

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COMMISSION ON
PEACE OFFICERS STANDARDS AND TRAINING

POST COMMISSION MEETING



TIME: 10:00 a.m.

DATE: Thursday, June 28, 2012

PLACE: Courtyard by Marriott - Cal Expo
1782 Tribute Road
Sacramento, California



REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS



Reported by:

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

Daniel P. Feldhaus, C.S.R., Inc.
Certified Shorthand Reporters
8414 Yermo Way, Sacramento, California 95828
Telephone 916.682.9482 Fax 916.688.0723
FeldhausDepo@aol.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

LAI LAI BUI
(Commission Chair)
Sacramento Police Department

WALTER ALLEN III
Member
Covina City Council

ROBERT COOKE
California Narcotics Officers' Association

FLOYD HAYHURST
Deputy Sheriff
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

SANDRA HUTCHENS
Sheriff-Coroner
Orange County

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

RONALD E. LOWENBERG
Director
Golden West College Criminal Justice Training Center

JOHN MCGINNESS
Sheriff (Retired)
Sacramento County Sheriff's Department

MICHAEL SOBEK
Sergeant
San Leandro Police Department

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



A P P E A R A N C E S

POST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

SANDRA SPAGNOLI
(Committee Chair)
California Peace Officers' Association

ELMO BANNING
Public Member

GEORGE BEITEY
State Chancellor's Community College Office

ALEX BERNARD
Public Member

JAMES BOCK
California Specialized Law Enforcement

RICHARD LINDSTROM
California Academy Directors Association

ALAN McFADON
Public Safety Dispatcher Advisory Council

MITCHELL MUELLER
California Highway Patrol

TIM WILLMORE
California Association of Police Training Officers



POST STAFF PRESENT

PAUL CAPPITELLI
Executive Director
Executive Office

WILLIAM "TOBY" DARDEN
POST Commission Counsel
Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

*per sign-in sheet
continued*

ALAN DEAL
Assistant Executive Director
Executive Office
Field Services Bureau

RICHARD REED
Assistant Executive Director
Executive Office
Administrative Services Division

RICHARD BOND
Bureau Chief
Management Counseling Services

JAN BULLARD
Chief
Learning Technology Resource Center

MITCH COPPIN
Bureau Chief
Computer Services

RON CROOK
Multimedia Specialist
Learning Technology Resource Center

APRIL CRUME
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance

FRANK DECKER
Bureau Chief
Basic Training Bureau

JOHN DINEEN
Bureau Chief
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

CHARLES EVANS
Legislative Liaison
Executive Office

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

*per sign-in sheet
continued*

TAMARA EVANS
Senior Consultant
Training Program Services

BRYON GUSTAFSON
Acting Bureau Chief
Training Program Services

KEVIN HART
Senior Consultant
Center for Leadership Development

DON LANE
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance

COLIN O'KEEFE
Testing Projects DPM
Computer Services

CONNIE PAOLI
Administrative Assistant
Executive Office

STEPHANIE SCOFIELD
Bureau Chief
Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau

ROBERT C. SMITH
Senior Consultant
Management Counseling Services

KENNETH L. WHITMAN
Special Consultant
Training Program Services

VALNA WILSON
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST STAFF PRESENT

*per sign-in sheet
continued*

RONALD T. WOOD
Senior Consultant
Training Delivery and Compliance



APPEARING RE ITEM S (ITR)

MICHAEL L. RAINS
Rains, Lucia, Stern, PC
Attorney for
International Training Resources

PUBLIC MEMBERS

per sign-in sheet

ROLFE APPEL
Director, Criminal Justice Training Center
Yuba College

DON MOURA
Retired (POST)

LUANN PANNELL
Los Angeles Police Department

MARISA McCULLOUGH
San Diego Regional Training Center



I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
Call to Order	13
Color Guard and Flag Salute	13
Sacramento County Sheriff's Department	
Moment of Silence	13
Deputy Robert Paris County Sheriff's Department	
Roll Call of Commission Members	14
Introduction of POST Advisory Committee Chair, POST Legal Counsel, and the Executive Director	15
Welcoming Address	
Sheriff Scott Jones Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. .	15
Awards Presentations	18
2011 POST Excellence in Training Awards	19
<i>Individual Achievement:</i>	
Lt. Chris J. Perez	19
<i>Organization Achievement:</i>	
Commander Donald Buchanan for Alameda County Sheriff's Office, Urban Shield	21
<i>Lifetime Achievement:</i>	
Michael Gray	22

I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

Awards Presentations *continued*

2011 O.J. "Bud" Hawkins Exceptional
Service Award

Michael DiMiceli 23

Public Comment 26

Approval of Minutes

A. Thursday, February 23, 2012, Commission
Meeting 26

Consent:

B.1 Report on Course Certification/
Decertification 27

B.2 Report on POST Strategic Plan
Implementation 27

B.3 Report on the Status of the Pilot Study
of Driver Training in the Basic Course 27

B.4 Report on Prevailing Trends in
Standards and Training 27

B.5 Report on SPO C.10.08 Conduct a
Comprehensive Review of the
Supervisory Course and Curriculum 27

B.6 Report on SPO A.08.08 Expand
Entry-Level Cognitive Testing for
Peace Officers 27

B.7 Report on the Learning Domain 18
Investigative Report Writing Project 27

I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

Consent: *continued*

B.8	Report on SPO B.15.10 Regarding the Development of a Quality Assessment Process for POST-Certified Courses . . .	27
B.9	Report on Cal EPA Grant Funding for Environmental Crimes Training	27
B.10	Report on SAFE Driving Campaign	27
B.11	Report on POST Developed Training for Peace Officers on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	27
B.12	Report on the Model Respiratory Protection Program for Law Enforcement .	27
B.13	Report on SAFE Driving Symposium	27
B.14	Report on the Crowd Management Summit .	27
B.15	Report on Academic Summit to Bridge Law Enforcement-Community Stakeholders Understanding of Protests and Demonstration	27
B.16	Report on Courses Displaced by the Closure of the Department of Justice Advanced Training Center	27
B.17	Report on SPO B.16.12 Develop an Interactive, Multimedia Version of the POST Student Workbooks	27

Finance Committee

C.	Report from Finance Committee Meeting held June 27, 2012, McGinness	27
----	---	----

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
Basic Training Bureau	
D. Report on Proposed Changes to Training and Testing Specifications for Peace Officer Basic Courses	29
E. Report on Proposed Changes to the Aviation Security Course	30
F. Report on Proposed Changes to the Field Training Officer Course	30
Center for Leadership Development	
G. Report on Augmentation of FY 2011-12 Contract for the Sherman Block Supervisory Leadership Institute	31
Computer Services Bureau	
H. Report on SPO C.14.1: Request to Contract for Development and Implementation of a Computer Based Testing System to Replace TMAS	33
Learning Technology Resources Bureau	
I. Report on Request to Contract for Learning Portal Hosting, Support, and Maintenance Services	39
J. Report on Request to Contract for Maintenance Fellow in Support of the Video Training Program	40
K. Report on Request to Contract to Complete Learning Portal Courses	42

I N D E X

Proceedings

Page

Management Counseling Services Bureau

- L. Report on Request to Contract for Web Based Computer Services for Management Studies 44
- M. Report on Request to Contract with Management Consultants 45

Standards and Evaluation Services Bureau

- N. Report on Augmentation of FY 2011-12 Contract for the Entry-Level Dispatcher Selection Test Battery . . . 47

Training Program Services Bureau

- O. Report on Request to Accept VAWA Grant Funds and Contract for Presentation of VAWA Courses 48
- P. Report on Request to Contract for a Management Fellow in Support of Public Safety Dispatcher Program . . . 50
- Q. Report on Request to Contract with San Diego Regional Public Safety Training Institute to Present Institute of Criminal Investigation Training 52
- R. Report on Request to Increase Institute of Criminal Investigation (ICI) Training Course Presentation with Existing ICI Presenters 53

Commission Appeal Hearings

- S. Report on Appeal to Commission by International Training Resources (ITR) . 57

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
Committee Reports	
T. Advisory Committee, Spagnoli	55
U. Legislative Review Committee, Sobek . .	56
V. Correspondence	--
W. New Business	98
Report on Isleton Police Department . .	98
Election of Commission Officers . . .	99
X. Old Business (<i>None</i>)	100
Future Commission Meeting Dates	101
Closed Executive Session	100
Adjournment	101
Reporter's Certificate	102



POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

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

Thursday, June 28, 2012, 10:00 a.m.

Sacramento, California

--oOo--

CHAIR BUI: Let's call this meeting to order.

Welcome everybody to Sacramento.

This morning, the Color Guard will be presented or provided for us by the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department.

May I have everybody stand?

(The Color Guard entered the room.)

CHAIR BUI: Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIR BUI: Please remain standing for a moment of silence for officers who have been killed in the line of duty since our last meeting.

Deputy Robert Paris, Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department.

(Moment of silence.)

(The Color Guard exited the room.)

CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

Let's give a round of applause for the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department.

(Applause)

CHAIR BUI: Connie, can we please have a roll call

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 of Commission members?

2 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

3 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Present.

4 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

5 *(No response)*

6 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

7 CHAIR BUI: Here.

8 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

9 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Here.

10 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

11 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Here.

12 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

13 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Here.

14 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

15 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Here.

16 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

17 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Here.

18 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

19 *(No response)*

20 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

21 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Here.

22 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

23 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Here.

24 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

25 *(No response)*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

2 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Here.

3 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

4 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Here.

5 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

6 I'd like to introduce:

7 The POST Advisory Committee Chair, Chief Sandra
8 Spagnoli.

9 Our POST Legal Counsel, Toby Darden.

10 Our Executive Director, Paul Cappitelli.

11 And I'd like to welcome our new commissioners:

12 Sandra Hutchens, sheriff; Deputy Sheriff Peter
13 Kurylowicz; and Sheriff Paul Parker.

14 Welcome.

15 *(Applause)*

16 CHAIR BUI: This morning, Sheriff Scott Jones from
17 the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department will provide
18 opening remarks for us.

19 Sheriff?

20 SHERIFF JONES: Good morning. And thank you very
21 much for the opportunity to come here and present to you.

22 Welcome to Sacramento, our fair city -- even though
23 you're in the city. I want you to know that in case
24 you're the victims of any crime or any...

25 Those are Rick Braziel's problems.

1 But just down the street, if you want to go spend
2 your money at lunchtime, just not very far down the road
3 is the County of Sacramento.

4 But thank you.

5 I don't need to tell anyone sitting around this
6 table what historic challenges we face in law enforcement
7 in the nation, generally; but specifically in California,
8 driven by the economy. But we can't forget necessarily
9 that these tremendous challenges give rise to tremendous
10 opportunities as well. The opportunities are to do
11 things that we have never done before: To change the
12 paradigm of law enforcement, which largely, for
13 200 years, has been to provide a proactive patrol
14 presence, apprehend violators, investigate crimes, and
15 assist with prosecution, to really change fundamentally
16 the ideas of how we provide policing service.

