

GANG DATABASE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

March 26, 2018, 10:00 am

Ziggurat Auditorium
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Members Present:

Ryan Cooper, Jerrod Burguan, Martin Vranicar, Jeremy Thornton, Jim Considine, Sammy Nunez, Aaron Harvey, Marisa Montes,

Members Not Present:

Kevin Gardner, Chief from the Division of Law Enforcement, California Department of Justice (DOJ).

- It should be noted that Nate DeValle was present for the afternoon session, representing Chief Gardner

DOJ Staff Present:

Jenny Reich, Arwen Flint, Shayna Rivera, Lisa McKim (Notetaker), and Courtney Andrade

1. Call to Order and Welcoming Remarks

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 by Jenny Reich, Director of the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigative Services (BCIIS) with DOJ.

This committee was established under the Fair and Accurate Gang Data Base Act of 2017. DOJ is responsible for providing administrative support for this committee and developing the regulations that will govern the use, operation and oversight of shared gang data bases in California.

Our agenda will cover:

- Brief introductions of committee members and DOJ staff
- Overview and update on Assembly Bill 90 (AB 90)
- Committee goals and objectives
- Bagley-Keene presentation by Deputy Attorney General Julia Zuffelato
- Overview of the CalGang® database
- Discuss regulations and the components that make up the regulations prescribed by AB 90
- Electing a chairperson
- Public comment at the end of the meeting
 - Mrs. Reich asked that the public limit their comments to one-two minutes, dependent on the number of speakers from the public

2. Committee Member Introductions

Mrs. Reich asked members to introduce themselves

- Jerrod Burguan, Chief of Police in San Bernardino, representing CA Police Chiefs Association
- Marty Vranicar – Assistant CEO for the California District Attorneys Association (CDAA); involved in negotiations on AB 90
- Jeremy Thornton, Deputy Public Defender from San Diego County, representing California Public Defenders Association
- Aaron Harvey, San Diego, Community Organizer
- Ryan Cooper, Los Angeles Police Department
- Professor Marisa Montes, Loyola Law School
- Jim Considine, San Bernardino Sheriff's Office, representing California State Sheriff's Association
- Sammy Nunez, Executive Director of Fathers and Families of San Joaquin, located in Stockton

3. Introduction of the DOJ Staff

- Jenny Reich
- Arwen Flint, Assistant Director
- Shayna Rivera, Manager for the CalGang Unit
- Lisa McKim
- Courtney Andrade

4. Overview of AB 90, Committee goals and objectives – Presentation by Mrs. Rivera, Manager of the CalGang Unit (DOJ)

(Packets were provided to committee, as well as handouts at the entrance to the auditorium)

- AB 90 mandates the DOJ to be responsible for promulgating regulations for any shared gang data base in which CA law enforcement agencies participate.
- Effective January 1, 2018, the CalGang Executive Board no longer administers or oversees CalGang. DOJ is now responsible,
- DOJ/BCIIS formed the CalGang Unit. Currently the unit consists of one manager but will have two analysts in the future.
- Effective January 1, 2018, AB 90 mandated a moratorium to be placed on CalGang, pending the certification of the database by the Attorney General and the purge required in Subdivision R was completed.
 - Subdivision R requires the purge of any record entered into CalGang that does not meet criteria for entry and that was based upon any of the following:
 - Jail classification, frequenting gang neighborhoods, or on the basis of an untested informant.
 - The CJIS team has gone through the database and is confident that the purge requirements per Subdivision R have been met.

