

CALIFORNIA  
ELECTRONIC  
INTERCEPTIONS REPORT



Annual Report  
to the  
Legislature  
2011

# CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General



Division of Criminal Law

Appeals, Writs & Trials Unit

This annual report is available on the  
California Attorney General's website:

<http://ag.ca.gov>

# *Table of Contents*

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1 Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2011.....	2
Table 2 General Description of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2011 .....	3
Table 3 Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges And Court Activity During Calendar Year 2011 .....	4
Table 4 Description of Communications Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2011 .....	5
Table 5 Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report.....	74
Table 6 Costs of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2011 .....	105
Table 7 Jurisdictions Reporting No Electronic Interception Activity During Calendar Year 2011 .....	132
Table 8 Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions Conducted in Prior Years.....	133
Appendix A: Penal Code section 629.62 “Report by Attorney General” .....	140

## *Executive Summary*

The Attorney General's Electronic Interceptions Report 2011, is issued in compliance with Penal Code section 629.62 and can be referenced on the Attorney General's website at <http://ag.ca.gov>.

Table 1 reflects that 21 California counties conducted wiretaps in 2011, resulting in a total of 697 electronic interception orders. The electronic interceptions resulted in 697 arrests and 193 convictions thus far, with the majority of the arrests and convictions arising from narcotics offenses.

Table 2 contains a description of the targeted offense, the location of the intercept, and the device intercepted.

Table 3 sets forth the number of electronic interception orders and extensions applied for in 2011, the average length of the interceptions, and the court activity resulting from the electronic interceptions.

Table 4 describes the communications obtained. It also sets forth comments by law enforcement on the usefulness of the electronic interception and the evidence obtained. The comments overwhelmingly underscore the importance of electronic interceptions as a crime fighting tool.

Table 5 contains the date of compliance with the inventory order and the number of inventory notices sent. It also lists the name of the applicant and the judge authorizing the interception.

Table 6 compiles the costs of the interception, which are broken down by the nature and quantity of personnel used and resource cost. This table also shows the total costs by county, as well as the aggregate state cost of electronic interceptions.

Table 7 lists the jurisdictions reporting no electronic interception activity during 2011.

Table 8 provides a supplemental report on arrests, convictions, costs, and trials that were not previously reported.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please contact the Criminal Law Division of the Attorney General's Office at (916) 324-5267.

**Table 1**  
**Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	No of Orders	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
Butte	4	28	28.0		28	28								3	3	3.0
Contra Costa	1	4	4.0			4									0	
Imperial	40	0													0	
Kern	8	13	2.6	1	6	12				3	6				6	1.2
Los Angeles	199	122	4.4	3		2								13	13	0.5
Madera	2	10	10.0			10									0	
Merced	16	36	4.0		24	36									0	
Orange	27	43	5.4			36		1			4			1	5	0.6
Placer	1	0													0	
Riverside	156	59	2.2			41					9				9	0.3
Sacramento	9	7	2.3	3				4							0	
San Bernardino	113	52	5.2	2		7					14				14	1.4
San Diego	45	153	11.8	8	4	140				4	81				81	6.2
San Joaquin	9	31	15.5	1	30	30		1	1	16	16				16	8.0
San Luis Obispo	2	0													0	
San Mateo	3	0													0	
Santa Barbara	12	37	9.3	0	31	37				29	35				35	8.8
Santa Clara	19	45	15.0	16	42	16									0	
Sonoma	4	11	5.5			11					9				9	4.5
Stanislaus	5	0													0	
Ventura	22	46	4.2	4	21	28			9		1				2	0.2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>697</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>193</b>

**Table 2**  
**General Description of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	No. of Orders	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
Butte	4		4	4			4						4				
Contra Costa	1			1							1		1				
Imperial	40			40							19		40				
Kern	8	1	2	7									8				
Los Angeles	199	18	2	178			2	9	2		193		198	8			1
Madera	2			2									2				
Merced	16		9	16							16		16				
Orange	27	2	4	23			3				27		27				
Placer	1	1											1	1			
Riverside	156			156							154		156				
Sacramento	9	8						2			2		9				
San Bernardino	113	12	11	92		1	2	1			108		113	1		14	
San Diego	45	4	2	39			1				43		45				
San Joaquin	9	1	8	7		1	1	1			9		9	1			
San Luis Obispo	2	2						2			1		1	2			
San Mateo	3	3						1			3		3	1			
Santa Barbara	12	1	8	10							11		12		8		
Santa Clara	19	8	5	13							18		19				
Sonoma	4			4							4		4				
Stanislaus	5			5							5		5				
Ventura	22	12	3	10			1	1			22		22	1			

**Table 3**  
**Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges**  
**And Court Activity During Calendar Year 2011**

