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

I N D E X

Proceedings **Page**

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 *continued*

- 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

Proceedings **Page**

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

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,

representing California Coalition of Law Enforcement Associations.

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

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

MR. FELDHAUS: Dan Feldhaus, the hearing reporter.

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

MEMBER McFADON: Alan McFadon with Dispatchers.

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

MEMBER DAVIS: James Davis, Academy Directors.

MEMBER BRUNET: Mark Brunet, Highway Patrol.

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

MEMBER BOCK: Jim Bock, Specialized Law Enforcement.

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

MEMBER BERNARD: Alex Bernard, public member.

MEMBER BANNING: Elmo Banning, public member.

MS. BOUVIA: Marie Bouvia, POST.

MS. PAOLI: Connie Paoli, POST staff.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

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

Bob?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, George.

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

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

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

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

Dave, would you please stand?

Dave has brought just an incredible wealth of

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

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

MR. CORNEJO: Thank you, Bob.

Good afternoon, Advisory Committee Members.

Can you hear me okay?

CHORUS: No.

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

Good afternoon, everybody.

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

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

Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Dave.

Mr. Chair?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

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

COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Commissioner Sandra Hutchens.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Commissioner Jethroe Moore.

COMMISSIONER DELAROSA: Commissioner Richard DelaRosa.

COMMISSIONER DUDLEY: Commissioner Joyce Dudley.

COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Commissioner Pete Kurylowicz.

COMMISSIONER RAMIREZ: Commissioner Batine Ramirez.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Good turn-out.

Thank you.

Let’s have roll call of the members.

MS. BOUVIA: Banning?

MEMBER BANNING: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Beitey?

MEMBER BEITEY: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Bernard?

MEMBER BERNARD: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Blanco?

MEMBER BLANCO: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Bock?

MEMBER BOCK: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Bonner?

MEMBER BONNER: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Brunet?

MEMBER BRUNET: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Casas?

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Davis?

MEMBER DAVIS: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Garner?

MEMBER GARNER: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: McFadon?

MEMBER McFADON: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Spagnoli?

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Waltz?

MEMBER WALTZ: Here.

MS. BOUVIA: Young?

MEMBER YOUNG: Here.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

Announcements and Correspondence.

Jan?

MS. BULLARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. You'll find correspondence located under

Tab L.

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

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

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

MEMBER BERNARD: So moved. Bernard.

MEMBER BOCK: Second. Bock.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any discussion?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All in favor?

(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: The motion carries.

All right, Review of the Commission Meeting Agenda.

Jan?

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

We are going to be starting with the consent calendar.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Are there any questions regarding the LEOKA program?

(No response)

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

MR. ZIGLAR: Good morning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

successful as they could be.

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

That's where we are at this point.

Does anybody have any questions?

Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

And having the access, like I said, with the

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

I hope that answered your question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Interesting.

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

MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ten, 15 minutes, maybe?

MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

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

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

MEMBER BANNING: Right.

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

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

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

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

MEMBER BANNING: Okay. Good.

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

MEMBER BANNING: Yes, great. Thank you.

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

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

It's a very interesting project.

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

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

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

MR. ZIGLAR: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: -- interviewing people,

right through the night.

MEMBER BANNING: Outstanding.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Did a great job.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Good. I'm very anxious to see that.

Thank you.

MR. ZIGLAR: You're welcome.

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

MEMBER BANNING: Yes, that's excellent.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Bob.

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

(No response)

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

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

MR. LOGGINS: Thank you, Jan.

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

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

That particular content is unique in that it's not driven by POST itself internally through subject-matter experts, nor is it driven by legislative mandates. Instead, the content of the curriculum is driven by our sister board, which is the California Emergency Standards

Authority, or as we call it, EMSA.

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

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

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

this new level of training.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Scott, what kind of

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

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

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

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

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

MR. LOGGINS: It will be mandatory on all officers

to know.

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

attested to by a 1070 class instructor.

MEMBER BLANCO: Okay.

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

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

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

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

MR. LOGGINS: Correct.

MS. BULLARD: Thank you, Scott.

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

MR. LOGGINS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Are there any questions regarding the procedural Justice Web page?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBER BLANCO: At the end, my bad.

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

MEMBER BLANCO: Okay, thank you.

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

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

And Jan, as she appropriately answered, is that we

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

MEMBER BLANCO: Got it. Thank you.

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

MS. SINGER: Good afternoon.

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

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

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

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

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

I'm happy to answer any questions.

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

Any questions?

(No response)

MS. BULLARD: Thank you, Kate.

MS. SINGER: Thanks.

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

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

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

Thank you, Kate.

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

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

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

Can you hear me now?

MS. BULLARD: It's Verizon.

MS. SCOFIELD: Good afternoon.

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

courses in the training and the use of these weapons.

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

It was signed by the Governor and became effective immediately.

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

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

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

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

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

This Commission action resulted in a bifurcated training requirement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

violence, and racial profiling.

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

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

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

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

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

in the Regular Basic Course.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recurring themes of the comments are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

And we'll be happy to answer any questions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But our recommendation is, at this time, that the

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

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

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

MEMBER DAVIS: *(Shaking head.)*

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: No?

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Sandra?

