



MEETING MINUTES

Chief's Advisory Committee Wednesday, April 29, 2026

The Wednesday, April 29, 2026 Chief's Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting was called to order by Chair Hollie at 5:36 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 5555 Perimeter Drive. She welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Roll Call

Committee Members Present: Emmet Apolinario (Vice Chair), Ron Barnes, Luke Powell, Alex O'Ryan, Dwayne Maynard, Guarav Goel, Kimberly Hollie (Chair), Zhen Xing, Chitra Goyal

Committee Members Absent: Lisa Baer

Staff Present: Chief Páez, Deputy Chief (D. Chief) Tabernik, D. Chief Lattanzi, Sergeant (Sgt.) Kovacs

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Chair Hollie asked for additions or corrections to the 03-17-2026 minutes of the Chief's Advisory Committee meeting. CP Maynard raised two items. First, he noted that on page 2 of 14, paragraph 6, an officer's name appeared to be misspelled in its second mention within the document. Second, on page 5 of 14, paragraph 6, a street reference appeared as two separate words.

CP Barnes raised a discrepancy on page 9 of 14, which noted that CP Barnes had departed at 6:36 PM, while page 12 reflected commentary attributed to CP Barnes. He stated that he had in fact remained present until the conclusion of the meeting.

Community Partner (CP) Barnes moved, V. Chair Apolonario seconded approval of the minutes as amended.

Vote: CP O'Ryan, yes; Chair Hollie, yes; V. Chair Apolinario, yes; CP Maynard, yes; CP Barnes, yes; CP Powell, yes; CP Guarav Goel, yes; CP Xing, yes; CP Chitra Goyal, yes.

[Motion carried 9-0.]

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

OLD BUSINESS

Chief Páez stated that there were no outstanding action items carried over from the previous meeting.

Before proceeding to new business, Chair Hollie paused to observe that April is both Arab American History Month and Deaf History Month, and extended recognition of both observances to the Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Review of Non-Bias Based Policing Analysis**

D. Chief Lattanzi presented a high-level overview of the Department's annual non-bias based policing administrative report, which is prepared by Law Enforcement Planner Tom Hirschy, a former lieutenant with more than 40 years of public service experience. D. Chief Lattanzi noted that, given the length and complexity of the full report, the presentation was designed to cover key highlights rather than the report's entirety. He also noted that, consistent with past practice, the full report would be made available on the Dublin Police Department's website following the meeting, as part of the Department's commitment to transparency and accountability.

D. Chief Lattanzi explained the purpose of the report: to serve as an administrative review for identifying any unlawful or improper bias within the agency, to maintain community trust, ensure legal compliance, promote fair and effective policing, identify and correct disparities, improve officer decision-making and training, and demonstrate accountability. He noted that the report also fulfills requirements under the department's CALEA accreditation standards.

Methodology

The report focuses on self-initiated contacts — specifically self-initiated suspicious person contacts and self-initiated traffic enforcement, including traffic stops, warnings, and citations — because these represent situations where officers are exercising their own independent perceptions and judgment, rather than responding to a third-party-initiated call directing them to a particular individual. D. Chief Lattanzi noted that the analysis employs multiple statistical measures, as well as professional judgment where appropriate, and also examines response-to-resistance incidents, citizen complaints, and property seizures for indications of potential bias.

Self-Initiated Suspicious Person Contacts

Using a sample size of 124 contacts, the report found that approximately 74 percent of self-initiated suspicious person contacts involved male individuals and approximately 22 percent involved female individuals. By race, 54 percent of contacts were with white individuals, 20 percent with Black individuals, approximately 7 percent with Hispanic individuals, and approximately 6.5 percent with Asian individuals. These figures were found to be consistent with the prior three years of data. By age, approximately 81.5 percent of individuals contacted for suspicious person matters were under the age of 49. Deputy Chief Lattanzi noted that this finding was not surprising.