17 We, out of practical or economic necessity, have had
18 to really change the way we do business. We've had to be
19 more engaged. We've had to gauge the public better.
20 Although we've talked about it, we've never been
21 particularly good about it. We've had to engage our
22 faith-based and community-based resources. We've had to
23 use technology better. We've had to appreciate and
24 embrace innovation and introspection in our own
25 organizations.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 So I try not to focus on the challenges without also
2 realizing the tremendous opportunities.

3 The opportunities also present challenges for POST.
4 POST is an organization that maintains the highest
5 standards of training for our law-enforcement profession.

6 I'd like to say thank you. You only need to go as
7 far as our borders to training beyond our state, our
8 national training, to fully appreciate the manner and the
9 quality of training that California law-enforcement
10 officers have.

11 I've had the opportunity to go to a National
12 Sheriffs' Association meeting back East earlier this
13 year. I went to some of their training. It was a very
14 surreal experience. But I was taken away, once again,
15 with a reminder about the quality that is the best in the
16 nation, of California law enforcement, and that is
17 directly attributable to POST.

18 It's easy to underappreciate that, as certainly is
19 evidenced by the Legislature every year, seeming to make
20 POST a tool for bargaining and in danger of losing
21 funding.

22 So just know that I and the other law-enforcement
23 leaders of this state stand behind you and your funding
24 as you stand behind us.

25 So I appreciate the opportunity, and I hope you have

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 a great couple of days, and enjoy your time here in
2 Sacramento.

3 I ordered some good weather for you. Hopefully,
4 that will stand.

5 So, thank you.

6 CHAIR BUI: Great. Thank you so much.

7 *(Applause)*

8 CHAIR BUI: Okay, at this time, we are going to have
9 our *Awards Presentations*.

10 *(Chair Bui proceeded to award ceremony area*
11 *across the room.)*

12 CHAIR BUI: Good morning. For those of you who
13 don't know me, I am Lai Lai Bui, Chair of the POST
14 Commission.

15 Each year, the Commission recognizes individuals and
16 an organization that have greatly contributed to the
17 success and effectiveness of the law-enforcement
18 community.

19 On behalf of the entire Commission, it is my
20 pleasure to honor this year's recipients who have
21 distinguished themselves by demonstrating a commitment to
22 exceptional service or excellence in training.

23 Assisting me today in the ceremony is Sandra
24 Spagnoli, chair of the Commission Advisory Committee, and
25 POST's Executive Director, Paul Cappitelli.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 At this time, I would like the award recipients to
2 come forward and be recognized.

3 *(Award recipients stepped forward.)*

4 CHAIR BUI: The *POST Excellence in Training Award*
5 was established in 1994 to encourage the innovation,
6 quality, and effectiveness of peace-officer training, and
7 to recognize the "best of the best."

8 There are three categories of the *POST Excellence in*
9 *Training Award*: Individual achievement, organizational
10 achievement, and lifetime achievement.

11 The Commission is proud to offer these annual awards
12 that affirm California's national reputation of being in
13 the forefront of law-enforcement training.

14 This year, there were 16 nominees for the three
15 award categories. The 15-member Commission Advisory
16 Committee reviewed all submissions, and after a rigorous
17 screening process, provided their recommendations to the
18 Commission for approval.

19 In addition to the trophies that will be given to
20 the recipients today, their names will be inscribed on a
21 perpetual plaque located at POST headquarters.

22 We begin with Individual Achievement.

23 The recipient of the *POST Excellence in Training*
24 *Individual Achievement Award* of 2011 is Lieutenant
25 Chris J. Perez, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

1 *(Applause)*

2 MS. BULLARD: Chris Perez was assigned as a sergeant
3 to the Pitchess Detention Center Range from July 2009 to
4 March 2011, when he was promoted to lieutenant.

5 While there, he became the catalyst for changing the
6 manner in which firearms training is taught and learned
7 by law-enforcement students. From his analysis of
8 officer-involved shootings, he identified the essential
9 skill-sets needed to be successful in deadly encounters,
10 and then put in place the training that would effectively
11 teach those skills.

12 Lieutenant Perez developed an instructor guide and
13 standardized drills that still stressed accuracy but
14 emphasized response under combat situations.

15 While in this assignment, Lieutenant Perez developed
16 the three-phase plan that:

17 Implemented a mandated instructor update training
18 and competency program.

19 Changed all firearms courses to closely enact the
20 actual skills and mindset to prepare for combat
21 situations.

22 And redesigned obsolete ranges to facilitate the new
23 training paradigm.

24 For these reasons, Lieutenant Chris Perez is the
25 winner of the *2011 POST Excellence in Training Award for*

1 *Individual Achievement.*

2 *(Applause)*

3 CHAIR BUI: The recipient of the *POST Excellence in*
4 *Training Organization Achievement Award* for 2011 is the
5 Alameda County Sheriff's Office, Urban Shield. Accepting
6 the award on behalf of the Alameda County Sheriff's
7 Department is Commander Donald Buchanan.

8 *(Applause)*

9 MS. BULLARD: The Alameda County Sheriff's Office
10 has been in the forefront of training excellence for
11 several years. An example of this valuable and effective
12 training is Urban Shield, created in 2006.

13 Urban Shield is a 48-hour continuous exercise that
14 is highly interactive, challenging, and task-driven. It
15 provides first-responders from all disciplines, public
16 and private, to train together in a real-life setting to
17 obtain the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to
18 perform key tasks required in large-scale disasters.

19 It is designed to identify and stretch regional
20 resources to their limits while expanding regional
21 collaboration and building positive relationships.

22 Urban Shield challenges the skills, knowledge, and
23 abilities of all who participate, and has received
24 national and international acclaim.

25 For these reasons, the Alameda County Sheriff's

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Office is the winner of the *2011 POST Excellence in*
2 *Training Award for Organizational Achievement.*

3 *(Applause)*

4 CHAIR BUI: The recipient of the *POST Excellence in*
5 *Training Lifetime Achievement Award* for 2011 is Executive
6 Director Michael Gray, San Diego Regional Training
7 Center.

8 *(Applause)*

9 MS. BULLARD: Michael Gray is the Executive Director
10 of San Diego Regional Training Center, and is responsible
11 for managing a number of the POST legacy training
12 programs such as the Instructor Development Institute,
13 IDI, and the Robert Presley Institute of Criminal
14 Investigations, ICI.

15 Mr. Gray began his law-enforcement career in 1984
16 with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. He
17 began his training career as a department field training
18 officer in 1989.

19 In 1993, while working LASD's Auto-Theft Task Force,
20 he became the instructor and administrator for the ICI
21 Vehicle Theft Investigations Course, training more than
22 300 investigators during this assignment.

23 After retiring from the Sheriff's Department, he
24 continued to pursue his passion of training
25 law-enforcement personnel.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 In 1997, Mr. Gray graduated from Class 6 of the POST
2 Master Instructor Development Program, and was later
3 selected to be a co-facilitator in this program from 2007
4 to 2011.

5 One of Mr. Gray's most significant accomplishments
6 was overseeing the initial design and development of the
7 annual POST Instructor Symposium, which has received
8 outstanding acclaim.

9 In recognition for his contributions, he was awarded
10 the ICI Excellence in Instruction Award in 2006, and the
11 Robert Presley ICI Founder's Award in 2009.

12 For these reasons, Michael Gray is the recipient of
13 the 2011 *POST Excellence in Training Award for Lifetime*
14 *Achievement*.

15 *(Applause)*

16 CHAIR BUI: The fourth award is the *O.J. "Bud"*
17 *Hawkins Exceptional Service Award*.

18 This award is dedicated to the legacy of "Bud"
19 Hawkins, who served the POST Commission under five
20 Attorneys General.

21 Nominees for this award can be a member of POST
22 staff, a subject-matter expert, a POST Advisory Committee
23 member, or a POST Commission member who has made
24 significant contributions that reflect dedication,
25 perseverance, and exceptional service to improving the

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 professionalism of California law enforcement.

2 The recipient of the *O.J. "Bud" Hawkins Exceptional*
3 *Service Award* for 2011 is Emeritus Michael C. DiMiceli,
4 Assistant Executive Director, Commission on POST.

5 *(Applause)*

6 MS. BULLARD: Mike DiMiceli began his law-
7 enforcement career in 1962. He was a patrolman with the
8 Berkeley Police Department, an investigator with Alameda
9 County District Attorney's office, and was appointed as
10 Chief of Police to Vail, Colorado, Police Department.
11 He was also the manager of governmental consulting for a
12 major international firm.

13 Mr. DiMiceli joined the POST family in 1981. During
14 his tenure, he served as a senior consultant in the
15 Training Program Services and Center for Leadership
16 Development Bureaus, and was then promoted to bureau
17 chief for Management Counseling Services Bureau.

18 While at POST, Mr. DiMiceli had many noted
19 accomplishments. He directed the development of the
20 law-enforcement Command College, the Sherman Block
21 Supervisory Leadership Institute, the Law Enforcement
22 Agency Accreditation Program, and the Peace Officer
23 Feasibility Study process.

24 In 1997, Mr. DiMiceli assumed the position of
25 assistant executive director to the Field Services

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Division, and he served in this capacity until his
2 retirement in 2011.

3 With 50 years of dedicated service, Mike DiMiceli
4 has left an indelible imprint on the law-enforcement
5 community. His work and commitment to improving the
6 training services delivered to law enforcement will be
7 appreciated for many, many years to come.

8 For these reasons, Mike DiMiceli is the winner of
9 the 2011 O.J. "Bud" Hawkins Exceptional Service Award.

10 *(Applause and standing ovation)*

11 MS. BULLARD: The recipients will now move forward
12 and receive their awards.

13 *(Awards recipients were presented with trophies
14 and photographs were taken.)*

15 MS. BULLARD: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me
16 in, once again, recognizing our recipients.

17 *(Applause)*

18 MR. CAPPITELLI: Ron, did you want a group photo?

19 MR. CROOK: That would be great.

20 MR. CAPPITELLI: So if we could have the recipients
21 come back, please.

22 *(Group photographs of award recipients were taken.)*

23 *(Applause)*

24 MS. BULLARD: That concludes our ceremony.

25 Thank you all very much for coming.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: Okay, please bear with me, as this is
2 our first meeting with an electronic agenda. So I'll try
3 to get through this as best as I can.

4 This is the time on the agenda for *Public Comment*.
5 This is the time set aside for members of the public to
6 comment on either items on the Commission agenda or
7 issues not on the agenda but pertaining to POST
8 Commission business.

9 Members of the public who wish to speak are asked to
10 limit their remarks to no more than five minutes each.

11 Please be advised that the Commission cannot take
12 action on items not on the agenda.

13 The public comments related to International
14 Training Resources will be heard at the time of the
15 appeal.

16 Are there any folks who would like to come forward?

17 *(No response)*

18 CHAIR BUI: Okay, on to the *Approval of Minutes*.

19 Do I have a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move to approve.

21 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Second. McGinness.

