

**CALIFORNIA
ELECTRONIC
INTERCEPTIONS REPORT**



**Annual Report
2020**

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ROB BONTA
Attorney General



Division of Criminal Law

Appeals, Writs & Trials Section

This annual report is available on the
California Attorney General's website:
<http://oag.ca.gov>

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Table 1: Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2020..... | 6 |
| Table 2: General Description of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2020 | 7 |
| Table 3: Electronic Interception Court Activity During Calendar Year 2020 | 8 |
| Table 4: Description of Communications Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2020 | 9 |
| Table 5: Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report..... | 43 |
| Table 6: Costs of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2020 | 66 |
| Table 7: Jurisdiction Reporting No Electronic Interception Activity During Calendar Year 2020..... | 92 |
| Table 8: Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions Conducted in Prior Years..... | 93 |
| Table 9: List of Electronic Interception Orders Approved But Never Installed or Not Used Calendar Year 2020..... | 94 |
| Table 10: Use of Wiretap Evidence in Administrative/Disciplinary Hearings..... | 95 |
| Appendix A: Penal Code section 629.62 “Report by Attorney General”..... | 96 |
| Appendix B: Penal Code sections 629.78 & 629.82 Additional Reporting Requirements..... | 97 |

Executive Summary

The 2020 Attorney General’s Electronic Interceptions Report is issued in compliance with Penal Code sections 629.62 and 629.82(d), and is available on the Attorney General’s website at: <https://oag.ca.gov>. To facilitate the preparation of this report, each county was directed to provide certain information regarding its electronic interception activity for the 2020 calendar year by January 6, 2021. This report reflects the information submitted.

Electronic interceptions are the interceptions of wire or electronic communications via wire, cable, radio, and other systems. In California, court-authorized interceptions of wire or electronic communications are used to target specific criminal offenses when conventional investigative techniques are inadequate or simply too dangerous to pursue. As such, the use of electronic interceptions constitutes an essential tool in law enforcement agencies’ battle against crime. Dangerous individuals and criminal entities, such as drug trafficking organizations (“DTOs”) and criminal street gangs, frequently rely on telecommunications to advance their criminal activity. Accordingly, electronic interceptions are essential in identifying, disrupting, and preventing crimes including murder, drug trafficking, and human trafficking. Such interceptions have successfully uncovered conspiracies to commit murder and have led to the seizure of significant amounts of narcotics, firearms, and criminally derived proceeds that facilitate ongoing criminal activity. Discoveries and seizures like these advance public safety.


This report contains electronic interception data and details about how authorized electronic interceptions enabled local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies to effectively combat crime at various levels. In part, the data reflect the following for 2020:

Overview

In 2020, California judges approved 457 orders authorizing electronic interceptions out of 458 applications submitted. This marks a 24% increase compared to 369 orders approved in 2019.

Wiretap orders were issued in 19 of California’s 58 counties, compared to 16 counties in 2019. The greatest numbers of orders authorizing electronic interceptions were issued in Los Angeles, Riverside, and Fresno Counties, with 189, 112, and 38 orders, respectively. In 2019, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties made up the three counties with the greatest number of orders, with 163, 40, and 39 orders, respectively.

The following graph shows the total number of orders authorizing interceptions each year over the ten-year period ending in 2020:




Criminal Offenses, Arrests & Convictions

Law enforcement agencies targeted various individual and combinations of offenses in the 458 applications for interception authority submitted to California courts in 2020 (Table 2). Those applications most frequently targeted narcotics offenses—299 times, or in approximately 65% of applications. Murder was a targeted offense in 76 applications, or approximately 17% of applications, and in 18 of the 19 counties reporting a wiretap. Applications included a gang offense as a targeted offense 69 times, or in 15% of applications. An offense other than murder, a gang offense, or a narcotics offense (e.g., kidnapping) was targeted 23 times, or in 5% of applications.

Authorized interceptions in 2020 resulted in 442 total arrests (Table 1). These arrests were predominantly for narcotics offenses (304), gang-related offenses (213), and murder (133). Each interception operation can result in the arrest of multiple people for multiple, overlapping offenses. Over the ten-year period ending in 2020, investigations involving electronic interceptions resulted in an average of approximately 725 arrests per year.

Figure 2. Total Orders & Arrests, 2011 - 2020



Due to the nature of the judicial process, whether through trials or guilty pleas in the superior courts or some other disposition, the bulk of the yearly arrests are not resolved by the time counties submit data for the annual report. Updated information on interception data reported in prior years can be found in Table 8 of this report.

Types, Lengths & Number of Interceptions

Tables 2 and 3 of this report show various data related to the nature of the electronic interceptions conducted. These data reflect the types of devices and locations targeted, the number of original interception orders and extensions, and information about the duration of such operations.

Interceptions overwhelmingly targeted portable devices such as cellular and/or mobile phones. In 2020, cell phones made up 90% of the total devices targeted. Similarly, in 2019, cell phones made up approximately 87% of the total devices targeted.

Regarding duration, California law limits the period of authorized interception in an original order to 30 days. This period may, however, be lengthened by one or more extensions if the authorizing judge determines that an extended period of interception is justified.

Similar to 2019, in 2020 the average length of the approved initial period of interception was 30 days. Further, judges granted 335 extensions of 457 total original orders. The average duration of actual interception activity per order authorizing such activity, including extensions, was approximately 57 days.

Additional details about each authorized interception operation are provided in Tables 4 and 5 of this report. Table 4 provides reported information about the number of persons whose communications were intercepted, the total number of communications intercepted, the breakdown between incriminating and other communications, and narrative comments on the reported


usefulness of the operations. Table 5 provides information about the statutorily mandated notice provided to persons whose communications were intercepted.

Costs of Interceptions

Table 6 of this report sets forth information about personnel and resource expenses that state and local agencies reported having incurred in conducting authorized interception operations. These data specifically exclude, however, costs otherwise covered by regularly incurred compensation of personnel, as well as personnel and resource costs covered by federal funding.

The reported personnel and resource costs totaled \$16,846,552, an approximate 17% increase from the total costs of \$14,399,646 reported in 2019. The average reported cost of an interception operation was \$36,863 (rounded), an approximate 6% decrease from the average cost of \$39,023 (rounded) in 2019.

The following graph shows the costs associated with interceptions operations, as reported, for the ten-year period ending in 2020:



Wiretap Evidence in Administrative or Disciplinary Hearings

Finally, the passage of Senate Bill No. 439 in 2019, codified in relevant part in Penal Code section 629.82(d), led to the inclusion of a new table and appendix for this report (Table 10 & Appendix B). As further described in section 629.82(d), that provision permits, and requires reporting of, the use of the contents of intercepted communications in an administrative or disciplinary hearing involving the employment of a peace officer.

No such usage was reported for 2020.

* * *

Questions or comments about this report can be directed to the Criminal Law Division of the Attorney General's Office at (916) 445-9555.

Table 1
Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020¹

| Reporting Jurisdiction | No. of Applications | Number of Persons Arrested | | Arrest Offenses | | | | | | Conviction Offenses | | | | | | Number of Persons Convicted | |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| | | Total | Avg. per Order | Murder | Gang | Narcotics | Terrorism | Kidnapping | Other | Murder | Gang | Narcotics | Terrorism | Kidnapping | Other | Total | Avg. per Order |
| Alameda | 6 | 3 | 0.5 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Contra Costa | 6 | 17 | 2.8 | 13 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Fresno | 38 | 45 | 1.2 | | 32 | 45 | | | 32 | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Kern | 6 | 4 | 0.7 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Los Angeles | 189 | 114 | 0.6 | 40 | 8 | 70 | | | 4 | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Merced | 2 | 5 | 2.5 | 5 | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Orange | 10 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Riverside | 112 | 21 | 0.2 | 4 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Sacramento | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| San Bernardino | 23 | 50 | 2.2 | 3 | 43 | 46 | 25 | | 3 | | | | | | | 0 | |
| San Diego | 3 | 8 | 2.7 | 8 | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| San Joaquin | 11 | 32 | 2.9 | 32 | 32 | 32 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| San Luis Obispo | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Santa Clara | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Solano | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Stanislaus | 3 | 26 | 8.7 | | 5 | | | 5 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 0.3 | |
| Tulare | 26 | 3 | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Ventura | 12 | 98 | 8.2 | 5 | 58 | 93 | | | 8 | | 5 | | | | | 5 | 0.4 |
| Yolo | 5 | 16 | 3.2 | 16 | 16 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| Total: | 458 | 442 | | 133 | 213 | 304 | 25 | 5 | 52 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | |

¹ Any disparity between "Number of Persons Arrested" and "Number of Persons Convicted" may be attributed to the fact that many of those arrested are awaiting resolution of their cases whether by prosecution or other disposition.

Table 2
General Description of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | No. of Applications | Targeted Offenses (Offenses Specified in Order) | | | | | | Targeted Location | | | | | Targeted Device | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|
| | | Murder | Gang | Narcotics | Terrorism | Kidnapping | Other | Residence | Business | Public Area | Portable device | Other | Cell Phone | Land Line | Pager | Computer | Other |
| Alameda | 6 | 6 | | | | | | | | | 6 | | 6 | | | | 6 |
| Contra Costa | 6 | 5 | | | | 1 | | | | | 6 | 1 | 6 | | | | 3 |
| Fresno | 38 | 1 | 32 | 5 | | | | | | | 36 | | 36 | | | | 7 |
| Kern | 6 | 5 | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | 6 | | 6 | | | | 4 |
| Los Angeles | 189 | 24 | 2 | 163 | | | 5 | | | | 189 | | 189 | 5 | | | |
| Merced | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | |
| Orange | 10 | 2 | 8 | 1 | | | | | | | 10 | | 10 | | | | |
| Riverside | 112 | 3 | 2 | 107 | | | | | | | 112 | | 112 | | | | |
| Sacramento | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| San Bernardino | 23 | 1 | 6 | 16 | | | | | | | 23 | | 23 | | | 1 | |
| San Diego | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| San Joaquin | 11 | 11 | | | | | | | | | 10 | 1 | 10 | | | | 9 |
| San Luis Obispo | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 2 | 2 | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | |
| Solano | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Stanislaus | 3 | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Tulare | 26 | | 5 | 1 | | 20 | | | | | | | 25 | | | | |
| Ventura | 12 | 1 | 6 | 5 | | | | | | | 12 | | 12 | | | | 3 |
| Yolo | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | 5 | | 5 | | | | 5 |

Table 3
Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges
And Court Activity During Calendar Year 2020²

| Reporting Jurisdiction | Number of Intercept Orders | | | | | Number of Extensions | | | | | | Total Duration of Wiretaps | | | Motions to Suppress | | | Number of Trials Resulting from Intercepts |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|--------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------|------------------|--------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------------|--------|---------|--|
| | Applications | Granted | Modified/Amended | Denied | Not Installed/Installed Not Used | Applications | Granted | Modified/Amended | Denied | Not Installed/Installed Not Used | Average Length | Requested Days | Actual Days | Avg. per Order | Granted | Denied | Pending | |
| Alameda | 6 | 6 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 180 | 137 | 23 | | | | |
| Contra Costa | 6 | 6 | | | | 5 | 5 | 1 | | | 20 | 248 | 182 | 30 | | | | |
| Fresno | 38 | 38 | | | | 13 | 12 | | | | 30 | 1530 | 1210 | 32 | | | | |
| Kern | 6 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | 180 | 80 | 13 | | | | |
| Los Angeles | 189 | 189 | | | | 197 | 197 | | | | 30 | 11580 | 11369 | 60 | | | | |
| Merced | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 60 | 50 | 25 | | | | 1 |
| Orange | 10 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | 300 | 236 | 24 | | | | |
| Riverside | 112 | 112 | | | 1 | 98 | 97 | 2 | | | 30 | 6240 | 10335 | 93 | | | | |
| Sacramento | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 30 | 11 | 11 | | | | |
| San Bernardino | 23 | 23 | 2 | | 2 | 9 | 9 | | 2 | 30 | 960 | 708 | 31 | | | | | |
| San Diego | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | 90 | 43 | 14 | | | | |
| San Joaquin | 11 | 11 | | | | 4 | 4 | | | | 30 | 450 | 365 | 33 | | | | |
| San Luis Obispo | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 60 | 56 | 28 | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 60 | 30 | 30 | | | | |
| Solano | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 30 | 25 | 25 | | | | |
| Stanislaus | 3 | 3 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 17 | 103 | 101 | 34 | | | | |
| Tulare | 26 | 26 | | | | 8 | 8 | | | | 30 | 1020 | 692 | 27 | | | | |
| Ventura | 12 | 12 | | | | | | | | | | 360 | 327 | 27 | | | | 35 |
| Yolo | 5 | 5 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 30 | 210 | 168 | 34 | | | | |

² While electronic interceptions often result in evidence leading to prosecution, they may also lead to further investigations and the prevention of crime at the state and federal levels.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Alameda | 2020-ALA-1 | 213 | 4,094 | 29 | 71 | Investigation of a double homicide of two juvenile criminal gang members/ associates by members of a rival criminal street gang and an attempted homicide of two individuals in a gang district of Union City by the same rival criminal street gang. Evidence from the wiretap operation produced direct and circumstantial evidence of the person responsible for both crimes. |
| | 2020-ALA-2 | 118 | 1,147 | 5 | 95 | See 2020-ALA-1. |
| | 2020-ALA-3 | 98 | 1,181 | 18 | 82 | See 2020-ALA-1. |
| | 2020-ALA-4 | 191 | 3,734 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-ALA-6. |
| | 2020-ALA-5 | 10 | 206 | 12 | 88 | See 2020-ALA-6. |
| | 2020-ALA-6 | 40 | 1,965 | 7 | 93 | This wiretap operation involved the investigation into suspects of a 2007 cold case gang homicide. Interceptions provided suspect leads and circumstantial evidence. |
| Contra Costa | 2020-CC-1 | 145 | 35,805 | 16 | 84 | Interceptions provided information about targets to a conspiracy to commit a gang related murder, produced evidence of consciousness of guilt, and assisted in obtaining a confession from one of the suspects. As a result, a cold case from 2005 was closed and three people were arrested and charged. |
| | 2020-CC-2 | 756 | 34,565 | 1.8 | 98 | A criminal street gang's members/associates have displayed a high propensity of violent crime for several decades and were recently involved in multiple shootings throughout the City of Richmond. It was imperative to conduct a wiretap investigation to thoroughly investigate and prevent violent attacks by the criminal street gang's members/associates against rivals in and around the City of Richmond. |