Of the 124 contacts in the sample, only 9 — approximately 7 percent — resulted in a formal report being filed. Among those 9 individuals, 4 were categorized as Black, 3 as white, and 2 had no race listed. D. Chief Lattanzi clarified that officers do not have access to race information on driver's licenses or in departmental systems, and therefore must make their best observational assessment of an individual's race during contact. He noted that race classifications are drawn from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) categories, which include white, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Hispanic is designated as an ethnicity rather than a race under NIBRS; however, the Department tracks it separately as a racial category given the number of Hispanic community

members encountered, in order to ensure that any disparities can be identified and addressed. Of the 9 contacts that generated reports, 7 of the 9 individuals were male, 1 was female, and 1 had no sex listed. The age range of those individuals was 19 to 70 years old.

Self-Initiated Traffic Stops

Regarding traffic stops by sex, 63 percent of self-initiated traffic stops involved male individuals and 36 percent involved female individuals. By race, 55.8 percent of traffic stops were of white individuals, 17.5 percent of Black individuals, 9 percent of Hispanic individuals, and 9.6 percent of Asian individuals. These figures were consistent with data from the prior three years. By age, the majority of individuals stopped were under the age of 39, with 27 percent falling in the 21-to-29 age range and 22 percent in the 30-to-39 age range.

CP Maynard sought clarification regarding how age categories were structured in the analysis. Chief Páez elaborated that for traffic stops, the data is broken down in age brackets of 0 to 17, 18 to 20, 21 to 29, 30 to 39, and each subsequent decade through 90 and older. He noted that some categories at the extremes contained very small numbers of contacts, which could cause percentages in those ranges to appear misleading — particularly when examining citation-versus-stop ratios in those segments.

Citation Percentage by Race — Further Analysis

D. Chief Lattanzi highlighted one category that warranted a deeper analytical review: the citation percentage by race. For white, Black, and Asian individuals, the percentage of traffic stops that resulted in a citation ranged from approximately 21.7 percent for Black individuals to 24.8 percent for white individuals, with an overall average across those groups of approximately 25.9 percent. For Asian individuals, the rate was 22.7 percent.

By contrast, Hispanic individuals received a citation in approximately 50.9 percent of their traffic stops — a rate roughly 13 percentage points above the overall average. Law Enforcement Planner Hershey conducted a deeper examination of those specific stops and found that approximately 45 percent of the citations issued to Hispanic individuals were for low-discretionary offenses: driver's license suspensions, no operator's license, temporary permit violations, or similar violations. Officers have little to no discretion in these situations, as a citation is the expected enforcement action. An additional approximately 13 percent were for speed violations at or above 21 miles per hour over the posted limit, which falls within the department's speed enforcement policy threshold and again leaves officers with minimal discretion. A further approximately 19 percent were for operating a vehicle while impaired — also a low-discretionary offense category. In total, these categories accounted for the elevated citation rate for Hispanic drivers in 2025 and were not found to indicate biased enforcement.

CP Barnes raised a question about contextualizing the raw numbers behind the racial percentages, noting that percentages alone could be misleading without understanding the underlying totals. D. Chief Lattanzi provided the specific figures: for Black individuals, 391 citations were issued out of 1,800 traffic stops, yielding the 21.7 percent rate. For white individuals, 1,422 citations were issued out of approximately 5,700 traffic stops, yielding the 24.8 percent rate. CP Barnes asked whether this disparity warranted concern. D. Chief Lattanzi stated that the department did not find the data to be concerning when considered alongside the breakdown of offense types, as the citation rates were attributable to low-discretionary enforcement situations.

D. Chief Lattanzi addressed the rationale for using at-fault traffic crash data rather than census population data as the benchmark for comparison. He explained that Dublin is not a bedroom community; it has significant hotel, business, and corridor traffic on routes such as I-270 and State Route 33, meaning that census data would not accurately reflect the driving population officers encounter. The at-fault crash data is considered a more reflective benchmark because it is community-responsive rather than self-initiated, captures individuals who were actually driving on Dublin's roads, and focuses specifically on at-fault drivers — a population more analogous to those officers would be focused on for behavioral enforcement purposes.