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	
Butte	4	4				1	1				30	150	56	14			1	1
Contra Costa	1	1										30	5	5				0
Imperial	40	40	2			15	15				30	1650	1593	40				0
Kern	8	8										240	188	24				0
Los Angeles	199	191			15	62	62		15	30	7590	6896	35			1	0	
Madera	2											103	52				0	
Merced	16	16	5			1	1	1		22	417	353	22				0	
Orange	27	27			2				2		810	718	27				0	
Placer	1	1									30	25	25				0	
Riverside	156	153	1	2	8	55	55	2	8	30	6314	5162	33			1	0	
Sacramento	9	9									253	87	10				1	
San Bernardino	113	111			7	55	55		7	30	4891	4311	38				0	
San Diego	45	44	5	1	2	28	28		2	30	2160	1496	33		1	1	1	
San Joaquin	9	9				4	4			30	390	267	30				0	
San Luis Obispo	2	2									60	46	23				0	
San Mateo	3	3									90	57	19				0	
Santa Barbara	12	12	1			4	4	2		30	480	313	26				0	
Santa Clara	19	19				15	15			30	995	1028	54				0	
Sonoma	4	4									120	90	23				1	
Stanislaus	5	4									120	72	14				0	
Ventura	22	22	3								660	486	22				0	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Butte	2011-BU-1	158	13,710	13	87	The interceptions led to the arrests and prosecutions of dozens of narcotics traffickers in Northern California and disruption of a criminal street gang. The investigation led to the seizure of 19 ounces of methamphetamine, 11 ounces of cocaine, eight firearms and \$28,096.45 in cash.
	2011-BU-2		0			
	2011-BU-3		0			
	2011-BU-4		0			
Contra Costa	2011-CC-1		900	3	97	Wiretap was initiated to investigate illegal narcotics activity committed by a supervisor in a law enforcement agency and his associate. Wiretap provided information that led to prosecution for that person and his associate, which in turn has resulted in federal and state charges, as well as identifying other law enforcement officers suspected of corruption.
Imperial	2010-IM-10		0			
	2011-IM-18	37	6,175	16	84	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceed transportation side of a drug trafficking organization (DTO) operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization have been fully identified as being part and partial of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2011-IM-19	24	827	34	66	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceed transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization have been fully identified as being part and partial of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to seize drugs, a vehicle, and arrest two individuals.
	2011-IM-20	18	6,491	13	87	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceeds transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization were fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2011-IM-21	96	10,321	14	86	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceeds transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization were fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests and money seizures related to this investigation.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-22	25	8,461	19	81	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceeds transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization were fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2011-IM-23	206	8,939	12	88	This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic proceeds transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial and San Diego counties, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization were fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2011-IM-24	94	12,577	9.7	90	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded four seizures of narcotics, which included 46 kilograms of cocaine, 15.4 kilograms of heroin, and 1.2 kilograms of methamphetamine. It is anticipated the following months of intercepts will yield more seizure, more arrests, and provide additional evidence to fully prosecute the cases to be filed.
	2011-IM-25	289	27,690	11	89	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of these target telephone numbers has yielded seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 46 kilograms of cocaine, 1.2 kilograms of methamphetamine, 15.4 kilograms of heroin, \$102,440 USD bulk currency, and two arrests.
	2011-IM-26	387	25,199	17	83	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of these target telephone numbers have yielded two seizures of narcotics which include eight kilograms of cocaine and 15.5 kilograms of methamphetamine, and two arrests. It is anticipated that the continued interception will lead to further seizures and the identification of coconspirators.
	2011-IM-27	99	6,818	11	89	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 15.5 kilograms of methamphetamine. One arrest was made.
	2011-IM-28	161	15,987	15	85	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of these target telephone numbers have yielded two seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 24 kilograms of cocaine and \$66,000 USD of bulk currency.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-29	344	13,579	11	89	These intercepts helped to penetrate, disrupt, and dismantle the smuggling operation, which is currently importing methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana into the United States. The intercepts have helped to identify, and will enable the prosecution of, the principle members of the smuggling organization. The intercepts have helped to identify the locations, ownership, and methods of concealment of assets and properties acquired by the members of this organization. Since March 2011, Special Agents assigned to this investigation have made 20 seizures resulting in the seizure of 213 kilograms of cocaine, 15.4 kilograms of heroin, and 148 pounds of methamphetamine, and approximately \$713,000 in bulk US currency.
	2011-IM-30	172	12,046	9	91	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. This wiretap was necessary to begin to identify the narcotic transportation side of a DTO operating in Imperial County, CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization were fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests, narcotic and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2011-IM-31	116	11,404	10	90	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded five seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 93.75 kilograms of cocaine, 42 pounds of methamphetamine, \$485,330 USD of bulk currency, 13 firearms. Ten arrests were made.
	2011-IM-32	274	10,323	12	88	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded five seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 93.75 kilograms of cocaine, 42 pounds of methamphetamine, \$485,330 USD of bulk currency, 13 firearms. Ten arrests were made.
	2011-IM-33	266	6,649	11	89	Numerous investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded five seizures of narcotics and bulk currency, which included 93.75 kilograms of cocaine, 42 pounds of methamphetamine, \$485,330 USD of bulk currency, 13 firearms. 10 arrests were made.
	2011-IM-34	18	99	13	87	Investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded seizures of one firearm, 30 pounds of methamphetamine, 35 pounds of cocaine, and approximately \$374,000 USD bulk currency.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	ns	
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-35	311	8,301	9	91	Investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded seizures of one firearm, 30 pounds of methamphetamine, 35 pounds of cocaine, and approximately \$374,000 USD bulk currency.
	2011-IM-36	202	13,169	15	85	Investigative leads and coconspirators identified. Interception of this target telephone number has yielded seizures of one firearm, 30 pounds of methamphetamine, 35 pounds of cocaine, and approximately \$374,000 USD bulk currency.
	2011-IM-37		9,227	8	92	Although the intercepts provided some information about the activities and structure of a DTO operating out of Mexicali, Mexico and through the Imperial County Ports of Entry, the information gleaned wasn't specific enough to be actionable and did not lead to arrests or seizures. In January 2012, a narcotic load driver, who was arrested at a Border Patrol checkpoint, identified one of the target subjects from this wire investigation as a contact/coordinator. The investigation will be resumed, and if necessary, agents will seek authorization to intercept the relevant target telephones.
	2011-IM-38	15	805	29	71	
	2011-IM-39	18	602	24	76	
	2011-IM-40	78	2,123	22	78	
	2011-IM-41	56	6,156	21	79	
	2011-IM-42	83	6,440	17	83	
	2011-IM-43	64	4,857	78	22	
	2011-IM-44	303	8,648	17	83	
	2011-IM-45		6,897	15	85	
	2011-IM-46		18,798	15	85	
	2011-IM-47		19,106	18	82	
	2011-IM-48		9,708	23	77	
	2011-IM-49		10,086	27	73	
	2011-IM-50		1,816	7	93	
	2011-IM-51		12,075	17	83	
	2011-IM-52		25,207	18	82	
	2011-IM-53		26,167	18	82	
	2011-IM-54		6,858	17	83	
	2011-IM-55		13,313	19	81	
	2011-IM-56		5,538	17	83	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern	2011-KE-14	24	912	12	88	During this wiretap, investigators identified a kilogram-quantity distributor of cocaine in the Bakersfield CA area, and likewise identified two of distributor's narcotics sources of supply. At the conclusion of this wire investigators seized one kilogram of cocaine and approximately \$25,000 from distributor. Agents from the DEA Bakersfield resident office then initiated investigations into distributor's sources of supply. These investigations culminated in wiretaps as well.