³ Comments are not mandated and may be edited.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Contra Costa (cont'd) | 2020-CC-3 | 714 | 31,351 | 2 | 96 | A criminal street gang's members/associates have displayed a high propensity of violent crime for several decades and were recently involved in multiple shootings throughout the City of Richmond. It was imperative to conduct a wiretap investigation to thoroughly investigate and prevent violent attacks by the criminal street gang's members/associates against rivals in and around the City of Richmond. |
| | 2020-CC-4 | 630 | 24,362 | 1 | 99 | A criminal street gang's members/associates have displayed a high propensity of violent crime for several decades and were recently involved in multiple shootings throughout the City of Richmond. It was imperative to conduct a wiretap investigation to thoroughly investigate and prevent violent attacks by the criminal street gang's members/associates against rivals in and around the City of Richmond. |
| | 2020-CC-5 | 6 | 15,521 | 2 | 98 | These interceptions showed that a group of suspects had taken steps to solicit minors for sex with an identified suspect. |
| | 2020-CC-6 | 9 | 12,153 | 6 | 94 | Wiretap involved a homicide investigation involving two gangs from the Bay Area. These two gangs were involved in the murder of another gang member from Richmond. |
| Fresno | 2020-FR-1 | 427 | 3,431 | 8 | 92 | Investigation resulted in the seizure of 137 pounds of methamphetamine, 42,950 counterfeit M30 pills, 3 kilograms of cocaine, 1 kilogram of heroin, 10 pounds of marijuana, 1 handgun, and \$89,290 cash. Thirteen (13) suspects were arrested. |
| | 2020-FR-2 | 40 | 212 | 7 | 93 | See 2020-FR-1. |
| | 2020-FR-3 | 421 | 3,407 | 27 | 73 | See 2020-FR-1. |
| | 2020-FR-4 | 267 | 9,054 | 14 | 86 | See 2020-FR-1. |
| | 2020-FR-5 | 173 | 2,294 | 23 | 77 | See 2020-FR-1. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-6 | 864 | 94,804 | 7 | 93 | Wiretap investigation yielded valuable intelligence and resulted in high profile arrests related to murder and attempted murder. It also led to the seizure of approximately \$100,000 in currency, 80 pounds of methamphetamine, and 25 firearms. It also resulted in approximately 30 felony arrests for murder, attempted murder, assault with a firearm, cocaine sales, methamphetamine sales, firearm sales, felony evading, and burglary. The wiretap further aided in interrupting a possible gang related shooting and yielded new evidence regarding a high-profile gang murder cold case from over 15 years ago. It also resulted in the acquisition of intelligence, knowledge of hierarchy, and how this particular gang operates. |
| | 2020-FR-7 | 4,185 | 51,876 | 10 | 90 | Originally targeting local white race-based gang members and their crimes (including drug trafficking, weapons trafficking, fraud, felony assaults, shootings and murders), the operation quickly grew to include law enforcement from various counties and ranging to several states. During the course of this investigation, law enforcement was able to successfully identify dozens of subjects involved in narcotics trafficking, firearms trafficking, possession of firearms by numerous ex-felons, burglaries, felony assaults, and countless other crimes. As a result of the wiretap, law enforcement was able to stop at least 2 murders and seize approximately 100 pounds of methamphetamine, 6 pounds of heroin, approximately \$135,000 in currency, and approximately 45 firearms. The wiretap also allowed law enforcement to identify members and associates of a large gang, who were allegedly using numerous local white race based gang members to commit crimes. |
| | 2020-FR-8 | 323 | 34,116 | 26 | 74 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-9 | 304 | 23,155 | 20 | 80 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-10 | 70 | 1,861 | 10 | 90 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-11 | 176 | 3,302 | 23 | 77 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-12 | 99 | 483 | 9 | 91 | See 2020-FR-7. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-13 | 314 | 6,634 | 16 | 84 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-14 | 69 | 291 | 7 | 93 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-15 | 121 | 4,456 | 6 | 94 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-16 | 46 | 779 | 5 | 95 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-17 | 180 | 15,841 | 8 | 92 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-18 | 73 | 4,359 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-19 | 50 | 5,599 | 23 | 77 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-20 | 309 | 63,482 | 22 | 78 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-21 | 232 | 6,617 | 21 | 79 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-22 | 522 | 18,638 | 9 | 91 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-23 | 1,316 | 29,076 | 13 | 87 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-24 | 18 | 4,704 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-25 | 129 | 4,571 | 8 | 92 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-26 | 427 | 2,601 | 14 | 86 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-27 | 40 | 2,233 | 18 | 82 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-28 | 63 | 5,252 | 11 | 89 | See 2020-FR-7. |
| | 2020-FR-29 | 534 | 50,765 | 5 | 95 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-30 | 463 | 91,773 | 4 | 96 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-31 | 244 | 2,549 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-32 | 85 | 1,877 | 6 | 94 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-33 | 29 | 8,557 | 1 | 99 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-34 | 71 | 23,008 | 7 | 93 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-35 | 28 | 2,021 | 8 | 92 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-36 | 218 | 11,220 | 4 | 96 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-37 | 58 | 8,460 | 4 | 96 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| | 2020-FR-38 | 39 | 818 | 3 | 97 | See 2020-FR-6. |
| Kern | 2020-KE-1 | 75 | 330 | 29 | 72 | Intercepts helped law enforcement identify co-conspirators, locate additional residences, and prevent violent acts, including home invasion robberies, a drug rip gone wrong, and a potential kidnapping. As a result of the wiretap, law enforcement seized 3 semi-automatic handguns, 1 short barreled AR-15 assault rifle, ammunition, high capacity magazines, 1/2 of a kilogram of heroin, and 1/2 of a pound of methamphetamine. One arrest has been made so far, pending further investigation. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Kern (cont'd) | 2020-KE-2 | 1 | 949 | 1 | 99 | Numerous in-progress criminal gang offenses were intercepted and interrupted. Several pertinent homicide related phone calls were intercepted and recorded. |
| | 2020-KE-3 | 39 | 551 | 8 | 92 | See 2020-KE-2. |
| | 2020-KE-4 | 1 | 188 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-KE-2. |
| | 2020-KE-5 | 3 | 904 | 12 | 88 | See 2020-KE-2. |
| | 2020-KE-6 | 16 | 889 | 12 | 88 | See 2020-KE-2. |
| Los Angeles | 2020-LA-1 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-2 | 54 | 1,066 | 50 | 50 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 100 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-4 | 273 | 1,771 | 20 | 80 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-5 | 108 | 1,327 | 63 | 37 | Resulted in the seizure of 10 kilograms of cocaine. |
| | 2020-LA-6 | 1,573 | 16,329 | 0 | 100 | Investigators are currently actively investigating this case, with more arrests anticipated. |
| | 2020-LA-7 | 362 | 2,559 | 15 | 85 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-8 | 79 | 916 | 48 | 52 | Interception of target telephones was disconnected prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-9 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-10 | 87 | 827 | 17 | 83 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 67 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-11 | 38 | 219 | 59 | 41 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-12 | 480 | 12,441 | 36 | 64 | During the interception period, agents made arrest(s) and were able to identify additional members of the targeted DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-13 | 104 | 2,194 | 15 | 85 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 43 kilograms of cocaine. |
| | 2020-LA-14 | 91 | 839 | 32 | 68 | Interception of target telephones were discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-15 | 4 | 57 | 88 | 12 | Interception of target telephones were discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-16 | 2 | 6 | 100 | 0 | Interception of target telephones were discontinued prior to any seizures. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-17 | 1,176 | 44,241 | 0.2 | 100 | Resulted in significant arrests and created a significant disruption within the targeted criminal enterprise. This investigation is ongoing. |
| | 2020-LA-18 | 1,176 | 17,520 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-19 | 272 | 13,632 | 25 | 75 | Interception of this phone led to the seizure of 1 pound of tar heroin and approximately 5,000 fentanyl pills. DEA continued the investigation. |
| | 2020-LA-20 | 1,176 | 8,567 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-21 | 1,176 | 6,853 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-22 | 475 | 13,984 | 92 | 8 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify more members of this DTO, as well as learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-23 | 249 | 10,499 | 32 | 68 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify more members of this DTO, as well as learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-24 | 1,176 | 7,668 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-25 | 48 | 677 | 30 | 70 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-26 | 1,176 | 11,054 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-27 | 66 | 2,239 | 10 | 90 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-28 | 29 | 211 | 41 | 59 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify more members of this DTO as well as learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-29 | 1,176 | 14,281 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones were discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-31 | 77 | 1,037 | 0.1 | 100 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$250,000. |
| 2020-LA-32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. | |
| 2020-LA-33 | 56 | 2,855 | 15 | 85 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. | |
| 2020-LA-34 | 43 | 272 | 58 | 42 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. | |
| 2020-LA-35 | 63 | 466 | 47 | 53 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$226,000. | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-36 | 21 | 434 | 82 | 18 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-37 | 31 | 638 | 53 | 47 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 151 kilograms of cocaine. |
| | 2020-LA-38 | 11 | 32 | 88 | 12 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-39 | 13 | 273 | 30 | 70 | Resulted in the seizure of 4 kilograms of cocaine and approximately \$200,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-40 | 20 | 165 | 89 | 11 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-41 | 72 | 680 | 34 | 66 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-42 | 116 | 1,124 | 65 | 35 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-43 | 52 | 802 | 6 | 94 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-44 | 37 | 825 | 73 | 27 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-45 | 9 | 36 | 47 | 53 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-46 | 53 | 365 | 49 | 51 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-47 | 526 | 22,040 | 11 | 89 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-48 | 144 | 4,414 | 58 | 42 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-49 | 178 | 2,079 | 1 | 99 | Targets were involved in a murder investigation. |
| | 2020-LA-50 | 7 | 2,626 | 5 | 95 | Despite the suspect mostly using Wi-Fi applications to communicate, law enforcement was able to intercept pertinent communications to aid in the arrest and provide additional evidence for prosecution. |
| | 2020-LA-51 | 231 | 2,264 | 65 | 35 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$215,000. |
| | 2020-LA-52 | 53 | 1,187 | 38 | 62 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 84 kilograms of cocaine and 346 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-53 | 1,007 | 51,197 | 19 | 81 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-54 | 525 | 18,891 | 1 | 99 | Target 1 committed a murder. Targets 2-4 were involved in a covering up for Target 1 after the murder. Interceptions led to a stronger case against target and resulted in obtaining additional evidence. |
| | 2020-LA-55 | 187 | 8,190 | 16 | 84 | During the interception period, agents made arrest(s) and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-56 | 121 | 1,713 | 61 | 39 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 23 kilograms of cocaine and \$250,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-57 | 203 | 4,364 | 79 | 21 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-58 | 672 | 42,341 | 2 | 98 | This wiretap involved two homicides being investigated by two local police agencies. The interceptions assisted in gathering information for both investigations. Information gathered from the intercepted telephone calls assisted with interviews of the suspects and locating residence where evidence was recovered. Interceptions also assisted with preventing crimes such as burglary and looting. |
| | 2020-LA-59 | 24 | 722 | 49 | 51 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 56 kilograms of cocaine and 140 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-60 | 371 | 27,369 | 18 | 82 | During the interception period agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-61 | 212 | 4,744 | 15 | 85 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-62 | 159 | 2,726 | 85 | 15 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 44 kilograms of cocaine, 155 pounds of methamphetamine and 6 kilograms of heroin. |
| | 2020-LA-63 | 12 | 161 | 79 | 21 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-64 | 44 | 588 | 65 | 35 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-65 | 72 | 811 | 17 | 83 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-66 | 435 | 10,387 | 51 | 49 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-67 | 191 | 9,578 | 25 | 75 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-68 | 11 | 219 | 55 | 45 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-69 | 51 | 530 | 86 | 14 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-70 | 9 | 49 | 86 | 14 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.7 million. |
| | 2020-LA-71 | 1,352 | 15,051 | 1 | 99 | Resulted in significant arrests and created a significant disruption within the targeted criminal enterprise. This investigation is ongoing. |
| | 2020-LA-72 | 26 | 320 | 81 | 19 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$460,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-73 | 298 | 5,750 | 26 | 74 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-74 | 37 | 2,250 | 10 | 90 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-75 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-76 | 205 | 4,550 | 0 | 100 | Targets were involved in a murder investigation. |
| | 2020-LA-77 | 308 | 17,786 | 5 | 95 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-78 | 18 | 87 | 52 | 48 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-79 | 909 | 45,861 | 2 | 98 | This wiretap involved two homicides being investigated by two local police agencies. The interceptions assisted in gathering information for both investigations. Information gathered from the intercepted telephone calls assisted with interviews of the suspects and locating residence where evidence was recovered. Interceptions also assisted with preventing crimes such as burglary and looting. |
| | 2020-LA-80 | 1,176 | 3,217 | 0 | 100 | See 2020-LA-17. |
| | 2020-LA-81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-82 | 289 | 2,335 | 3 | 97 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-83 | 65 | 663 | 78 | 22 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-84 | 482 | 20,246 | 0 | 100 | This wiretap involved two homicides being investigated by two local police agencies. The interceptions assisted in gathering information for both investigations. Information gathered from the intercepted telephone calls assisted with interviews of the suspects and locating residence where evidence was recovered. Interceptions also assisted with preventing crimes such as burglary and looting. |
| | 2020-LA-85 | 63 | 414 | 46 | 54 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-86 | 590 | 23,186 | 22 | 78 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-88 | 4 | 24 | 100 | 0 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-89 | 43 | 659 | 86 | 14 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-90 | 3 | 22 | 0 | 100 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-91 | 370 | 27,798 | 21 | 79 | During the interception period agents made arrests and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-92 | 139 | 1,684 | 20 | 80 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-93 | 274 | 4,911 | 18 | 82 | During the interception period agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-94 | 39 | 928 | 10 | 90 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-95 | 110 | 2,403 | 0 | 100 | Targets were involved in a murder investigation and destroying of evidence related to the murder. Targets were also involved in gang related crimes. Intercepts assisted with the murder investigation and allowed Investigators to ensure the safety of the community from violent gang activity. |
| | 2020-LA-96 | 283 | 7,208 | 23 | 77 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-97 | 79 | 1,448 | 72 | 28 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-98 | 52 | 616 | 55 | 45 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 126 kilograms of cocaine and \$220,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-99 | 43 | 250 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-100 | 679 | 72,942 | 3 | 97 | The wiretap was crucial in solving the Long Beach mass shooting. |
| | 2020-LA-101 | 51 | 625 | 82 | 18 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-102 | 828 | 24,846 | 12 | 88 | During the interception period, agents made an arrest and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-104 | 534 | 18,858 | 31 | 69 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-105 | 31 | 151 | 71 | 29 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$50,000 in narcotics proceeds and 500 pounds of marijuana. |
| | 2020-LA-106 | 190 | 769 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-107 | 258 | 2,490 | 28 | | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-108 | 7 | 27 | 93 | 7 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$300,000 in narcotics proceeds. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-109 | 174 | 537 | 0 | 100 | This wiretap involved two homicides being investigated by two local police agencies. The interceptions assisted in gathering information for both investigations. Information gathered from the intercepted telephone calls assisted with interviews of the suspects and locating residence where evidence was recovered. Interceptions also assisted with preventing crimes such as burglary and looting. |