22 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

23 All in favor?

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

25 *(No response)*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

2 *(No response)*

3 CHAIR BUI: Any abstentions?

4 *(No response)*

5 CHAIR BUI: The motion passes.

6 *Consent Report.* I believe there are 17 items on the
7 consent report.

8 Are there any items that either one of the
9 commissioners would like a presentation on or that we
10 need to pull?

11 *(No response)*

12 CHAIR BUI: Okay, then with that, can I get a motion
13 to approve the consent report?

14 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: So moved. McGinness.

15 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Second. Sobek.

16 CHAIR BUI: All in favor?

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

18 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

19 *(No response)*

20 CHAIR BUI: Any abstentions?

21 *(No response)*

22 CHAIR BUI: All right.

23 Pardon me while I scroll down.

24 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Is it time for Finance?

25 CHAIR BUI: Yes, *Finance Committee report*, please.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: I thought you'd never ask.
2 The Finance Committee met yesterday with unanimous
3 participation, reviewed the report furnished by staff,
4 and concluded unanimously to recommend moving forward
5 with the staff's recommendation.

6 The bottom line is POST finances are in good hands.

7 There's some things that -- some details that may
8 cause some concern. But the bottom line is, there are
9 revenues anticipated to come in to put the overall
10 financial health of POST at this juncture in good shape.

11 So if anybody has any questions for Mr. Reed, I'm
12 sure he'd be happy to respond; but that's where we are
13 today.

14 CHAIR BUI: Wonderful. Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Motion to approve the Finance
16 report.

17 CHAIR BUI: Do I have a second?

18 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Second. Allen.

19 CHAIR BUI: All in favor?

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

21 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

22 *(No response)*

23 CHAIR BUI: Yes, if we could have the commissioners
24 give their name before they make their motion, for the
25 reporter.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 I'm sorry, all in favor?

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

3 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

4 *(No response)*

5 CHAIR BUI: Okay, any abstentions?

6 *(No response)*

7 CHAIR BUI: All right.

8 Item D, *Report on Proposed Changes to the training*
9 *and Testing Specifications for Peace Officer Basic*
10 *Courses.*

11 Do we need a presentation?

12 *(No response)*

13 CHAIR BUI: No? Okay.

14 Well, then could I please get a motion on this item?

15 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move to approve.

16 Lowenberg.

17 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Second. McGinness.

19 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

20 All in favor?

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

22 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

23 *(No response)*

24 CHAIR BUI: Any abstentions?

25 *(No response)*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: All right, the motion passes.

2 Item E, *Report on Proposed Changes to the Aviation*
3 *Security Course.*

4 Do we need a presentation from staff on this?

5 *(No response)*

6 CHAIR BUI: Okay, motion to approve?

7 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Hutchens. Motion.

8 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

9 Second?

10 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Cooke.

11 CHAIR BUI: Cooke?

12 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

13 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

14 All in favor?

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

16 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

17 *(No response)*

18 CHAIR BUI: Any abstentions?

19 *(No response)*

20 CHAIR BUI: All right.

21 Item F, *Report on Proposed Changes to the Field*
22 *Training Officer Course.*

23 Do we need any discussion on this item?

24 *(No response)*

25 CHAIR BUI: All right, could I please --

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Motion to approve. Sobek.
2 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.
3 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Second. Wallace.
4 CHAIR BUI: All in favor?
5 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*
6 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?
7 *(No response)*
8 CHAIR BUI: Abstentions?
9 *(No response)*
10 CHAIR BUI: All right. Item G, *Report on*
11 *Augmentation of Fiscal Year 2011-12 Contract for the*
12 *Sherman Block Supervisory Leadership Institute.*
13 Do we need a presentation?
14 This will be a --
15 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Move to approve.
16 McGinness.
17 CHAIR BUI: Can I get a second?
18 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Allen. Second.
19 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.
20 This is a roll-call vote.
21 MS. PAOLI: Allen?
22 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.
23 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?
24 *(No response)*
25 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

2 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

3 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

4 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

5 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

7 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

8 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

9 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

10 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

11 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

13 *(No response)*

14 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

15 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

16 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

17 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

19 *(No response)*

20 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

21 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

23 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

24 CHAIR BUI: I saw that Commissioner Sobek thought he

25 was going to catch me on the roll-call vote.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Let me make an announcement and say that there will
2 be roll-call votes for the next several items.

3 So Item H, *Report on SPO C.14.11, Request to*
4 *Contract for Development and Implementation of a*
5 *Computer-Based Testing System to Replace TMAS.* And we
6 will have a presentation from staff on this one, please.

7 MS. SCOFIELD: Good morning, Madam Chair,
8 Commissioners. I'm Stephanie Scofield with the Standards
9 Evaluation Services Bureau.

10 TMAS is our Testing Management and Assessments
11 Systems. This is our software program that delivers the
12 written exams to all of the basic academies here in
13 California.

14 We are currently undertaking a project to replace
15 that system. This is a joint effort between the
16 Standards and Evaluations Bureau and our Computer
17 Services Bureau.

18 I'd like to introduce Colin O'Keefe from our
19 Computer Services Bureau to provide you with a report.

20 MR. O'KEEFE: Good morning. Thank you.

21 I am Colin O'Keefe with Computer Services Bureau,
22 and I'd like to give a brief overview on this item.

23 This is a joint effort between Computer Services and
24 Standards and Evaluation Bureau. And Computer Services
25 will provide the technical expertise and control agency

1 relations. And by that, I mean, that this is a
2 reportable project, an I.T. project that requires
3 interaction with the Department of Finance, Department
4 of General Services for procurement, and the California
5 Technology Agency.

6 Computer Services will be leading the interaction
7 with those agencies. At the same time, Standards and
8 Evaluation Bureau will be designing the functional
9 requirements for this new system and providing the
10 expertise in testing.

11 Approximately 50 sites currently have TMAS
12 installed, and most use the test-delivery component to
13 deliver computer-based testing. Others print test
14 workbooks using the TMAS system, leading to a paper-based
15 testing.

16 In January 2010 POST reported that TMAS cannot
17 adequately secure and protect tests, mostly due to lax
18 secure and auditing with regard to test printing
19 functionality.

20 In June 2010, the Commission directed staff to
21 contract for completion of a feasibility study report, or
22 FSR, for the replacement of the current TMAS system. The
23 resulting FSR was approved December 21st of 2011.

24 There are two broad categories where the current
25 TMAS system has become functionally obsolete: The first

1 is security, and the second is functionality.

2 And just to provide a couple of examples from each
3 of those areas, security -- computer lockdown technology,
4 meaning the security of the testing stations at the
5 test-taking site, has progressed quite a bit in the last
6 eight years. And we would like to eliminate the current
7 weaknesses in the system and replace it with a more
8 modern, up-to-date technical system.

9 Activity logging and permissions of the current
10 system are weak, and allow administrative staff, in some
11 cases, to see tests that they really shouldn't be
12 authorized to see.

13 And finally, non-site computers, in theory, can
14 access the current TMAS system. And we will eliminate
15 that with a new system.

16 The second area is functionality. The current TMAS
17 system is not capable of accommodating other tests that
18 POST wishes to automate, such as the entry-level law
19 enforcement test, the public safety dispatcher test, and
20 skills and scenario test-scoring components.

21 TMAS has a closed design, limiting data sharing and
22 export functionality, meaning, you can't pull test
23 scoring to integrate with other systems to see
24 correlations.

25 Finally, TMAS modifications are costly, and the

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 basic system design hinders changes that would fix the
2 security and functionality flaws. It would be
3 cost-prohibitive to fix the existing system.

4 POST staff has done a market analysis, including
5 face-to-face meetings with relevant vendors at the
6 Association of Testing Professionals Conference in
7 February 2011, and concluded there are several
8 configureable-off-the-shelf or COTS packages that could
9 replace TMAS and offer better security and functionality.

10 POST will work with control agency oversight to do
11 a standard I.T. competitive procurement, resulting in
12 selection, configuration, and implementation of a direct
13 replacement for TMAS.

14 The amount requested for this item is \$2,739,560.
15 And I would note that that amount covers the project
16 through implementation of the TMAS system which spans
17 three fiscal years.

18 Thank you.

19 MS SCOFIELD: May we answer any questions?

20 CHAIR BUI: Okay. Do we have a motion to authorize
21 the Executive Director to contract for products and
22 services necessary for the acquisition, configuration,
23 implementation, and verification of software to replace
24 POST's current automated testing system in an amount not
25 to exceed \$2,739,560?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Move it. Lowenberg.
2 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: So moved. Hayhurst.
3 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Lowenberg.
4 Do I have a second?
5 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Hayhurst.
6 CHAIR BUI: Hayhurst? Thank you.
7 All in favor?
8 Oh, roll-call vote.
9 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: I told you.
10 CHAIR BUI: Oh, darn it.
11 MS. PAOLI: Allen?
12 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.
13 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?
14 *(No response)*
15 MS. PAOLI: Bui?
16 CHAIR BUI: Yes.
17 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?
18 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.
19 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?
20 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.
21 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
22 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.
23 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
24 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
25 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

2 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

3 *(No response)*

4 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

5 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

7 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

8 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

9 *(No response)*

10 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

11 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

13 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

14 CHAIR BUI: Okay, he's like standing behind a rock,
15 waiting to pounce out at me.

16 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Madam Chair, can I make a
17 comment?

18 CHAIR BUI: Yes, sir.

19 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Thank you.

20 I'd like to publicly thank Bureau Chief Scofield and
21 her staff for the work that they've been doing for the
22 last many months and beyond that, is to be commended.
23 This is a very sensitive and important area, as we all
24 know --

25 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: -- based on events that
2 have occurred over the last few years.

3 I don't believe we can do too much in this area to
4 protect the integrity of the training that we do in the
5 state, especially in the academy.

6 So my hat's off to Bureau Chief Scofield and her
7 staff.

8 CHAIR BUI: Well said, Commissioner. Thank you.

9 MS. SCOFIELD: Thank you.

10 CHAIR BUI: On to Item I, *Report on Request to*
11 *Contract for Learning Portal Hosting, Support, and*
12 *Maintenance Services.*

13 Do we need a presentation from staff?

14 *(No response)*

15 CHAIR BUI: Okay, this is a roll-call vote.
16 Actually, can I get a motion, to begin with?

17 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: I'll move it. Allen.

18 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Hutchens. Second.

19 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

20 Roll-call vote.

21 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

22 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

23 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

24 *(No response)*

25 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

2 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

3 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

4 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

5 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

7 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

8 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

9 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

10 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

11 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

13 *(No response)*

14 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

15 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

16 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

17 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

19 *(No response)*

20 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

21 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

23 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

24 CHAIR BUI: Item J, *Report on Request to Contract*
25 *for Management Fellow in Support of the Video Training*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 *Program.*

2 Would anybody like a presentation from staff?

3 *(No response)*

4 CHAIR BUI: Okay, can I get a motion, please?

5 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: So moved. McGinness.

6 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Kurylowicz. Second.