	2011-KE-15	32	2,134	77	23	This investigation confirmed that known gang members were trafficking narcotics in our local area to unknown persons. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to identify several members of criminal street gangs that were involved in the conspiracy. The main target dropped its phone during the course of the wire tap but not prior to law enforcement officers identifying a viable source of supply, which led to a spin-off wire tap, and leads being passed to local agencies. The target and several coconspirators were eventually arrested and several search warrants and additional arrests were made on a spin-off wire.
	2011-KE-16	6	102	30	70	This wiretap investigation was utilized to solve a cold murder case from 2004. At the conclusion of this wiretap, one suspect was arrested and as of January 2011, a plea agreement has been reached for the suspect to take law enforcement to the location where he disposed of the victim's body.
	2011-KE-17	10	81	65	35	During this wiretap, investigators identified a multi-kilogram-quantity distributor of cocaine based in the Bakersfield CA area. Investigators intercepted several phone calls between distributor and his source of supply for methamphetamine who was based in Mexico. During these calls it became evident to investigators that distributor was working for the source of supply in Mexico to import and distribute methamphetamine in the Kern County area. Distributor discontinued use of the target telephone and investigators terminated this wiretap.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2011-KE-18	182	2,074	23	77	This investigation confirmed that members of a DTO were trafficking narcotics in our local area. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to identify several sources of supply of cocaine, methamphetamine and marijuana. During the first phase takedown, search warrants were executed at three locations resulting in the seizure of marijuana plants, methamphetamine, and three arrests. A search warrant/arrest was not executed on the main wire target, as a lead has been passed on for his source of supply that resulted in a Federal T-3. Lab results came back for the methamphetamine and tested 100% pure d-methamphetamine hydrochloride, consistent with high quality methamphetamine made in Mexican super labs.
	2011-KE-19	5	275	41	59	During this wiretap, investigators identified a multi-kilogram-quantity distributor of cocaine based in the Bakersfield CA area. Investigators intercepted calls between distributor and his source of supply for methamphetamine who was based in Mexico. Distributor was directed to collect narcotics proceeds and deliver the proceeds to a business located in the Los Angeles area. Investigators also identified distributor's primary narcotics runner as well as a stash location for methamphetamine. During a surveillance operation, distributor discontinued the use of the target telephone and left the Bakersfield area. Investigators executed search warrants on the stash location and distributor's primary residence. These search warrants resulted in the seizure of approximately nine pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$50,000. Distributor was never arrested.
	2011-KE-20	182	2,074	23	77	This investigation confirmed that members of a DTO were trafficking narcotics in our local area. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to identify several sources of supply of cocaine, methamphetamine and marijuana. During the first phase takedown, search warrants were executed at three locations resulting in the seizure of marijuana plants, methamphetamine, and three arrests. A search warrant/arrest was not executed on the main wire target, as a lead has been passed on for his source of supply that resulted in a Federal T-3. Lab results came back for the nine+ pounds of methamphetamine and tested 100% pure d-methamphetamine hydrochloride, consistent with high quality methamphetamine made in Mexican super labs.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2011-KE-21	9	2,026	33	67	This investigation confirmed that known gang members were trafficking narcotics in our local area to unknown persons. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to identify several members of criminal street gangs that were involved in the conspiracy. The target and several coconspirators were eventually arrested and several search warrants and additional arrests were made on spin-off wires.
Los Angeles	2011-LA-215	40	8,957	12	88	
	2011-LA-216	12	585	8	91	Information from wire intercept will be utilized to establish probable cause in double murder case against suspect.
	2011-LA-217	5	123	20	80	Intercepted communications will be used to indict all subjects identified.
	2011-LA-218	70	2,263	2	98	The investigation is ongoing and entering a second phase. Currently, we are attempting to obtain a Title III Order for individuals responsible for smuggling and distributing quantities of drugs to Los Angeles County based distributors. The same individuals were responsible for furnishing drugs to individuals arrested in the first phase of the operation.
	2011-LA-219	172	19,068	17	83	The target subjects were arrested with four kilograms of cocaine. Charges are pending. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-220	0	3	0	100	This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-221	35	1,336	13	87	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2011-LA-222	40	2,359	6	94	Interceptions allowed investigators to infiltrate a Mexico-based money-laundering operation and provided additional information as to the targets' roles and bulk cash movement from the United States to Mexico. This investigation continues to pursue the Mexico targets.
	2011-LA-223	18,000	26,308	3	97	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-224	56	1,200	29	71	Agents intercepted numerous telephone calls between the target and his narcotics costumers, as well as his narcotics sources of supply. Agents will use this information, along with any new information gathered, to fully identify those narcotics customers and sources of supply, in order to make future arrests and seizures.
	2011-LA-225	16	181	11	89	This investigation continues.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-226	41	22,209	1	99	Wiretap orders were requested and obtained to help gather information and statements on an unsolved 2009 murder investigation of an 18-year-old male, as well as, in part of, five additional gang related murders and gang activity investigations. Prior to the wire request, little to no information was available on these cases that would have lead to an arrest or conviction. As of this date, several gang-committed robbery and residential burglary investigations have been solved and numerous hand guns have been taken off the streets. In addition, the identity as well as incriminating statements of five murder suspects have been obtained.
	2011-LA-227	10	5,725	1	99	Wiretap orders were requested and obtained to help gather information and statements on an unsolved 2009 murder investigation of an 18-year-old male, as well as, in part of, five additional gang related murders and gang activity investigations. Prior to the wire request, little to no information was available on these cases that would have lead to an arrest or conviction. As of this date, several gang-committed robbery and residential burglary investigations have been solved and numerous hand guns have been taken off the streets. In addition, the identity as well as incriminating statements of five murder suspects have been obtained.
	2011-LA-228	5,840	12,028	9	91	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-229	4	12	0	100	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-230	15	8,211	0	100	Wiretap orders were requested and obtained to help gather information and statements on an unsolved 2009 murder investigation of an 18-year-old male, as well as, in part of, five additional gang related murders and gang activity investigations. Prior to the wire request, little to no information was available on these cases that would have lead to an arrest or conviction. As of this date, several gang-committed robbery and residential burglary investigations have been solved and numerous hand guns have been taken off the streets. In addition, the identity as well as incriminating statements of five murder suspects have been obtained.
	2011-LA-231	44	6,812	12	88	Intercepts have aided agents in identifying several members of a DTO. Intercepts have also provided intelligence on how the organization operates.
	2011-LA-232	35	1,669	13	87	The target subject was arrested with 10 pounds of methamphetamine. Charges are pending. This investigation continues.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-233	50	1,680	15	85	Currently the investigation is ongoing and there have been no arrests. Agents seized three kilograms of cocaine that were destined for England. Agents contacted DEA in England to arrange an International Controlled Delivery. Once all coconspirators have been identified, arrests will be forthcoming.
	2011-LA-235	43	4,098	8	92	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-236	133	2,463	40	60	Interception of the target telephone(s) was important to identify individuals in the organization, stash-house locations, methods of operation, and location of other sources of supply.
	2011-LA-237	21	943	16	84	The wiretap led to the seizure of 47 kilograms of cocaine. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-238	47	4,188	16	84	Ongoing investigation