Arrests by Race

D. Chief Lattanzi reported that in 2025, two racial categories stood out for further analysis in arrest data: Black individuals, who represented 27.6 percent of arrests (168 out of 608 total arrests), and Hispanic individuals, who represented 12.2 percent (74 arrests). The Committee was again informed that a substantial portion of these arrests were attributable to low-discretionary offense categories. For Black individuals, approximately 42 percent of arrests were warrant-related, 21 percent were for OVI offenses, 12.5 percent for assault, menacing, domestic violence, or strangulation, and 6.5 percent for theft or receiving stolen property. Combined, these four categories accounted for approximately 82 percent of all arrests of Black individuals, of which approximately 72 percent were considered low-discretionary events. For Hispanic individuals, approximately 24 percent of arrests were warrant-related, 43 percent were for OVI offenses, and approximately 11 percent for assault or domestic violence — totaling approximately 78.3 percent attributable to low-discretionary offenses.

Benchmark Comparisons

D. Chief Lattanzi stated that when the traffic citation data by sex, traffic stops by race, and citations by race were each compared against the at-fault traffic crash benchmark, all categories fell within a range consistent with the prior three years of data. No additional analysis was warranted in any of those categories.

Property Seizures

The report identified one property seizure recorded in 2025. D. Chief Lattanzi explained that the funds — totaling \$292,000 — were actually seized in 2023 as part of a narcotics investigation conducted by the Department's Community Impact Unit in conjunction with other jurisdictions. The case involved a seizure of more than \$1,000,000 from a semi-truck stop in Oklahoma. The court issued its judgment entry in 2025, awarding Dublin's portion of those funds. The seized funds are held in a seizure account subject to statutory requirements, and are used for furthering investigations and other law enforcement purposes.

Citizen Complaints

In 2025, two citizen complaints were filed against officers that either alleged or inferred bias. Both complaints were fully investigated by supervisors and reviewed through the chain of command up to the Chief of Police. One complaint was determined to be unfounded. The other was determined to reflect proper conduct by the officer. Chief Páez added detail on both incidents. The first involved a traffic stop of an African American woman who was stopped overnight for traveling at 41 miles per hour in a 25-mile-per-hour zone. While the individual did not file a formal written complaint, comments made during the stop were sufficient to trigger a review through a bias lens. Body camera footage was reviewed and no indication of bias was found. The second involved a

dispute between a complainant and neighbors over the use of a common area in an apartment complex. The same officer had responded to a previous complaint by the same individual, and a similar complaint was filed on the subsequent response. Again, no bias was identified upon review. Chair Hollie expressed appreciation for the Department's diligence in treating the first incident as a complaint even in the absence of a formal filing, given the comments made during the stop.

Prior Year Recommendations — Status Update

CP Barnes inquired about the status of the four recommendations included in the 2024 non-bias based policing report, and suggested that future presentations address those recommendations at the outset before proceeding to the current year's analysis. Chief Páez acknowledged the recommendation and addressed each item in turn.

The first recommendation concerned potential changes to race and ethnicity designations in response to evolving federal-level categorization changes. Chief Páez indicated that, because these changes were initiated under a prior administration and their final form remains uncertain, the Department has elected to maintain its current categories in the interest of year-over-year consistency. No change has been made at this time, though the matter remains on the horizon.

The second recommendation addressed the distinction between the terms "sex" and "gender" in the Department's data reporting. CALEA uses the term "gender" in its standards, though the Department reports on biological sex. Mr. Hirschy's notation flagged the terminological inconsistency. However, during the department's CALEA on-site assessment, the categorization received praise for its thoroughness, and no deficiency was cited. The Department expects CALEA to reconcile its own terminology in the future.

The third recommendation noted that the Department's current Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Records Management System (RMS) does not provide all the functionality needed to facilitate efficient data entry and extraction for this analysis. CP Barnes agreed this was a significant finding, noting that it also related to concerns about missed data. Chief Páez confirmed that the Department is in the process of researching and transitioning to a new CAD and RMS system, with an anticipated 18-month implementation period, and that the data functionality requirements for this analysis will be a key consideration in that procurement.