7 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

8 All in favor?

9 Oh, roll-call vote. Thank you.

10 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

11 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

13 *(No response)*

14 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

15 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

16 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

17 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

19 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

21 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

23 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

25 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

2 (No response)

3 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

4 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

5 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

6 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

7 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

8 (No response)

9 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

10 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

11 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

12 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

13 CHAIR BUI: Item K, *Report on Request to Contract to*
14 *Complete Learning Portal Courses.*

15 Do we need additional information?

16 (No response)

17 CHAIR BUI: Motion, please?

18 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: So moved, McGinness, to
19 advance this for the roll-call vote, Madam Chair.

20 CHAIR BUI: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.

21 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Second. Cooke.

22 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote, please, Connie.

23 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

24 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

25 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 (No response)

2 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

3 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

4 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

5 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

7 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

8 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

9 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

10 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

11 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

13 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

14 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

15 (No response)

16 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

17 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

19 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

21 (No response)

22 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

23 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

25 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: Okay, Item L, *Report on Request to*
2 *Contract for Web-based Computer Services for Management*
3 *Studies.*

4 Would anybody like a presentation?

5 *(No response)*

6 CHAIR BUI: All right, could we have a motion?

7 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Motion. Hutchens.

8 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Hutchens, motion.

9 Second?

10 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Second. Allen.

11 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote.

12 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

13 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

14 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

15 *(No response)*

16 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

17 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

19 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

21 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

23 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

25 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

2 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

3 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

4 *(No response)*

5 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

6 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

7 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

8 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

9 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

10 *(No response)*

11 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

12 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

13 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

14 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

15 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

16 Item M, *Report on Request to Contract with*

17 *Management Consultants.*

18 Do we need additional information from staff?

19 *(No response)*

20 CHAIR BUI: Could I please have a motion?

21 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Motion. Sobek.

22 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Second. Kurylowicz.

23 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote.

24 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

25 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?
2 (No response)
3 MS. PAOLI: Bui?
4 CHAIR BUI: Yes.
5 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?
6 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.
7 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?
8 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.
9 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
10 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.
11 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
12 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
13 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
14 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
15 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
16 (No response)
17 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?
18 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.
19 MS. PAOLI: Parker?
20 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.
21 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?
22 (No response)
23 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?
24 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.
25 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

2 CHAIR BUI: Item N, *Report on Augmentation of Fiscal*
3 *Year 2011-12 Contract for the Entry-Level Dispatcher*
4 *Selection Test Battery.*

5 Would anybody like a presentation from staff?

6 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Move to approve.

7 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

8 Second, please?

9 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Cooke. Second.

10 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote.

11 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

12 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

13 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

14 *(No response)*

15 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

16 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

17 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

18 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

19 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

20 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Abstain.

21 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

22 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

23 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

24 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

25 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

2 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

3 *(No response)*

4 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

5 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

7 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

8 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

9 *(No response)*

10 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

11 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

13 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

14 CHAIR BUI: Okay, on to Training Program Services
15 Bureau. Item O, *Report on Request to Accept VAWA Grant*
16 *Funds and Contract for Presentation of VAWA Courses.*

17 MR. GUSTAFSON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIR BUI: Yes, sir?

19 MR. GUSTAFSON: We were just notified on Monday that
20 funding for this item has been reduced. However, Cal EMA
21 expects to restore that funding later this year. So if
22 the Commission is so inclined, I would recommend simply
23 amending that motion to say "in an amount up to
24 \$583,547." And that will save us bringing it back to you
25 when they restore the money. So I'm just suggesting that

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 you accept whatever they give us.

2 CHAIR BUI: Okay. So is everybody okay with
3 amending that language to reflect "up to \$583,547"?

4 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Make a motion as recommended.

5 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Parker.

7 CHAIR BUI: Second?

8 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Second. Allen.

9 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote.

10 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

11 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

13 *(No response)*

14 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

15 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

16 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

17 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

19 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

21 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

23 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

25 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

2 (No response)

3 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

4 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

5 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

6 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

7 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

8 (No response)

9 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

10 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

11 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

12 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

13 CHAIR BUI: Item P, *Report on Request to Contract*
14 *for Management Fellow in Support of the Public Safety*
15 *Dispatcher Program.*

16 Would anybody like additional information from
17 staff?

18 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Move to approve.

19 McGinness.

20 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Second. Sobek.

22 CHAIR BUI: Roll-call vote.

23 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

24 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

25 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 *(No response)*

2 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

3 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

4 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

5 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

6 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

7 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Abstain.

8 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

9 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

10 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

11 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

12 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

13 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

14 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

15 *(No response)*

16 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

17 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

18 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

19 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

21 *(No response)*

22 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

23 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

25 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 CHAIR BUI: And we have only two more items.

2 Item Q, *Report on Request to Contract with San Diego*
3 *Regional Public Safety Training Institute to Present*
4 *Institute of Criminal Investigation Training.*

5 Presentation needed?

6 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Move to approve.

7 McGinness.

8 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Second.

10 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Second. Hayhurst.

11 CHAIR BUI: Second, Commissioner Lowenberg?

12 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Sure.

13 CHAIR BUI: Okay, roll-call vote.

14 MS. PAOLI: Allen?

15 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

16 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?

17 *(No response)*

18 MS. PAOLI: Bui?

19 CHAIR BUI: Yes.

20 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?

21 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.

22 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?

23 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.

24 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?

25 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?

2 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.

3 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?

4 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.

5 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?

6 *(No response)*

7 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?

8 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

9 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

10 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

11 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

12 *(No response)*

13 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

14 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

15 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

16 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

17 CHAIR BUI: The last item up for bid is Item R,

18 *Report on Request to Increase Institute of Criminal*

19 *Investigation, ICI, Training Course Presentations with*

20 *Existing ICI Presenters.*

21 Presentation needed?

22 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Move to approve.

23 McGinness.

24 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

25 Can we get a second?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Hutchens. Second.
2 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Second. Parker.
3 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Hutchens, second?
4 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.
5 CHAIR BUI: Okay, roll-call vote?
6 MS. PAOLI: Allen?
7 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.
8 MS. PAOLI: Anderson?
9 *(No response)*
10 MS. PAOLI: Bui?
11 CHAIR BUI: Yes.
12 MS. PAOLI: Cooke?
13 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Yes.
14 MS. PAOLI: Hayhurst?
15 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Yes.
16 MS. PAOLI: Hutchens?
17 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.
18 MS. PAOLI: Kurylowicz?
19 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: Yes.
20 MS. PAOLI: Lowenberg?
21 COMMISSIONER LOWENBERG: Yes.
22 MS. PAOLI: McDonnell?
23 *(No response)*
24 MS. PAOLI: McGinness?
25 COMMISSIONER MCGINNESS: Yes.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MS. PAOLI: Parker?

2 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

3 MS. PAOLI: Ramos?

4 *(No response)*

5 MS. PAOLI: Sobek?

6 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes.

7 MS. PAOLI: Wallace?

8 COMMISSIONER WALLACE: Yes.

9 CHAIR BUI: Thank you. The motion passes.

10 Okay, Item S, *Report on Appeal to Commission by*
11 *International Training Resources.*

12 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Madam Chair?

13 CHAIR BUI: Yes, sir?

14 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Can I make a recommendation:
15 Can we could do committee reports before that?

16 CHAIR BUI: I don't see a problem with that. We can
17 go ahead and jump forward.

18 *Advisory Committee, Item T.*

19 Chief, are you ready to make a report?

20 MS. SPAGNOLI: Sure.

21 CHAIR BUI: Okay.

22 MS. SPAGNOLI: One of the annual discussions we had
23 at the POST Advisory Committee is to elect a chair and a
24 vice chair. And we're recommending that the chair for
25 the next year, starting at the October meeting, is

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 tentatively Mario Casas, representing CCLEA. He wasn't
2 here so we just nominated him.

3 CHAIR BUI: A nice pass. Well done.

4 MS. SPAGNOLI: So we are waiting for him to accept
5 it.

6 And then the vice chair would be Jim Bock,
7 representing Specialized Law Enforcement.

8 And then any other report that we had, I think one
9 of the themes that we did discuss yesterday, just as it
10 relates to dispatchers in the integration of POST really
11 formalizing and addressing the needs of the dispatchers,
12 which, as we know, impacts front-line law enforcement.
13 So that was the comments in the meeting.

14 And that's all I have to report at this time.

15 CHAIR BUI: Okay, do we have an update from
16 Commissioner Sobek from the Leg. Committee?

17 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Yes, Madam Chair. We had quite
18 a bit to go over on the legislative front.

19 There are only two issues that we'd like to have the
20 full Commission vote on.

21 The Leg. Committee on SB 1002 from Yee. Senator
22 Yee, that's a public-records legislative issue. And we
23 request and ask the full Commission to remove the
24 opposition and to become neutral on this. And I'd like
25 to get a vote on that.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 And also on AB 2029, we feel that it's not a
2 law-enforcement issue for POST, and that we shouldn't
3 spend the resources to deal with this, and that it should
4 be coming from Consumer Affairs. So we would like to
5 take a position of "oppose, unless amended."

6 And I'd like to get the full commission to approve
7 both of that. That was recommended by the committee.

8 CHAIR BUI: Can we get a motion to accept the
9 proposals made by the Legislative Committee?

10 COMMISSIONER KURYLOWICZ: I make a motion to accept
11 both proposals by the Legislative Committee. Kurylowicz.

12 COMMISSIONER COOKE: Second. Cooke.

13 CHAIR BUI: All in favor?

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

15 CHAIR BUI: Any opposed?

16 *(No response)*

17 CHAIR BUI: Any abstentions?

18 *(No response)*

19 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

20 Okay, back to Item S. This is the time in the
21 agenda set aside for members of the public to comment on
22 the *Appeal to Commission by International Training*
23 *Resources*, Item S of the agenda.

24 Members of the public who wish to speak concerning
25 this item are asked to limit their remarks to no more

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 than five minutes each.

2 The Commission does reserve the right to limit
3 public comment that becomes cumulative.

4 Each speaker is asked to state their name and, if
5 they wish, to identify their agency or company
6 affiliation.

7 Speakers that are authorized to speak on behalf of
8 their agency or company are asked to state for the record
9 that they are authorized to speak for their agency or
10 company.

11 Does anyone have any public comment on the ITR
12 appeal?

13 *(No response)*

14 CHAIR BUI: Okay. At this time the Commission will
15 consider the appeal of International Training Resources
16 concerning the decision by POST staff to decertify all
17 training courses previously certified by POST for
18 presentation by ITR.

19 The decision to decertify these courses was
20 initially made by POST staff, and was effective
21 October 28th, 2011.

22 ITR appealed to the Executive Director who, on
23 January 23rd, 2012, denied the appeal and upheld the
24 decision of POST staff.

25 Pursuant to Commission Regulation 1058, ITR has

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 appealed to the full commission, and the matter is now on
2 for the hearing of that appeal.

3 The Commission will receive a presentation from
4 representatives of ITR who are present today.

5 Following the presentation by ITR, the Commission
6 will hear the staff report.

7 Each presentation is expected to not exceed
8 30 minutes. However, upon request, the Commission chair
9 may grant additional time beyond the 30 minutes, if the
10 chair believes the request is appropriate and warranted.