	2011-LA-239	16	395	25	85	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2011-LA-240	33	331	39	61	The interceptions enabled investigators to identify additional individuals involved in this DTO. Investigators seized \$16,640 from a courier and obtained valuable intelligence about this DTO. Investigators believe, based on conversations, this was a phone used to communicate with customers. The intelligence gained through interceptions will help investigators as they continue their investigation into this DTO and ultimately the prosecution of multiple members of this organization.
	2011-LA-241		0			The target subject discontinued using this telephone.
	2011-LA-242	54	392	13	87	Interceptions allowed investigators to identify and arrest two illegal aliens based in Los Angeles who were laundering drug proceeds.. Interceptions also provided intelligence on trafficker's methods of laundering drug proceeds. This ongoing investigation continues to pursue the additional members of this money-laundering cell. Approximately \$100,000 in counterfeit and suspected stolen merchandise was seized along with \$27,000 in drug proceeds by investigators as a result of interceptions.
	2011-LA-243	82	1,151	16	84	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-244	383	21,310	22	78	Monitoring of the above telephones was beneficial in the identification of narcotic organizations and individuals selling narcotics in Los Angeles County and surrounding areas. The monitoring of the listed phones resulted in seizure of narcotics and narcotic proceeds that had a direct link to Los Angeles County. To date, approximately 15 pounds of methamphetamine, 3.5 kilograms of cocaine, \$400,000 of narcotic proceeds, and one handgun have been seized.
	2011-LA-245	1,357	2,920	5	95	Ongoing investigation.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angles (cont'd)	2011-LA-246	85	4,653	16	84	Agents seized 47 kilograms of cocaine as a result of intercepted conversations on target telephone. The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-247	98	3,347	33	67	Agents intercepted numerous telephone calls over the target telephone, between the target subject and his narcotic costumers, as well as his narcotic sources of supply. Agents were able to iniatate a wiretap on one of the sources of supply from information obtained from this wiretap.
	2011-LA-248	50	2,803	89	11	This wiretap provided information which initiated narcotic investigations of coconspirators operating in the state of California.
	2011-LA-249		0			The target subject discontinued using this telephone.
	2011-LA-250	0	2	0	100	Intercepted communications will be used to indict all subjects identified as having an indictable offense during this case.
	2011-LA-251		0			The target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2011-LA-252	122	229	18	82	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-253	21	1,615	19	81	Interception of this target subject allowed agents to identify narcotic associates involved in the distribution of cocaine and methamphetamine.
	2011-LA-254	39	1,376	3	97	No significant events or seizures occurred during the period of this wiretap investigation.
	2011-LA-255		0			This wiretap was installed, but no intercepts were captured since the user made changes to his subscriber information prior to installation.
	2011-LA-256	119	1,180	2	98	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-257	20	1,737	15	85	Interception led to the identification of stash locations associated with other members of the target organization.
	2011-LA-258	4	24	75	25	Intercepted communications will be used to indict all subjects identified as having an indictable offense during this case.
	2011-LA-259	34	22,792	0	100	Wiretap orders were requested and obtained to help gather information and statements on an unsolved 2009 murder investigation of a 18-year-old male, as well as, in part of, five additional gang related murders and gang activity investigations. Prior to the wire request, little to no information was available on these cases that would have lead to an arrest or conviction. As of this date, several gang-committed robbery and residential burglary investigations have been solved and numerous hand guns taken off the streets. In addition, the identity as well as incriminating statements of five murder suspects have been obtained.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-260	33	1,569	11	89	Agents seized 37 kilograms of cocaine and 1.1 million dollars in cash as a result of interceptions on target telephone. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-261	36	641	12	88	Seizure of approximately 19 pounds of marijuana.
	2011-LA-262	120	2,885	14	84	Interceptions allowed investigators to identify and arrest two illegal aliens based in Los Angeles who were laundering drug proceeds.. Interceptions also provided intelligence on trafficker's methods of laundering drug proceeds. This ongoing investigation continues to pursue the additional members of this money-laundering cell. Approximately \$100,000 in counterfeit and suspected stolen merchandise was seized along with \$27,000 in drug proceeds by investigators as a result of interceptions.
	2011-LA-263	42	892	34	66	In February 2011, a state search warrant was executed at the residence associated with the suspect. During the search of the residence, approximately 5 kilograms of cocaine and \$29,980 were seized. No arrests were made.
	2011-LA-264	5,474	8,159	15	85	During the interception the target subject spoke a lot about drug trafficking. However, agents were unable to seize any narcotics from the target subject. This case is ongoing.
	2011-LA-265	50	5,249	11	89	This wiretap provided information which initiated narcotic investigations of coconspirators operating in the states of California.
	2011-LA-266	25	1,064	31	69	Based on intercepted calls over this target telephone, agents arrested two individuals and seized approximately one kilogram of cocaine.
	2011-LA-267	244	386	16	84	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-268	7	121	12	88	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2011-LA-269	36	3,615	16	84	In March 2011, three members of the organization, including the user of this telephone, were arrested and are being held and charged in San Bernardino County. Three vehicles, a kilogram of cocaine, and a pound of methamphetamine were seized.
	2011-LA-270	65	2,324	3	97	Suspect(s) involved in this investigation are part of a DTO based in Mexico and the United States. The suspect(s) in charge of the organization coordinate the shipments and sales of the narcotics via cellular phones. Pertinent conversations intercepted are crucial in order to show the suspect(s) involvement, since members within the organization are reluctant to testify against other suspect(s) involved.
	2011-LA-271		0			Although this target telephone was monitored for 22 days, no calls were intercepted.
	2011-LA-272	75	2,271	27	73	This investigation continues.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-273	68	1,390	17	83	Interception of the target telephone(s) was important to identify individuals in the organization, stash-house locations, methods of operation, and location of other sources of supply.
	2011-LA-274		0			The target subject discontinued service before we could intercept any calls.
	2011-LA-275	57	1,212	17	83	Wiretap interceptions led to the seizure of two kilos of cocaine and three ounces of methamphetamine.
	2011-LA-276	26	901	16	84	The investigation is ongoing. The law enforcement team is in the process of obtaining a Title III Order for the primary's new cellular telephone.
	2011-LA-277	0	17	0	100	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-278	138	9,548	28	72	Wiretap investigation was conducted to gain information on the narcotic sales and distribution activity of a subject operating in the Los Angeles County area.
	2011-LA-279	6	117	59	41	Interception of this phone led to the identification of second target telephone, which resulted in the seizure of approximately \$454,000
	2011-LA-280	0	0			No calls were intercepted.
	2011-LA-281		0			Although court authorization was granted to intercept communications to and from target telephone #2, agents did not activate interception of target telephone #2 due to lack of use.
	2011-LA-282		0			
	2011-LA-283	51	6,602	14	86	No significant events or seizures took place during the period of this wiretap investigation.
	2011-LA-284	41	1,046	17	83	Intercepting target telephones assisted agents with identification of stash houses used by the target subjects. Search warrants have not been served and no arrests have been made. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-285	35	771	16	84	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2011-LA-286	2	50	0	100	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-287	8	117	15	85	Intercepted communications will be used to indict all subjects identified as having an indictable offense during this case.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-288	284	4,520	20	80	The interceptions provided the basis for evidence in all criminal charges brought in this investigation, both in terms of evidence and in terms of identification of suspects. Furthermore, all seizures and arrests in this case were the results of intercepted communications which allowed investigators to determine who was involved in the alleged narcotics trafficking violations. Conspiracy was a primary focus of this investigation. All of the evidence to support the criminal conspiracy allegations were found in the intercepted communications. Without intercepted communications, no charges could have been brought in this case.
	2011-LA-289	8	248	25	75	Based on information from this wiretap, investigators were able to open Wiretap No. 11-25