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

that amount of training over a short period of time. We don't want to take the equipment away because it's important equipment, they've been trained. But from a liability aspect, that if something happens and we are exposed as an agency for not having POST certification, deploying this equipment, meeting the standards, and then having to argue that we met the standard but couldn't get the certification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: So you would consider expanding

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBER GARNER: Insufficient.

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

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

Does that make sense?

MR. DECKER: It does make sense.

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

MEMBER DAVIS: Right.

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

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

Shouldn't that be part of the audit?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MEMBER BRUNET: Could I ask a clarifying question?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DECKER: No, no.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

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

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

I need a motion from the Committee to --

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: -- to support the items on

this regular agenda.

MEMBER BLANCO: Marcelo Blanco, by the way.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: So moved.

Is there a second?

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All in favor?

(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, motion carries.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

And I hope that you enjoy "Complacency."

(A video presentation was played.)

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

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

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

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

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

Step into my office.

EDDIE: I didn't do anything.

SECOND OFFICER: It's good.

FIRST OFFICER: All right.

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

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

SCREENSHOT: Complacency.

Non-recognition of danger.

[Scene 2: Police vehicle with sirens sounding, approaches a location on the side of the road of a recent vehicle-versus-motorcyle accident, with a car pulled over to the side, and a motorcycle laying on the side of the road.

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

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

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

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

OFFICER: Sir, I'm here to help you.

Please stay still for me.

[Officer pulls out the first-aid kit, and pulls out box of protective medical gloves. The box of medical gloves is empty.]

SCREEN SHOT: Complacency.

Failure to prepare.

[Scene 3: Man and woman are arguing loudly in front of a Thrift store as a deputy sheriff vehicle pulls up.)

WOMAN: Screw you.

MAN: How about that, huh?

[Man strikes the woman, and then man takes off running from deputy sheriff]

WOMAN (to Officer): You saw what he did. You saw what he did.

[Officer starts running after the man as he speaks into his radio]

DEPUTY SHERIFF: 331, full pursuit.

He went down the parking lot.

[In slow motion: Deputy sheriff running, then starts grabbing his left arm and chest, suffering a heart attack; falls against side of building. He is sweating profusely and slowly falling to the ground

while leaning against a building and passes out.]

SCREEN SHOT: Complacency.

Denial.

Complacency kills.

For more information, go to Below 100.org.

California POST 2015.

(End of video presentation)

(Applause)

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

Thank you.

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

Thank you, Jan.

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

Let's start counter-clockwise here.

Elmo Banning?

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

Sorry. No reports. Elmo Banning. Thank you.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Alex?

MEMBER BERNARD: No report.

MEMBER BLANCO: No report.

MEMBER BOCK: No report.

MEMBER BONNER: I've got a report.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: All right, nice.

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

MEMBER BONNER: Just for you, Elmo.

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

charges, no affidavit, no nothing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So that's my report.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Sheriff, I have a question.

Are you aware what the AG's --

MEMBER BONNER: What was the question again?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Sheriff, over here.

MEMBER BONNER: Where?

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: I was a ventriloquist…

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

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

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

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

portals?

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

So I don't know.

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you.

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

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

MEMBER BLANCO: Yes.

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

MEMBER BLANCO: Correct.

MEMBER BONNER: -- and who pays for it.

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

MEMBER BONNER: Yes.

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

So, I know. Troublesome.

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you, Ed.

MEMBER BONNER: Thank you.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Mark?

MEMBER BRUNET: Nothing to report.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Jim?

MEMBER DAVIS: Nothing to report.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Greg?

MEMBER GARNER: Nothing. Thank you.

MEMBER McFADON: Yes, a couple minutes.

Alan McFadon with the POST Dispatch Advisory Council.

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

MS. BULLARD: AICC?

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

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

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

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

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

Well done. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

So, good job.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR STRESAK: Thank you, Chief.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you.

Brad?

MEMBER YOUNG: No report.

MEMBER WALTZ: Randy Waltz. No report.

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Mario Casas.

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

In my younger years, I would text it out to everybody, but…

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: No report.

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

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

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

Anyway, just an FYI on that pending legislation.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Thank you, Bob.

I have two items related to the California Community Colleges.

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

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

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

Traditionally, any in-service or academy class

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

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

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

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

Jim, you look like you're --

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: I hate to say --

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

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

MEMBER DAVIS: Exactly, yes.

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

MEMBER YOUNG: Hey, George?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Yes?

MEMBER YOUNG: It's my understanding from our

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

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

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

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Okay, no volunteers.

Thank you.

Old and New Business.

Jan?

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

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

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

Do I have any nominations for chair?

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

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Second.

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

MEMBER McFADON: Do you want it?

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: No.

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

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

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

(No response)

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

All in favor?

(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Congratulations, Mario. Or condolences.

(Applause)

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

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

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

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR CASAS: Second.

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: Can I confer with Mario first?

MEMBER BANNING: No.

All in favor?

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

Any other nominations for vice chair?

(No response)

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

All those in favor, say "aye."

(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Any opposed?

(No response)

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Congratulations.

(Applause)

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

MEMBER SPAGNOLI: How did this just happen?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BEITEY: Okay, Jan?

MS. BULLARD: Okay, the next meeting, tomorrow

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

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

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

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

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

also reminding you.

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

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

All right, meeting adjourned.

(Gavel was sounded.)

(The Advisory Committee meeting concluded 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 Diplomate Reporter
Certified Realtime Reporter