| | 2020-LA-110 | 31 | 257 | 39 | 61 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-111 | 15 | 91 | 57 | 43 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$200,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-112 | 191 | 4,765 | 47 | 53 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$430,000 in narcotics proceeds and 90 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-113 | 27 | 412 | 23 | 77 | During the interception period, agents made an arrest and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-114 | 43 | 866 | 75 | 25 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$260,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-115 | 31 | 95 | 13 | 87 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-116 | 1,402 | 14,219 | 4 | 96 | Resulted in significant arrests. This investigation is on-going. |
| | 2020-LA-117 | 47 | 676 | 81 | 19 | Resulted in the seizure of 80 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-118 | 75 | 522 | 19 | 81 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 27 kilograms of cocaine. |
| | 2020-LA-119 | 440 | 9,973 | 8 | 92 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-120 | 34 | 358 | 65 | 35 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-121 | 35 | 351 | 39 | 61 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-122 | 29 | 99 | 79 | 21 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| 2020-LA-123 | 107 | 6,602 | 3 | 97 | The wiretap was crucial in solving the Long Beach mass shooting. | |
| 2020-LA-124 | 100 | 5,497 | 35 | 65 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-125 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 100 | Initial investigation targeted subject believed to be in Mexico. Due to the inactivity of Target Telephone #1 no drug or money was seized during the interception. |
| | 2020-LA-126 | 56 | 299 | 80 | 20 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-127 | 28 | 354 | 18 | 82 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-128 | 1,402 | 14,219 | 4 | 96 | Resulted in significant arrests. This investigation is on-going. |
| | 2020-LA-129 | 94 | 1,686 | 11 | 89 | During the interception period agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-130 | 14 | 94 | 81 | 19 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately 25 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-131 | 45 | 431 | 98 | 2 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$450,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-132 | 48 | 321 | 20 | 80 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-133 | 1,402 | 14,219 | 4 | 96 | Resulted in significant arrests. This investigation is ongoing. |
| | 2020-LA-134 | 40 | 318 | 31 | 69 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-135 | 33 | 645 | 25 | 75 | Interceptions aided law enforcement in seizing approximately 15 pounds of methamphetamine and several thousands of dollars in narcotics proceeds. Assisted in removal of dangerous narcotics from Los Angeles, S. El Monte, and San Bernardino County. |
| | 2020-LA-136 | 60 | 3,847 | 5 | 95 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-137 | 194 | 2,230 | 15 | 85 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-138 | 2 | 283 | 3 | 97 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-139 | 177 | 5,881 | 20 | 80 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-140 | 156 | 3,667 | 9 | 91 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-141 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 100 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-142 | 5 | 1,550 | 2 | 98 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-143 | 307 | 6,749 | 33 | 67 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-144 | 325 | 20,430 | 24 | 76 | Resulted in the recovery of over 30 firearms, the seizure of several pounds of narcotics and several thousand dollars, and the identification of numerous high-ranking gang members. The wiretap has led to the suppression of violent crime and gang shootings in the community. Information obtained from the wiretap is still being used to assist with homicide and assault with a deadly weapon investigations. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-145 | 60 | 21,947 | 6 | 94 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-146 | 55 | 945 | 29 | 71 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-147 | 310 | 35,350 | 11 | 89 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-148 | 205 | 11,516 | 16 | 84 | DEA continued this investigation. Interception of this phone led to the seizure of 13 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-149 | 97 | 2,540 | 22 | 78 | Resulted in the recovery of over 30 firearms, the seizure of several pounds of narcotics and several thousands of dollars, and the identification of numerous high-ranking gang members. The wiretap has led to the suppression of violent crime and gang shootings in the community. Information obtained from the wiretap is still being used to assist with homicide and assault with a deadly weapon investigations. |
| | 2020-LA-150 | 77 | 2,754 | 27 | 73 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-151 | 30 | 686 | 8 | 92 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-152 | 268 | 6,589 | 15 | 85 | DEA continued this investigation. No significant seizures of narcotics or currency were made as a result of this wiretap during this period. |
| | 2020-LA-153 | 20 | 590 | 20 | 80 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-154 | 306 | 6,812 | 55 | 45 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$600,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-155 | 173 | 2,972 | 74 | 26 | Resulted in the seizure of approximately \$330,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-156 | 12 | 234 | 46 | 54 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-157 | 7 | 59 | 80 | 20 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-158 | 249 | 9,185 | 27 | 73 | During the interception period, agents made arrests and were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-159 | 96 | 873 | 76 | 24 | During the interception period, agents were able to make an arrest and identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-160 | 39 | 1,782 | 16 | 84 | During the interception period, agents were able to make an arrest and identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-161 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-162 | 6 | 399 | 51 | 49 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-163 | 19 | 301 | 16 | 84 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-164 | 8 | 56 | 75 | 25 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-165 | 246 | 4,593 | 17 | 83 | Resulted in the seizure of \$40,000 in narcotics proceeds, 220 pounds of methamphetamine, and two kilograms of suspected Fentanyl. |
| | 2020-LA-166 | 48 | 1,921 | 60 | 40 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-167 | 98 | 1,982 | 36 | 64 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-168 | 103 | 1,214 | 50 | 50 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-169 | 11 | 64 | 67 | 33 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-170 | 9 | 90 | 79 | 21 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-171 | 124 | 2,636 | 12 | 88 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-172 | 8 | 204 | 85 | 25 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-173 | 135 | 1,968 | 9 | 91 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-174 | 7 | 98 | 27 | 73 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-LA-175 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 100 | Targets discontinued use of the Target Telephones. |
| | 2020-LA-176 | 7 | 76 | 92 | 8 | Targets discontinued use of Target Telephone. |
| | 2020-LA-177 | 126 | 4,046 | 23 | 77 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-178 | 6 | 41 | 85 | 15 | Targets discontinued use of Target Telephone. |
| 2020-LA-179 | 95 | 900 | 4 | 96 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-180 | 98 | 14,253 | 22 | 78 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-181 | 750 | 29,836 | 21 | 79 | Resulted in the seizure of 121 pounds of methamphetamine. |
| | 2020-LA-182 | 51 | 1,467 | 12 | 88 | During the interception period, agents were able to arrest and identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-183 | 13 | 624 | 22 | 78 | During the interception period, agents were able to identify additional members of this DTO and learn more about the details of their workings. |
| | 2020-LA-184 | 139 | 2,080 | 55 | 45 | Resulted in the seizure of \$715,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-185 | 55 | 1,037 | 83 | 17 | Resulted in the seizure of \$350,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-186 | 46 | 361 | 26 | 74 | Resulted in the seizure of 36 kilograms of cocaine, 11 kilograms of heroin, 2 kilograms of fentanyl, 500,000 pills of fentanyl, and approximately \$40,000 in narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-LA-187 | 44 | 173 | 19 | 81 | Target discontinued use of Target Telephone. |
| | 2020-LA-188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | Target discontinued use of Target Telephone. |
| | 2020-LA-189 | 20 | 4,561 | 65 | 35 | During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation of the DTO and identified other targets, leading to additional wiretaps. Investigators learned that the target subjects are trafficking heroin, fentanyl, cocaine and methamphetamine in several counties and other states. Thus far, agents have seized multiple pounds of methamphetamine, fentanyl, heroin, as well as several firearms and narcotics proceeds. |
| Merced | 2020-MER-1 | 55 | 29,433 | 2 | 98 | This wiretap operation, undertaken during a murder investigation, assisted authorities in locating several accessories after the fact. It also helped provide evidence tending to exonerate one of the individuals initially viewed as a co-conspirator in the murder. |
| | 2020-MER-2 | 55 | 29,433 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-MER-1. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Orange | 2020-OR-1 | 24 | 4,089 | 1 | 99 | Although no one was arrested as a result of this wiretap operation, it produced valuable information in this ongoing investigation. |
| | 2020-OR-2 | 6 | 370 | 11 | 89 | Operation was terminated early due to COVID-19. |
| | 2020-OR-3 | 94 | 2,252 | 4 | 96 | The wiretap operation conducted during this cold case homicide investigation produced statements later used to interview the suspect of the crime. |
| | 2020-OR-4 | 39 | 1,116 | 6 | 94 | This was an investigation of a 1980 cold case homicide. Although the investigation is still pending, a subject was all but eliminated as a suspect. |
| | 2020-OR-5 | 20 | 1,586 | 20 | 80 | This wiretap operation produced valuable information about the inner-workings of a local street gang involved in sales of controlled substances for the benefit of the gang. |
| | 2020-OR-6 | 100 | 5,899 | 3 | 97 | A series of wiretap operations targeted members and associates of the Mexican Mafia in Orange County. |
| | 2020-OR-7 | 30 | 4,288 | 1 | 99 | See 2020-OR-6. |
| | 2020-OR-8 | 50 | 14,326 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-OR-6. |
| | 2020-OR-9 | 120 | 24,789 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-OR-6. |
| | 2020-OR-10 | 75 | 8,821 | 2 | 98 | See 2020-OR-6. |
| Riverside | 2019-RIV-33 | 90 | 36,053 | 7 | 93 | |
| | 2019-RIV-35 | 72 | 7,014 | 23 | 77 | |
| | 2019-RIV-37 | 106 | 3,274 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2019-RIV-41 | 10 | 493 | 28 | 72 | |
| | 2019-RIV-42 | 347 | 17,579 | 32 | 68 | |
| | 2019-RIV-43 | 284 | 4,510 | 10 | 90 | |
| | 2019-RIV-44 | 33 | 393 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-1 | 109 | 3,308 | 10 | 90 | |
| | 2020-RIV-2 | 65 | 5 | 34 | 66 | |
| | 2020-RIV-3 | 288 | 124 | 6 | 94 | |
| 2020-RIV-4 | 39 | 1,254 | 84 | 16 | | |
| 2020-RIV-5 | 101 | 1,879 | 4 | 96 | | |
| 2020-RIV-6 | 179 | 9,957 | 26 | 74 | | |
| 2020-RIV-7 | 179 | 5,752 | 27 | 73 | | |
| 2020-RIV-8 | 111 | 3,159 | 34 | 66 | | |
| 2020-RIV-9 | 205 | 10,120 | 33 | 67 | | |
| 2020-RIV-10 | 136 | 7,519 | 12 | 88 | | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-11 | 31 | 352 | 27 | 73 | |
| | 2020-RIV-12 | 57 | 902 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-13 | 75 | 2,207 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-14 | 80 | 3,507 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-15 | 199 | 8,936 | 34 | 66 | |
| | 2020-RIV-16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any arrest or seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-17 | 527 | 14,540 | 15 | 85 | During the period of authorized interception, authorities seized the following: approximately 50 pounds of methamphetamine, approximately 2 kilograms of black tar heroin, approximately 2 kilograms of fentanyl, approximately 20,000 counterfeit fentanyl laced M-30 oxycodone pills, and approximately \$43,443.00 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-18 | 248 | 9,591 | 27 | 73 | |
| | 2020-RIV-19 | 56 | 2,191 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-20 | 190 | 3,605 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-21 | 55 | 1,826 | 36 | 64 | |
| | 2020-RIV-22 | 95 | 5,298 | 24 | 76 | |
| | 2020-RIV-23 | 16 | 639 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-24 | 27 | 816 | 38 | 62 | |
| | 2020-RIV-25 | 143 | 3,584 | 21 | 79 | |
| | 2020-RIV-26 | 217 | 12,593 | 12 | 88 | |
| | 2020-RIV-27 | 868 | 41,436 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-28 | 210 | 5,441 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-29 | 46 | 2,378 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-30 | 39 | 1,078 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-31 | 56 | 2,158 | 15 | 85 | |
| | 2020-RIV-32 | 111 | 5,112 | 41 | 59 | During the period of authorized interception, authorities seized the following: approximately 114 pounds of methamphetamine, approximately 4 kilograms of cocaine, approximately 4 pounds of brown heroin, approximately 10,000 counterfeit fentanyl laced M-30 oxycodone pills, and approximately \$39,160.00 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-33 | 158 | 5,116 | 36 | 64 | During this wiretap investigation, authorities seized a total of 1.75 pounds of methamphetamine and \$11,800.00 in U.S. currency. They also made two arrests, which are pending prosecution. |
| | 2020-RIV-34 | 885 | 53,244 | 16 | 84 | During this wiretap operation, agents seized \$53,400 in U.S. currency as narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-35 | 199 | 3,771 | 1 | 99 | |
| | 2020-RIV-36 | 86 | 2,542 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-37 | 73 | 1,838 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-38 | 20 | 10,651 | 2 | 98 | Interceptions of communications related to planned violence by a criminal street gang, and law enforcement authorities were able to intervene and prevent harm to others. |
| | 2020-RIV-39 | 86 | 2,542 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-40 | 263 | 7,395 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-41 | 507 | 10,482 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-42 | 5 | 476 | 27 | 63 | |
| | 2020-RIV-43 | 81 | 3,004 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-44 | 36 | 1,774 | 40 | 60 | |
| | 2020-RIV-45 | 53 | 5,561 | 12 | 88 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-46 | 368 | 9,448 | 5 | 95 | The interception of the targets in this investigation was invaluable in identifying targets and co-conspirators in the distribution of narcotics and illegal firearms possession for the benefit of the criminal street gang being investigated. |
| | 2020-RIV-47 | 181 | 6,737 | 52 | 48 | |
| | 2020-RIV-48 | 379 | 16,740 | 11 | 89 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-49 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 100 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-50 | 129 | 7,624 | 15 | 85 | |
| | 2020-RIV-51 | 588 | 14,662 | 25 | 75 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: approximately 12 pounds of methamphetamine, 2 assault rifles, a shotgun, a handgun and \$216,608 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-52 | 205 | 9,228 | 22 | 78 | During this wiretap operation, agents seized \$111,000 in U.S. currency as narcotics proceeds. |
| 2020-RIV-53 | 209 | 2,032 | 56 | 44 | | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-54 | 120 | 4,726 | 8 | 92 | During this wiretap operation, agents seized approximately 150 pounds of methamphetamine and 34 kilograms of cocaine. |
| | 2020-RIV-55 | 333 | 26,945 | 6 | 94 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-56 | 10 | 173 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-57 | 70 | 807 | 13 | 87 | |
| | 2020-RIV-58 | 232 | 10,622 | 50 | 50 | |
| | 2020-RIV-59 | 125 | 6,809 | 10 | 90 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-60 | 432 | 5,766 | 8 | 92 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized approximately 5.6 kilograms of methamphetamine and 0.257 kilograms of cocaine, and the case is pending potential federal prosecution. |
| | 2020-RIV-61 | 8 | 623 | 31 | 69 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-62 | 37 | 1,650 | 46 | 54 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-63 | 148 | 5,893 | 10 | 90 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-64 | 255 | 2,528 | 11 | 89 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: approximately 1 kilogram of cocaine, 1 pound of methamphetamine, and \$45,760 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-66 | 36 | 158 | 40 | 60 | |
| | 2020-RIV-67 | 485 | 25,668 | 16 | 84 | Interception of target telephone was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-68 | 62 | 991 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-69 | 2,534 | 17,687 | 4 | 96 | Interceptions of the targets in this investigation proved invaluable in identifying target, subjects, and co-conspirators in the distribution of narcotics and illegal firearms possession for the benefit of the local criminal street gang being investigated. |
| | 2020-RIV-70 | 20 | 716 | 70 | 30 | |
| | 2020-RIV-71 | 235 | 5,388 | 44 | 56 | |
| | 2020-RIV-72 | 35 | 5,917 | 17 | 83 | |
| | 2020-RIV-73 | 58 | 1,158 | 32 | 68 | |
| | 2020-RIV-74 | 72 | 2,335 | 23 | 77 | |
| | 2020-RIV-75 | 246 | 10,255 | 15 | 85 | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-76 | 78 | 1,813 | 38 | 62 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized 28.5 pounds of methamphetamine, and the case is pending. |
| | 2020-RIV-77 | 64 | 1,725 | 30 | 70 | |
| | 2020-RIV-78 | 135 | 2,214 | 1 | 99 | |
| | 2020-RIV-79 | 95 | 2,437 | 15 | 85 | |
| | 2020-RIV-80 | 37 | 434 | 31 | 69 | |
| | 2020-RIV-81 | 15 | 4,899 | 2 | 98 | Interceptions of communications related to planned violence by a criminal street gang, and law enforcement authorities were able to intervene and prevent harm to others. |
| | 2020-RIV-82 | 675 | 3,426 | 2 | 98 | Interceptions of the targets in this investigation proved invaluable in identifying target, subjects, and co-conspirators in the distribution of narcotics and illegal firearms possession for the benefit of the local criminal street gang being investigated. |
| | 2020-RIV-83 | 17 | 442 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-84 | 60 | 1,541 | 25 | 75 | |
| | 2020-RIV-85 | 315 | 3,024 | 26 | 74 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, approximately 2 kilograms of cocaine, 2 AR-15 rifles, and a handgun. |