The fourth recommendation addressed what Mr. Hirschy described as diminishing returns from the increasing granularity of subcategory analysis. As categories are subdivided further across multiple demographic dimensions, the analytical value of those subdivisions decreases and the risk of obscuring meaningful patterns increases. This observation was also validated in the post-meeting discussion with a subject matter expert. As a result, the department has begun peeling back some of the subcategorization. Chief Páez committed to identifying specifically which categories were removed and to bringing that information back as an old business item at a future meeting.

CP Xing raised a question about whether there is a national standard or third-party framework that governs the metrics and methodology used in this type of analysis. Chief Páez acknowledged that no single national standard has been identified by Mr. Hirschy or prescribed by any external entity for this type of administrative review. The approach used by the Department has evolved over time as the best available practice, and the Department continues to seek refinements. He noted that the at-fault crash benchmark approach, for example, has been refined progressively over the years, including an earlier period in which observers were posted at intersections to manually collect demographic data on drivers — a method acknowledged to be imperfect.

CP Xing also asked about the demographics of the two complainants who alleged bias. Chief Páez confirmed that both were African American women. He did not recall the specific ages.

CP Barnes closed by commending the breadth and quality of the analysis produced by Mr. Hirschy, and asked that the Committee's appreciation be conveyed to him. Chief Páez expressed gratitude on behalf of the Department for both the recognition and the Committee's engaged questions throughout the presentation.

- **Review of the Annual Use of Force and Vehicle Pursuit Analysis**

D. Chief Tabernik prefaced his presentation by noting the substantial scope of analytical work produced by Law Enforcement Planner Tom Hirschy, which extends well beyond the reports covered in this meeting to include operations and patrol bureau workload analyses, detective workload analyses, and numerous other administrative reviews. He stated that the three reports covered this evening were selected because they are the most relevant to the Committee's oversight function.

Scope of Police Activity in 2025

To provide context for the use-of-force data, D. Chief Tabernik cited key operational statistics for 2025: the Department handled approximately 64,000 calls for service; conducted more than 11,000 traffic stops; made 579 arrests; and took 776 traffic crash reports. Against that backdrop, the Department recorded 12 responses to resistance, which D. Chief Tabernik described as an extraordinarily small number relative to the total volume of public interactions.

Policy and Training Overview

D. Chief Tabernik emphasized that de-escalation and communication are high organizational priorities and are embedded in both policy and practice. The Department invests significantly in training, including 60 hours of defensive tactics instruction at the police academy for all sworn officers and twice-annual in-service training with a strong emphasis on scenario-based instruction. Scenarios are developed from incidents that have occurred within the jurisdiction or from instructive situations identified by the Department's expert training staff. The goal is to equip officers to resolve situations without the use of force wherever possible.

He defined the full spectrum of use-of-force responses tracked by the Department, ranging from the highest level — discharge of a firearm — down through lesser levels including taser deployment (probe deployment, drive stun, and laser display), application of pepper spray, baton use, takedowns, joint manipulation, escort positions, and overcoming more than minor resistance. He clarified that handcuffing without resistance and minor physical guidance do not constitute use of force, but that overcoming more than minor resistance does.

Use of Firearms

D. Chief Tabernik reported that the Department did not discharge a firearm at any person in 2025, nor was there any negligent discharge. The Department filed 28 use-of-firearm reports during the year: 23 were for the humane destruction of animals — predominantly deer — and 5 were for the pointing of a firearm at a person. He noted that officers are required to report all instances of pointing a firearm, and that these reports are reviewed by supervisors, a tactics instructor, and the deputy chief before being finalized. He stated that 5 pointing-of-firearm incidents represent a very

small number and is a reflection of intentional organizational emphasis on the gravity of that action.

Chief Páez read aloud the relevant policy language governing the pointing of firearms: sworn officers should only point a firearm at a person when it is objectively reasonable to do so. The most significant factor is a reasonable perception of the threat of death or serious physical harm to the officer or the public. Officers are directed to consider the totality of the circumstances, including the severity of the offense, the proximity of weapons, and prior knowledge of the suspect's propensity for violence. Chief Páez noted that this specific policy language was added in 2021, following discussions with the Department's tactics team, to provide officers with clearer guidance on what must be articulated in their justification for pointing a firearm. He observed that the number of pointing-of-firearm reports has declined since that policy language was introduced.