- Ms. Reich and Mrs. Flint will meet with the Attorney General on March 28th to discuss the findings
- Notice Requirements
 - Law enforcement agencies (LEAs) must notify individuals prior to being added to a shared database;
 - Affords individuals the opportunity to inquire if they are in a shared database and which agency has placed them there.
- Contesting a Designation
 - Ability to submit written documentation to a LEA to contest a designation
 - AB 90 recasts as a petition process the review and appeal process that authorizes challenges to the inclusion in a shared gang database
- DOJ is mandated to produce an annual report;
 - Number of people added and removed in the previous 12 months
 - Number of petitions for removal in the previous 12 months
 - Categorized by zip code, agency, race, gender and age
 - Results must be posted from each user's agency periodic audit on the Attorney General's website (www.oag.ca.gov) The report will also include a PDF with executive summary, charts and graphs, with an "at a glance" view of demographics. It will include an excel spreadsheet allowing data to be used by researchers and the public
 - GDTAC agendas can also be found at this website
- Access
 - Cannot be used for employment or military screening purposes
 - Cannot be used for federal immigration law purposes, unless required by state or federal statute or regulation
- Gang Database Technical Advisory Committee (GDTAC)
 - AB 90 mandated the establishment of this committee
 - Consists of 11 members with three common characteristics:
 - Substantial knowledge of issues related to gang intervention, Suppression or prevention or efforts
 - Decision making authority for the agency or organization that he/she represents
 - Willingness to serve on a committee with a commitment to contribute to the committee's work.
 - The committee is subject to the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act
- Regulation Deadline
 - January 1, 2020
 - February 4, 2019 (DOJ internal deadline)
- Meetings scheduled
 - Three additional meetings for 2018 in various locations across the state to create a draft of regulations.

5. Bagley Keene Presentation

Mrs. Rivera introduced Deputy Attorney General Julia Zuffelato from the Government Law Section (GLS) of the DOJ to give a presentation on the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act. She reminded the committee members about their obligations with regard to transparency in conducting business as a board member.

Ms. Zuffeleto gave a brief overview of the responsibilities of the GLS. Ms. Zuffeleto reminded the board members that complying with Bagley Keene is not always intuitive and takes a conscious effort, but suggested that if the board members embrace the purposes of Bagley Keene it may be easier to comply with its requirements. Ms. Zuffeleto detailed the two key philosophies behind the creation of the board as consensus building and the inclusion of the public.

Ms. Zuffeleto suggested that board members talk to no more than one other member about board business outside of a public meeting. All members of the board are subject to Bagley Keene from the moment they were appointed.

Ms. Zuffeleto explained that the basic idea behind the Bagley Keene Act is that all meetings, defined as a quorum of a state body to deliberate on a matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the board, should be open to the public. Deliberation covers all phases of the decision making process from gathering information to final vote and that the public has a right to be present throughout this process.

Ms. Zuffeleto detailed the prohibition of serial meetings among a quorum of members or through an intermediary through any form of communication including all technological forms. Staff briefings are an exception to the serial meeting prohibition, which allows individual board members and staff to exchange information, but that staff may not share the comments they receive from an individual board member with other board members.

Ms. Zuffeleto detailed the allowance of board members to meet with one other person as long as those communications are not shared with other board members. Ms. Zuffeleto mentioned that social events, open meetings of other public bodies, and conferences open to the public are not subject to Bagley Keene attended by a quorum of the board if board business is not discussed there. Board members can attend meetings of subcommittees they are members of but only as an observer.

Ms. Zuffeleto detailed the rights of the public to participate at public meetings stating that no identification of the public members is required, that meeting locations must be publicized and ADA compliant, that time limits must be reasonable, and that the public has access to public meeting records.

Questions for Ms. Zuffeleto:

Q: Are emails subject to PRA?

A: All communications involving public business is a matter of public record however there is a list of exceptions in the Act. Good rule is to generally expect the email may be considered; as well as correspondence on a personal device.

Ms. Zuffeleto clarified that Public records should be posted on the website

Mrs. Rivera will facilitate sending out drafts of the regulations; the committee members will respond one on one.

Q: Do all of the records have to be posted on the website? Or can they be just posted on document that summarizes the comments?

A: Bagley Keene does not require these records be posted on the website; it is a standard practice and best practice

Q: Can committee members discuss comments with peers?

A: Committee members asking for feedback from the colleagues, they are not subjects. May be done internally, as long as you are not sharing with other members.

Q: Do you have to brief staff one at time?

A: DOJ must do it one on one. Organization staff is not subject to the open meeting restrictions; except as other intermediaries with other board members.