| 2020-RIV-86 | 102 | 1,557 | 9 | 91 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, approximately 2 kilograms of cocaine, 2 AR-15 rifles, and a handgun. | |
| 2020-RIV-87 | 250 | 4,691 | 37 | 63 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: approximately 3 pounds of methamphetamine, approximately 57.3 grams of cocaine, and approximately \$18,563.00 in illicit narcotics proceeds. | |
| 2020-RIV-88 | 269 | 3,423 | 22 | 78 | | |
| 2020-RIV-89 | 66 | 5,099 | 17 | 83 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized the following: 1,572.6 grams of cocaine, 3,740.5 grams of methamphetamine, 56.4 grams of heroin, and \$36,469.12 in U.S. currency. The case is pending prosecution. | |
| 2020-RIV-90 | 11 | 59 | 22 | 78 | | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|--------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-91 | 17 | 233 | 23 | 77 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-94 | 83 | 2,358 | 10 | 90 | This wiretap operation was instrumental in preventing a gang-related shooting. Agents recovered multiple firearms and identified a gang leader responsible for extortion in Riverside County. |
| | 2020-RIV-96 | 14 | 389 | 18 | 82 | |
| | 2020-RIV-98 | 77 | 4,818 | 10 | 90 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized approximately 424.6 grams of methamphetamine and \$2,500 is U.S. currency. |
| | 2020-RIV-99 | 17 | 322 | 40 | 60 | During this wiretap operation, authorities seized \$331,291 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-100 | 34 | 652 | 26 | 74 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-101 | 23 | 733 | 15 | 85 | |
| | 2020-RIV-102 | 145 | 1,914 | 40 | 60 | This wiretap operation yielded evidence of extortion, produced narcotics, and narcotics distribution. It also led to the seizure of \$25,000 in extortion proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-103 | 40 | 2,175 | 1 | 99 | |
| | 2020-RIV-104 | 228 | 418 | 0 | 100 | Interceptions in this investigation proved invaluable in identifying target, subjects, and co-conspirators in the distribution of narcotics and illegal firearms possession for the benefit of the local criminal street gang being investigated. |
| | 2020-RIV-105 | 401 | 982 | 20 | 80 | |
| | 2020-RIV-106 | 107 | 7,719 | 45 | 55 | During the course of this wiretap operation, authorities seized \$98,401.00 in illicit narcotics proceeds. |
| | 2020-RIV-107 | 26 | 725 | 36 | 64 | |
| | 2020-RIV-109 | 56 | 1,558 | 15 | 85 | Interception of target telephones was discontinued prior to any seizures. |
| | 2020-RIV-110 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 100 | |
| | 2020-RIV-111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The wiretap was not installed or initiated. |
| Sacramento | 2020-SAC-1 | 143 | 1,826 | 7.8 | 92.2 | |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| San Bernardino | 2020-SBD-1 | 1,500 | 13,418 | 8 | 92 | Initial investigation led to the wiretap investigation, which, in turn, led to the arrests of several subjects for various weapons and narcotics offenses. Ultimately, following the wiretap investigation, investigators identified and arrested six subjects for two separate gang-related murders. |
| | 2020-SBD-2 | 854 | 3,073 | 7 | 93 | |
| | 2020-SBD-3 | 350 | 1,171 | 10 | 90 | During the interception period, authorities arrested one person for the sales of narcotics and for unlawful possession of a firearm. |
| | 2020-SBD-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | After the signing of this wiretap order, the telephone lines became inactive and the wire tap investigation was never initiated. |
| | 2020-SBD-5 | 419 | 2,135 | 3 | 97 | |
| | 2020-SBD-6 | 19 | 602 | 48 | 52 | As a result of this wiretap investigation, additional suspects, vehicles and locations were identified and narcotics were seized. Without the wiretap interceptions, it would not have been possible to seize the narcotics and advance the investigation toward the prosecution of numerous suspects. |
| | 2020-SBD-7 | 42 | 514 | 47 | 53 | During the interception period, investigators were able to recover narcotics and U.S. currency. |
| | 2020-SBD-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Never installed. |
| | 2020-SBD-9 | 119 | 1,723 | 13 | 87 | During the interception period, investigators were able to recover drugs, firearms, and U.S. currency. |
| | 2020-SBD-10 | 673 | 2,510 | 15 | 85 | During the interception period, investigators were able to recover drugs and firearms. |
| | 2020-SBD-11 | 33 | 334 | 56 | 44 | No items were recovered during the interception period. |
| | 2020-SBD-12 | 24 | 388 | 48 | 52 | As a result of this wiretap investigation, numerous targets, locations, and vehicles were identified. A significant amount of narcotics were seized in relation to a DTO. Without the interceptions, the information obtained would have remained unknown and the seizures would not have occurred. It is anticipated that this investigation will lead to the arrest and prosecution of numerous suspects involved in the sale of illicit narcotics from Mexico throughout the United States. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|-------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| San Bernardino (cont'd) | 2020-SBD-13 | 426 | 2,897 | 24 | 76 | |
| | 2020-SBD-14 | 1,757 | 1,833 | 58 | 42 | Narcotics were intercepted. |
| | 2020-SBD-15 | 120 | 2,487 | 4 | 96 | As a result of this wiretap investigation, numerous targets, locations and vehicles were identified. Money was seized in relation to a DTO. Without the wiretap intercept this information obtained would have remained unknown and the seizure would not have occurred. It is anticipated that this investigation will lead to the arrest and prosecution of numerous suspects involved in the sale of illicit narcotics from Mexico throughout the United States. |
| | 2020-SBD-16 | 15 | 284 | | | As a result of this wiretap investigation, numerous targets, locations, and vehicles were identified. Money was seized. It is anticipated that the information obtained will lead to the arrest and prosecution of numerous suspects involved in the sale of illicit narcotics from Mexico throughout the United States. |
| | 2020-SBD-17 | 419 | 4,082 | 1 | 99 | |
| | 2020-SBD-18 | 111 | 3,086 | 14 | 86 | |
| | 2020-SBD-19 | 42 | 594 | 1 | 99 | Although the investigation is ongoing, intelligence gained from the interceptions revealed a person involved in a DTO operating in Mexico and the United States. The DTO traffics large amounts of illegal narcotics. |
| | 2020-SBD-20 | 89 | 1,107 | 1 | 99 | Authorities arrested two two people for murder and one person for being an accessory. |
| | 2020-SBD-21 | 209 | 2,155 | 11 | 89 | |
| | 2020-SBD-22 | 357 | 5,608 | 13 | 87 | |
| | 2020-SBD-23 | 209 | 7,339 | 13 | 87 | The wiretap interceptions were vital to investigators combatting the criminal activities of criminal street gangs. It is anticipated that the investigation will result in the arrests of top members of the gang. The arrests will make the streets of San Bernardino County much safer. |
| San Diego | 2020-SD-1 | 147 | 2,320 | 13 | 87 | This wiretap operation enabled law enforcement to eliminate a suspect in a gang-related double homicide. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| San Diego (cont'd) | 2020-SD-2 | 177 | 7,596 | 16 | 84 | This wiretap investigation led to evidence used to arrest and prosecute multiple unsolved murders and attempt murders committed by members of a criminal street gang. |
| | 2020-SD-3 | 45 | 1,900 | 65 | 35 | See 2020-SD-2. |
| San Joaquin | 2020-SJ-1 | 166 | 1,196 | 5 | 95 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-2 | 800 | 15,149 | 21 | 79 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-3 | 174 | 1,178 | 46 | 54 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-4 | 379 | 4,366 | 16 | 84 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-5 | 64 | 1,695 | 28 | 72 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-6 | 302 | 5,115 | 18 | 82 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-7 | 37 | 331 | 20 | 80 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-8 | 906 | 4,941 | 11 | 89 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-9 | 283 | 2,179 | 18 | 82 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-10 | 119 | 1,637 | 40 | 60 | See 2020-SJ-11. |
| | 2020-SJ-11 | 48 | 734 | 21 | 79 | Since January 2019, the Stockton Police Department (SPD) has identified numerous Asian criminal street gangs as one of the most violent security threat groups in the City of Stockton. In July 2020, SPD partnered with the California Department of Justice/California Highway Patrol Special Operations Unit and the San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office to investigate gang members relating to multiple shootings and homicides. During the investigation, agents/officers initiated wiretaps on 21 cellular telephones and 19 social media accounts, conducted physical surveillance, and engaged in other investigative techniques. As a result of the investigation, authorities arrested 32 individuals and seized 38 firearms, 1 pound of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1,296 Ecstasy pills, 20 pounds of marijuana, 115 marijuana plants, and approximately \$40,000.00 in U.S. currency. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| San Luis Obispo | 2020-SLO-1 | 4 | 9,587 | 2 | 98 | In this investigation into a missing person and murder, the suspect, his parents, and his sister are in constant cell phone communication and have previously spoken about the investigation of the missing individual. This wiretap operation was used to potentially gain information about the murder and location of the missing person through the conversations among the suspect, his parents, and his sister. |
| | 2020-SLO-2 | 267 | 33,785 | 2 | 98 | This wiretap operation advanced an investigation of the murder of a 27-year-old resident of San Luis Obispo County. The victim had been missing for several months and had been assisting in the prosecution of another homicide that occurred earlier in the year. There was significant media attention, public awareness, and fear surrounding the case. The interceptions corroborated much of the information previously discovered in the investigation and revealed additional evidence and suspects. Ultimately, authorities arrested one person and charged that person for the murder. Authorities also arrested seven other people and charged them with being accessories to murder. The arrests put our community at ease and helped to strengthen the relationship between the public and law enforcement within the county. |
| Santa Clara | 2020-SCL-1 | 106 | 788 | 11 | 89 | This wiretap operation has produced evidence and statements that have furthered a cold case homicide investigation. |
| | 2020-SCL-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The wiretap application was not approved. |
| Solano | 2020-SOL-1 | 189 | 2,050 | 10 | 15 | The interceptions produced evidence of gang activity involving a target and his accomplices. It also produced evidence of gun trafficking, narcotic sales, and information about a homicide. The interception of gang activity led to valuable street-level information that was passed to local police departments. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Stanislaus | 2020-STA-1 | 93 | 6,460 | 3 | 97 | This wiretap operation produced evidence related to two murders, three attempted murders, and aggravated kidnapping believed to be committed by Norteno gang members and associates. The investigation, encompassed by this order and an order previously reported in 2019, resulted in the arrest of five Norteno gang members and associates for aggravated kidnapping. |
| | 2020-STA-2 | 2,352 | 15,670 | 19 | 81 | This wiretap operation produced evidence related to predicate offenses within Penal Code section 186.22. The interceptions identified individuals committing these crimes, including individuals identified as Norteno criminal street gang members. The evidence collected has helped disrupt the Norteno criminal street gang and their sub-sets within the Turlock area. A homicide investigation is ongoing. |
| | 2020-STA-3 | 127 | 5,995 | 1 | 99 | See 2020-STA-2. |
| Tulare | 2020-TUL-1 | 257 | 13,802 | | | This wiretap investigation resulted in the dismantling of the Norteno criminal street gang in the Cutler/Orosi area, the prevention of several violent assaults, and the solving of an attempted homicide. |
| | 2020-TUL-7 | 47 | 2,386 | | | See 2020-TUL-1. |
| | 2020-TUL-8 | 122 | 3,362 | | | See 2020-TUL-1. |
| | 2020-TUL-9 | 14 | 98 | | | See 2020-TUL-1. |
| | 2020-TUL-10 | 58 | 4,381 | | | See 2020-TUL-1. |
| | 2020-TUL-11 | 0 | 2,492 | | | This wiretap operation produced information about a gang used to prevent violent assaults and led to the seizure of drugs and money. |
| | 2020-TUL-12 | 97 | 1,675 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults, and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-13 | 0 | 332 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-14 | 0 | 3,426 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-15 | 0 | 1,066 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Tulare (cont'd) | 2020-TUL-16 | 0 | 3,426 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-17 | 0 | 2,274 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-18 | 0 | 4,027 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-19 | 0 | 3,968 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-20 | 0 | 917 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-21 | 0 | 2,820 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-22 | 93 | 2,006 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-23 | 49 | 2,006 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-24 | 69 | 837 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-25 | 9 | 41 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-26 | 86 | 2,560 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-27 | 67 | 3,782 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-28 | 25 | 300 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-29 | 41 | 156 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-30 | 7 | 108 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |
| | 2020-TUL-31 | 0 | 1,567 | | | This wiretap operation was used to dismantle street gangs, prevent violent assaults and seize drug money. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Ventura | 2020-VE-2 | 67 | 7,497 | 0.76 | 99 | Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify gang members involved in illegal firearm activities and stash houses. As a result of this investigation, investigators were able to disrupt the flow of illegal firearms within the community and disrupt the gang. Additionally, arrests made as a result of the wiretap investigation led to the subsequent arrest of two people for murder. |
| | 2020-VE-3 | 5 | 7,237 | 15 | 85 | The interceptions provided a basis to determine the workings of the DTO and to identify persons involved with it. Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify members of the DTO and stash houses. As a result of this investigation, investigators were able to disrupt the flow of narcotics into the community. |
| | 2020-VE-4 | 10 | 14,327 | 14 | 86 | The interceptions provided a basis to determine the workings of the DTO and to identify persons involved with it. Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify members of the DTO and stash houses. As a result of this investigation, investigators were able to disrupt the flow of narcotics into the community. |
| | 2020-VE-5 | 6 | 5,384 | 16 | 84 | The wire interception allowed for the identification of members of the Southern California Drug Trafficking Organization, who were distributing narcotics in Ventura County. The ultimate investigation resulted in the seizure of 229 pounds of methamphetamine, 2 kilograms of heroin, 500 Fentanyl pills, and \$161,271 from the DTO. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|-----------|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Ventura (cont'd) | 2020-VE-6 | 5 | 5,457 | 40 | 60 | The interceptions provided a basis to determine the workings of the DTO and to identify persons involved with it. Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify members of the DTO and stash houses. As a result of this investigation, investigators were able to disrupt the flow of narcotics into the community. |
| | 2020-VE-7 | 517 | 34,410 | 5 | 95 | During the course of this investigation, multiple firearms were confiscated from various gang members. The members of this particular gang had, in the six months prior to the electronic surveillance, become increasingly active and violent. The gang was responsible for many crimes, including carjackings, shootings, and robberies. The interceptions gave investigators insight into how the gang worked and the crimes in which they had recently been involved. The benefit to the community is that several firearms were taken out of the hands of violent gang members. |
| | 2020-VE-8 | 177 | 1,018 | 6.7 | 93 | Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the suspects in the case reduced their ability to commit the targeted offenses. As a result of this investigation, investigators were able to confirm the target suspects' involvement in the target offenses prior to COVID taking effect. |
| | 2020-VE-9 | 534 | 12,754 | 23 | 77 | Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify gang members involved in illegal firearm activity, illegal narcotics activity, and stash houses for firearms and controlled substances. As a result of this investigation, detectives were able to disrupt the flow of illegal firearms and narcotics within the community and disrupt criminal street gangs operating within Ventura County. Additionally, as a direct result of intercepted communications and physical surveillance, law enforcement made approximately three felony arrests and seized illegally possessed firearms and controlled substances intended for distribution. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Ventura (cont'd) | 2020-VE-10 | 328 | 5,816 | 12.5 | 87 | During this investigation, a firearm was confiscated from a gang member. The members of this gang had, in the six months prior to the electronic surveillance, become increasingly active and violent. The interceptions gave investigators insight into how the gang worked and crimes in which they had recently been involved. The benefit to the community is that these gang members were identified as being involved in the crimes for which it is anticipated they will be arrested. These gang members were also found to be involved in defrauding the Employment Development Department. The gang members were targeting innocent victims by obtaining their personal identifying information and using that information to falsely apply for unemployment benefits. This was a crime targeted during this operation, and the members of the gang will no longer be victimizing members of the community in which they operate. |
| | 2020-VE-11 | 841 | 15,363 | 15 | 85 | Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify gang members involved in illegal firearm activity, illegal narcotics activity, and stash houses for firearms and controlled substances. As a result of this investigation, detectives were able to disrupt the flow of illegal firearms and narcotics within the community. Additionally, as a direct result of intercepted communications, working in conjunction with physical surveillance, law enforcement made approximately four felony arrests, one misdemeanor arrest, and seized illegally possessed firearms and controlled substances intended for distribution. |