Taser

The Department recorded 3 taser uses in 2025. Two of these incidents were related to the pursuit of a stabbing suspect in January. In those two incidents, the taser was deployed but was unsuccessful due to circumstances outside the officer's control. The third taser incident was determined to be outside of policy, and the officer involved was addressed through the Department's disciplinary process.

Other Use-of-Force Categories

D. Chief Tabernik reported that there were no applications of a baton or pepper spray during 2025. The remaining uses of force — 8 of the 12 total incidents — involved some type of lower-level physical technique, including escort positions, takedowns, and balance displacement. He noted that 8 of the 12 incidents involved individuals experiencing some form of mental health issue, including 4 that were directly related to mental health crises, suicide attempts, or behavioral health episodes. In several of these cases, officers did not make arrests but instead intervened through a "mission-specific seizure" — using measured physical force to protect the life of a community member in crisis who was not being taken into custody.

D. Chief Tabernik described several illustrative incidents. One involved the stabbing suspect pursuit from January, in which officers attempted to detain the individual on scene before the suspect fled in a vehicle; a pit maneuver was subsequently performed and taser was deployed during the ensuing pursuit, and the suspect was ultimately taken into custody with assistance from other jurisdictions and charged with attempted murder. Another incident occurred at a school, where a School Resource Officer (SRO) responded to an individual who was harassing young students. After extensive de-escalation and communication efforts failed to produce voluntary compliance, the officer detained the individual without taking the individual to the ground, placing him in handcuffs.

Demographics and Patterns

Of the 12 individuals involved in response-to-resistance incidents, 10 were male and 2 were female. 9 were white, 2 were identified as Hispanic, and 1 was identified as Black. The age range spanned from 14 to 60 years old. All 12 incidents involved uniformed officers, drawn from patrol, the SRO program, the Community Impact Unit, and the traffic division.

D. Chief Tabernik noted that when juvenile responses to resistance were examined separately, 3 of the 12 total incidents involved juveniles — representing 3 of 4 such incidents over the last three years. Two of those three juvenile incidents involved mental health-related intervention requiring involuntary admission or crisis response, and one involved a domestic violence situation.

No patterns were identified in the data. All 12 incidents were reviewed using the same chain-of-command process as all other use-of-force events: the officer completes a report, the first-line supervisor reviews it, a member of the tactics training team reviews it, and it is then reviewed by the applicable deputy chief and the Chief of Police. Of the 12 incidents, 11 were found to be objectively reasonable and in accordance with policy. One was found to be outside of policy and was addressed through additional training and corrective action.

In 2025, 1 officer sustained a minor injury and 7 subjects sustained minor injuries. In each use-of-force incident, medics are immediately summoned to the scene to evaluate all parties. No legal action was initiated against the Department in connection with any of the 2025 incidents.

The three most common techniques used by officers were the escort position, takedown, and balance displacement — all consistent with the Department's training priorities.

Handcuffs and Minor Resistance

V. Chair Apolinario inquired whether the application of handcuffs is tracked as a use of force. D. Chief Tabernik and Chief Páez explained that handcuffing is not classified as a use of force unless it is accompanied by overcoming more than minor resistance. Handcuffs are a mechanism of control and securing, not a trained implement for overcoming resistance in the same manner as other tools. However, supervisors are instructed to err on the side of filing a report when there is any question about the level of resistance encountered.

Sgt. Kovacs provided additional context from his experience as a patrol supervisor. He described one incident in which a highly intoxicated individual was handcuffed for their own protection without any use of force, but sustained a very minor injury from the handcuffs themselves, prompting the filing of a full use-of-force report. He also described a second incident in which he and another sergeant jointly determined, based on the minimal physical contact required to secure a subject, that the level of resistance did not rise to the threshold of a formal response-to-resistance report. He noted that body camera footage and officer articulation are central to making those determinations.