	2011-LA-290	151	5,126	38	62	The interceptions provided the basis for evidence in all criminal charges brought in this investigations, both in terms of evidence and in terms of identification of suspects. Furthermore, all seizures and arrests in this case were the results of intercepted communications which allowed investigator to determine who was involved in the alleged narcotics trafficking violations. Conspiracy was a primary focus of this investigation all of the evidence to support the criminal conspiracy allegations were found in the intercepted communications. Without intercepted communications, no charges could have been brought in this case.
	2011-LA-291	163	4,664	14	86	Take down of the operation is being planned in coordination with other law enforcement agencies.
	2011-LA-292	35	1,250	76	24	Intercepted calls during this wiretap assisted investigators with the identification of multiple narcotics associates in the target organization as well as seizing approximately 30 kilograms of cocaine in Washington state.
	2011-LA-293	15	314	16	84	Intercepting target telephones assisted agents with identification of stash houses used by the target subjects. As this case is ongoing, search warrants have not been served and no arrests have been made.
	2011-LA-294	75	2,753	13	87	This wiretap provided information which initiated narcotic investigations of coconspirators operating in Los Angeles County as well as a separate distribution network.
	2011-LA-295	1,288	1,950	21	79	During the interception, the target subject used the target telephone and spoke a lot about drug trafficking. However, agents were unable to seize any narcotics from the target subject. This case is ongoing.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-296	1,807	4,531	9	91	During the interception, the target subject used the target telephone and spoke a lot about drug trafficking. However, agents were unable to seize any narcotics from the target subject. This case is ongoing.
	2011-LA-297	15	220	84	16	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately \$454,000 in narcotics proceeds in April 2011.
	2011-LA-298	256	670	23	77	The interceptions are directly connected to target and other people and to drug activities which are significant for prosecution.
	2011-LA-299	127	6,048	36	64	The interceptions obtained during this wiretap have led to seven arrests. Due to the continuing investigation, all seven individuals arrested were released pending future prosecution. The intercepted calls helped agents and detectives determine the workings of the individuals involved. Additionally, the interceptions helped to recover narcotics and narcotics proceeds.
	2011-LA-300	6	81	74	26	Intercepted communications will be used to indict all subjects identified as having an indictable offense during this case.
	2011-LA-301	60	1,200	6	94	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-302	15	17,184	0	100	Wiretap orders were requested and obtained to help gather information and statements on a unsolved 2009 murder investigation of a 18-year-old male, as well as, in part of, five additional gang-related murders and gang activity investigations. Prior to wire request, little to no information was available on these cases that would have lead to an arrest or conviction. As of this date, several gang-committed robbery and residential burglary investigations have been solved and numerous handguns taken off the streets. In addition, the identity s well as incriminating statements of five murder suspects have been obtained.
	2011-LA-303	87	1,387	17	83	The target subject discussed the distribution of narcotics. No target subjects have been arrested yet.
	2011-LA-304	29	2,941	12	88	The target subject was arrested with five kilograms of cocaine. The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues. Charges are pending.
	2011-LA-305	62	368	94	6	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately 20 kilograms of cocaine in April 2011, as well as the seizure of approximately 12 kilograms of cocaine in May 2011.
	2011-LA-306	136	4,279	17	83	The target subject discussed the distribution of narcotics. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-307	28	356	32	68	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of other members of the target organization.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-308	56	1,783	2	98	During the course of the interceptions of the target, information developed led to identifying the target of the DTO. Intercepts assisted investigators with identifying person(s), location(s), pattern and structure of the DTO operation in the state of California and Washington.
	2011-LA-309		0			Interception of the target telephone was never initiated.
	2011-LA-310	9	324	5	95	This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-311	43	909	31	69	This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-312	167	9,651	12	88	Interception of three target telephones assisted with the seizure of \$226,000. The criminal case has not yet been filed.
	2011-LA-313	5	49	82	18	Interception led to the identification of multiple narcotics traffickers and associated stash locations for the organization.
	2011-LA-314	10	130	85	15	Interceptions pursuant to these wiretaps led to the identification of other members of the target organization which were previously unknown. Approximately 31 kilograms of cocaine were seized in May 2011.
	2011-LA-315	161	1,395	58	42	During the ongoing investigation, agents learned the DTO was responsible for smuggling illegal drugs from Mexico to the United States and narcotic proceeds, firearms, and tactical military equipment from the United States to Mexico. Agents also learned the DTO's extensively utilized method to launder narcotic proceeds. To date, the investigation has resulted in the seizure of approximately 3.4 million dollars of narcotic proceeds. 48 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 kilograms of cocaine, 70 pounds of heroin, and the arrest of 15 DTO members.
	2011-LA-316	210	8,750	32	68	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately \$2,576,640 and 25 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-LA-317	6	298	24	76	During the course of this intercept, agents seized approximately \$328,000 of narcotics proceeds and arrested two individuals for narcotics trafficking. The investigation is ongoing. Further narcotics, money seizures and arrests are anticipated.
2011-LA-318	57	4,635	11	89	This wiretap was initiated as a gang wire and successfully stopped a planned escape from a correctional facility. Several gang members were identified and the case is still pending. The target subject remains a main player with the target gang and continues to communicate with several gang members and their illegal activities.	
2011-LA-319	2,253	2,551	4	96	This wiretap primarily focused on a cell of narcotics traffickers operating in California. During the course of the wiretap, the cell head of this DTO fled into Mexico after observing a surveillance following him.	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-320	5	7	100	0	Law enforcement officers were able to identify couriers and locations associated with the target organization. Approximately \$2,100,000 were seized.
	2011-LA-321	28	2,143	16	84	Interceptions indicated the user of this phone is a narcotics courier. Intercepted conversations over this phone and others related resulted in the seizure of approximately 8 kilograms of cocaine and 50 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2011-LA-322	11	31,162	1	99	The three individuals directly involved in the murder of the victim were arrested and charges are filed. The preliminary hearing is pending. Two additionally individuals were also arrested for conspiracy; however, charges were not filed. Without this wiretap, the arrest and prosecution of these three suspects of murder would not have been possible.
	2011-LA-323	25	1,215	27	73	Based on intercepted calls over this target telephone, agents were able to identify a source of supply who has a strong association to Mexico.
	2011-LA-324	218	2,432	9	91	The target subjects discontinued using these telephones. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-325	65	1,042	16	84	The interception of calls assisted in the identification of residence, "stash" locations and other subjects involved with the DTO. Intercepts assisted in identifying other members, pattern of the DTO and the arrest and seizures of six kilograms of cocaine. The information developed from the intercepts will successfully assist in the dismantling of the DTO.
	2011-LA-326	2	81	3	97	The target subject discussed the distribution of narcotics. No targetsSubjects have been arrested yet.
	2011-LA-327	10	150	82	18	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately \$2,026,013 as well as the identification of multiple other cells of the target organization which were previously unknown.
	2011-LA-328	4	762	52	48	The wiretap investigation provided information regarding the narcotics activities of the target subject and his criminal associates in the Los Angeles County area.
	2011-LA-329	50	582	16	84	This period of interception was beneficial to the larger undercover operation which has identified a money laundering network which moves "bulk cash" between the United States and Mexico. No seizures or arrests during this period. The investigation is ongoing. Approximately 50 individuals were intercepted over this wiretap.