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted | Total No. of Communications Intercepted | Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9)) | | Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | Incriminating Communications (%) | Other Communications (%) | |
| Ventura (cont'd) | 2020-VE-12 | 2,432 | 55,235 | 20 | 80 | Without the interception of communications, investigators would not have been able to identify gang members involved in illegal firearm activity, illegal narcotics activity, and stash houses for firearms and controlled substances. As a result of this investigation, detectives were able to disrupt the flow of illegal firearms and narcotics within the community and disrupt criminal street gangs operating within Ventura County. Additionally, as a direct result of intercepted communications, law enforcement made approximately 23 felony arrests, 16 misdemeanor arrests, obtained 15 felony arrest warrants, and located several stolen vehicles. |
| | 2020-VE-13 | 3,964 | 59,877 | 9 | 91 | See 2020-VE-12. |
| Yolo | 2020-YO-1 | 872 | 19,411 | 11 | 89 | See 2020-YO-5. |
| | 2020-YO-2 | 333 | 6,470 | 14 | 86 | See 2020-YO-5. |
| | 2020-YO-3 | 53 | 1,357 | 28 | 72 | See 2020-YO-5. |
| | 2020-YO-4 | 69 | 3,151 | 49 | 51 | See 2020-YO-5. |
| | 2020-YO-5 | 265 | 12,668 | 20 | 80 | This wiretap operation led to the seizure of evidence to substantiate the crimes of murder, drug trafficking, and firearms violations committed by gang members for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with the Norteno and Sureno criminal street gangs. Several acts of violence, including murder, were prevented during the course of the investigation. Intercepted communications also identified the command structure of the Norteno and Sureno criminal street gangs in Yolo County. The investigation culminated in an operation that included the service of six residential search warrants and three felony arrests in Yolo County. In total, authorities made 16 felony arrest during this investigation. Seizures included 12 firearms, 1 pound of marijuana, 6.5 grams of cocaine, and \$14,587.00 in U.S. currency. |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Alameda | 2020-ALA-1 | Clubb, Officer | Nancy E. O'Malley | Hon. Jon R. Rolefson | 5/26/2020 | 5/22/2020 | 5/26/2020 | 44 |
| | 2020-ALA-2 | Clubb, Officer | Nancy E. O'Nalley | Hon. Jon R. Rolefson | 5/26/2020 | 5/22/2020 | 5/26/2020 | 62 |
| | 2020-ALA-3 | Clubb, Officer | Nancy E. O'Malley | Hon. Jon R. Rolefson | 5/26/2020 | 5/22/2020 | 5/26/2020 | 113 |
| | 2020-ALA-4 | Blass, Detective | Nancy E. O'Malley | Hon. Kevin Murphy | 3/15/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-5 | Blass, Detective | Kevin Dunleavy | Hon. Kevin Murphy | 3/16/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-6 | Blass, Detective | Nancy E. O'Malley | Hon. Kevin Murphy | 3/15/2021 | | | |
| Contra Costa | 2020-CC-1 | Gonzalez, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. John Cope | 5/7/2020 | | 5/4/2020 | 144 |
| | 2020-CC-2 | Thomas, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. John Cope | 8/1/2020 | | 7/1/2020 | 154 |
| | 2020-CC-3 | Thomas, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. John Cope | 8/1/2020 | | 7/1/2020 | See 2020-CC-2 |
| | 2020-CC-4 | Thomas, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. John Cope | 8/1/2020 | | 7/1/2020 | See 2020-CC-2 |
| | 2020-CC-5 | Coffin, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. John Cope | 5/24/2020 | | 4/6/2020 | 9 |
| | 2020-CC-6 | Hannis, Detective | Diana Becton | Hon. Hon. John J. Cope | 12/14/2020 | | 12/14/2020 | 15 |
| Fresno | 2020-FR-1 | Verbera, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | | | 12/9/2020 | 31 |
| | 2020-FR-2 | Verbera, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | | | 12/9/2020 | 7 |
| | 2020-FR-3 | Verbera, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | | | 12/9/2020 | 17 |
| | 2020-FR-4 | Verbera, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | | | 12/9/2020 | 32 |
| | 2020-FR-5 | Verbera, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | | | 12/9/2020 | 24 |
| | 2020-FR-6 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | 542 |
| | 2020-FR-7 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-8 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-9 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-10 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-11 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-12 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-13 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-14 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-15 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-16 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-17 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-18 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-19 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-20 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-21 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-22 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-23 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-24 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-25 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-26 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-27 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-28 | Phelps, Detective | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-29 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-30 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-31 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-32 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-33 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-34 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-35 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-36 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-37 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| | 2020-FR-38 | Kaid, Deputy | Lisa Smittcamp | Hon. Alvin Harrell III | 7/19/2020 | | 7/21/2020 | See 2020-FR-6 |
| Kern | 2020-KE-1 | Merritt, TFO- CHP | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. Honorable John R. Brownlee | | | | |
| | 2020-KE-2 | Fernandez, Deputy | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. John R. Brownlee | 9/14/2020 | | 8/17/2020 | 25 |
| | 2020-KE-3 | Fernandez, Deputy | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. John R. Brownlee | 9/14/2020 | | 8/17/2020 | See 2020-KE-2 |
| | 2020-KE-4 | Fernandez, Deputy | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. John R. Brownlee | 9/14/2020 | | 8/17/2020 | See 2020-KE-2 |
| | 2020-KE-5 | Fernandez, Deputy | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. John R. Brownlee | 9/14/2020 | | 8/17/2020 | See 2020-KE-2 |
| | 2020-KE-6 | Fernandez, Deputy | Cynthia Zimmer | Hon. John R. Brownlee | 9/14/2020 | | 8/17/2020 | See 2020-KE-2 |
| Los Angeles | 2020-LA-1 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 4/17/2020 | | 4/17/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-2 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/22/2021 | 12/22/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-3 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/14/2020 | 4/20/2020 | 8/27/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-4 | Ubovich, TFO | Joseph Esposito | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-5 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-6 | Ibarra, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 5/5/2020 | 4/21/2020 | 5/15/2020 | 237 |
| | 2020-LA-7 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/24/2020 | | 8/7/2020 | 1 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-8 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-9 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/9/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-10 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-11 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/22/2021 | 12/22/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-12 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-13 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | 7/10/2020 | 9/24/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-14 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 4/21/2020 | | 5/15/2020 | 5 |
| | 2020-LA-15 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 4/21/2020 | | 4/21/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-16 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 4/21/2020 | | 5/15/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-17 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | 5/7/2020 | 12/11/2020 | 106 |
| | 2020-LA-18 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | 5/7/2020 | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-19 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/14/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 17 |
| | 2020-LA-20 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | 5/7/2020 | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-21 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | 5/7/2020 | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-22 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-23 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-24 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-25 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/14/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 7 |
| | 2020-LA-26 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | 5/7/2020 | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-27 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/24/2020 | | 9/4/2020 | 13 |
| | 2020-LA-28 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-29 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-30 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2020 | | 3/24/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-31 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/1/2020 | 5/20/2020 | 9/10/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-32 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 5/20/2020 | | 6/12/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-33 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/24/2020 | | 8/7/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-34 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 6/4/2020 | | 6/23/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-35 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 4/21/2020 | | 5/15/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-36 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 6/4/2020 | | 6/23/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-37 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/18/2020 | 6/4/2020 | 8/27/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-38 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/17/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-39 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 6/30/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-LA-40 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 6/30/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-41 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-42 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/8/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-43 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/13/2020 | | 7/13/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-44 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/8/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-45 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | 7/8/2020 | 9/24/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-LA-46 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/8/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-47 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-48 | Carrillo, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-49 | Libe, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/2/2020 | 8/6/2020 | 9/10/2020 | 91 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-50 | Vargas, Sergeant | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-51 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | 7/8/2020 | 9/24/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-LA-52 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/22/2021 | 11/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-53 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-54 | Saldana, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/10/2020 | 8/26/2020 | 12/30/2020 | 393 |
| | 2020-LA-55 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/26/2021 | 10/28/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-56 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 7/8/2020 | | 7/24/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-LA-57 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-58 | Ling, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/21/2020 | | 11/11/2020 | 201 |
| | 2020-LA-59 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/19/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-60 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-61 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-62 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/22/2021 | 12/22/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-63 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/4/2021 | 12/4/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-64 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/4/2021 | 12/4/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-65 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/14/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-66 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/19/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-67 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/26/2021 | 10/28/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-68 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/19/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-69 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/19/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-70 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/17/2021 | 10/19/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-71 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-72 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-73 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-74 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/7/2020 | 9/8/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-75 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/6/2020 | | 8/13/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-76 | Gonzales, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 11/12/2020 | 9/29/2020 | 12/30/2020 | 84 |
| | 2020-LA-77 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-78 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/6/2020 | | 8/13/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-79 | Ling, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/21/2020 | | 11/11/2020 | 201 |
| | 2020-LA-80 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 105 |
| | 2020-LA-81 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/13/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-82 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/1/2020 | | 9/10/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-83 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/18/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-84 | Ling, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/21/2020 | | 11/11/2020 | 201 |
| | 2020-LA-85 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-86 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-87 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/6/2020 | | 11/17/2020 | 27 |
| | 2020-LA-88 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/1/2020 | | 9/10/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-89 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-LA-90 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-91 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-92 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-93 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-94 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-95 | Gonzales, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/28/2020 | 9/29/2020 | 12/30/2020 | 86 |
| | 2020-LA-96 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/26/2021 | 10/28/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-97 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/4/2020 | | 12/14/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-98 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/18/2020 | | 8/27/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-99 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/29/2020 | | 10/7/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-100 | Mattia, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/1/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 93 |
| | 2020-LA-101 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/22/2021 | 11/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-102 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-103 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-104 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-105 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-106 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-LA-107 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/9/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-108 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-109 | Ling, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-110 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 10/26/2020 | | 11/11/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-111 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 9/17/2020 | | 9/24/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-112 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/22/2021 | 11/24/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-113 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-114 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/16/2020 | 9/30/2020 | 12/30/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-115 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/22/2021 | 11/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-116 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/18/2021 | 12/18/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-117 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-118 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-119 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-120 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-121 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-122 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/4/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-123 | Mattia, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/1/2020 | | 12/11/2020 | 93 |
| | 2020-LA-124 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-125 | Calderon, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 11/24/2020 | | 12/14/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-126 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 11/24/2020 | | 11/24/2020 | 0 |
| | 2020-LA-127 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/22/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-128 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/18/2021 | 12/18/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-129 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-130 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/4/2020 | | 12/14/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-LA-131 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/8/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-132 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-133 | Sanchez, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/18/2021 | 12/18/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-134 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/16/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-135 | Shimizu, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/11/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-136 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/2/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-137 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-138 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/6/2021 | 10/8/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-139 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 8/24/2020 | | 9/4/2020 | 18 |
| | 2020-LA-140 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-141 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-142 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/4/2021 | 12/4/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-143 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-144 | Makari, Officer | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/1/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-145 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-146 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/31/2021 | 12/31/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-147 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-148 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/12/2020 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-149 | Makari, Officer | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/12/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-150 | Gomez, TFO | Joseph Esposito | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/19/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-151 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/28/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-152 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/2/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-153 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-154 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/20/2021 | | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-155 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/30/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-156 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/12/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-157 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/4/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-158 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/13/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-159 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/10/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-160 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-161 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/30/2021 | 12/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-LA-162 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 11/24/2020 | | 12/14/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-LA-163 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-164 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 12/16/2020 | | 12/30/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-LA-165 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/13/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-166 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-167 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/19/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-168 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/29/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-169 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 1/29/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-170 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/10/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-171 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-172 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-173 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/1/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-174 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 2/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-175 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/16/2021 | | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-176 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/18/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-177 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-178 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/19/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-179 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/25/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-180 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-181 | Gomez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-182 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-183 | Gutierrez, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-184 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-185 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/25/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-186 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-187 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/24/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-188 | Ubovich, TFO | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/25/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-189 | Carrillo, Detective | Jackie Lacey | Hon. Larry P. Fidler | 3/13/2021 | | | |
| Merced | 2020-MER-1 | Bowen, Officer | Kimberly Lewis | Hon. Steven K. Slocum | 9/13/2020 | | 1/8/2021 | 61 |
| | 2020-MER-2 | Bowen, Officer | Kimberly Lewis | Hon. Steven K. Slocum | 9/13/2020 | | 1/8/2021 | See 2020-MER-1 |
| Orange | 2020-OR-1 | Womack, Deputy | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 3/23/2021 | 12/17/2020 | | |
| | 2020-OR-2 | Womack, Deputy | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 3/23/2021 | 12/17/2020 | | |
| | 2020-OR-3 | Gibbons, Detective | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 1/6/2021 | 10/6/2020 | | |
| | 2020-OR-4 | Fletcher, Detective | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 2/12/2021 | 11/12/2020 | | |
| | 2020-OR-5 | Depasquale, Deputy | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Lance Jensen | 3/16/2021 | 12/17/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Orange (cont'd) | 2020-OR-6 | Murray, Investigator | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 1/13/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-OR-7 | Murray, Investigator | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 1/29/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-OR-8 | Murray, Investigator | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 2/7/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-OR-9 | Murray, Investigator | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Kimberly Menninger | 2/17/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-OR-10 | Murray, Investigator | Todd Spitzer | Hon. Jonathan Fish | 2/17/2021 | | | |
| Riverside | 2019-RIV-33 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 10/4/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 31 |
| | 2019-RIV-35 | Swan, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 4/13/2020 | | 3/16/2020 | 12 |
| | 2019-RIV-37 | Marszalek, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 5/21/2020 | | 9/25/2020 | 36 |
| | 2019-RIV-41 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 4/15/2020 | | 3/16/2020 | 4 |
| | 2019-RIV-42 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/15/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 59 |
| | 2019-RIV-43 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 5/15/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 10 |
| | 2019-RIV-44 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 4/22/2020 | | 3/16/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-RIV-1 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/5/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 9 |
| | 2020-RIV-2 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 5/5/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-3 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 5/16/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 52 |
| | 2020-RIV-4 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/15/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-RIV-5 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 5/20/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-RIV-6 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 7/21/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 28 |
| | 2020-RIV-7 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/27/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 48 |
| | 2020-RIV-8 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 10/7/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 44 |
| | 2020-RIV-9 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 11/6/2020 | | 10/6/2020 | 48 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-10 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/21/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-RIV-11 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/21/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-RIV-12 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. David A. Gunn | 8/22/2020 | 11/18/2020 | 12/28/2020 | 8 |
| | 2020-RIV-13 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. David A. Gunn | 7/25/2020 | 10/25/2020 | 11/13/2020 | 24 |
| | 2020-RIV-14 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. David A. Gunn | 7/25/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 36 |
| | 2020-RIV-15 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 10/4/2020 | | 6/19/2020 | 82 |
| | 2020-RIV-16 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 7/10/2020 | | 7/10/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-17 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 2/26/2021 | 2/26/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-18 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 9/5/2020 | | 11/16/2020 | 84 |
| | 2020-RIV-19 | Marszalek, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. John D. Molloy | 6/30/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 14 |
| | 2020-RIV-20 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/22/2020 | 11/18/2020 | 12/28/2020 | 11 |
| | 2020-RIV-21 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/22/2020 | 11/11/2020 | 12/21/2020 | 30 |
| | 2020-RIV-22 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/24/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 19 |
| | 2020-RIV-23 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/1/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-RIV-24 | Pope, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/1/2020 | | 12/28/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-RIV-25 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/8/2020 | | 8/20/2020 | 54 |
| | 2020-RIV-26 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/13/2020 | 12/10/2020 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-27 | Carroll, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/13/2020 | 3/16/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-28 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/12/2020 | | 10/5/2020 | 76 |
| | 2020-RIV-29 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/13/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 11 |
| | 2020-RIV-30 | Pope, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 8/22/2020 | 11/18/2020 | 12/28/2020 | 1 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-31 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/4/2020 | 1/2/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-32 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 1/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-33 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/24/2020 | | 10/28/2020 | 104 |
| | 2020-RIV-34 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 12/27/2020 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-35 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/21/2020 | 12/20/2020 | 1/11/2021 | 9 |
| | 2020-RIV-36 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/16/2020 | | 10/6/2020 | 43 |
| | 2020-RIV-37 | Iniguez, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/24/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 13 |
| | 2020-RIV-38 | Denham, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 11/4/2020 | | 12/2/2020 | 20 |
| | 2020-RIV-39 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 11/12/2020 | | 10/6/2020 | 8 |
| | 2020-RIV-40 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/19/2020 | | 12/28/2020 | 7 |
| | 2020-RIV-41 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/19/2020 | | 12/28/2020 | 12 |
| | 2020-RIV-42 | Iniguez, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 9/17/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-43 | Payne, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/30/2020 | | 10/13/2020 | 26 |
| | 2020-RIV-44 | Iniguez, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 10/7/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 17 |
| | 2020-RIV-45 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/10/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-46 | Caldwell, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/27/2020 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-47 | Francis, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/21/2021 | | 12/3/2020 | 50 |
| | 2020-RIV-48 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/27/2020 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-49 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/6/2020 | | 1/11/2021 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-50 | Mayberry, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/24/2020 | | 11/17/2020 | 3 |
| | 2020-RIV-51 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/17/2021 | | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-52 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/17/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-53 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/21/2021 | | 12/3/2020 | 68 |
| | 2020-RIV-54 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-55 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-56 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/10/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-57 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/10/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-58 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/5/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-59 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/5/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-60 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/16/2021 | | 12/28/2020 | 70 |
| | 2020-RIV-61 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/22/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-62 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/22/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-63 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-64 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-66 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/4/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-67 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/6/2020 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-68 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 10/27/2020 | 1/8/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-69 | Denham, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/13/2020 | 2/2/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-70 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 10/19/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 4 |
| | 2020-RIV-71 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/12/2020 | | 10/6/2020 | 50 |
| | 2020-RIV-72 | Payne, Detective | MICHAEL A. HESTRIN | Hon. MAC R. FISHER | 10/30/2020 | | 10/20/2020 | 17 |
| | 2020-RIV-73 | Carroll, Investigator | MICHAEL A. HESTRIN | Hon. MAC R. FISHER | 10/2/2020 | 1/28/2021 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-74 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/5/2020 | | 8/28/2020 | 20 |
| | 2020-RIV-75 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/28/2020 | 2/24/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-76 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/17/2020 | | 12/28/2020 | 49 |
| | 2020-RIV-77 | Mayberry, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 10/8/2020 | | 11/13/2020 | 2 |
| | 2020-RIV-78 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/7/2020 | | 1/11/2021 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-79 | Payne, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/6/2020 | | 11/17/2020 | 27 |
| | 2020-RIV-80 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/12/2020 | 3/12/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-81 | Denham, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/30/2020 | | 12/21/2020 | 10 |
| | 2020-RIV-82 | Denham, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/25/2020 | 2/2/2021 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-83 | Iniguez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 11/26/2020 | | 11/26/2020 | 1 |
| | 2020-RIV-84 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/18/2020 | | 12/28/2020 | 39 |
| | 2020-RIV-85 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/25/2020 | | 1/12/2021 | 7 |
| | 2020-RIV-86 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 12/27/2020 | | 1/12/2021 | 7 |
| | 2020-RIV-87 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-88 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/13/2021 | 11/25/2020 | | |
| | 2020-RIV-89 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/4/2021 | | 12/28/2020 | 54 |
| | 2020-RIV-90 | Carroll, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/26/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-91 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/7/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-94 | Aguilar, Agent | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 1/28/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-96 | Iniguez, Detective | MICHAEL A. HESTRIN | Hon. MAC R. FISHER | 2/19/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-98 | Cook, TFO | MICHAEL A. HESTRIN | Hon. MAC R. FISHER | 2/27/2021 | | 1/11/2021 | 36 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|--------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-99 | Carroll, Investigator | John Aki | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 2/22/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-100 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/5/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-101 | Iniquez, Detective | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/5/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-102 | Aguilar, Agent | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/4/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-103 | Cook, Deputy | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/4/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-104 | Ortiz, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 2/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-105 | Aguilar, Agent | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Samuel Diaz Jr. | 3/6/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-106 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/19/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-107 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/9/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-109 | Pope, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/20/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-110 | Carroll, Investigator | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | 3/4/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-RIV-111 | Cook, TFO | Michael A. Hestrin | Hon. Mac R. Fisher | | | | Never Installed |
| Sacramento | 2020-SAC-1 | Englefield, Investigator | Rod Norgaard | Hon. Michael Bowman | 1/22/2021 | | 12/23/2020 | 97 |
| San Bernardino | 2020-SBD-1 | Sims, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 6/15/2020 | 4/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-2 | Sims, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 4/9/2020 | 4/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-3 | Sims, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. Williams Jefferson Powell, IV | 4/24/2020 | 4/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-4 | Callahan, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 5/28/2020 | | | Never Installed |
| | 2020-SBD-5 | Sims, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 5/26/2020 | 4/24/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-6 | Callahan, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 6/4/2020 | 9/3/2020 | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| San Bernardino (cont'd) | 2020-SBD-7 | Carter, Officer | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 6/22/2020 | 7/17/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-8 | Moreno, Deputy | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 7/6/2020 | | | Never Installed |
| | 2020-SBD-9 | Carter, Officer | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 7/14/2020 | 7/17/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-10 | Carter, Officer | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 8/19/2020 | 8/27/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-11 | Carter, Officer | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 7/30/2020 | 8/3/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-12 | Callahan, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 8/3/2020 | 9/3/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-13 | Brosowske, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 9/18/2020 | | 9/21/2020 | 55 |
| | 2020-SBD-14 | Ramirez, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 8/31/2020 | | 9/2/2020 | 9 |
| | 2020-SBD-15 | Callahan, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 9/9/2020 | 9/3/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-16 | Callahan, TFO | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 9/9/2020 | 9/3/2020 | | |
| | 2020-SBD-17 | Brosowske, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 9/21/2020 | | 9/21/2020 | 145 |
| | 2020-SBD-18 | Brosowske, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 11/11/2020 | | 10/1/2020 | 23 |
| | 2020-SBD-19 | Brosowske, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 10/29/2020 | | 10/1/2020 | 9 |
| | 2020-SBD-20 | Craig, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 11/5/2020 | | 10/29/2020 | 36 |
| | 2020-SBD-21 | Brosowske, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 2/18/2020 | | 10/2/2020 | 23 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| San Bernardino (cont'd) | 2020-SBD-22 | Bean, Detective | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 2/18/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-SBD-23 | Bean, Deputy | Jason Anderson | Hon. William Jefferson Powell, IV | 2/9/2021 | | | |
| San Diego | 2020-SD-1 | Newquist, Detective | Summer Stephan | Hon. Michael Groch | 2/5/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-SD-2 | Wilson, Detective | Summer Stephan | Hon. Michael S. Groch | 3/3/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-SD-3 | Wilson, Detective | Summer Stephan | Hon. Michael S. Groch | 3/3/2021 | | | |
| San Joaquin | 2020-SJ-1 | Gutierrez, Detective | Tori Verber-Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/23/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-2 | Metcalf, CADOJ | Tori Verber-Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 1/6/2021 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-3 | Metcalf, CADOJ | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 1/6/2021 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-4 | Kestler, Detective | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/28/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-5 | Arista, Detective | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/13/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-6 | Metcalf, CADOJ | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/25/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-7 | Arista, Detective | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/28/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-8 | Naves, Investigator | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/31/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-9 | Naves, Investigator | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 1/6/2021 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-10 | Arista, Detective | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. George Abdallah | 1/9/2021 | | 11/4/2020 | See 2020-SJ-11 |
| | 2020-SJ-11 | Arista, Detective | Tori Verber Salazar | Hon. Richard Guiliani | 12/23/2020 | | 11/4/2020 | 159 |
| San Luis Obispo | 2020-SLO-1 | Smith, Detective | Ada Eric J. Dobroth | Hon. Honorable Hernaldo J. Baltodano | 5/4/2020 | | 5/4/2020 | 28 |
| | 2020-SLO-2 | Aanerud, Detective | Ada Eric J. Dobroth | Hon. Honorable Jesse J. Marino | 9/28/2020 | 12/3/2020 | 3/8/2021 | |
| Santa Clara | 2020-SCL-1 | Wong, Detective | Jeffrey Rosen | Hon. Hon. Eric Geffon | 2/23/2021 | | | |
| Solano | 2020-SOL-1 | Hughes, Officer | Eric Charm | Hon. Donna L. Stashyn | 6/9/2020 | | 4/17/2020 | 189 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Stanislaus | 2020-STA-1 | Bollinger, Detective | Birgit Fladager | Hon. Linda McFadden | 2/21/2020 | | 2/24/2020 | 94 |
| | 2020-STA-2 | Dias, Stanislaus | Birgit Fladager | Hon. Nancy Leo | 10/16/2020 | | 9/11/2020 | 174 |
| | 2020-STA-3 | Dias, Stanislaus | Birgit Fladager | Hon. Nancy Leo | 10/16/2020 | | 9/11/2020 | See 2020-STA-2 |
| Tulare | 2020-TUL-1 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Timothy Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-7 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Timothy Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-8 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Timothy Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-9 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Timothy Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-10 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Timothy Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-11 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-12 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Micahael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-13 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-14 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-15 | Sanche, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-16 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-17 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-18 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-19 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-20 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-21 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Seltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-22 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-23 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Tulare (cont'd) | 2020-TUL-24 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-25 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-26 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-27 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-28 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-29 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-30 | Sanchez, Sgt. | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-31 | Thigpin, Detective | Tim Ward | Hon. Michael Sheltzer | | | | |
| Ventura | 2020-VE-2 | Cruz, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 6/6/2020 | | 5/13/2020 | 67 |
| | 2020-VE-3 | Freede, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 3/30/2021 | 1/5/2021 | | |
| | 2020-VE-4 | Torres, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 3/30/2021 | 1/5/2021 | | |
| | 2020-VE-5 | Delacerda, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 3/30/2021 | 1/5/2021 | | |
| | 2020-VE-6 | Freede, Detective | Cheryl M. Temple | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 2/23/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-VE-7 | Velasquez, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 2/21/2021 | 11/30/2020 | | |
| | 2020-VE-8 | Jauregui, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 12/3/2020 | | 11/30/2020 | 53 |
| | 2020-VE-9 | Foote, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Ben Coats | 1/18/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-VE-10 | Velasquez, Detective | R. Miles Weiss | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 1/14/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-VE-11 | Foote, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Ben Coats | 2/25/2021 | | | |
| | 2020-VE-12 | Foote, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 10/2/2020 | 9/3/2020 | 10/2/2020 | 282 |
| | 2020-VE-13 | Foote, Detective | Gregory D. Totten | Hon. Anthony Sabo | 10/2/2020 | 9/3/2020 | 10/2/2020 | See 2020-VE-12 |
| Yolo | 2020-YO-1 | Amoruso, Detective | Jeff Reisig | Hon. Peter M Williams | 9/20/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | See 2020-YO-5 |