11 Questions from the commissioners and each party's
12 responses to each question will not count against the
13 30 minutes initially allotted to each party.

14 Commissioners are encouraged, if possible, to hold
15 questions until the end of each party's presentation.

16 The Commission will not accept at this time any
17 additional comments from the public, as the public-
18 comment period has already occurred.

19 The public comments previously made concerning this
20 issue will be given due consideration by the Commission
21 during deliberation in closed session.

22 Following the presentation by ITR and POST staff,
23 the completion of questioning of each party by the
24 Commission, the Commission will return to and complete
25 the regular agenda.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 The Commission's deliberation on the appeal will
2 take place in closed session pursuant to Government Code
3 section 11126(c)(3) as announced in the agenda. Present
4 in closed session will be the commissioners, our counsel,
5 and the court reporter.

6 After deliberation and completion of the closed
7 session, the Commission will reconvene and adjourn.

8 Pursuant to Commission Regulation 1058, the
9 Executive Director will be asked to notify ITR of the
10 Commission's decision concerning the appeal within ten
11 calendar days.

12 Let us begin with the presentation by ITR.

13 MR. RAINS: Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of
14 the POST Commission. Good morning, my name is Mike
15 Rains. I'm an attorney.

16 I believe the Commission has received a letter from
17 me on behalf of ITR, Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss, appealing
18 the decertification decision of ITR.

19 And let me indicate, Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss are here
20 with me today.

21 Does the Commission wish them to come up? Is that
22 something that would be desirable?

23 CHAIR BUI: That is purely up to you, if they have
24 any information to give to the Commission, that's...

25 MR. RAINS: All right. I'm planning on doing most

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 of the talking. If there were technical questions that
2 any of the commissioners had, I may have to call upon
3 them to answer them. So we'll just wait and see how that
4 plays out, if we may.

5 CHAIR BUI: Sure.

6 MR. RAINS: Thank you.

7 Let me gather my materials together and try to
8 gather my thoughts here, if I can.

9 Let me first of all open by saying this: As a
10 lawyer, I've had a great honor to teach for Ben and Dave
11 in their SWAT basic course and their tactical commanders
12 course. And I teach on the subject of legal issues
13 dealing with deployment of SWAT teams. And it's an honor
14 and a pleasure to do that because I represent police
15 officers for a living -- my firm does. And it's such a
16 vital issue to talk to officers about the things that
17 happen in SWAT operations that get them in trouble
18 legally. And so it has been a great honor to do that.
19 And I am pleased to be here today to talk to the
20 Commission. And I thank you for your indulgence.

21 Let me say this: Both Ben and Dave, who I know
22 well, feel terrible about the accident that occurred to
23 Officer Short on July 21st of 2011. They feel terrible
24 about it. It's a scar on them. It's a scar on their
25 reputations.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 I would ask this Commission to think about this,
2 though. Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss have been teaching
3 law-enforcement officers in subjects dealing with SWAT
4 team operations, with diversionary devices and deployment
5 of those, for years and years.

6 ITR has been in existence for 16 years. They have
7 had more than 8,000 students come to their classes. They
8 have taught more than 20,000 hours of training to
9 8,000 students. And the accident to Officer Short -- the
10 tragic, tragic injury to Officer Short is the first
11 training incident that has resulted in an injury to one
12 of their students in all these hours, in all of these
13 years, with all of these students.

14 These are not men given to reckless conduct, these
15 are not men given to dangerous conduct. The lives of
16 their students mean too much to them.

17 And I want this Commission to know that, and to
18 think about that as you deliberate on their fate today.

19 Now, what issue are we here for? When you think
20 about it -- when you think about it, the decision by POST
21 that we are here to appeal has put Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss
22 out of business. They've been teaching law-enforcement
23 officers for a combined total of over five decades; and
24 the decertification decision is not just the distraction-
25 device course that resulted -- the breaching course --

1 that resulted in this injury. That's not the decision.
2 The decision decertifies 18 separate courses, most of
3 which have nothing whatsoever to do with deployment of
4 diversionary devices at all.

5 CHAIR BUI: Mr. Rains, let me interrupt you for just
6 one second here, okay? As part of your 30 minutes, you
7 get time for rebuttal. So if you need time later --

8 MR. RAINS: Great.

9 CHAIR BUI: -- we'll have to carve out some time.
10 Just so that you're aware.

11 MR. RAINS: I appreciate that, Madam Chair. And I
12 was going to start off by saying I'll be brief; but I'm a
13 lawyer, so that never works.

14 But I did plan for some rebuttal time. And I'm
15 going to talk about a lawyer issue in a minute.

16 I thought I probably did need some rebuttal time.
17 So my initial remarks will probably be about ten minutes,
18 15 minutes, something like that.

19 CHAIR BUI: Okay.

20 MR. RAINS: And then I will leave some rebuttal
21 time.

22 CHAIR BUI: Okay, great. Thank you.

23 MR. RAINS: So I want to move on to something here.

24 And let me say this, at the risk of sounding too
25 much like a lawyer -- I'm going to wander into a lawyer

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 issue for a minute. And it's an important issue to me as
2 a lawyer, because we don't know if further appeal would
3 have to occur or will occur in connection with this
4 matter.

5 And the lawyer issue is this, and then I'll get back
6 to the point at hand: I've never done a POST Commission
7 appeal before. This is my first trip to this Commission.
8 And so I'm a new kid on the block.

9 And so I wrote a letter to the Commission, you know,
10 respectfully asking what are the rules. I've done a
11 number of administrative hearings, I've done a lot of
12 trial work, but I've never done one of these.

13 And so Mr. Darden was kind enough to send me a
14 letter in May, advising me sort of what the rules were.
15 And in that letter, he said that -- and one of the things
16 that's important to we lawyers is, who has the burden of
17 proof here? Does the Commission have to prove the
18 allegations to support the decertification, or do
19 Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss and ITR have to disprove the
20 allegations? And that really is an important issue to us
21 lawyers.

22 Mr. Darden's letter indicated that, in fact,
23 Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss, ITR, bears the burden of proof
24 here.

25 And I will say to the Commission, to Mr. Darden,

1 with all due respect -- I know he is a very smart man and
2 a learned man -- I believe in a proceeding of this
3 nature, that POST, the Commission, does bear and should
4 bear the burden of proof.

5 And let me just talk about that for a minute.

6 The impact of the decision here today is to revoke
7 licenses of two men to teach, to teach 18 separate
8 courses. That's the net impact of this decision, is to
9 revoke their license. And there are numerous decisions
10 in California that have talked about what happens when
11 somebody points a finger at a professional and revokes
12 their license to work in their chosen field. What
13 happens, and who has to prove it up?

14 You know, in the criminal trial work that I do, I
15 always remind the juries that when the prosecutor points
16 the finger at my client and says, "You committed a
17 crime," the prosecutor has to prove it up. They have to
18 present sufficient evidence to sustain their allegations.

19 I dare say, most of you here at this table today,
20 being professional law-enforcement people, would say
21 yourselves, if you think about this for a minute, suppose
22 myself -- suppose somebody pointed the finger at me and
23 challenged my ability to perform my job, my ability to do
24 things competently. They pointed the finger at me, and
25 they said, "No, you're not competent. You don't do

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 things right. Wouldn't you" --

2 CHAIR BUI: Mr. Rains, your client is the appellant.
3 So if you've got a case to present, let's maybe move
4 forward with it, okay?

5 MR. RAINS: I just needed to make this point for the
6 record.

7 CHAIR BUI: Sure. It's duly noted, so we can move
8 on.

9 MR. RAINS: All right.

10 CHAIR BUI: Thank you.

11 MR. RAINS: Thank you.

12 So what we are dealing with here is this: A tragic
13 incident that occurred on July 21st of 2011. And we
14 received Mr. Lane's report finally on May 29th. We had
15 less than a month to digest it, to see it, to respond to
16 it. I wish we could have got it sooner, but we didn't.

17 And so Mr. Tisa this week did present additional
18 materials to the Commission. And I hope you've had an
19 opportunity to study those.

20 At issue, of course, is the incident that resulted
21 in the injury to Officer Short.

22 There were subject-matter experts that were
23 discussed in Mr. Lane's report. And Sergeant Sterett of
24 the Orange County Sheriff's Department did a calculation
25 that the explosive equivalent that was placed in the

1 chamber of the distraction device used in this case, the
2 WallBanger manufactured by Safariland, as it's called,
3 amounted to .36 pounds of TNT. That's one-third of a
4 pound of TNT, according to that calculation.

5 You probably have seen, in Mr. Tisa's materials,
6 that, in fact, that calculation is wrong.

7 I dare say, folks, if that charge, that explosive
8 charge, was the explosive equivalent of a third of a
9 pound of TNT, we wouldn't be here appealing the decision
10 today because Mr. Tisa and every one of those students
11 would have been dead. That's just simply not possible.

12 My suspicion is that the correct calculation was
13 .036 pounds, not .36 pounds; and that was an error.
14 Mr. Tisa's own calculation has the explosive equivalent
15 of TNT of being roughly a half an ounce of TNT.

16 So I just want the Commission to be clear, I think
17 there were some errors that led to some gross
18 miscalculations of the explosive equivalent that caused
19 the injury to Officer Short.

20 Now, I'm going to say this, and then I'm going to
21 tell you, at least, or I'm going to ask you to consider
22 your final decision.

23 In this case, we know from the evidence, from
24 witnesses interviewed, Officer Short was offered the use
25 of a shield -- a face shield by Mr. Harden -- in fact,

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 more than once. That was confirmed by Sergeant Morales
2 from Salinas Valley Prison, Mr. Tisa had talked to him
3 and he said, "Yes, I heard it being offered, and he
4 turned it down."

5 In retrospect, you know what? It shouldn't have
6 been offered to Officer Short. He should have been told,
7 "You're going to put it on, buddy. You're going to wear
8 it." It shouldn't have been offered; but it was. And he
9 said, "No, I have my Oakley glasses provided by my own
10 department, and I'm going to wear them, and I feel safe
11 doing that."

12 The other thing that I was struck with as I went
13 through these materials -- and I want to read this to you
14 because I think it's important.

15 Paul Vandiver from Concord PD was one of the
16 individuals interviewed by Mr. Lane. And actually,
17 Sergeant Vandiver offered some comments about the
18 training that were not very complimentary to Mr. Tisa and
19 Mr. Bliss and ITR. And so I found it very interesting
20 that in his interview he said this -- this, I'm reading
21 from Mr. Lane's report at page 13.

22 "Vandiver said they were told to avert their faces
23 when detonating the device, but someone said something to
24 Officer Short, and he peeked up just as the charge
25 exploded."

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Now, think about that: He was told to divert his
2 head. He was told to turn away from the explosion. But
3 according to Sergeant Vandiver, he didn't. He looked
4 directly at it because somebody said something.