	2011-LA-330		0			The target subject discontinued using this telephone. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-331	14	63	0	100	Target telephone number remained active during interception. All calls were either checking voice mail, or hang ups.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-332	39	1,207	16	84	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Los Angeles County and with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, numerous kilos of cocaine, and the seizure of thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-LA-333	10	13	100	0	Law enforcement officers were able to identify couriers and locations associated with the target organization. The seizure of narcotics, narcotics proceeds and many arrests are anticipated.
	2011-LA-334	194	2,784	2	98	The cases against the six defendants would not have been filed without the interception obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial but has been filed.
	2011-LA-335	8	174	17	83	Interception on the target telephones assisted agents with the seizure of three kilograms of cocaine, four pounds of methamphetamine, and the seizure of approximately \$75,000. One was arrested, but the case has not been filed with the District Attorney's Office. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-336	5	65	66	34	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of other members of the target organization which were previously unknown. The investigation into these targets has resulted in other seizures of narcotics of narcotics proceeds based on wiretap signed in other counties in the Southern California area.
	2011-LA-337	71	1,617	23	77	Interceptions are important to assist in identifying a higher level of narcotic traffickers and their sources of supply.
	2011-LA-338	13	20	65	35	With this interception, law enforcement officers were able to identify couriers and locations associated with the target organization. Law enforcement officials are coordinating with law enforcement counterparts to dismantle this narcotics trafficking organization.
	2011-LA-339	492	17,506	6	94	Target subjects are involved in the trafficking of narcotics and firearms from Arizona to California. Narcotics and firearms have been seized in California and Arizona as a result of these intercepts.
	2011-LA-340	8	252	97	3	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately \$530,000 in narcotics proceeds, 12 pounds of methamphetamine, and one kilogram of cocaine.
	2011-LA-341	624	23,715	19	81	This wiretap provided information which initiated narcotic investigations of coconspirators operating in California and Minnesota.
	2011-LA-342	91	1,034	5	95	Interception of two target telephones assisted the case with the seizure of approximately \$113,283. This case is ongoing.
	2011-LA-343	40	951	32	68	Ongoing investigation.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-344	20	27	74	26	With the interception of this wiretap, law enforcement officials were able to identify couriers and locations associated with the target organization. This is an ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-345	94	2,893	6	94	The interception of calls assisted in the identification of subjects involved with the DTO. Interceptions assisted in identifying patterns and locations used by the DTO.
	2011-LA-346	4	7,051	4	96	This was a "body dump" homicide investigation. There were no witnesses, no crime scene, and no weapon recovered. The only evidence recovered from the location was the body. Two suspects were arrested for Penal Code § 187(a) and related charges. Narcotics and money were recovered. This case would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial.
	2011-LA-347	91	5,145	4	96	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with identification of additional drug traffickers and stash houses.
	2011-LA-348	40	1,116	20	80	During the interception, agents identified other members of the DTO. Interception of the target telephone assisted the case with the seizure of \$248,000. One person was arrested, but the case has not yet been filed.
	2011-LA-349	8	152	27	73	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-350		0			Wiretap order was signed, but the wiretap was not installed, as the phone account for the target phone was discontinued prior to installation of the wiretap.
	2011-LA-351	4	528	18	82	Investigators seized 21 kilograms of cocaine and arrested two individuals, who were later released because this investigation is still ongoing.
	2011-LA-352	113	1,332	11	89	Intercepts assisted in identifying members, pattern of the DTO, and an arrest and seizure of 19 kilograms of cocaine. Information from intercepts will successfully assist in the dismantling of the DTO and ensure the safety of all communities that the DTO operates.
	2011-LA-353	5	95	89	11	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of a target located in Denver, Colorado. DEA Denver is currently investigating the individual initially identified during this wiretap and they have made multiple seizures of narcotics in the Denver area.
	2011-LA-354	66	609	44	56	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-355	5	54	93	7	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of a target Oregon, and the seizure of two kilograms of cocaine and the arrest of one individual.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-356	1	4,469	1	99	This was a "body dump" homicide investigation. There were no witnesses, no crime scene, and no weapon recovered from the location where the body was found. Two suspects were arrested for murder. Narcotics and money were recovered. This case would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial.
	2011-LA-357	145	2,146	7	93	The target subject was involved in the trafficking of narcotics and firearms from Arizona to California. Several illegal narcotics and weapons were seized from his residence in the state of Arizona.
	2011-LA-358	187	6,456	12	88	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with identification of additional money launderers, drug traffickers, and stash houses. This investigation is ongoing.
	2011-LA-359	50	1,671	20	80	The interception of this target telephone was continued under Wiretap No. 11-166. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-360	3	145	28	72	During the wiretap investigation, no seizures were made. The telephone was dropped on or about August 2011.
	2011-LA-361	9	338	26	74	The target subject discontinued using this phone. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-362	42	1,640	16	84	During the interception, agents identified other members of the DTO. This case is ongoing.
	2011-LA-363	97	5,034	8	92	Interceptions led to a seizure of approximately \$165,000, one kilogram of cocaine, one pound of heroin, and one firearm. The DTO has been disrupted as a result.
	2011-LA-364	35	450	81	19	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of other members of the target organization that were previously unknown.
	2011-LA-365	14	65	0	100	This wiretap provided information which initiated narcotic investigations of coconspirators operating in California and Minnesota.
	2011-LA-366	1	739	6	94	This is a "body dump" investigation. There were no witnesses, no crime scene, and no weapon recovered. The only evidence recovered from the location was the body. Two suspects were arrested for murder and related charges. Narcotics and money were recovered. This case would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation.
	2011-LA-367	1	2,216	5	95	The target subject discussed the transportation of narcotics proceeds. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-368	116	4,825	11	89	The target subjects discussed the trafficking of narcotics proceeds. Five subjects were arrested and released pending further investigation.
	2011-LA-369	16	326	31	69	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-370	18	693	13	97	The target subject discontinued using this phone. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-371	45	3,860	11	89	This wiretap provided information of a DTO operating in Los Angeles County.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-372	59	2,636	11	89	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-373	4	45	89	11	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the identification of other members of the target organization that were previously unknown.
	2011-LA-374	368	20,618	9	91	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-375		0			The target subject of this investigation discontinued utilizing the target telephone prior to the approval of the court order for this wiretap investigation.
	2011-LA-376	20	322	19	81	The target subject discontinued using this phone. Agents seized 15 kilograms of cocaine and \$470,900. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-377	16	264	70	30	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-378	199	3,348	6	94	During this wiretap investigation, agents have been able to identify several money couriers. Agents have seized approximately \$500,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-LA-379	45	2,912	59	41	Agents were able to identify county-based narcotics traffickers. Surveillance follow-up and additional investigation is currently taking place.
	2011-LA-380	7	3,401	11	89	The intention was to identify the members of an international DTO and dismantle the organization.
	2011-LA-381	387	12,172	2	98	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-382	148	7,935	6	94	During this wiretap investigation, agents have been able to identify additional money launders. Agents have been able to seize approximately \$100,000 in narcotics proceeds. Agents will be presenting the case in a near future for prosecution.
	2011-LA-383	147	3,925	22	78	There have not been any arrests or convictions in relation to this wiretap.