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official | Person Authorizing Application | Judge Authorizing Application | Date of Order for Service of Inventory | Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory | Date of Compliance With Inventory Order | Number of Inventory Notices Sent |
|------------------------|-----------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Yolo (cont'd) | 2020-YO-2 | Amoruso, Detective | Jeff Reisig | Hon. Peter M Williams | 9/20/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | See 2020-YO-5 |
| | 2020-YO-3 | Amoruso, Detective | Jeff Reisig | Hon. Peter M Williams | 9/20/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | See 2020-YO-5 |
| | 2020-YO-4 | Amoruso, Detective | Jeff Reisig | Hon. Peter M Williams | 9/20/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | See 2020-YO-5 |
| | 2020-YO-5 | Amoruso, Detective | Jeff Reisig | Hon. Peter M Williams | 9/20/2020 | | 9/17/2020 | 215 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|---------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Alameda | 2020-ALA-1 | See 2020-ALA-3 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-2 | See 2020-ALA-3 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-3 | 3 monitors a day, 8 field agents, 1 technician | 249,459 | 37,527 | 286,986 |
| | 2020-ALA-4 | See 2020-ALA-6 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-5 | See 2020-ALA-6 | | | |
| | 2020-ALA-6 | 4 monitors, 1 case agent, 1 technician | 397,687 | 700 | 398,387 |
| Alameda Total | | | 647,146 | 38,227 | 685,373 |
| Contra Costa | 2020-CC-1 | approximately 25 officers/detectives | 95,360 | 9,000 | 104,360 |
| | 2020-CC-2 | 25 investigators | 107,750 | 5,400 | 113,150 |
| | 2020-CC-3 | 25 investigators | 102,520 | 4,400 | 106,920 |
| | 2020-CC-4 | 25 investigators | 85,430 | 2,200 | 87,630 |
| | 2020-CC-5 | 10 detectives/ investigators | 89,650 | 9,000 | 98,650 |
| | 2020-CC-6 | 9 detective/ investigators | 202,860 | 13,500 | 216,360 |
| Contra Costa Total | | | 683,570 | 43,500 | 727,070 |
| Fresno | 2020-FR-1 | 3 monitors, 15 agents and 1 technician | 97,000 | 2,330 | 99,330 |
| | 2020-FR-2 | 3 monitors, 15 agents, 1 technician | 97,000 | 1,159 | 98,159 |
| | 2020-FR-3 | 3 monitors, 15 agents, 1 technician | 97,000 | 2,246 | 99,246 |
| | 2020-FR-4 | 3 monitors, 15 agents, 1 technician | 97,000 | 3,224 | 100,224 |