CP Maynard sought clarification on the reporting process for pointing a firearm. D. Chief Tabernik outlined the full process: the officer has a duty to immediately report the incident to their supervisor; the officer then completes a use-of-firearm report articulating the specific reasons they perceived a threat to life or the safety of others; the report is reviewed by the first-line supervisor, who may request clarification or additional detail; it is then reviewed by a tactics instructor; and once both have signed off, it is submitted to the applicable deputy chief for final approval. Chief Páez confirmed that all five pointing-of-firearm reports from 2025 were brought to his attention by the deputy chiefs throughout the year, consistent with the practice of keeping him informed of significant incidents even before the annual review.

Vehicle Pursuit Analysis

D. Chief Tabernik transitioned to the Department's vehicle pursuit analysis, describing Dublin's pursuit policy as intentionally restrictive compared to many other law enforcement agencies. Officers "may" — not "shall" or "should" — pursue a fleeing vehicle only when the offense involves: attempted or threatened serious physical harm; kidnapping or abduction; or traffic violations where the suspect's conduct before the pursuit creates a strong probability of serious physical harm. Pursuits for property crimes, including stolen vehicles, are not authorized under policy.

In 2025, the department recorded 5 vehicle pursuits — an increase of 4 from the prior year. D. Chief Tabernik offered important context: several of these pursuits were initiated by officers and then terminated by supervisors upon the supervisor's determination that the initial justification did not meet policy criteria. Two of the five were terminated so quickly — within 5 to 10 seconds of initiation — that the word "pursuit" is almost a misnomer; both occurred on the night shift when there was minimal public traffic on the roadway. Those incidents were nonetheless addressed through the Department's disciplinary process.

One of the five pursuits that the Committee had previously reviewed involved Officer Keel and Officer Dietz, in which Officer Keel performed what D. Chief Tabernik described as a textbook pit maneuver in connection with a stabbing suspect. The fourth pursuit was initiated after an individual threatened another person with a firearm at a local business. That pursuit reached speeds in excess of 100 miles per hour on the freeway before a supervisor terminated it due to increasing traffic congestion and unacceptable public safety risk. As D. Chief Lattanzi explained, the supervisor's decision to terminate the pursuit did not end the investigation; plainclothes officers and officers from other jurisdictions were dispatched to the registered owner's address, and the individual was ultimately identified and taken into custody.

Chair Hollie posed a question about what happens to an investigation when a pursuit is terminated — specifically in a hypothetical kidnapping scenario — and whether the Department simply ceases its efforts. D. Chief Tabernik explained that terminating the pursuit does not mean stopping the investigation. The Department leverages whatever information has been gathered — license plate, vehicle description, driver identity — and can call upon regional resources including aerial support, other jurisdictions, and investigative follow-up to continue pursuing the matter through alternative means.

CP Goel inquired about whether inter-jurisdictional protocols and joint training exist for situations where a pursuit crosses jurisdictional boundaries. D. Chief Tabernik confirmed that the Department's policy and training direct officers to prefer that the jurisdiction of occurrence take over a pursuit when it leaves Dublin's boundaries. He also noted that when pursuits initiated by other jurisdictions enter Dublin, Dublin supervisors actively monitor those situations through dispatch. If the offense for which the other jurisdiction is pursuing does not meet Dublin's policy criteria, Dublin officers will not join the pursuit, though they may assist by closing freeway exits or deploying stop sticks. Sgt. Kovacs noted that drones have been used successfully to prevent pursuits — particularly in stolen vehicle situations, where aerial monitoring has enabled officers to locate and intercept suspects without ever initiating a chase.

Regarding a policy change noted in this year's analysis, D. Chief Tabernik reported that the Department updated its approach to controlled deflation device (stop stick) deployment for stolen vehicles. While the department does not pursue stolen vehicles, officers may now deploy stop

sticks when an officer has articulable suspicion or reliable information — such as a direct communication from another law enforcement agency — that a vehicle is stolen and is not expected to stop voluntarily. This change was described as a deliberate and measured response to growing community concern about vehicle theft, providing an additional tool for officers without authorizing high-speed pursuits.

All 5 pursuits were reviewed through the same chain-of-command process used for use-of-force incidents. D. Chief Tabernik also noted that during this review cycle, the Department discovered that officers were using varying and outdated versions of the pursuit reporting form — sometimes the same form used during a pursuit years prior — and that intentional steps have been taken to standardize form usage going forward.