6. Overview of the CalGang Database – Committee Member Cooper, LAPD

- CalGang
 - Allows agencies to share information as it's a pointer system. Member Cooper stressed that just because your name is in CalGang, it does not mean you're a gang member. He clarified that it is a confidential database and it is not used for background checks, employment, military, housing, medical, college entrance, etc. It is to be used for Law enforcement criminal investigative purposes per 28 CFR Part 23 Code of Regulations.
- Records are purged from the system after 5 years if additional criteria is not added.
 - If you're stopped, you are evaluated to see if you meet any criteria, if you do, then you will be added, and have a new purge date.
- When purged out of the system, everything is completely removed; no identifiers when purged
- Audited annually using a statistically valid sample size
 - Reviews accuracy of the information and source documents that support criteria
- Everything a user does is tracked and audited
 - Printing, copy, paste, screen prints are not permitted; only two people can currently print in LA County
 - Not used for court purposes
 - Control P cannot be used to print;
 - This is monitored closely
- Users must take recertification test every 2 years
- AB 90 requires notifications, the ability to ask about inclusion, and request removal from inclusion in a shared gang database.
- Notification Letter should include
 - Date
 - Criteria
 - Contact Information
- Source documents are the following:
 - Field interview cards
 - Arrest reports
 - Crime reports
 - Incident report
 - Gang registrations (PC 186.30)

- Miscellaneous (other agencies may have internal tracking) very seldom used
- Some of the findings by the CA State Auditor’s Office (CSAO)
 - They recommended we review gangs/gang member entries for accuracy
 - Regular audits have already been happening for at least the last two years.
 - When auditing, Member Cooper brings source documentation, reports (valid sample size) and will review his source documents with two other people from two other nodes.
 - Reviewing documentation for integrity
 - Audits/Inspections are reported to DOJ
 - Records needing to be fixed, deleted, modified, are done by the administrator
 - In the CSAO audit, accuracy of the personal information was addressed was primarily due to human error:
 - An example was a DOB that was mis-keyed so it looked like infants were in the database – which they aren’t.
 - All data entered is done by hand
 - Error rate of less than a 10th of a percent
 - New validation codes are in place for dates, etc., to allow more accuracy
 - Ex: purge dates
 -
 - Programming change has been made to catch major discrepancies (date & age parameters)
 - Hands on training has been standardized
 - Access levels are assigned as appropriate, based on expertise
- Criteria used for inclusion in the database:
 - Self-admit
 - Gang dress
 - Frequents gang area
 - Seen displaying gang hand signs/symbols
 - Seen or arrested with a gang member(s)
 - Has gang tattoos
 - Commits a gang related crime
 - Identified as a gang member by a reliable source
 - This could be a confidential informant, parent, teacher, Non-confidential informant (for hire), law enforcement, parole or probation officer.

Questions for Member Cooper:

Q: Can the FBI print records in CalGang?

A: No, they have “view only” access

Q: Is CalGang used in a gang sweep?

A: Being in the database does not make you a target of a gang sweep alone. Several other factors are considered.

Q: Are there incentives for using or including in the gang system

A: No

Member Cooper then clarified different nodes. A person could have a record in LA node and Orange node. If one purges out, the other remains if they are still active in that area. They aren't linked. A lot of members, in his experience, bounce between LA and San Bernardino County.

Q: What documents are used to put individuals into the system? Can victims of crimes be put in the database?

A: Member Cooper provided the example of a person being shot by a drive by because he claimed. That could be used as a criteria – gang related crime to but put in the system. DUI or Domestic violence wouldn't be in there – its gang related crimes only. The actual reports aren't necessary in the database – the info in the database is pointing to the source documents which can help confirm gang membership. CalGang made it so I can see that there are various gang contacts across the state. All of these documents and criteria entered are reviewed by a supervisor, and a gang expert.

Q: How many nodes are there statewide?

A: San Jose, Fresno County, LA Sheriff's, Kern County, Orange County, San Diego County, San Bernardino County, Riverside DA. Arizona, New Mexico, and Spokane also access CalGang. They comply with our rules. Some connection issues with ATF.

Q: What is the minimum age in the database?

A: 10 years old; at this time the youngest is 12 or 13. Member Cooper provided an example of a LAPD record of an 11-12 year old who had been a third generation gang member.

7. Break

The Committee recessed at 11:20 am and reconvened at 12:33 with a quorum present.

The following Members arrived for the meeting:

- Nate Davalle, DOJ representative for Chief Gardner
- Committee Member Wes McBride, California Gang Investigators Association, Retired, Los Angeles Sheriff's Department

Committee Consultation and discussion of items to consider for inclusion in regulations to be promulgated pursuant to Penal Code Section 186.36 - Arwen Flint, DOJ

The role of DOJ is to provide oversight of CalGang, promulgate regulations and facilitate communication. The role of this committee is to advise and provide Subject Matter Expertise (SMEs) to the DOJ team.