5 Could all the training in the world have changed
6 that? Could anything have changed that? And the answer
7 is no. And we can only hope that students in these kinds
8 of classes know and understand and follow the
9 instructions given. And sometimes they do and sometimes
10 they don't.

11 I don't mean to suggest for a minute that Officer
12 Short is responsible for his own injury. I'm saying that
13 there is evidence here that instruction was given on how
14 to avoid the very type of injury that occurred; and for
15 whatever reason, Officer Short looked up at the last
16 minute.

17 So I'm going to get to my point about what I would
18 like the Commission to consider in a minute.

19 But let me say this -- and I'm going to read from
20 one of Mr. Tisa's submissions and ask this Commission
21 something as I read this, right after I read it.

22 Mr. Tisa -- these are his own words -- says this:
23 "There is no reasonable way, with any degree of
24 calculated certainty, that breaching instructors can
25 accurately predict the following: A, that there will be

1 any debris or fragments at all; B, the composition of the
2 debris or fragment as to the target material; C, the
3 actual composition of the debris and fragment; D, the
4 direction of the movement or the travel of the debris or
5 fragment; E, the velocity of the debris or fragment; F,
6 the kinetic injury of the debris or fragment; G, the size
7 of the debris or fragment; H, the weight of the debris or
8 fragment; I, the impact point of the debris or fragment
9 upon contact with an object or person."

10 There is absolutely no way to predict that,
11 according to Mr. Tisa who, of course, had taught this
12 same course earlier in the year. This was the second
13 course of this nature that Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss taught.

14 Mr. Tisa goes on and says this -- and I think it's
15 important for the Commission to think about it --
16 "During the course of presenting forced breaching
17 courses, there will always be the actual or potential
18 possibility for debris or fragments of the target
19 composition being separated from the breach point upon
20 execution of a specific breaching procedure. Because of
21 the inherent hazards of breaching courses, it is with
22 reasonable certainty, based upon extensive years of
23 accumulated experience of the instructors, that some
24 breaching instructors and course participants will, on
25 rare occasions, be struck by debris or fragments during

1 the practical application phase of breaching courses."

2 Those are really my client's own words. And when I
3 read his materials, I actually called him up, and I said,
4 "Ben, I agree with everything you said. What you're
5 saying is, you can do everything in the world here --
6 everything in the world to prevent an accident, but you
7 can't do it with any absolute certainty. And you know
8 what? People can get injured. And you know what, Ben?
9 You're crazy to be teaching this stuff. You're out of
10 your mind to be teaching this stuff because you, by your
11 own words, say there is always a risk of danger." And
12 that was my words to my own client.

13 But I'm going to ask this body this, because you
14 need to think about this: This course is designed for
15 a very important purpose. It's designed to help
16 law-enforcement officers do what they need to do in
17 situations where there are hostages taken, where there is
18 an active shooter inside who needs to be stopped. And
19 this helps officers make the entry into these places
20 better, more efficient, safer for them, and safer for
21 those they have to protect. That is what this course is
22 designed to do.

23 So this Commission can decertify this course. And
24 frankly, I'm here to tell you that we don't object to
25 that. We think the Commission should decertify this

1 course. This is a 16-hour course.

2 And, you know, some of the students interviewed
3 said, "Well, the only thing that we were taught about,
4 was the WallBanger."

5 You know, folks, the WallBanger is really the only
6 diversionary device used for breaching on the market that
7 we know of. It's been in existence for six years, after
8 extensive training by Safariland. And it is the only
9 device of this nature. It's patented. Nobody else has
10 copied it.

11 So, yes, that's what they were taught because that
12 was the nature of the course, to teach what products are
13 there, and to tell the students how to properly use them.

14 But the course was only 16 hours.

15 I dare say -- and I look at this -- I'm not a
16 training expert. I'm probably just a novice. But I said
17 to myself, 16 hours for a course that's this important,
18 that involves a device of this nature? I don't think
19 16 hours is enough.

20 CHAIR BUI: Mr. Rains, you have 14 minutes.

21 MR. RAINS: Oh, I'll be done long before then.

22 CHAIR BUI: Okay.

23 MR. RAINS: And so we say to the Commission, based
24 on the words of Mr. Tisa, you know, there are dangers in
25 these courses.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 And, you know, I'd like this Commission to think
2 about this. How many -- how many instructors want to
3 wade into the thicket, as I'm going to call it, of
4 teaching courses of this nature? Courses where injury to
5 students can occur, where we spend more time trying to
6 avert the injury rather than probably teaching the
7 technical side of what to do? But that's what this
8 course was all about.

9 And Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss have taught this, and
10 they've taught other courses involving munitions and
11 weapons for years and years and years, again, without an
12 accident attributable to the training event.

13 So that's what we're dealing with.

14 And I'm here to tell the Commission that I think,
15 frankly, the original certification of this course for
16 16 hours simply wasn't enough.

17 I don't think it was well-thought-out enough. I
18 don't think it was well-thought-out enough by Mr. Tisa or
19 Mr. Bliss or by the Commission or by Mr. Lane, who
20 certified the course.

21 And so I think the Commission should look at it.
22 It should not do away with it because this kind of course
23 is far too important to the safety of law enforcement to
24 abandon it. This kind of training has to occur. You
25 cannot turn your backs on your officers in these kinds of

1 situations. So don't do it. Rethink it.

2 Which brings me to my hopefully final point, for the
3 moment, and that is this: The decertification decision
4 decertifies, as I said, 18 courses, including this one.
5 And my question is: Why? Why did we put these guys out
6 of business for courses such as tactical communications
7 operator?

8 Their basic SWAT course has been, really, the lead
9 course, I think in this state, for SWAT-team operations.
10 Their tactical commanders course has been a very, very
11 well-recognized course in this state. And yet, they are
12 no longer allowed to teach that.

13 Let me add one of the things so the Commission
14 knows, and I want to make sure the record is clear on
15 this, Mr. DiMiceli's letter of October 24th of 2011 also
16 indicated that Mr. Tisa could not teach POST-certified
17 courses. It did not so exclude Mr. Bliss. So I'm not
18 appealing that decision as to Dave Bliss. But, of
19 course, I am appealing the decision as to Mr. Tisa.

20 But why -- why did we do that? And I can understand
21 the distraction-device diversionary instructor's course
22 being decertified. We agree to it. We think it's
23 prudent.

24 But we appeal the decertification of all the other
25 courses that have never put students in harm's way, that

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 only make our law-enforcement officers in this state
2 better, and that allow our law-enforcement officers to
3 get the wealth of training and knowledge and experience
4 of instructors like Ben Tisa and Dave Bliss.

5 So respectfully, I would ask the Commission to
6 reconsider the decertification of those additional
7 courses unrelated to the use of distraction or
8 diversionary devices as breaching instruments.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR BUI: Thank you, Mr. Rains.

11 Next, we will hear from Alan Deal.

12 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Commissioner Bui, I have a
13 question for him.

14 CHAIR BUI: I'm sorry.

15 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: What actions has -- what has
16 ITR put into place to correct any possible safety hazards
17 in the future?

18 MR. RAINS: Well, of course, one thing that happened
19 was shortly after this incident, they were told to no
20 longer teach this course. So, as you know, there have
21 been no preparations to teach the course and no specific
22 procedures that they would put into place because they
23 were told they weren't teaching.

24 I can tell you that based on the materials submitted
25 by Mr. Tisa, that their initial response to this incident

1 with those students, was that no longer are students
2 going to be offered protective eyewear.

3 I think one of the other students interviewed said
4 that all students were told that they should wear that
5 and they should continue to wear protective eyewear and
6 other gear.

7 I think Mr. Tisa said it would be mandatory to wear
8 face shields thereafter, and not just simply glasses,
9 such as those worn by Officer Short. So I know that was
10 done.

11 I think, frankly, had this course been set up to be
12 taught again, there certainly would have been a
13 rethinking about some of the things that caused this
14 incident: The size of the room, which is certainly an
15 issue, that was entered; the composition of the door that
16 was used as part of the training exercise. Those were
17 things that obviously have been the subject of debate in
18 this case.

19 And Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss have given great thought
20 to that. But truthfully, it's not like they've
21 communicated those thoughts to POST because they were
22 decertified and told that they were no longer teaching
23 the course.

24 And until that came up again, we didn't think -- and
25 I didn't think, as their lawyer -- that they should be

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 offering these things up.

2 I've said to this Commission, I think 16 hours for
3 this course is not long enough. And we completely agree
4 with the decertification of this course.

5 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: Thank you, sir.

6 CHAIR BUI: Are there any additional questions for
7 Mr. Rains?

8 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So your -- if you don't mind,
9 Chair?

10 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Allen?

11 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So your issue is the fact that
12 the decertification is justified for the course; but your
13 beef is the fact that the other courses are also
14 decertified? That's the issue, just to clarify?

15 MR. RAINS: That would be an accurate statement of
16 my beef.

17 CHAIR BUI: Do we have any other questions?

18 *(No response)*

19 CHAIR BUI: Okay, moving on to Mr. Deal.

20 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Madam Chair?

21 CHAIR BUI: Yes, sir?

22 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Can we take a break for a quick
23 second?

24 CHAIR BUI: You know, it is a good time to take a
25 ten-minute break.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.

2 CHAIR BUI: Okay.

3 *(Recess taken from 11:13 to 11:28 a.m.)*

4 CHAIR BUI: Okay, let's continue.

5 Alan Deal?

6 MR. DEAL: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners.

7 Good morning. In a brief conversation I just had
8 with Mr. Rains, he asked that I correct the record.

9 Letters were sent to both Mr. Bliss and Mr. Tisa
10 with regards to the decertification of the courses, as
11 well as restricting their ability to teach in any POST
12 courses, or coordinate or provide services of safety
13 officers. So he did acknowledge that the letters were
14 sent to both owners of ITR.

15 There are six allegations against the presenters of
16 the Distraction-Device Breaching course, for Mr. David
17 Bliss and Mr. Ben Tisa, partners of International
18 Training Resources, or "ITR."

19 The allegations are contained in the agenda item
20 that you've received.

21 The first allegation, it is alleged that ITR failed
22 to adhere to provisions of the safety policy approved as
23 a condition of certification of the course.

24 It is alleged that ITR used instructors who are not
25 approved as a condition of certification of the course.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Allegation 3: It is alleged that ITR departed from
2 the content of the course specified in the approved
3 expanded-course outline, and hourly distribution for the
4 course.

5 Allegation 4: It is alleged that ITR improperly and
6 incorrectly prepared distraction-device munitions.

7 Allegation 5: It is alleged that ITR allowed
8 experimental use of explosive materials not approved
9 within the certification of the course.

10 Allegation 6: It is alleged that ITR engaged in
11 experimental deployment of equipment and munitions that
12 exceeded the experience and competence of the
13 instructional personnel who were present at the scene.

14 The agenda item under Tab S and the investigation
15 report previously provided to the Commission and to ITR
16 address the allegations and include the supporting
17 statements and conclusions that led to the decision by
18 POST staff to sustain each of the allegations.

