs' meetings
10 and so on, we advise about this, and we talk about, you
11 know, make sure they're aware of the legislative mandates
12 that are out there.

13 MEMBER BRUNET: Could I ask a clarifying question?

14 In regards to the RBC component, that one must
15 complete the RBC before one can complete the 16-hour
16 course, did I understand you to say that we're going to
17 continue that and the recommendation moving forward would
18 be that? Or --

19 MR. DECKER: No. The other agenda item that
20 accompanies this one, will clarify and put the rifle
21 long-barrel training requirement in an area of the
22 regulation where it more clearly fits and it's more
23 apparent.

24 And secondly, we will eliminate the prerequisite.
25 And the prerequisite was a recommendation, keeping in

1 mind that when a lot of this came out, rifles were still,
2 in some cases, considered to be a specialized weapon.
3 They were not considered for general deployment. That's
4 why the prerequisite was established.

5 MEMBER BRUNET: So along the discussion, I thought
6 it was bifurcated, the short-barrel and the long-barrel;
7 that the recommendation that I thought you had said is
8 that, moving forward, you would try to combine those
9 two elements together to be all one.

10 But did you say earlier, that the short-barrel would
11 be still required to have the RBC completed before you
12 can do the 16-hour course?

13 MR. DECKER: Well, I think there's two things.

14 One, the training requirement is all in one. You
15 take the course, and it satisfies either the long- or
16 short-barrel. But where the Commission action rests that
17 specifies long-barrel training, is not a good fit. What
18 we're doing is we're putting it in the regulation on
19 mandated training, where it will be readily apparent that
20 this is a Commission training requirement.

21 As far as long-barrel versus short-barrel, one of
22 the interesting aspects of this is, you look at the
23 five categories or issues of -- training issues that have
24 been identified in our meetings around the state, and the
25 short-barrel versus long-barrel is really only one of

1 those five issues. Some of the other issues are more
2 of a concern, either lack of awareness of the legislative
3 mandate, lack of awareness that the training has to be
4 POST-certified, or that people have gone ahead and just
5 done the training and not bothered to document it or
6 request certification.

7 MEMBER BRUNET: So I guess I'll ask maybe a more
8 specific question.

9 So in regards to how the Highway Patrol trains, it's
10 included -- the rifle training, the short-barrel, the
11 shotgun and rifle are included as part of the RBC -- at
12 least they have always been.

13 In our discussion earlier, I was not clear on the
14 fact that it was a requirement, at least by POST
15 standards, not by the Penal Code, but by POST Commission,
16 I believe, that you couldn't complete the 16-hour rifle
17 course until you completed the RBC. And that --

18 MR. DECKER: That is correct. That's the way the
19 regulation stands now.

20 MEMBER BRUNET: Is that the way it will continue,
21 or is that an item for consideration?

22 MR. DECKER: No, no.

23 The request of the Commission in the accompanying
24 agenda item will be to eliminate that prerequisite all
25 together.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BRUNET: Okay, all right. That's what I
2 thought it was, but I had misunderstood amongst the
3 dialogue. So thank you.

4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Somewhat of a
5 complicated issue that deals with existing law and
6 existing regulation, and the fact that it's been in place
7 for about 20 years.

8 The good news is that we will continue to work on
9 this issue, we'll continue to collaborate with you on
10 resolving the practical application at the line level of
11 getting this training completed. And we will stay on
12 this until we resolve it; that it makes it a little
13 clearer, a little easier to follow and a little easier
14 to comply.

15 Frank, Stephanie, thank you so much for the report.

16 MS. BULLARD: Is there a request for any other items
17 that are on the regular agenda at this time?

18 *(No response)*

19 MS. BULLARD: If not, this concludes the review of
20 the agenda for tomorrow.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right. Thank you,
22 again all the staff that presented.

23 I need a motion from the Committee to --

24 MEMBER BLANCO: I'll make a motion -- now.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: -- to support the items on

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 this regular agenda.

2 MEMBER BLANCO: Marcelo Blanco, by the way.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: So moved.

4 Is there a second?

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Second by Mario Casas,
6 CCLEA.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All in favor?

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

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

10 *(No response)*

11 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, motion carries.

12 At this time, let's take a five-minute break, so we
13 can get some electronic equipment reconnected for our
14 presentation when we return.

15 Thank you.

16 *(Recess taken from 2:17 p.m. to 2:31 p.m.)*

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, we'll start with
18 a presentation from Jan.