A draft will be provided prior to the next meeting, in June, for review:

- Regulations must be based on empirical information
- 186.34 - Gang data base that is accessed by an agency or person outside an agency that created the records that populates the data base is considered a shared gang data base within CA
- Regulations in place by Jan 2020
 - SMEs follow the regulatory process; provided by DOJ
- Complete draft is due to DOJ by February 2019
- File with Office of Administrative Law (OAL)
 - 45 day comment period, estimated to be June 2019
 - Public hearing will be held for

- May take through the end of August 2019 to finalize
 - Final submission end of October 2019; they have a required 30 day review period
 - If we are unable to meet the deadline; it must be reported to OAL

Mrs. Flint referred back to the Bagely Keene presentation provided by Ms. Zuffeleto. In order to efficiently draft regs and comply with Bagley Keene Committee Members will have one to one communication with Mrs. Rivera. She will send out 1st draft for Committee Review. Committee will provide comments back to Mrs. Rivera who will then summarize the comments and provide a copy at the time of the next meeting and to the public. Mrs. Flint recommended the Committee confer with their SMEs within their organization/constituency.

Mrs. Flint then began reviewing the handout provided to the Committee and to the public on the regs. She explained that she was looking for high level feedback from the Committee before DOJ begins drafting the regs. She went through each section and asked members to provide any feedback or ask questions.

Sections K and L

- K6: Who can access shared gang databases?
 - Discussed earlier in Member Cooper's presentation and matches
- K2: What is required to access, is training required?
 - Ex: Pulled from previous documentation *CalGang Policies and Procedures*
- K4: Addresses security of equipment
- K5: What if equipment goes missing?
 - This is equipment that people access the CalGang database on
 - Member Vranicar asked: Was there an indication by the state auditor that there was missing equipment?
 - Mrs. Flint answered: Not that we are aware of. Language is verbatim of what is in the CalGang Policies.
 - Mr. Vranicar replied: In the run up to getting AB 90 passed, there were concerns that equipment is secure. Concerns are data security, privacy, hacking is a big deal; some procedures or regulation needs to be addressed
 - Mrs. Flint answered: We will review this with respect to the DOJ security policies

K7 & K8:

- Addresses how records are not to be used:
 - Member Cooper requested that we address third party requests in the regs re: notifications. He provided an example of a military Recruiter asking whether x person was in the database. Member Cooper told the Recruiter he could not provide that information. X person then called and requested the information for himself – which is legal. Member Cooper felt that the Recruiter found a way around the policy and is concerned with any liability there may be there.

L1,5,6,7

- Addresses entering and purging documentation procedures will need to be in place
 - Regulations may point to policy and procedures; DOJ will provide guidance and make aware of the options

L 2,3,4

- Addresses designation criteria for gang members and retention periods
- L2 and 3 must be based on empirical research; research may encompass more the retention
 - Research may be conducted through the DOJ Research Center
 - 2 examples pulled from the systems policies and procedures
 - 5 year period for purging, also pulled from systems policies and procedures

Mrs. Flint clarified that if something is already clearly described or encompassed in an existing law we do not have to create regulations.

K - N

- Addresses supervisor and periodic reviews/audits

K1

- Addresses system integrity of shared gang database

K9

- States that the Committee cannot discuss or access individual records
- Not a regulation, but a responsibility of the committee to advise the DOJ developing standardized periodic training for those requiring access to CalGang

Open Questions and Feedback from Committee Members:

Q: Member Vranicar: A number of years ago there was a push by DOJ to combine CalGang and Smart Justice (SJ); is DOJ going incorporate CalGang into SJ?

A: Mrs. Reich: At this time DOJ will not be incorporating CalGang into SJ.

Q: Member Thornton: Regarding disseminating records that are in CalGang and disclosing them; if someone is registered in CalGang, and there is a court filing, with gang allegation, and the case is dismissed, what happens in the CalGang database?

A: Member Cooper: CalGang just tells you where to go locate the source documents, i.e., contact the agency; departmental resouSrce; DO NOT reference CalGang in the reports.

Q: Member Montes: Suggested addressing the issue of military or immigration and would like clarification on section K9 from the draft regulations.

A: Mrs. Flint: DOJ will bring the question to the DAG assigned to CalGang and provide clarification. Defer to DAG for review. Does the process we have outlined sound reasonable to the committee? (The Committee was in agreement)

Q: Member Vranicar: Bagley Keene clarification; Can we share information with each other (committee members) so long as it's one-to-one?