⁴ Total costs per electronic interception and per county do not delineate between sources of funds (county, state, federal).

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-5 | 3 monitors, 15 agents, 1 technician | 97,000 | 2,117 | 99,117 |
| | 2020-FR-6 | 6 monitors, 6 surveillance/arrest team, 1 supervisor | 54,137 | 0 | 54,137 |
| | 2020-FR-7 | 2 affidavit writers, 8 monitors, 3 analysts, 10 surveillance, 6 tactical, 3 supervisors | 250,232 | 0 | 250,232 |
| | 2020-FR-8 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-9 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-10 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-11 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-12 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-13 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-14 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-15 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-16 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-17 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-18 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-19 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-20 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-21 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-22 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-23 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-24 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-25 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |
| | 2020-FR-26 | See 2020-FR-7 | | | |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Fresno (cont'd) | 2020-FR-27 | | See 2020-FR-7 | | |
| | 2020-FR-28 | | See 2020-FR-7 | | |
| | 2020-FR-29 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-30 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-31 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-32 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-33 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-34 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-35 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-36 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-37 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| | 2020-FR-38 | | See 2020-FR-6 | | |
| Fresno Total | | | 789,369 | 11,076 | 800,445 |
| Kern | 2020-KE-1 | 2 monitors | 33,851 | 1,600 | 35,451 |
| | 2020-KE-2 | 30 monitors | 12,600 | 10,000 | 22,600 |
| | 2020-KE-3 | | See 2020-KE-2 | | |
| | 2020-KE-4 | | See 2020-KE-2 | | |
| | 2020-KE-5 | | See 2020-KE-2 | | |
| | 2020-KE-6 | | See 2020-KE-2 | | |
| Kern Total | | | 46,451 | 11,600 | 58,051 |
| Los Angeles | 2020-LA-1 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-2 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-3 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-4 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-5 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-6 | 2 homicide investigators, 2 OSS investigators, 6 monitors, 1 crime analyst, 1 surveillance sergeant, 6 surveillance deputies | 164,000 | 9,000 | 173,000 |
| | 2020-LA-7 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-8 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-9 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-10 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-11 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-12 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-13 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-14 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-15 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-16 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-17 | 15 monitors, 2 technicians, 1 analyst, 2 investigating officers | 245,000 | 160,000 | 405,000 |
| | 2020-LA-18 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-19 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-20 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-21 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-22 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-23 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-24 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-25 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-26 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-27 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-28 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-29 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-30 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-31 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-32 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-33 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-34 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-35 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-36 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-37 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-38 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-39 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-40 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-41 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-42 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-43 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-44 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-45 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-46 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-47 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-48 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-49 | 2 monitors, 1 agent | 23,712 | 3,000 | 26,712 |
| | 2020-LA-50 | 1 lead homicide detective, 2 assisting homicide detectives, 12 monitors (sworn personnel), 1 criminal Analyst, 1 surveillance systems engineer, 12 surveillance detectives | 73,715 | 3,000 | 76,715 |
| | 2020-LA-51 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-52 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-53 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-54 | 4 monitors, 1 agent | 63,400 | 12,000 | 75,400 |
| | 2020-LA-55 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-56 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-57 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-58 | 26 monitors, 3 technicians, 1 analyst | 68,514 | 42,741 | 111,255 |
| | 2020-LA-59 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-60 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-61 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-62 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-63 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-64 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-65 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-66 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-67 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-68 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-69 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-70 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-71 | 15 monitors, 2 technicians, 1 analyst, 2 investigating officers | 245,000 | 160,000 | 405,000 |
| | 2020-LA-72 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-73 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-74 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-75 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-76 | 2 monitors, 1 agent | 23,712 | 3,000 | 26,712 |
| | 2020-LA-77 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-78 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-79 | 26 monitors, 3 technicians, 1 analyst | 68,514 | 42,714 | 111,228 |
| | 2020-LA-80 | See 2020-LA-17 | | | |
| | 2020-LA-81 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-82 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-83 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-84 | 36 monitors, 3 technicians, 1 analyst | 68,514 | 42,741 | 111,255 |
| | 2020-LA-85 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-86 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-87 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-88 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-89 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-90 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-91 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-92 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-93 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-94 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-95 | 2 monitors, 1 agent | 47,424 | 6,000 | 53,424 |
| | 2020-LA-96 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-97 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-98 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-99 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-100 | 24 monitors, 1 technician | 216,000 | 20,000 | 236,000 |
| | 2020-LA-101 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-102 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-103 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-104 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-105 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-106 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-107 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-108 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-109 | 26 monitors, 3 technicians, 1 analyst | 68,514 | 42,741 | 111,255 |
| | 2020-LA-110 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-111 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-112 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-113 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-114 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-115 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-116 | 15 monitors, 2 technicians, 1 analyst, 2 investigating officers | 80,000 | 8,000 | 88,000 |
| | 2020-LA-117 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-118 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-119 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-120 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-121 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-122 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-123 | 24 monitors, 1 technician | 216,000 | 3,200 | 219,200 |
| | 2020-LA-124 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-125 | 2 monitors, 1 technician | 9,135 | 1,600 | 10,735 |
| | 2020-LA-126 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-127 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-128 | 15 monitors, 2 technicians, 1 analyst, 2 investigating officers | 80,000 | 8,000 | 88,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-129 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-130 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-131 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-132 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-133 | 15 monitors, 2 technicians, 1 analyst, 2 investigating officers | 80,000 | 8,000 | 88,000 |
| | 2020-LA-134 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-135 | 3 monitors, 2 agents | 29,406 | 3,100 | 32,506 |
| | 2020-LA-136 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-137 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-138 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 40,000 | 1,200 | 41,200 |
| | 2020-LA-139 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-140 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-141 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-142 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 24,000 | 19,800 | 43,800 |
| | 2020-LA-143 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-144 | 8 monitors, 2 technicians | 109,890 | 15,840 | 125,730 |
| | 2020-LA-145 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 80,000 | 48,000 | 128,000 |
| | 2020-LA-146 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-147 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 80,000 | 48,000 | 128,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-148 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-149 | 8 monitors, 2 technicians | 56,610 | 8,160 | 64,770 |
| | 2020-LA-150 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-151 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 40,000 | 1,200 | 41,200 |
| | 2020-LA-152 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-153 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 40,000 | 1,200 | 41,200 |
| | 2020-LA-154 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-155 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-156 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-157 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-158 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-159 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-160 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-161 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-162 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-163 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-164 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-165 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-166 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-167 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-168 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-169 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-170 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-171 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-172 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-173 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-174 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-175 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-176 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-177 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-178 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-179 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-180 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-181 | 2 monitors | 28,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 |
| | 2020-LA-182 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-183 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 42,250 | 4,000 | 46,250 |
| | 2020-LA-184 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-185 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|--------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Los Angeles (cont'd) | 2020-LA-186 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-187 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-188 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-LA-189 | 2 monitors, 2 investigators | 40,000 | 3,600 | 43,600 |
| Los Angeles Total | | | 6,119,060 | 1,097,837 | 7,216,897 |
| Merced | 2020-MER-1 | 3 agents, which included an interpreter | 85,000 | 13,282 | 98,282 |
| | 2020-MER-2 | See 2020-MER-1 | | | |
| Merced Total | | | 85,000 | 13,282 | 98,282 |
| Orange | 2020-OR-1 | 1 monitor, 1 technician | 8,400 | 1,500 | 9,900 |
| | 2020-OR-2 | 1 monitor, 1 technician | 2,100 | 1,500 | 3,600 |
| | 2020-OR-3 | 12 officers, 1 technician, 12 officers | 9,500 | 2,160 | 11,660 |
| | 2020-OR-4 | 2 monitors (police officers), 1 technician | 13,920 | 2,100 | 16,020 |
| | 2020-OR-5 | 1 technician, 5 investigators | 9,000 | 1,500 | 10,500 |
| | 2020-OR-6 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 27,000 | 2,400 | 29,400 |
| | 2020-OR-7 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 9,000 | 5,600 | 14,600 |
| | 2020-OR-8 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 9,000 | 2,100 | 11,100 |
| | 2020-OR-9 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 9,000 | 3,200 | 12,200 |
| | 2020-OR-10 | 3 monitors, 1 technician | 27,000 | 3,200 | 30,200 |
| Orange Total | | | 123,920 | 25,260 | 149,180 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside | 2019-RIV-33 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 142,080 | 3,000 | 145,080 |
| | 2019-RIV-35 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 54,720 | 7,000 | 61,720 |
| | 2019-RIV-37 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 86,400 | 4,000 | 90,400 |
| | 2019-RIV-41 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 38,400 | 6,000 | 44,400 |
| | 2019-RIV-42 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors | 84,480 | 5,000 | 89,480 |
| | 2019-RIV-43 | 4 monitors, 4 agents, 2 technicians | 36,000 | 4,000 | 40,000 |
| | 2019-RIV-44 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 3,000 | 31,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-1 | 4 monitors, 4 agents, 2 technicians | 36,000 | 4,000 | 40,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-2 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 27,840 | 2,000 | 29,840 |
| | 2020-RIV-3 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 27,840 | 4,000 | 31,840 |
| | 2020-RIV-4 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-5 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-6 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 84,480 | 6,000 | 90,480 |
| | 2020-RIV-7 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech | 54,720 | 5,000 | 59,720 |
| | 2020-RIV-8 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech | 135,360 | 5,000 | 140,360 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-9 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech | 162,240 | 5,000 | 167,240 |
| | 2020-RIV-10 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-11 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-12 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 tech | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-13 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 tech | 18,000 | 200 | 18,200 |
| | 2020-RIV-14 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech | 8,680 | 6,000 | 14,680 |
| | 2020-RIV-15 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors. 1 tech | 28,820 | 6,000 | 34,820 |
| | 2020-RIV-16 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-17 | 2 monitor(2), 1 agent(s), 1 technician(s) | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-18 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 82,560 | 6,000 | 88,560 |
| | 2020-RIV-19 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 55,680 | 5,000 | 60,680 |
| | 2020-RIV-20 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-21 | 2 monitors. 1agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-22 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors,1 technician | 83,520 | 6,000 | 89,520 |
| | 2020-RIV-23 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,820 | 3,000 | 31,820 |
| | 2020-RIV-24 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-25 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,820 | 3,000 | 31,820 |
| | 2020-RIV-26 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-27 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-28 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 85,440 | 4,000 | 89,440 |
| | 2020-RIV-29 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 80,640 | 4,000 | 84,640 |
| | 2020-RIV-30 | 2 monitors, 1 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-31 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-32 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-33 | 11 linguists; 1 technician | 56,161 | 2,000 | 58,161 |
| | 2020-RIV-34 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-35 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-36 | 1 Officer, 2 Civilian Monitors, 1 Tech | 85,440 | 2,000 | 87,440 |
| | 2020-RIV-37 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 48,000 | 3,000 | 51,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-38 | 16 combined detective, monitors, transcribers and technicians | 99,945 | 8,000 | 107,945 |
| | 2020-RIV-39 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 78,720 | 2,000 | 80,720 |
| | 2020-RIV-40 | 4 Monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-41 | 4 Monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-42 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 24,960 | 2,000 | 26,960 |
| | 2020-RIV-43 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 53,760 | 4,000 | 57,760 |
| | 2020-RIV-44 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 2,000 | 30,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-45 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-46 | 1 monitor | 57,600 | 1,084 | 58,684 |
| | 2020-RIV-47 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 82,560 | 2,000 | 84,560 |
| | 2020-RIV-48 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-49 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-50 | 2 monitors | 24,476 | 1,500 | 25,976 |
| | 2020-RIV-51 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-52 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-53 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 55,680 | 2,000 | 57,680 |
| | 2020-RIV-54 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-55 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-56 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 1,000 | 29,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-57 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-58 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-59 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-60 | 14 linguists; 1 technician | 31,804 | 2,000 | 33,804 |
| | 2020-RIV-61 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-62 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-63 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-64 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-66 | 2 Monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-67 | 4 monitors, 2 Agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-68 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-69 | 10 combined monitors, detectives and technicians | 288,000 | 8,700 | 296,700 |
| | 2020-RIV-70 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 2,000 | 30,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-71 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 51,840 | 4,000 | 55,840 |
| | 2020-RIV-72 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech | 28,800 | 3,000 | 31,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-73 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-74 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 2,000 | 30,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-75 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-76 | 9 linguists, 1 technician | 36,553 | 2,000 | 38,553 |
| | 2020-RIV-77 | 2 Monitors | 28,264 | 3,600 | 31,864 |
| | 2020-RIV-78 | 2 monitors, 1 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-79 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 56,640 | 3,000 | 59,640 |
| | 2020-RIV-80 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-81 | 16 combined homicide detectives, monitors, technicians | 39,978 | 3,800 | 43,778 |
| | 2020-RIV-82 | 1 monitor | 13,440 | 1,084 | 14,524 |
| | 2020-RIV-83 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 1,000 | 29,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-84 | 3 linguists, 1 technician | 21,708 | 2,000 | 23,708 |
| | 2020-RIV-85 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-86 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-87 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-88 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-89 | 11 linguists at 336 hours | 20,231 | 2,000 | 22,231 |
| | 2020-RIV-90 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-91 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-94 | 10 sworn personnel | 80,000 | 2,500 | 82,500 |
| | 2020-RIV-96 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 1,000 | 29,800 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|-------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Riverside (cont'd) | 2020-RIV-98 | 2 monitors | 24,000 | 2,000 | 26,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-99 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-100 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-101 | 1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician | 28,800 | 2,000 | 30,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-102 | 10 sworn personnel | 80,000 | 2,500 | 82,500 |
| | 2020-RIV-103 | 2 monitors, 1 installer, 2 technicians | 28,000 | 1,800 | 29,800 |
| | 2020-RIV-104 | 2 officers, 1 technician and 1 monitor | 5,000 | 1,000 | 6,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-105 | 10 sworn personnel | 80,000 | 2,500 | 82,500 |
| | 2020-RIV-106 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-107 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-109 | 2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | 2020-RIV-110 | 2 monitors, 1 agent, 1 technician | 18,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| Riverside Total | | | 4,219,500 | 298,268 | 4,517,768 |
| Sacramento | 2020-SAC-1 | 4 agents, 1 technician | 22,905 | 27,800 | 50,705 |
| Sacramento Total | | | 22,905 | 27,800 | 50,705 |
| San Bernardino | 2020-SBD-1 | 1 technician, 11 officers | 719,400 | 35,108 | 754,508 |
| | 2020-SBD-2 | 1 technician, 11 monitors/officers | 16,000 | 5,980 | 21,980 |
| | 2020-SBD-3 | 1 technician, 11 monitors/officers | 16,000 | 2,990 | 18,990 |
| | 2020-SBD-5 | 1 technician, 11 monitors | 16,000 | 5,980 | 21,980 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| San Bernardino (cont'd) | 2020-SBD-6 | 2 technicians, 3 monitors | 67,238 | 1,600 | 68,838 |
| | 2020-SBD-7 | 1 technician, 10 monitors/officers | 14,090 | 2,575 | 16,665 |
| | 2020-SBD-9 | 1 technician, 10 monitors | 14,090 | 2,568 | 16,658 |
| | 2020-SBD-10 | 1 technician, 10 monitors | 14,090 | 7,191 | 21,281 |
| | 2020-SBD-11 | 1 technician, 10 monitors | 14,090 | 1,278 | 15,368 |
| | 2020-SBD-12 | 2 technicians, 3 monitors | 67,238 | 1,000 | 68,238 |
| | 2020-SBD-13 | 1 technician, 2 civilian monitors, 1 officer | 25,520 | 2,000 | 27,520 |
| | 2020-SBD-14 | 1 technician, 4 monitors | 26,500 | 0 | 26,500 |
| | 2020-SBD-15 | 1 technician, 2 monitors/transcriptionists | 67,238 | 1,600 | 68,838 |
| | 2020-SBD-16 | 1 technician, 2 monitors/translators | 67,238 | 1,600 | 68,838 |
| | 2020-SBD-17 | 1 technician, 2 monitors | 22,000 | 5,980 | 27,980 |
| | 2020-SBD-18 | 1 technician, 2 monitors | 22,000 | 5,980 | 27,980 |
| | 2020-SBD-19 | 1 technician, 2 monitors | 22,000 | 5,980 | 27,980 |
| | 2020-SBD-20 | 1 technician, 3 monitors | 11,200 | 2,750 | 13,950 |
| | 2020-SBD-21 | 1 technician, 2 monitors | 22,000 | 5,980 | 27,980 |
| | 2020-SBD-22 | 2 installation technicians, 8 sworn deputies/detectives | 15,000 | 16,000 | 31,000 |
| | 2020-SBD-23 | 2 installation technicians, 8 deputies/detectives | 15,000 | 15,000 | 30,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| San Bernardino Total | | | 1,273,932 | 129,140 | 1,403,072 |
| San Diego | 2020-SD-1 | 24 monitors, 1 case agent, 2 technicians | 25,449 | 2,700 | 28,149 |
| | 2020-SD-2 | See 2020-SD-3 | | | |
| | 2020-SD-3 | 4 monitors, 1 wire room supervisor, 1 technician, 4 detectives for stimulation/surveillance | 27,728 | 3,925 | 31,653 |
| San Diego Total | | | 53,177 | 6,625 | 59,802 |
| San Joaquin | 2020-SJ-1 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-2 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-3 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-4 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-5 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-6 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-7 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-8 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-9 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-10 | See 2020-SJ-11 | | | |
| | 2020-SJ-11 | Eight officers/agents as monitors. | 96,978 | 58,969 | 155,947 |
| San Joaquin Total | | | 96,978 | 58,969 | 155,947 |
| San Luis Obispo | 2020-SLO-1 | 24 monitors, 1 detective, 2 clerks | 98,758 | 3,423 | 102,181 |
| | 2020-SLO-2 | 10 monitors, 2 technicians | 10,000 | 500 | 10,500 |
| San Luis Obispo Total | | | 108,758 | 3,923 | 112,681 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|--------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Santa Clara | 2020-SCL-1 | 5 personnel for install, 23 monitors | 106,624 | 0 | 106,624 |
| Santa Clara Total | | | 106,624 | 0 | 106,624 |
| Solano | 2020-SOL-1 | 4 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technicians | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| Solano Total | | | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 |
| Stanislaus | 2020-STA-1 | 10 monitors 1 interpreter 4 room supervisors 1 technician 1 case agent | 8,000 | 6,300 | 14,300 |
| | 2020-STA-2 | 1-2 technicians/analysts, 2-3 wire monitors, 1 case agent | 56,594 | 13,956 | 70,550 |
| | 2020-STA-3 | See 2020-STA-2 | | | |
| Stanislaus Total | | | 64,594 | 20,256 | 84,850 |
| Tulare | 2020-TUL-1 | | 29,113 | 4,875 | 33,988 |
| | 2020-TUL-7 | | 14,611 | 775 | 15,386 |
| | 2020-TUL-8 | | | 850 | 850 |
| | 2020-TUL-9 | | | 775 | 775 |
| | 2020-TUL-10 | | | 850 | 850 |
| | 2020-TUL-11 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-12 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-13 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-14 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-15 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-16 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-17 | Cost not available | | | |
| | 2020-TUL-18 | Cost not available | | | |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Tulare (cont'd) | 2020-TUL-19 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-20 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-21 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-22 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-23 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-24 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-25 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-26 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-27 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-28 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-29 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-30 | | Cost not available | | |
| | 2020-TUL-31 | | Cost not available | | |
| Tulare Total | | | 43,724 | 8,125 | 51,849 |
| Ventura | 2020-VE-2 | 6 investigators, 1 technician | 0 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| | 2020-VE-3 | 6 agents, 3 monitors, 3 technicians | 0 | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| | 2020-VE-4 | 7 agents, 6 monitors, 1 technician | 0 | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| | 2020-VE-5 | 7 agents, 6 monitors/interpreters, 1 technician | 0 | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| | 2020-VE-6 | 6 agents, 5 monitors, 3 technicians | 0 | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| | 2020-VE-7 | 5 monitors, 2 agents, 1 manager | 42,000 | 27,950 | 69,950 |
| | 2020-VE-8 | agents | 7,000 | 1,200 | 8,200 |
| | 2020-VE-9 | 6 agents | 15,000 | 10,000 | 25,000 |