19 MS. BULLARD: But I'm very pleased to let you see
20 the next "Did You Know?" It's on complacency. And as
21 you know, complacency is one of the five major tenets in
22 the Below 100 National Officer Safety Campaign. So when
23 this actually goes live -- we haven't put it up on our
24 Web site yet -- when it goes live, the viewers will then
25 be able to click, and it will take them right to the

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 Below 100 campaign Web site, so that they'll have access
2 to a lot of officer safety information.

3 So I give my thanks, once again, to our remarkable
4 video production company, which is digital OutPost; and
5 to Larry Ellsworth, who is the manager of our training
6 video project.

7 And I hope that you enjoy "Complacency."

8 *(A video presentation was played.)*

9 *[Scene 1: Police officers in SUV*
10 *observing a young man on a bicycle.]*

11 *OFFICER 1 (speaking to partner): Hey,*
12 *check it out. There's little Eddie Liu.*

13 *Hey, check and see if he still got that*
14 *petty theft warrant for his arrest.*

15 *[Police SUV drives up and parks in front*
16 *of convenience store. Officer 1 exits*
17 *vehicle and speaks with Eddie.]*

18 *OFFICER 2: Eddie, my man. Why don't*
19 *you come talk to me for a moment?*

20 *Step into my office.*

21 *EDDIE: I didn't do anything.*

22 *SECOND OFFICER: It's good.*

23 *FIRST OFFICER: All right.*

24 *[As Officer 1 reaches for handcuffs, he*
25 *takes eyes off of Eddie; and Eddie pulls out*

1 a gun from his pocket and draws on Officer 1.
2 Officer 1 realizes Eddie is pointing gun at
3 him, drops handcuffs, and starts to reach for
4 his own weapon.]

5 SCREENSHOT: Complacency.

6 Non-recognition of danger.

7 [Scene 2: Police vehicle with sirens
8 sounding, approaches a location on the side
9 of the road of a recent vehicle-versus-
10 motorcycle accident, with a car pulled over
11 to the side, and a motorcycle laying on the
12 side of the road.]

13 The distressed driver waves at the
14 police vehicle. An injured motorcyclist is
15 laying on the ground near a mailbox in
16 a rural neighborhood. There are two
17 civilian witnesses watching. The officer
18 gets out of the car.]

19 DRIVER: I don't know what happened
20 here. I just saw the --

21 OFFICER: Okay, do me a favor: Just
22 stay right there. Just stay right there,
23 okay?

24 [Motorcyclist loudly moaning in pain
25 with large bleeding wound to his thigh]

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 OFFICER: Sir, I'm here to help you.
2 Please stay still for me.
3 [Officer pulls out the first-aid kit,
4 and pulls out box of protective medical
5 gloves. The box of medical gloves is empty.]
6 SCREEN SHOT: Complacency.
7 Failure to prepare.
8 [Scene 3: Man and woman are arguing
9 loudly in front of a Thrift store as a
10 deputy sheriff vehicle pulls up.)
11 WOMAN: Screw you.
12 MAN: How about that, huh?
13 [Man strikes the woman, and then man
14 takes off running from deputy sheriff]
15 WOMAN (to Officer): You saw what he
16 did. You saw what he did.
17 [Officer starts running after the man as
18 he speaks into his radio]
19 DEPUTY SHERIFF: 331, full pursuit.
20 He went down the parking lot.
21 [In slow motion: Deputy sheriff
22 running, then starts grabbing his left arm
23 and chest, suffering a heart attack; falls
24 against side of building. He is sweating
25 profusely and slowly falling to the ground

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 *while leaning against a building and passes*
2 *out.]*

3 *SCREEN SHOT: Complacency.*

4 *Denial.*

5 *Complacency kills.*

6 *For more information, go to*

7 *Below 100.org.*

8 *California POST 2015.*

9 *(End of video presentation)*

10 *(Applause)*

11 MS. BULLARD: So we will put this up on our
12 Web site, probably next week, and have it go live.

13 Thank you.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: It looks like another
15 potential award winner.

16 Thank you, Jan.

17 All right, now, it's time for our Advisory members'
18 reports.

19 Let's start counter-clockwise here.

20 Elmo Banning?

21 MEMBER BANNING: I have nothing. I'm good. Thank
22 you.

23 Sorry. No reports. Elmo Banning. Thank you.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Alex?

25 MEMBER BERNARD: No report.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BLANCO: No report.

2 MEMBER BOCK: No report.

3 MEMBER BONNER: I've got a report.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, nice.

5 MEMBER BANNING: You'll want to hear an Ed Bonner
6 story.

7 MEMBER BONNER: Just for you, Elmo.

8 Thank you.

9 Just a couple of things from State Sheriffs that I
10 think will have some impact on POST down the road.

11 The Governor signed AB 71, which is the collection
12 of data regarding serious bodily injury; and at the same
13 time, the federal government is looking at collecting
14 similar data. So there are conversations ongoing right
15 now.