- A: Ms. Flint: A copy of first draft will be sent by Mrs. Rivera with a BCC to all members
- Feedback will be provided directly to Mrs. Rivera (communication will be one-one)
 - Mrs. Rivera then compiles all edits/feedback into one document for public comment and discussion at the next meeting.
- Q: Member McBride: Please clarify section L7
- Mrs. Flint read out loud L7 verbatim to ensure everyone knew what was being questioned.
- Q: Member McBride: Are we talking about other LEAs? I get a lot of calls. What if El Paso calls me to see if someone is in the database?
- A: Member Cooper: CalGang has procedures outlined in the policy and procedures on proxy requests.
- Must have a right to know and need to know.
- Q: Member Vranicar: L is the outline of which policy and procedures have to be in place
- A: You must have policy and procedures outline; DOJ should provide a draft of best practices for these policies and procedures for calls from other agencies. Gang migration is frequently happening.
- Q: Member Montes: Clarify from CalGang policy and procedures; this is a first iteration of the language. It's just a place to start and provide suggestions. Additional language would be welcomed, right?
- A: Mrs. Flint: Yes, we just wanted to provide some samples – a starting place.
- Q: Member Thornton: Are the records kept by individuals departments of those who inquire on themselves? Are there records of ineffective documentation?
- A: Member Cooper: The departments are responsible; will be documented if they are in the system. The vendor is working on capturing the # of requests. Verification stats are kept now.
- Q: Member Nunez: Would like a landscape analysis of shared gang databases. He wants to be sure there is no impact to folks who have been notified that they are denied housing because of known gang affiliation. Referencing L5, what is the notification process?
- A: Member Cooper: Notification letter must be sent out prior to being put into the CalGang system with the exception of 1040 and 6254 of the Government Code (refer to SB 90 handout); letter is sent out, written notification; field interview card; kept like a traffic ticket; most agencies send out a letter; request to know if you're in the system; in writing by attorney, family member; must be a proper person; make sure it's not a gang member, potential hire, landlord;
- Complete the form;
 - Due diligence to ensure the proper person not just anyone is asking; make sure it's not another gang member; housing landlord, employer, etc.
 - Written request to be added or removed
- Q: Member Nunez: What is the turn-around time?
- A: Member Cooper: 30 days
- Q: Member Nunez: The 11 year old you mentioned that was in the database earlier...Is there any intervention in place? How can prevention be done?
- A: Member Cooper: LAPD is very involved with at risk kids; keep tabs on him to offer help

Q: Member Montes: Can we be provided with the training of what is already out there?
A: Ryan Cooper: There is a PowerPoint presentation that outlines the Dos and Don'ts and it can then be customized to the LEA area.

- i.e. Fresno, use photos from your area
- We may be able to provide a generic training as we have different levels of training..maybe training mode?

Q: Member Montes: I feel like I could provide better feedback if we were provided with training. It would be good to have an understanding of what is being done already.

A: Mrs. Flint: I agree but we have to be careful as what is provided to the committee must also be provided to the public so there may be security issues.

Q: Member Harvey: How are agencies mitigating the notification process, i.e., address changes? I like the tear off idea.

A: Member Cooper: There is no universal notification procedure – it's up to each individual agency. LAPD maintains documents; needs to be evaluated by a gang expert.

Q: Member McBride: Can we share the documents provided to us?

A: Mrs. Flint: Yes.

Q: Member Montes: Would it be possible to have the definition designating a criminal organization as a street gang?

A: Mrs. Flint: Yes, there are some definitions in the current legislation; they will be brought out. DOJ will populate info from current Policies and Procedures to look more regulatory.

Q: Member Nunez: Are parents notified their children are going in the CG database?

A: Member Considine: Yes, in AB 2298 it is explained in detail.

Q: Member Nunez: Are there levels or degrees of gang participation captured in the database? I've heard stats that only 1% or 5% of members are involved in criminal acts. To me, there's degrees of participation. Is there a way in the system to differentiate them?

A: Member Cooper: No level or degrees. Comments can be added to a note field, for example, "Shot Caller."

Member McBride requested an electronic copy of the draft regulations and DOJ confirmed that it would be emailed.