19 Also, the agenda item refers to a 2005 complaint
20 involving training presented by ITR. In that instance,
21 staff investigated the complaint, and concluded that ITR
22 had conducted unsafe live-fire exercises as part of a
23 SWAT course; failed to ensure that proper safety
24 equipment was used by students and instructors; allowed
25 instructors not approved by POST to provide instruction;

1 added training that was not approved in the certified
2 curriculum; and presented a course previously suspended
3 by POST.

4 Based on the determination that the most recent
5 allegations were sustained, the serious consequences of
6 the allegations, and consideration of the 2005 sustained
7 allegations, staff made the decision to decertify all
8 courses presented by ITR.

9 The courses have been decertified since October 28,
10 2011.

11 The issues under consideration:

12 The injury of Officer Michael Short was preventible.
13 It was not an accident since it occurred as a result of
14 negligence on the part of the presenter of the training.

15 Several of the allegations can best be observed by
16 watching the videos taken by students who were present
17 when Officer Short was injured.

18 I'd like to show two short videos. The
19 commissioners have received copies of those videos. The
20 second video is very graphic. And I mention that because
21 there might be some members in the audience that wish not
22 to observe the second video.

23 Ron?

24 *(The first video clip was presented.)*

25 *(The second video clip was presented.)*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MR. DEAL: From the videos, you are able to see
2 things that assisted staff in making the decision to
3 sustain the allegation.

4 Officer Short was provided instruction in the
5 placement of the WallBanger device. He was the person
6 holding the WallBanger device.

7 Mr. Frank Harden, not an approved instructor of the
8 course, was providing that instruction.

9 The device was placed in the center of a door rather
10 than near the locking device.

11 Mr. Harden helped position Officer Short and the
12 device, then retreated to a position of safety. Officer
13 Short was left alone.

14 Officer Short nodded his head, then Tisa stood some
15 distance away as the device was remotely detonated. Ben
16 Tisa was not wearing protective headgear. The force of
17 the blast resulted in the handle of the WallBanger being
18 impaled into the cinderblock wall behind Officer Short.
19 Officer Short sustained serious injuries.

20 I'd like to provide an overview of POST's role as it
21 relates to the certification of courses.

22 What does it mean when POST certifies a course? It
23 means a number of things.

24 It means it has been reviewed by POST for specified
25 requirements.

1 It means the course adheres to requirements
2 specified in Commission regulations and procedures.

3 It means the course identifies all instructors,
4 their qualifications, whether they have satisfied
5 specified instructor training requirements.

6 It means the course has comprehensive safety
7 guidelines.

8 It means the course has an expanded course outline
9 that addresses and adheres to appropriate law-enforcement
10 content.

11 It means the course has an hourly distribution of
12 the content.

13 It means the course has been approved and published
14 by POST for law-enforcement agencies to consider when
15 selecting and sending employees to training.

16 It also, in most instances, allows for continuing
17 professional training credit.

18 I'd like to describe to you the fairly narrow focus
19 in terms of the purpose of the investigation by POST.

20 There are three things:

21 First, to assess adherence to Commission
22 regulations.

23 Second, to assess adherence to safety practices
24 described in the safety plan.

25 And finally, to identify whether current procedures

1 are adequate in the areas of safety and regulation.

2 Certification of courses involves trust: Trust that
3 the presenter will do what they have said they will do
4 within the course certification requirements.

5 POST approves courses and trusts that the presenter
6 of a course will present the curriculum in the way it is
7 described in the expanded course outline, and that the
8 students and instructors will adhere to the safety plan
9 prepared by the presenter and included in the course
10 certification package.

11 In this course, the presenter failed to
12 unambiguously state to POST that the course centered
13 solely on the use of the WallBanger, a proprietary device
14 marketed exclusively by Safariland, a law-enforcement
15 equipment company; that one week after the course was
16 presented, one of the principals of ITR improperly and
17 inappropriately added two individuals to the previously
18 approved course as instructors.

19 In the most recent course and in the 2005 matter,
20 ITR violated Commission regulations, procedures, and
21 safety requirements. ITR has demonstrated that it cannot
22 be trusted to adhere to course certification
23 requirements.

24 It is not in the Commission's interest to do further
25 business with ITR.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Of note is that Mr. Tisa was a participant in the
2 development of the POST student safety guidelines. In
3 1989 Mr. Tisa was a subject-matter expert to the
4 committee that assisted POST with the development of the
5 guidelines on student safety in certified courses.

6 The area of expertise designated for Mr. Tisa was
7 distraction devices.

8 When the POST Commission receives a complaint or
9 becomes aware of a presenter engaging in unsafe training
10 practices, staff has an obligation to investigate.
11 Failure to do so may leave the Commission and staff
12 vulnerable to litigation and liable for injuries
13 sustained by students and instructors.

14 Failure to suspend and/or decertify a presenter of
15 training who repeatedly violates Commission regulations
16 would be irresponsible.

17 Mr. Gordon Graham, known to many of you, noted for
18 his work in the field of law-enforcement risk management,
19 has repeatedly said, "If something is predictable, it is
20 preventible."

21 Past performance by ITR has been a predictor of
22 future behavior. ITR has previously engaged in unsafe
23 training practices that resulted in POST suspending and
24 decertifying courses, albeit no one was injured during
25 the 2005 incident.

1 The facts of the appeal:

2 The issues in this appeal are straightforward. ITR
3 failed to follow agreed-upon Commission rules and safety
4 guidelines in the presentation of the Distraction-Device
5 Breaching Instructor course. ITR used a device that was
6 not specifically identified or acknowledged during the
7 course-certification process.

8 ITR allowed a vendor to make a sales presentation
9 concerning equipment not related to the course.

10 ITR allowed students to experiment with munitions
11 with which the presenter was not familiar and had not
12 previously conducted the same experiments.

13 ITR was not licensed to possess or deploy the
14 munitions used during the course.

15 ITR allowed munitions to be used in a manner that
16 would otherwise require deployment by a qualified bomb
17 technician.

18 ITR allowed unauthorized instructors to be involved
19 in the training.

20 ITR did not instruct students on how to properly
21 calculate the pressures and destructive effects of the
22 munitions before each exercise.

23 ITR failed to calculate the pressures and
24 destructive effects of the distraction-device loads for
25 both the placement and manner that they were to be

1 applied.

2 ITR failed to ensure that students used readily
3 available safety equipment sufficient to the hazards of
4 the exercise.

5 ITR unnecessarily put a student in harm's way by
6 remotely detonating an explosive charge less than three
7 feet from the student.

8 Would POST have approved the course if a single
9 proprietary breaching device product was the basis of
10 training? Possibly.

11 The question is whether there is an unmet training
12 need for such a device. The device would have to be
13 specifically made known to POST. The device would have
14 to undergo testing, and safety issues would have to be
15 evaluated.

16 The instructors would have to be properly trained
17 and experienced in the use and application of the device.

18 Agencies considering sending people to the course
19 would need to know that the course is limited to a single
20 proprietary device, whether the product is in the
21 agency's equipment inventory or whether the agency is
22 considering the purchase of the product and wishes to
23 assess its utility.

24 It appears that few of the agencies that attended
25 the course have the WallBanger in their equipment

1 inventory.

2 A determination would need to be made whether the
3 item of equipment is a destructive device and, therefore,
4 must be deployed by a qualified bomb technician, not a
5 member of an entry team.

6 According to the subject-matter experts consulted
7 during the investigation by POST staff, the WallBanger is
8 a destructive device requiring loading and deployment to
9 be performed by a qualified bomb technician.

10 The decision to decertify all courses presented by
11 ITR included review and consideration of the 2005
12 incident that also led to suspension and decertification
13 of some courses presented by ITR.

14 POST considered the liability that the Commission
15 could be exposed to if staff failed to take the action
16 that it did.

17 Since this is not the first occurrence that ITR has
18 put law-enforcement officers in unreasonable risk during
19 training, it is critical that the action taken to address
20 these significant lapses in judgment sends a message that
21 blatant disregard of Commission regulations, negligence,
22 and a cavalier attitude about adherence to the rules will
23 not be tolerated.

24 The Commission is responsible for providing
25 high-quality training and ensuring the trainees return

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 to their departments well-trained and free of serious
2 injury.

3 No sheriff or chief should accept that a serious
4 training injury is the cost of doing business.

5 The decertification by POST of courses presented by
6 ITR does not bar nor prevent ITR from presenting
7 law-enforcement training in California. ITR can market
8 and present its training anywhere in California and
9 elsewhere; it merely must do so without POST
10 certification.

11 CHAIR BUI: Mr. Deal, you have 14 minutes.

12 MR. DEAL: In conclusion, the investigation
13 substantiates sustaining the allegations contained in the
14 agenda item. The allegations are serious. This is not
15 the first time that ITR has failed to follow Commission
16 regulations and adhere to appropriate safe practices
17 during training.

18 The injury sustained by Officer Short was
19 preventible. ITR disregarded Commission regulations and
20 safety practices during the presentation of the
21 Distraction-Device Breaching Instructor course.

22 POST entrusted ITR with the safety of the law-
23 enforcement students, and ITR violated that trust.

24 I'm prepared to respond to questions.

25 CHAIR BUI: Commissioners, does anybody have a

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 question for Mr. Deal?

2 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: I have a question.

3 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Hutchens, please?

4 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Are you telling us that POST
5 was unaware of the WallBanger device?

6 MR. DEAL: That's correct.

7 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Do you have any devices in the
8 breaching course that you're aware of -- or how do you
9 understand that it's taught?

10 MR. DEAL: Our understanding was a traditional
11 approach, where there are other presenters, where they
12 use what is referred to as a "bang pole." They may use
13 a ram, other types of mechanical devices, to force
14 entry; and then apply the distraction device to provide a
15 light -- a large flash of light and noise that distracts
16 individuals, to allow officers to safely enter into a
17 room or a location.

18 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Thank you.

19 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Hutchens?

20 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Yes.

21 You talked about the 2005 complaint, an unsafe
22 live-fire training.

23 MR. DEAL: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: How did that come to POST's
25 attention?

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 MR. DEAL: It came to our attention as a result of
2 some video that was taken by students -- and photographs
3 that were taken by students -- that were attending a SWAT
4 course. And those got posted on a Web site.

5 There was a sergeant -- and I'm forgetting right
6 now the name of the agency -- that became aware of the
7 training practice shared with him by two of the students
8 from his department. And he brought that to the
9 attention of his staff, which resulted in them giving him
10 direction to contact POST and make that information known
11 to POST.

12 COMMISSIONER HUTCHENS: Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Just a real quick question.

14 Was that the only course -- I got the impression
15 there was more than one course that got decertified for
16 them.

17 MR. DEAL: The numbers seem to fluctuate for reasons
18 I can't explain. But they have, at any one time, had up
19 to 22 courses certified to them.

20 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: But in 2005, it was just the
21 80-hour SWAT course that was decertified?

22 MR. DEAL: There were a couple of courses that were
23 suspended during the course of the investigation. And
24 then later on, after those courses were brought into the
25 existing requirements and regulations, some of those

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 courses were allowed to be then taught again by ITR.