16 The FBI was looking at modifying the Uniform Crime
17 Reporting program, so it also ties into LEOKA, the
18 officers killed in the line of duty.

19 But AB 71's definition of "serious bodily injury"
20 is a bodily injury that involves substantial risk of
21 death, unconsciousness, protracted and obvious
22 disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of the
23 function of a bodily member or organ.

24 The concern that many of us have that we've talked
25 to the FBI about through their advisory policy program,

1 is in addition to the risk of death and unconsciousness,
2 they added "extreme physical pain." By whose measure, is
3 our pushback and our question. We don't know.

4 And then we had the "impairment of the function of a
5 bodily member or organ or mental faculty." So that the
6 FBI will now -- the proposal before them is to define
7 the loss or impairment of a mental faculty as qualifying
8 for the use of force if it results, again, from physical
9 contact, officer-versus-officer, vehicle contact,
10 canine-officer contact, chemical spray, electronic-
11 controlled device, or the shooting.

12 Right now, the Uniform Crime Reporting and the FBI
13 CJIS is working with the IACP, Major Chiefs, National
14 Sheriffs' Association, Major Sheriffs, the Association
15 of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, and the Police
16 Executive Research Forum, working with, again, CJIS --
17 FBI CJIS Advisory Policy Board, the FBI, and DOJ.

18 So it's going to be interesting to see how we
19 collect that stuff as it aligns with what the State of
20 California is requiring.

21 The second thing, the Sheriffs are having issues
22 with, and probably cities also, Immigration and Customs
23 Enforcement, ICE, regarding detainers. Right now, what
24 their ask is, is that once the person is done, that the
25 state -- the counties hold them on a detainer with no

1 charges, no affidavit, no nothing.

2 We're saying, "No. Thank you so much," because it's
3 a violation of a Constitutional right.

4 The director, Sarah Saldaña, came and met with the
5 Sheriffs a couple weeks ago, and didn't really
6 satisfactorily answer anybody's questions.

7 And then last week, Senate Bill 2146 had died in --
8 it was the Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans
9 Act. And what it would have, in effect, done is withhold
10 federal funds from California, if we followed the Trust
11 Act and, again, Secure Cities. So that's -- it's dead
12 right now; but we still have severe problems with that.

13 And then the last thing, which I think is
14 interesting is AB 953, the Racial Profiling bill mandates
15 reporting of occurrences of racial profiling during
16 stops.

17 It's an interesting bill, and it has been signed
18 into law -- and, again, I think that somewhere down, that
19 POST will be involved in it because it's going to require
20 some level of training. It requires the time and date
21 and location of the stop; the reason for the stop; the
22 result of the stop, such as no action, warning, citation,
23 property seizure, or arrest. It also -- if a warning was
24 given, what was the warning? What did you tell them? If
25 the arrest was made, the charge.

1 And I think one that, again, we're having problems
2 with is the perceived race, ethnicity, gender, and
3 approximate age of the person stopped. Provided that
4 the identification of those characteristics shall be
5 based on the observation and perception of the peace
6 officer making the stop. The information shall not --
7 shall not be requested from the person stopped.

8 So they're asking us to give them data and take a
9 good guess.

10 So delayed implementation of it, January 1st, 2017.
11 It requires the Attorney General shall issue regulations
12 for the collection and the reporting of the data. Peace
13 officers -- more than a thousand peace officers that we'd
14 require on April Fool's Day, 2019, it's the law; and
15 several years after that, depending on the size of the
16 agencies.

17 And I'm happy to report that members -- that
18 included members include the California Highway Patrol,
19 city and county law-enforcement agencies, and California
20 State or University educational institutions. It
21 excludes probation and correctional officers.

22 So there are three things, I think, on the horizon
23 that will have an impact on POST, and certainly impacting
24 the way we're going to be doing business.