STAFF COMMENTS

- **Update on Crime Trends and Police Activity - Police Chief Justin Paez**

Chief Páez reported that through the end of March 2026, nearly all crime categories are trending downward compared to the same period in 2025. Part 1 violent crime, overall theft offenses, theft from vehicle reports, and stolen vehicles are all lower than at the corresponding point last year.

Two categories showed a modest uptick and are being monitored. Breaking and entering offenses increased from 6 to 7 reports in the first three months of the year. Burglaries increased from 4 to 7 reports over the same comparison period. Chief Páez noted that while these are singular-digit increases and the community remains very safe, the trends are being actively tracked.

Regarding traffic, the total number of crash reports increased slightly — 168 in the first three months of 2026 versus 159 in the same period last year, a difference of 9. More concerning were trends in serious-injury and OVI-related crashes. Serious injury crash reports increased from 2 to 4 for the first quarter. OVI-related crashes increased from 2 to 8 incidents over the same period. Chief Páez noted that the total number of traffic stops remained essentially consistent with the prior year — approximately 3,006 in the first three months of 2026 versus a similar number in 2025 — indicating that enforcement activity has been maintained at comparable levels.

On the subject of speeding, Chief Páez noted that the number of speed citations is trending lower than in recent years. He acknowledged the multi-year emphasis of the Slow Down Dublin initiative and expressed cautious optimism that the decrease may be attributable to gradual changes in driver behavior resulting from sustained enforcement attention to speed, though he noted that continued monitoring will be needed to distinguish a meaningful trend from a temporary data point.

Chief Páez concluded by reiterating a recurring public safety message: despite the downward trend in stolen vehicles and vehicle thefts, the Department continues to document monthly incidents of firearms being stolen from vehicles. He urged the public to remove firearms from unattended vehicles and to ensure they are secured appropriately, emphasizing that this remains a priority preventative message for the department.

ROUNDTABLE

D. Chief Tabernik confirmed, in response to Vice Chair Apolinario's earlier inquiry, that the mental health town hall is proceeding as planned on Wednesday, May 7, 2026, from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM at the Dublin Recreation Center. He noted that multiple community vendors will be in attendance and

that a full agenda has been prepared. He encouraged committee members to participate in what he described as an important and beneficial community conversation.

Chief Páez thanked the Committee members for their engagement throughout a data-intensive meeting. He acknowledged CP Barnes for having suggested, following last year's meeting, that a more focused interim discussion be held on the non-bias based policing data. That meeting was held and resulted in approximately an hour-and-a-half of substantive conversation involving the Chair, Vice Chair, and department staff, which in turn shaped the structure of the presentation this evening. Chief Páez also noted that any individual committee members wishing to engage in a more in-depth discussion on any topic between formal meetings are welcome to reach out, as such individual conversations can take place without triggering public meeting requirements.

Chief Páez highlighted that V. Chair Apolinario has been invited to speak at the upcoming New Americans naturalization ceremony, to be held the following week at the recreation center, where new citizens will take their oath of citizenship. V. Chair Apolinario confirmed the engagement and expressed that it is a personal honor to represent Dublin and to share his own naturalization experience with attendees. Chief Páez noted that Christine Nardecchio coordinates this annual event, and encouraged any members who wish to participate or assist to contact her.

Chief Páez announced that the May meeting will be CP Maynard's final official meeting as a member of the Chiefs Advisory Committee, as his term is concluding. He stated that the agenda for the May meeting has been intentionally kept light to allow ample time for the Committee to properly recognize and honor CP Maynard's contributions over the five and a half years of the Committee's existence.

CP Maynard expressed his gratitude to the Committee and reflected on the significance of the Committee's work. He noted that transparency and accountability — one of the Committee's founding pillars — had been well demonstrated throughout the evening's meeting, particularly in the willingness of department leadership to respond substantively to the questions raised by CP Barnes and others. CP Maynard stated that seeing the Committee and the Department engage in this manner has been deeply rewarding over the course of his tenure.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.



Chair, Chief's Advisory Committee



Deputy Clerk of Council