	2011-LA-384	22	894	9	91	The target subject discontinued using these phones. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-385	26	1,481	4	96	Target subject was a narcotics proceeds courier that transported narcotics to Mexico.
	2011-LA-386	174	5,180	2	98	Interceptions led to seizure of approximately \$165,000, one kilograms of cocaine, one pound of heroin, and one firearm. The DTO has been disrupted as a result.
	2011-LA-387	19	689	13	87	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues. Agents seized 19 kilograms of cocaine and \$400,000 as a result of interceptions. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-388	117	4,595	15	85	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with the identification of additional drug traffickers and stash houses.
	2011-LA-389	211	6,828	0	100	The cases against the six defendants would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial but has been filed.
	2011-LA-390	2	3	0	100	Primary suspect stopped using telephone prior to interception of incriminating communications.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-391	0	6	0	100	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-392	77	2,740	17	83	The target subjects discontinued using these telephones. This investigation continues. In September 2011, agents seized about nine kilograms of cocaine, seven pounds of methamphetamine and about \$494,748 as a result of interceptions. Charges will be filed at a later date.
	2011-LA-393	22	468	22	78	Interceptions led to information which resulted in the arrests of four defendants in October 2011.
	2011-LA-394	44	3,036	17	83	The target subject discontinued using this phone. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-395	78	686	85	15	There have not been any arrests or convictions in relation to this wiretap.
	2011-LA-396	88	1,491	15	85	The target subjects discontinued using these phones. This investigation continues. Two separate seizures made as a result of interceptions: 120 kilos of cocaine and about \$653,149. Three suspects were arrested and released. Charges are pending.
	2011-LA-397	29	1,092	24	76	In November 2011, agents seized about nine kilos of cocaine, four pounds of methamphetamine and about \$38,920 as a result of interceptions. Charges will be filed at a later date. Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-398	1	21	100	0	With the assistance of Wiretap No. 11-198, agents were able to identify Mexican-based narcotics traffickers responsible for sending thousands of kilograms into the United States and Canada. This investigation is still ongoing.
	2011-LA-399	20	477	30	70	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-400	13	246	6	94	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues. Agents seized one kilogram of cocaine from the target subject. Charges are pending.
	2011-LA-401	64	696	8	92	The target subject discussed the distribution of narcotics. No target subjects have been arrested.
	2011-LA-402	263	5,135	10	90	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with identification of additional narcotics proceeds launderers. Agents were able to seize approximately \$180,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-LA-403	17	585	28	72	Interceptions during this time period resulted in the identification of other individuals involved in the narcotics trafficking activities of the target organization.
	2011-LA-404	28	614	32	68	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with the identification of additional narcotics proceeds launderers. No arrests were made.
	2011-LA-405	6	23	9	91	Interception of the target telephone has assisted agents with the identification of target subjects.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2011-LA-406	118	21,397	1	99	Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with the identification of additional narcotics proceeds launderers. No arrests were made.
	2011-LA-407	244	15,402	23	77	Interceptions pursuant to this wiretap led to the seizure of approximately \$1,300,000 in narcotics proceeds and approximately 30 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-LA-408		0			
	2011-LA-409	5	57	58	42	Based on the information obtained from the wiretap intercepts: one day investigators seized three kilograms of cocaine and \$10,900 in US Currency, no arrests were made; the next day, investigators executed a search warrant. Subsequently, investigators seized approximately \$174,000 in US Currency, eight kilograms of cocaine and a Rolex watch.
	2011-LA-410	5	142	11	89	This investigation continues.
	2011-LA-411	813	19,226	3	97	Ongoing investigation.
	2011-LA-412		0			The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2011-LA-413	40	498	7	93	The target subject is one of two primary suspects in a double homicide which occurred in Los Angeles County.
	2011-LA-414	44	1,140	14	86	The target subject discussed the distribution of narcotics. No arrests were made.
Madera	2011-MAD-1	173	2,544	27	73	
	2011-MAD-2	96	4,155	41	59	
Merced	2012-MER-3	15	50	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-11 through 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2012-MER-4	15	50	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-10 and 11-12 through 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2012-MER-5	15	50	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-10 through 11-11 and 11-13 through 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Merced (cont'd)	2012-MER-6	27	90	75	25	Along w/ wiretaps 11-10 through 11-12 and 11-14 through 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2012-MER-7	59	190	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-10 through 11-13 and 11-15 through 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-MER-8	114	380	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-10 through 11-14 and 11-16: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-MER-9	59	190	75	25	Along with wiretaps 11-10 through 11-15: during this investigation, agents seized a fully functional methamphetamine super laboratory, approximately 20 pounds of methamphetamine, methamphetamine manufacturing pre cursors, and approximately \$80,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-MER-10	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-2 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-11	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 and wiretaps 11-3 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-12	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-2 and wiretaps 11-4 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-13	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-3 and wiretaps 11-5 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-14	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-4 and wiretaps 11-6 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-15	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-5 and wiretaps 11-7 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Merced (cont'd)	2011-MER-16	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-6 and wiretaps 11-8 through 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-17	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-7 and wiretap 11-9: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
	2011-MER-18	115	18,249	6	94	Along with wiretaps 11-1 through 11-8: several pounds of methamphetamine and 76 guns were confiscated.
Orange	2010-OR-29	8	1,008	51	49	The investigation is continuing.
	2011-OR-41	39	217	46	54	The wiretaps were instrumental in the arrests of the seven suspects and the seizure of four pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$80,000 in cash.
	2011-OR-42	12	768	47	53	The wiretap conversations resulted in the seizure of approximately \$41,000 in cash, but have not resulted in any arrests. However, the investigation into this DTO is continuing and resulted in the issuance of subsequent wiretaps in Orange County.
	2011-OR-43	0	0	0	0	Interception and monitoring was never initiated because after the intercept order was signed, the telephone service provider advised law enforcement agents that service to the telephone was suspended by the provider due to non-payment of the account balance.
	2011-OR-44	31	630	17	83	The intercepted conversations revealed the target subject was engaged in narcotics trafficking. However, the target subject discontinued use of the telephone. The investigation has resulted in the issuance of subsequent intercept orders in Orange County. The investigation is continuing.
	2011-OR-46	1	43	0	100	This particular wiretap did not result in any incriminating conversations. The telephone became inactive the weekend before the wiretap was installed. The only conversations overheard were recordings from the service provider telling the subscriber to make payment on the account or service would be suspended. A total of nine persons were arrested as a result of this investigation. One has pleaded guilty and eight are pending trial in Orange County Superior Court. This investigation involved several Orange County wiretaps. Two additional target subjects are under a federal indictment and have federal arrest warrants outstanding.
	2011-OR-47	45	762	21	79	The wire interceptions have been instrumental in building a case against a prison gang that controls the distribution of narcotics on the streets. A subsequent wiretap was issued in the investigation. The case is being prepared for submission to the district attorney for filing of criminal charges.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2011-OR-48		0			The target telephone was disconnected before wire interception could be set up.