25 So that's my report.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Sheriff, I have a
2 question.

3 Are you aware what the AG's --

4 MEMBER BONNER: What was the question again?

5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Sheriff, over here.

6 MEMBER BONNER: Where?

7 Oh, I thought it was -- Elmo was looking back at me.
8 So, sorry.

9 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: I was a ventriloquist...

10 I had a question regarding the AG's efforts. Will
11 Cal Sheriffs, Cal Chiefs, and other organizations be at
12 the table as they define the data-collection procedures
13 for AB 953?

14 MEMBER BONNER: There's a meeting set up, I think
15 with the Attorney General's office for Friday, the 13th
16 of November. They're trying to pull that together right
17 now.

18 FBI CJIS did a conference call two weeks ago.
19 They're going down another stream, working with the
20 agencies identified.

21 So I think that the unfortunate reality is that the
22 data is kind of set: This is what we're going to have
23 to get. But how do we get it, where is it housed, is it
24 part of the Uniform Crime Reporting for the Feds, or are
25 they actually looking at stand-alone, using the LEO

1 portals?

2 So I don't know. And I'm not sure that the DOJ
3 really had a good idea when it was enacted. That was
4 just: "We're going to do this. Let's go, team."

5 So I don't know.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: So 953 poses its own
7 challenges. But just in a bigger picture, in terms of
8 data collection, you know, it's pretty clear to me that
9 more and more communities and organizations are looking
10 to extract law-enforcement data on a variety of topics.

11 So I believe the challenge that still remains is
12 going to be who collects the data; and how is it
13 collected; but more importantly, who interprets the data?

14 And I really think that we need, as a law-
15 enforcement community, to stay focused on who is going to
16 be interpreting the data and providing input at the table
17 on how that's going to be done, if that makes any sense.

18 MEMBER BONNER: Well, in the bill, there was an
19 advisory report put together of all stakeholders. I
20 didn't see the law enforcement, probably management.

21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you.

22 MEMBER BLANCO: Possibly, Sheriff, the smaller
23 agencies are going to have -- it's going to begin with
24 the larger agencies, and then it gets extended for quite
25 a period of years for smaller agencies.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BONNER: Yes, it's down to -- fewer than
2 344 peace officers will not have to begin reporting until
3 April 1st, 2023.

4 MEMBER BLANCO: Yes.

5 MEMBER BONNER: So by then, we'll figure out what it
6 is we'll be reporting, and how to do it --

7 MEMBER BLANCO: Correct.

8 MEMBER BONNER: -- and who pays for it.

9 MEMBER BLANCO: And the fact that we're being told
10 to racially profile, in a sense.

11 MEMBER BONNER: Yes.

12 I think one of the other challenges, though, from
13 our training, how we're going to train our staffs to do
14 this, but also my big concern -- my personal editorial
15 opinion, is just the fear of depolicing, where we stop
16 making those contacts, that we stop doing our job.
17 Because, you know, why?

18 So, I know. Troublesome.

19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: And my comments are
20 directed above AB 953. That has its issues in itself.
21 But as more and more, we're expected to provide data on
22 other incidents, other issues -- use of force, et cetera,
23 et cetera, et cetera -- yet the question is still going
24 to beg, who is going to interpret the data? Is it going
25 to be interpreted objectively?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you, Ed.

2 MEMBER BONNER: Thank you.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Mark?

4 MEMBER BRUNET: Nothing to report.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Jim?

6 MEMBER DAVIS: Nothing to report.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Greg?

8 MEMBER GARNER: Nothing. Thank you.

9 MEMBER McFADON: Yes, a couple minutes.

10 Alan McFadon with the POST Dispatch Advisory
11 Council.

12 We just met in August; and I was asked to make you
13 aware that we are updating the Dispatch -- one moment.

14 MS. BULLARD: AICC?

15 MEMBER McFADON: No, the strategic plan. And
16 there's a separate strategic plan being built at the
17 Dispatcher Advisory Committee level, but it's in line
18 with the main POST Strategic Plan. That was the
19 important part.

20 And one of the items is dispatcher career
21 resiliency; and this DVD just got circulated. I hate
22 to give Larry Ellsworth kudos twice in one meeting, but
23 himself and Rosanna McKinney did a great job.

24 If you haven't seen this, it's called "Dispatchers
25 Career Resiliency." And it's got two formats. One is

1 a self-paced, two-hour course in there; and the other one
2 is a facilitated course that you could do in a classroom.