2 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Was that 80-hour SWAT course
3 recertified?

4 MR. DEAL: Yes, it was.

5 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Okay, just curious.

6 CHAIR BUI: Commissioner Hayhurst?

7 COMMISSIONER HAYHURST: During the time after they
8 recertified ITR on all the courses, at any time, did POST
9 do any spot-checks to make sure they were still in
10 compliance, to make sure that they were in compliance
11 with POST regulations?

12 MR. DEAL: I don't have that information. I can't
13 respond to that.

14 CHAIR BUI: Any other questions?

15 COMMISSIONER COOKE: I just have one, because we're
16 talking about a whole lot of classes here -- or courses.

17 Have there been anything else on these other classes
18 that have come up with course evaluations that have said
19 they've deviated from the course outline, such as this
20 one here?

21 MR. DEAL: Not that we're aware of.

22 CHAIR BUI: What about student evaluations? Are
23 there different responses in how they feel about the
24 courses?

25 MR. DEAL: I would say spotty at best, as far as

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 student evaluations. And I'm not speaking specific to
2 ITR.

3 The course evaluations are voluntary, that may be
4 completed by a student. They can do it online, if they
5 wish to submit it.

6 I don't have any of that information to be able to
7 say specifically what the opinions of the students have
8 been relative to ITR-presented courses.

9 CHAIR BUI: Any more questions?

10 Mr. Rains?

11 MR. RAINS: Yes.

12 CHAIR BUI: Would you like to use the rest of your
13 nine and a half minutes?

14 MR. RAINS: Probably something less than nine and a
15 half minutes. But a few minutes, if I may.

16 CHAIR BUI: Okay, please.

17 MR. RAINS: Thank you.

18 I will respond to a few of the things that the
19 Commission has asked about, and some comments by
20 Mr. Deal.

21 I want to talk about, first of all, the 2005
22 incident, because POST seems to be relying -- or Mr. Deal
23 does -- in urging the Commission to rely heavily on that
24 as a basis to decertify ITR from all of these other
25 courses.

1 Let's put that in the proper context.

2 First of all, six years elapsed between that
3 incident and this tragic incident with Officer Short.
4 Six years of classes taught by ITR without an injury,
5 without an incident, without a complaint.

6 Thousands of hours of instruction, to thousands of
7 students, and not a complaint and not an incident. So I
8 think we need to put that in its proper context.

9 That course -- that was a SWAT course -- involved a
10 45-minute live-fire exercise at the end of an 80-hour
11 course. It was only a 45-minute live-fire exercise. And
12 the complaining party was not even in attendance.

13 The complaining party was angry because there had
14 been a discussion by Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss about the
15 fact that that agency needed to update some of its
16 training. And thereafter, a complaint was lodged against
17 Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss, and an investigation of sorts
18 done; not, frankly, to the satisfaction of them. But
19 they agreed at that time -- because they wanted to work
20 with POST, as they do here today -- they agreed to not
21 teach that particular course, that 45-minute course at
22 any time.

23 And I want to be clear with the Commission here
24 because I always, as a lawyer representing police
25 officers, talk about the value of training and to

1 officers, to those they protect. And you can never get
2 enough training. You can never give your officers enough
3 training. But training is meaningless unless it's real.

4 And, you know, you sitting here today and me sitting
5 here today, have to realize that you're sending your
6 officers out in harm's way every single day of their
7 lives, where they're going to get shot at and they're
8 going to have to shoot back, where they're going to have
9 to confront situations that may cost them their lives and
10 the lives of their colleagues. And you have to get them
11 realistic training.

12 And realistic training, in this dangerous world that
13 you live in, that you're part of, means they're going to
14 be subjected to things. They're going to be subjected to
15 gunfire, they're going to see explosions, they are going
16 to hear explosions, they've got to know what they are
17 because they've got to function with them. And their
18 functioning with them effectively may save lives.

19 I don't want you to lose sight of that, because that
20 was the complaint on the prior exercise, is that it was
21 too real. And maybe it subjected officers to too-close
22 proximity to live fire, that they shouldn't have been in
23 that proximity.

24 And yet, what's going to happen to a cop in a fire
25 fight?

1 And Mr. Tisa spent a great deal of time in his
2 materials talking about this course of conditioning
3 students -- conditioning students. That's what this
4 course was about, at least in part. Not the first day.
5 It was an academic exercise. But the second day was to
6 see how these things functioned.

7 Let me indicate, by the way, that this course was
8 taught in February as well. This was the second time
9 this course was taught. The course is entitled,
10 "Distraction-Device Breaching Instructor course."

11 Mr. Deal would suggest, I think to the Commission,
12 that somehow, some way, POST wasn't aware that the
13 WallBanger device was going to be used.

14 Well, first of all, Mr. Tisa nor Mr. Bliss never
15 tried to keep that from this Commission.

16 You know, Mr. Lane, who did the investigation in
17 this case, was also the man who certified the course. To
18 me, as a lawyer, that seems a little odd that you'd have
19 the man who certified the course do the investigation.
20 But he was, and he did.

21 And he didn't inquire of Mr. Tisa or Mr. Bliss,
22 "Hey, are you going to use -- What are you going to use?
23 Are you going to use a WallBanger? What are you going
24 to use?"

25 I told you that, really, the only device that fits

1 this category of a distraction-device breaching
2 instrument is the WallBanger.

3 CHAIR BUI: Five minutes, Mr. Rains.

4 MR. RAINS: It's been around for six years.

5 So I understand the sense here. But, again, this
6 course was taught in February. Mr. Tisa and Mr. Bliss
7 were open to questions all the time from POST, and were
8 open to criticism if others thought that they were
9 teaching this course to the exclusion of other
10 instruments in the arsenal that law enforcement can use;
11 and they weren't.

12 Again, we come back to this. We come back to an
13 issue of fundamental fairness.

14 Fundamental fairness that you all are part of every
15 day in your lives, and ask yourselves, is this course
16 that we readily agree should be decertified -- because
17 I don't think enough thought went into it. I've said
18 that during my opening statement, I'll say that now, and
19 I say that sincerely, because I have too many friends who
20 are in law enforcement. I don't want to see them lose
21 their lives, and I don't want to see citizens lose their
22 lives, either, because cops aren't properly trained to
23 real, live training that prepares them for the dangers
24 they face every day.

25 And that's the issue this Commission will have to

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 confront sooner or later with the training that we're
2 talking about today.

3 Let's take this course off the charts. I understand
4 the Commission doing that.

5 But I'm saying this: Do you put these guys out of
6 business? For all that they've done for law enforcement,
7 for all of the hours they've spent without a complaint,
8 without an injury, because of this?

9 It's tragic, it was unexpected, unanticipated.

10 I'll say one last thing: There were two other
11 instructors there: Ron McCarthy and Frank Harden. Both
12 of these guys are legendary -- legendary police officers.
13 Mr. McCarthy with LAPD for years and years. And they are
14 knowledgeable about this particular WallBanger device.
15 They have worked with Safariland for years and years on
16 it, and they were there.

17 And you know what? According to Mr. Deal -- and I
18 think he's right -- they weren't on the instructors
19 course. And technically -- technically, then they
20 shouldn't have been there.

21 But you know what? They were an extra pair of eyes,
22 four extra eyes. Four extra eyes who know this device,
23 who have worked with this device, who have used this
24 device themselves, who know its capabilities, who know
25 its power. They were there.

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 And I understand the Commission faulting Mr. Tisa
2 and Mr. Bliss for not having them on the roster before,
3 and they should have done it.

4 But think about it: They were there because Ben
5 and Dave wanted the students to be safe. They weren't
6 putting on a class that was calculated to injure, like
7 this one did. They were putting on a class because they
8 wanted the students to walk home, to be safe, and to know
9 how to use this device properly.

10 That's all the rebuttal I have at this point, unless
11 there's any questions.

12 CHAIR BUI: Any questions, Commissioners?

13 (*No response*)

14 CHAIR BUI: Thank you, Mr. Rains.

15 MR. RAINS: Thank you.

16 CHAIR BUI: Mr. Deal, do you have a rebuttal?

17 MR. DEAL: No.

18 CHAIR BUI: Okay. At this time -- the Commission
19 will consider all the information presented in closed
20 session.

21 So Item S is concluded at this time.

22 Let's move on to "W," *New Business, Report on*
23 *Isleton Police Department.*

24 MR. DINEEN: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission,
25 my name is John Dineen, bureau chief for Training

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Delivery and Compliance. And this is just an
2 information-only report on the Isleton Police Department,
3 which has been an issue for us before, in the past.

4 As of last month, the Isleton Police Department has
5 terminated the relationship they had with their chief of
6 police and also put their existing officers on leave at
7 the present time.

8 We went down to do a brief compliance inspection,
9 and were not able to come up with any personnel or
10 training files. So they're in the process right now of
11 having a temporary contract with the Sacramento Sheriff's
12 Department. And they had a town meeting last week and a
13 city council meeting tonight that will decide whether or
14 not their department will either try to reinstate and/or
15 to go permanently with the Sacramento Sheriff's
16 Department. And we should know that by probably sometime
17 next week.

18 So this, again, is just an information item only
19 that the department in the future could be decertified
20 and not in the POST program anymore.

21 CHAIR BUI: Thank you, sir.

22 MR. DINEEN: Okay, any questions?

23 *(No response)*

24 CHAIR BUI: All right, on to *Election of Commission*
25 *Officers.*

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 Normally, we would have the former chair, the
2 current chair, and the vice chair present as the
3 nomination committee. However, we are missing Mr. Bob
4 Doyle. And I think Mr. Sobek will stand in for
5 Mr. Doyle, since you were the chair prior to him,
6 correct?

7 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Stand in for him -- when?

8 CHAIR BUI: For the nomination committee.

9 COMMISSIONER SOBEK: Okay.

10 CHAIR BUI: And Mr. McDonnell is not here. So maybe
11 we can meet at some other time between this meeting and
12 the next meeting.

13 Old Business.

14 Paul?

15 MR. CAPPITELLI: I have none.

16 CHAIR BUI: No?

17 Okay, we will then go to closed session in
18 15 minutes.

19 Let's take a quick break.

20 *(Midday recess taken at 12:01 p.m.)*

21 *(The Commission met in executive closed*
22 *session from 12:28 p.m. to 2:09 p.m.)*

23 CHAIR BUI: We're back in session.

24 The Commissioners discussed the litigation matters.
25 And we deliberated, and have rendered a decision on the

POST Commission Meeting, June 28, 2012

1 ITR appeal.

2 The written decision will be forwarded to ITR within
3 ten days pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(3).
4 So that matter is done.

5 Any other questions, comments, or concerns by
6 commissioners?

7 *(No response)*

8 CHAIR BUI: All right, our next meeting is scheduled
9 for October 24th, 25th, 2012, at the Embassy Suites in
10 Burlingame.

11 This meeting is adjourned.

12 Thank you, folks.

13 *(The Commission meeting concluded at 2:09 p.m.)*

14 --oOo--

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify:

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

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

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand on July 2nd, 2012.

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