9. Chairperson elected

- Mrs. Reich opened the floor for nominations for a chairperson
 - MOTION: Member Montes nominated Member Nunez
 - APPROVAL: Unanimous - Member Nunez elected as Chairperson

10. Break

The Committee recessed at 1:28, and reconvened at 2:00 pm with a quorum present.

11. Public Comment Period

Member Nunez is now facilitating and stated that depending on the number of comments each person may have up to 5 minutes.

Sean Garcia-Leys, Staff Attorney with Urban Peace Institute – Assisted with drafting AB 90

- Shared gang data bases –vs- CalGang

In reviewing public records there were references to other shared gang data bases – Gang Cop, WSIN, RisGang and other multi-state gang data bases, FBI has a gang file populated with LEAs; National Gang Intelligence Center Department of Homeland Security has Fusion Centers which includes info that qualifies as gang information; Falcon, number of shared and operational for the last several years; most of these qualify under the statute.

- What is a data base? AB 90 did not include the definition of “access” or “data base” Member Cooper referred to it as a pointer system. This has grown in law enforcement agencies with the ability to search multiple systems; is Palntier shared. This is relevant in Chicago and a similar issue in New York. Therefore it’s not just a California issue, but an issue across the states.
- In conclusion the committee is urged to do two things:
 1. Create an inventory of all shared gang data bases that are used by LEAs across California
 2. Define “access” and “data base”

Emilio Zapian, Organizer with the Youth Justice Coalition of Los Angeles

- A close friend served with a gang injunction and was put in the database as a teenager because of where he lived. The friend described the injunctions as a “prison without walls” and being put on the data base as a sentence. He was a lead organizer who helped pass SB 485 and AB 90
- It is recommended to:
 - Establish CalGang as the State’s only gang data base to more effectively monitor and guarantee fairness, accuracy and transparency. This would include eliminating all other shared gang data bases
 - Put a process in place to ensure all LEAs fully implement SB 458 AB 2298
 - Ensure statewide process to notify people when they are added to the data base and a standard and fair process to ensure people can challenge the designation at the agency level. Ensure local state and courts are implementing the right to a court hearing. To strengthen the intent of AB 90 to eliminate federal access to shared data bases in California will ensure that data bases will not be used with ICE and Immigration
 - Limit to two years and automatically purge if there is no gang related arrests;
 - Immediately remove a person if they complete parole or probation to give them a true fresh start
 - Establish a process for the DOJ to audit and purge CalGang twice a year to check for accuracy and fairness and to purge all bad data or names that do not meet the criteria
 - Create and monitor effectiveness of automatic purging of names once the time period occurs.

Jonathan Feldman, CA Police Chiefs Association (CPCA)

- There were two bills last year; there was AB 90 and there was a senate bill. CPCA was the sponsor for the senate bill which was our attempt to clean up the data base. We looked at the audit, knew changes need to be made to the database and put those recommendations from the Auditor into the bill.
- There was a deal struck where most of SB was inserted into AB90 but a lot was taken out. Wanted things applied to all databases, not just shared which we rejected as well as Governor's office. Language about immigration was specific, agreed upon. Things taken out prior to bill. As you try to develop regs, understand there was 6 months language negation/debate. What was finally agreed upon was very deliberate. Look at SB 505 and see how much was put into AB 90. Look at the intent of the language, the intent of the compromise and keep that in mind. It's not one sided, it's both sides working together. Keep this in mind as you move forward.

Ellie, Youth Organizer, Youth Justice Coalition

- I want to reiterate the urgency and need to have public access to this information. You should hold these meetings out in the community because it's important; many community members are not able to come out to places like this. Community members would feel more comfortable if the meetings were held in the community. This would give them the opportunity to share and voice their opinions. I urge the committee to hold these meetings out in the community.

Raymond Aguilar, Youth Organizer San Joaquin County

- I work with youth and some may be identified as gang members. Many are young teenagers and I would like to see them not criminalized. Please look into a way that they do not stay on the gang data base. If they commit a crime and are given an injunction, convicted of a crime and identified as a gang member, there is a 10 year enhancement. Look into a better way we can fix the system so we can help the kids that are at risk and not further criminalize them.

Mrs. Reich concluded the meeting by saying that the next meeting will be in June, Friday the 15th or Monday the 18th in Los Angeles; September San Diego; also considering video conferencing;

12. Closing Remarks & Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:14 p.m. by Chairperson Nunez

#