3 But I suggest you just look at the introduction.
4 If you've never understood how hard it is to get a
5 dispatcher to work 20 or 30 years and retire off the
6 floor, that's an eye-opener. It really is.

7 Well done. Thank you.

8 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: So Larry didn't really pay us on
9 this side of the table; but I do want to make a comment
10 about the body-worn camera project that I participated
11 in, the video. And you really don't know what goes into
12 this video until you participate in drafting a video.

13 And kudos to Raegan Matthews, the production
14 manager; and also Larry Ellsworth, the senior consultant,
15 who really put POST's best foot forward.

16 I haven't seen the final version, but I saw the
17 almost-final version; and not only was it an outstanding
18 job, it was very professionally done, and a lot of work
19 went into that.

20 So thank you for POST, for putting that together and
21 getting out in front of the issues that are really
22 important on body cameras.

23 So, good job.

24 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Chief.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 Brad?

2 MEMBER YOUNG: No report.

3 MEMBER WALTZ: Randy Waltz. No report.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Mario Casas.

5 I have no report; but I just want to tell you how
6 I'm really restraining myself from taking a photograph
7 right now of Mark, with a cup in front of him that says
8 "Smashing is better."

9 In my younger years, I would text it out to
10 everybody, but...

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: No report.

12 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: I have one more issue
13 that I wanted to make you aware of -- we will address it
14 tomorrow in the Leg. Committee -- is the Right to Die
15 legislation, that it was passed. That does have
16 significant training implications for law enforcement,
17 that's spread into the criminal investigation realm.
18 So it actually spills into basic course content, it
19 spills into homicide investigations, it spills into our
20 coroner's course, and into our Institute for Criminal
21 Investigation.

22 So we are looking at that; and we'll be bringing
23 together a group of subject-matter experts to identify
24 the issues, and the training issues, and then develop
25 curriculum accordingly.

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 The question I pose is, can a terminally ill death-
2 row inmate take their own life; and if they do,
3 can they do it in a humane matter? That's just a side
4 comment.

5 Anyway, just an FYI on that pending legislation.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you, Bob.

7 I have two items related to the California Community
8 Colleges.

9 At the last Academy Consortium meeting, we had --
10 we were supposed to have Pam Walker, who is a vice
11 chancellor for the State Chancellor's office, address
12 Title 5 and its impact on running academies.

13 Unfortunately, Pam wasn't able to be there; and the
14 replacement was a little underwhelming in terms of
15 providing information. So I have asked POST staff if
16 we could get Pam to join us at the January Academy
17 Consortium meeting, so that we can get some necessary
18 information on especially the impact that academies have
19 that are run through colleges, which are the majority of
20 them.

21 The other item is that my instructional Vice
22 Chancellor has advised us that, statewide, they are
23 making some changes in how attendance is recorded for
24 some of our in-service classes, including academies.

25 Traditionally, any in-service or academy class

1 attendance has been gathered daily throughout the
2 entire academy, and the college is reimbursed for state
3 apportionment based on the total number of hours of
4 attendance, versus a standard semester college course,
5 where after about the first two weeks of the class, if
6 you're enrolled in the class, you are considered to have
7 attended the entire semester.

8 And I was told that any in-service or academy class
9 that lasts five days or longer, the attendance process
10 will be changed over to that census-type of attendance,
11 so that after about the first couple weeks of the academy
12 starting, anyone that's currently enrolled on that date
13 will be considered to have attended the whole academy,
14 unless they actually have a formal withdrawal or drop
15 from the course. That, at least from my perspective,
16 will cut a lot of paperwork out for us having to turn
17 in those voluminous pages of individual attendance
18 recorded for each person, each day.

19 I don't know the exact date of implementation, but
20 I'm under the impression it's going to happen soon.

21 Any comments to that, those of you with college
22 academies?

23 Jim, you look like you're --

24 MEMBER DAVIS: I am. That's remarkable, in terms of
25 the ability of us, of the academies to track attendance

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 at specific classes, especially those that are required
2 by legislation. So I'm not sure how that's going to
3 change life, because we're still going to have to keep
4 those records. It will just mean that the State doesn't
5 care about it.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Well, I think for
7 apportionment purposes, that's not going to be required.
8 But, obviously, you're correct, for POST requirements,
9 to make sure that they've attended scenarios and meet
10 those mandated hours of training.