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2020

| Reporting Jurisdiction | EICOS No. | Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used | Personnel Cost (\$) | Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.) | Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---|---|
| Ventura (cont'd) | 2020-VE-10 | agents | 24,800 | 30,225 | 55,025 |
| | 2020-VE-11 | 6 agents | 15,000 | 18,000 | 33,000 |
| | 2020-VE-12 | 6 investigators, 1 technician | 29,000 | 12,000 | 41,000 |
| | 2020-VE-13 | 6 investigators, 1 technician, 1 monitor | 44,000 | 13,000 | 57,000 |
| Ventura Total | | | 176,800 | 168,775 | 345,575 |
| Yolo | 2020-YO-1 | See 2020-YO-5 | | | |
| | 2020-YO-2 | See 2020-YO-5 | | | |
| | 2020-YO-3 | See 2020-YO-5 | | | |
| | 2020-YO-4 | See 2020-YO-5 | | | |
| | 2020-YO-5 | 8 Officers, agents as monitor. | 74,620 | 47,761 | 122,381 |
| Yolo Total | | | 74,620 | 47,761 | 122,381 |
| Grand Total | | | 14,836,128 | 2,010,424 | 16,846,552 |

Table 7
Jurisdictions Reporting No
Electronic Interception Activity During
Calendar Year 2020⁵

| | | |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Alpine | Amador | Butte |
| Calaveras | Colusa | Del Norte |
| El Dorado | Glenn | Humboldt |
| Imperial | Inyo | Kings |
| Lake | Lassen | Madera |
| Marin | Mariposa | Mendocino |
| Modoc | Mono | Monterey |
| Napa | Nevada | Placer |
| Plumas | San Benito | San Francisco |
| San Mateo | Santa Barbara | Santa Cruz |
| Shasta | Sierra | Siskiyou |
| Sonoma | Sutter | Tehama |
| Trinity | Tuolumne | Yuba |
| CADOJ | | |

⁵ Consistent with statutory reporting requirements, the jurisdictions listed in Table 7 reported that they did not apply for a court order authorizing the interception of electronic communications.

Table 8
Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions
Conducted in Prior Years

| Reporting Jurisdiction | Report Year | Date of Application | Reference No. | EICOS No. | Cost (\$) | Persons Arrested | | Trials Completed | Motions to Suppress | | | Persons Convicted | |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|--------|---------|-------------------|---|
| | | | | | | Number | Offense(s) | | Granted | Denied | Pending | Number | Offense(s) |
| San Bernardino | | 2/15/2018 | 2018-76996 | | | 34 | Narcotics, firearms | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Narcotics, conspiracy to commit crime, |
| | | 5/6/2018 | 2018-77148 | | | 6 | Narcotics, firearms, conspiracy to commit crime | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Narcotics, firearms |
| | | 5/4/2017 | 2017-15 | | | 10 | Stolen goods, street terrorism, firearms, carjacking | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Carjacking |
| San Diego | | | 16-05, 16-09, 16-10 | | | | | | | | | 1 | Money laundering |
| | | | 17-04, 17-06, 17-11, 17-13, 17-17 | | | | | | | | | 1 | Narcotics |
| | | | 19-07 | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | | | 19-08 | | | 2 | Narcotics | 0 | | | | 0 | |
| | | | 19-03, 19-04, 19-05, 19-06 | | | | | | | | | 3 | Narcotics |
| Stanislaus | | | 18-06, 18-07, 18-08 | | | | | | | | | 2 | Attempted murder, firearm enhancement |
| | | | 18-09 | | | | | | | | | 1 | Murder |
| | | | 19-08, 19-09 | | | | | 1 | | | | 5 | Aiding and abetting escape |
| | | | 19-01, 19-02, 19-03, 19-04, 19-05, 19-06, 19-07 | | | | | | | | | 4 | Conspiracy to commit murder, assault with deadly weapon, gang enhancement |
| | | | 20-01, 20-02 | | | | | | | | | 1 | Felon in possession of a firearm, cultivation of marijuana |

Table 9
List of Electronic Interception Orders
Approved But Never Installed or Not Used
Calendar Year 2020⁶

| Approved But Never Installed | Installed But Never Used |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2020-RIV-111 | |
| 2020-SBD-4 | |
| 2020-SBD-8 | |

⁶ There are various reasons why an application for an electronic interception may be approved but never implemented. For example, the user of a targeted device or number may cease using the particular device or number before law enforcement agents can begin intercepting communications.

Table 10
Use of Wiretap Evidence in Administrative/Disciplinary Hearings

No data reported for 2020

Appendix A: Penal Code section 629.62 “Report by Attorney General”

(a) The Attorney General shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Legislature, the Judicial Council, and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on interceptions conducted under the authority of this chapter during the preceding year. Information for this report shall be provided to the Attorney General by any prosecutorial agency seeking an order pursuant to this chapter.

(b) The report shall include all of the following data:

- (1) The number of orders or extensions applied for.
- (2) The kinds of orders or extensions applied for.
- (3) The fact that the order or extension was granted as applied for, was modified, or was denied.
- (4) The number of wire or electronic communication devices that are the subject of each order granted.
- (5) The period of interceptions authorized by the order, and the number and duration of any extensions of the order.
- (6) The offense specified in the order or application, or extension of an order.
- (7) The identity of the applying law enforcement officer and agency making the application and the person authorizing the application.
- (8) The nature of the facilities from which or the place where communications were to be intercepted.
- (9) A general description of the interceptions made under the order or extension, including (A) the number of persons whose communications were intercepted, (B) the number of communications intercepted, (C) the percentage of incriminating communications intercepted and the percentage of other communications intercepted, and (D) the approximate nature, amount, and cost of the manpower and other resources used in the interceptions.
- (10) The number of arrests resulting from interceptions made under the order or extension, and the offenses for which arrests were made.
- (11) The number of trials resulting from the interceptions.
- (12) The number of motions to suppress made with respect to the interceptions, and the number granted or denied.
- (13) The number of convictions resulting from the interceptions and the offenses for which the convictions were obtained and a general assessment of the importance of the interceptions.
- (14) Except with regard to the initial report required by this section, the information required by paragraphs (9) to (13), inclusive, with respect to orders or extensions obtained in a preceding calendar year.
- (15) The date of the order for service of inventory made pursuant to Section 629.68, confirmation of compliance with the order, and the number of notices sent.
- (16) Other data that the Legislature, the Judicial Council, or the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall require.

(c) The annual report shall be filed no later than April of each year, and shall also include a summary analysis of the data reported pursuant to subdivision (b). The Attorney General may issue regulations prescribing the content and form of the reports required to be filed pursuant to this section by any prosecutorial agency seeking an order to intercept wire or electronic communications.

(d) The Attorney General shall, upon the request of an individual making an application, provide any information known to him or her as a result of these reporting requirements that would enable the individual making an application to comply with paragraph (6) of subdivision (a) of Section 629.50.

Appendix B: Penal Code sections 629.78 & 629.82 Additional Reporting Requirements

Section 629.78:

Any person who has received, by any means authorized by this chapter, any information concerning a wire or electronic communication, or evidence derived therefrom, intercepted in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, may, pursuant to Section 629.82, disclose the contents of that communication or derivative evidence while giving testimony under oath or affirmation in any criminal court proceeding or in any grand jury proceeding, or in an administrative or disciplinary hearing involving the employment of a peace officer.

Section 629.82:

(a) If a peace officer or federal law enforcement officer, while engaged in intercepting wire or electronic communications in the manner authorized by this chapter, intercepts wire or electronic communications relating to crimes other than those specified in the order of authorization, but that are enumerated in subdivision (a) of Section 629.52, grand theft involving a firearm, a violation of Section 18750 or 18755, or a violent felony as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5, (1) the contents thereof, and evidence derived therefrom, may be disclosed or used as provided in Sections 629.74 and 629.76 and (2) the contents and any evidence derived therefrom may be used under Section 629.78 when authorized by a judge if the judge finds, upon subsequent application, that the contents were otherwise intercepted in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. The application shall be made as soon as practicable.

(b) If a peace officer or federal law enforcement officer, while engaged in intercepting wire or electronic communications in the manner authorized by this chapter, intercepts wire or electronic communications relating to crimes other than those specified in subdivision (a), the contents thereof, and evidence derived therefrom, may not be disclosed or used as provided in Sections 629.74 and 629.76, except to prevent the commission of a public offense. The contents and any evidence derived therefrom may not be used under Section 629.78, except where the evidence was obtained through an independent source or inevitably would have been discovered, and the use is authorized by a judge who finds that the contents were intercepted in accordance with this chapter.

(c) The use of the contents of an intercepted wire or electronic communication relating to crimes other than those specified in the order of authorization to obtain a search or arrest warrant entitles the person named in the warrant to notice of the intercepted wire or electronic communication and a copy of the contents thereof that were used to obtain the warrant.

(d) (1) If a peace officer or federal law enforcement officer, while engaged in intercepting wire or electronic communications in the manner authorized by this chapter, intercepts wire or electronic communications relating to crimes, other than those specified in subdivision (a), and involving the employment of a peace officer, the contents thereof, and evidence derived therefrom, may not be disclosed or used as provided in Sections 629.74 and 629.76, except to prevent the commission of a public offense or in an administrative or disciplinary hearing involving the employment of a peace officer. The contents and any evidence derived therefrom may not be used under Section 629.78, except if the evidence was obtained through an independent source or inevitably would have been discovered, and the use is authorized by a judge who finds that the contents were intercepted in accordance with this chapter.

(2) This section does not authorize the use of an intercepted wire or electronic communication involving acts that only involve a violation of a departmental rule or guideline that is not a public offense under California law.

- (3) If an agency employing peace officers utilizes evidence obtained pursuant to this subdivision in an administrative or disciplinary proceeding, the agency shall, on an annual basis, report both of the following to the Attorney General:
- (A) The number of administrative or disciplinary proceedings involving the employment of a peace officer in which the agency utilized evidence obtained pursuant to this subdivision.
 - (B) The specific offenses for which evidence obtained pursuant to this subdivision was used in those administrative or disciplinary proceedings.
- (4) (A) The Attorney General may issue regulations prescribing the form of the reports required to be filed pursuant to paragraph (3) by an agency utilizing intercepted wire or electronic communications in an administrative or disciplinary proceeding against a peace officer.
- (B) The Attorney General shall include information received pursuant to paragraph (3) in its annual report made pursuant to Section 629.62.