



-----Original Message-----

From: Wayne Quint [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 5:38 PM
To: Alvarez, Manny@POST <Manny.Alvarez@post.ca.gov>
Cc: Bunch, Kirk@POST <Kirk.Bunch@post.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Emailing: Quint to POST_Public Comment_Study May 10 2022

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of POST. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender. Report SPAM to the Helpdesk. <<mailto:%20helpdesk@post.ca.gov>>

Mr. Alvarez,

Please advise receipt of the attached letter that was sent via email to you on May 10, 2022.

Respectfully,

Wayne J. Quint, Jr., Executive Director
Professional Peace Officers Association (PPOA)
188 East Arrow Highway
San Dimas, CA 91773
[REDACTED]



188 E. ARROW HIGHWAY

SAN DIMAS, CA 91773

[323] 261.3010

INFO@PPOA.COM

WWW.PPOA.COM

May 11, 2022

Manuel Alvarez, Executive Director
Commission on POST
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, California 95605

Re: Request for Public Comment/1983 Study

Dear Mr. Alvarez:

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association (PPOA), I hereby request that the agenda for the May 25-26 POST meeting add for public comment 11 CCR § 1005(a) and its relation to the 1983 Study mentioned in POST's Addendum-ISR.

The reason for this request is that despite the opportunity given the public to comment on the amended ISR, the 1983 Study it references on pages 3-4 was neither placed on POST's website nor mailed or emailed to interested parties pursuant to Gov. Code § 11347.1. While that statute requires a 15-day opportunity to comment on "any technical, theoretical, or empirical study . . . or similar document" that POST adds to the "rulemaking file," reference in the amended ISR to this Study suggests it will, or at least should, be added. Otherwise, why mention it in the ISR? Omitting mention of it in the Final Statement of Reasons accompanying a re-submission of the regulation by POST to the Office of Administrative Law for approval is not a fair solution unless POST also includes a statement that it is no longer relying on any such Study for support of its re-submission.

This request takes on added importance given the difficulty in finding the correct referenced Study. It does not appear to be on POST's website, or if it is, finding it is like searching for the proverbial needle in a haystack. Efforts by several organizations to locate it have produced different documents, none of which support the Addendum-ISR's statement that "permitting appointing authorities at District Attorney's Offices discretion to appoint graduates from either RBC or SIBC basic training promotes consistency with all other POST investigative positions across California." Perhaps none of us have found the precise Study the ISR references. All the documents we have found in our individual efforts expressly run counter to that conclusion or inference from what they say about the possible equivalency between the RBC and SIBC certificates for becoming a DAI.

Thank you in advance for your prompt reply to this request and for including our request in your supplemental administrative record to OAL.

Cordially,

Wayne J. Quint, Jr.
Executive Director

"PROFESSIONALS REPRESENTING PROFESSIONALS"

WJQ:mv