11 MEMBER DAVIS: Right, and they've attended more
12 than -- they haven't missed more than 5 percent,
13 et cetera, yes.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: I hate to say --

15 MEMBER DAVIS: So, our work is going to remain the
16 same. It's just...

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Actually, it might
18 increase, because we might now have two sets of
19 attendance records.

20 MEMBER DAVIS: Exactly, yes.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: I'll tell them to disregard
22 that. We'll just stick with what we're doing now.

23 MEMBER YOUNG: Hey, George?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Yes?

25 MEMBER YOUNG: It's my understanding from our

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 district that the Triple O Speed fund is doing the same
2 as you're describing, and it will make it much easier for
3 all the academies or all the college academies statewide.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: I think we're probably
5 going to find out as we go along exactly what that means
6 to us in terms of implementation.

7 Are there any comments from the commissioners that
8 are present? If so, please step up to the microphone and
9 let us hear you.

10 *(No response)*

11 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Okay, no volunteers.

12 Thank you.

13 Old and New Business.

14 Jan?

15 MS. BULLARD: Just a reminder that at the next
16 meeting, in February, the Committee comes in a day early;
17 so this is going to be February 23rd, for the purposes of
18 doing a review with the nominees for the Training in
19 Excellence and "Bud" Hawkins awards.

20 And also that at the end of this meeting, it is now
21 time for you to elect a new chair and vice chair.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, so it's time
23 for us to, as a committee, to elect a new chair and
24 vice chair for next year.

25 Do I have any nominations for chair?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BANNING: Elmo Banning. I'd like to nominate
2 Mario Casas.

3 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Second.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Is there a second on that?
5 Sandra?

6 MEMBER McFADON: Do you want it?

7 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: No.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: That's the next question.
9 That's the next question.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: I'm a team member.
11 Part of the team.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Are there any other
13 nominations for chair?

14 *(No response)*

15 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Hearing none, can I have a
16 vote?

17 All in favor?

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

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

20 *(No response)*

21 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Congratulations, Mario.
22 Or condolences.

23 *(Applause)*

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: And for our vice chair, do
25 we have any nominations?

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 MEMBER BOCK: Jim Bock. I'd like to nominate Sandra
2 Spagnoli.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, is there a
4 second?

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Second.

6 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Can I confer with Mario first?

7 MEMBER BANNING: No.

8 All in favor?

9 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Mario, you don't get a
10 choice, who your vice is, but...

11 Any other nominations for vice chair?

12 *(No response)*

13 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, hearing none,
14 can I have a vote?

15 All those in favor, say "aye."

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

17 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

18 *(No response)*

19 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Congratulations.

20 *(Applause)*

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: By the way, I plan to
22 be away for the first part of the year.

23 MEMBER SPAGNOLI: How did this just happen?

24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Okay, Jan?

25 MS. BULLARD: Okay, the next meeting, tomorrow

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 Leg. is going to be held in what's called the "Shutters
2 East 2." And that's actually in the real building, not
3 the bounce house. And it's right across. And if you
4 walk in that door that said "Gallery" that you came out,
5 and just turn to your right, it's all the way down at
6 the end, on the right, if you want to be there.

7 The Commission meeting will be held in this room at
8 ten o'clock.

9 The next Advisory Committee meeting is going to be
10 February 24th at one o'clock. We're going to hold it at
11 the Museum of Tolerance. And what we are doing is,
12 arranging for a private tour for our commissioners and
13 our Advisory Committee members to be held after the
14 Advisory Committee meeting.

15 And for those of you who have never experienced the
16 Museum of Tolerance, I would really encourage you to
17 come because it is one of those experiences that can
18 change how you view everything. It's just really
19 impactful, and it will give you an insight into what our
20 officers are going through that are participating in that
21 program in their academy.

22 Oh, that will be on the 23rd. The 23rd is when
23 you'll make that determination. And before that, we will
24 send you the packet, and that will have the nomination
25 material in it. And you'll get a letter ahead of time

POST Advisory Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

1 also reminding you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, thank you, Jan.

3 Finally, I'd like to note that this is the first
4 time that I recall that every Advisory Committee member
5 has been present for a meeting. I'm sure it must be
6 San Diego that got you down here. So, thank you.

7 All right, meeting adjourned.

8 *(Gavel was sounded.)*

9 *(The Advisory Committee meeting concluded*
10 *at 2:57 p.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 November 12, 2015.

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