	2011-OR-49	19	425	11	89	The target subjects discontinued use of the target telephones. The investigation is continuing and resulted in subsequent wiretaps being issued in Orange County.
	2011-OR-50	52	1,824	12	88	As a result of the wire intercept, two individuals were arrested and will be prosecuted in Los Angeles County. The target subject discontinued use of the phone, but the investigation resulted in the issuance of subsequent wiretaps in Orange County.
	2011-OR-51	14	57	48	52	The wire intercepts provided information concerning narcotics distribution being overseen by a criminal street gang. The investigation is continuing and criminal charges are expected to be filed in 2012 against several individuals.
	2011-OR-52	42	1,872	8	92	The wire intercepts provided law enforcement agents insight into the day-to-day workings of this DTO. The investigation resulted in the issuance of a subsequent wiretap in Orange County. The investigation is continuing.
	2011-OR-53	3	17	1	99	The target subject discontinued use of the cell phone. The investigation is continuing and resulted in subsequent intercept orders being issued in Orange County.
	2011-OR-54	67	958	33	67	The wire interceptions have been instrumental in building a case against a prison gang that controls the distribution of narcotics on the streets. A previous wiretap was issued in the investigation. The case is being prepared for submission to the district attorney for filing of criminal charges.
	2011-OR-55	17	3,186	6	94	The target subjects discontinued use of these cell phones. The investigation is continuing and has resulted in a subsequent intercept order in Orange County.
	2011-OR-56	28	636	19	81	The intercepted conversations have assisted in identifying some members of this DTO. The target subjects have discontinued use of the target telephones and law enforcement agents are seeking to identify new phones. So far the investigation has resulted in the seizure of approximately one kilogram of cocaine and approximately one-half pound of methamphetamine.
	2011-OR-57	90	6,386	9	91	The intercepted conversations enabled law enforcement to identify certain individuals involved in narcotics trafficking. The investigation is continuing but has resulted in the seizure of approximately 1,000 pills of MDMA.
	2011-OR-58	0	23	0	100	The target subjects have discontinued use of the target telephones. The investigation is continuing and had several previous intercept orders issued in Orange County.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2011-OR-59	13	306	25	75	This investigation has concluded. As the result of an earlier intercept order in this investigation, about \$41,000 in narcotics proceeds were seized.
	2011-OR-60	1	764	27	73	The wire intercept resulted in the arrest and conviction of the target subject.
	2011-OR-61	52	2,391	20	80	The wire intercept was beneficial in investigating a DTO that is bringing methamphetamine from Mexico into Orange County for distribution and resulted in a subsequent intercept order being issued in Orange County.
	2011-OR-62	8	239	52	48	The wire intercept resulted in law enforcement identifying additional participants in a DTO.
	2011-OR-63	9	442	10	90	The wire interceptions allowed law enforcement to locate the suspect in Mexico and monitor his movements there. This information resulted in a subsequent intercept order in Orange County, which resulted in the arrest the suspect and nine other persons.
	2011-OR-64	119	5,074	19	81	As a result of leads obtained from a prior intercept order, agents were able to use the information from the present intercept order monitor the activities of a cocaine and methamphetamine DTO operating in Orange County.
	2011-OR-65	15	687	28	72	The intercepts on this wiretap allowed law enforcement to locate the main target subject in Mexico and arrest him at the U.S./Mexico border. Afterward, nine other suspects were arrested.
	2011-OR-66	23	2,696	1	99	The intercepts have established the existence of a methamphetamine distributor in Orange County. The investigation is continuing.
	2011-OR-67	14	328	30	79	The intercepts on this wiretap resulted in a subsequent intercept order being issued in Orange County. The investigation is continuing.
Placer	2011-PLA-1	224	7,060			
Riverside	2011-RIV-76	34	1,269	33	66	Not applicable - no convictions.
	2011-RIV-77	78	4,147	1	99	The intercepts provided investigators with a broader-view of the DTO. It also led to the seizure of approximately 34 pounds of methamphetamine, four firearms and contraband consistent with the processing of methamphetamine.
	2011-RIV-78	7	614	15	85	An investigation was conducted into the narcotics trafficking of a DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of cocaine, methamphetamine, and heroin from Mexico into the Southern California area for distribution. Approximately 12 kilograms of cocaine, six pounds of methamphetamine, three and one-half pounds of black tar heroin, and approximately \$65,000 and two firearms were seized during this wiretap investigation.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-79	2	29	6	94	An investigation was conducted into the narcotics trafficking of a DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of cocaine, methamphetamine and heroin from Mexico into the Southern California area for distribution. Approximately 12 kilograms of cocaine, six pounds of methamphetamine, three and one-half pounds of black tar heroin, and approximately \$65,000 and two firearms were seized during this wiretap investigation.
	2011-RIV-80	33	2,534	13	87	The target subject discontinued use of this phone; investigation continues/pending.
	2011-RIV-81	10	138	28	72	This case investigation is pending and there are no results/description to report at this time.
	2011-RIV-82	16	2,869			Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-83	32	585	28	72	Information gathered through intercepted communications led to incriminating conversations, the residence locations of suspects, and the location of a methamphetamine stash house. Two pounds of methamphetamine, \$9,000 and three firearms were discovered as a result of search warrants served. These search warrants were made possible partly from intercepted communications.
	2011-RIV-84	132	4,661	17	83	The target subject(s) discontinued using these phones; this investigation continues/pending.
	2011-RIV-85	95	2,441	31	69	An investigation was conducted into the narcotics trafficking of a DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of cocaine, methamphetamine, and heroin from Mexico into the Southern California area for distribution. Approximately 12 kilograms of cocaine, six pounds of methamphetamine, 3 1/2 pounds of black tar heroin, and approximately \$65,000 and two firearms were seized during this wiretap investigation.
	2011-RIV-86	0	0	0	0	Case is pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-87	87	2,268	25	75	This intercept order provided investigators with further insight into the hierarchy of the DTO within Mexico. Intelligence gained as a result of this intercept order also led to the seizure of approximately .5 of methamphetamine.
	2011-RIV-88	79	4,189	26	74	No comment.
	2011-RIV-90	11	178	2	98	Intercepted communications and use of electronic surveillance led to the residence and possible identification of the suspect, as well as the DTO's methods of operation.
	2011-RIV-91	58	1,958	20	80	No comment.
	2011-RIV-92	24	1,179	26	74	Although it did not lead to any seizures, this intercept order allowed investigators to expand their investigation into this Mexican-based DTO.
	2011-RIV-95	0	2	0	0	The target subject(s) discontinued using these phones; investigation continues.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-96	36	1,441	10	90	The target subject discontinued using this phone; this investigation continues/pending.
	2011-RIV-97		0			
	2011-RIV-98	153	8,596	5	95	The target subject(s) discontinued using these phones. This investigation continues: three and one-half pounds of methamphetamine and one pound of heroin seized as a result of intercepted conversations. Charges will be filed at a later date.
	2011-RIV-99	49	759	5	95	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2011-RIV-100	67	7,075	21	79	This interception order allowed detectives to identify additional members within the DTO as well as their rolls. It also led to the seizure of approximately five pounds of methamphetamine
	2011-RIV-101	23	318	11	89	To date, there have not been any arrests or convictions related to this wiretap.
	2011-RIV-102	60	457	28	72	Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-103	68	4,830	7	93	The target subject(s) discontinued using these phones. This investigation continues: three and one-half pounds of methamphetamine and one pound of heroin seized as a result of intercepted conversations. Charges will be filed at a later date.
	2011-RIV-104	65	2,960	23	77	This investigation led to the seizure of approximately 13 pounds of methamphetamine and provided investigators with additional intelligence regarding activities with the DTO.
	2011-RIV-105	1	44	50	50	Interceptions were necessary in obtaining information on key personnel within the DTO, as well as identification of other possible locations and vehicles.
	2011-RIV-106	28	2,186	28	72	Case pending.
	2011-RIV-107	116	5,098	23	77	Case pending.
	2011-RIV-108	0	24	0	0	The target subject discontinued using this phone; this investigation continues.
	2011-RIV-109	72	8,644	19	81	Intelligence gained through this intercept order led to the seizure of approximately \$76,590 in drug proceeds, and provided further insight into the activities of the DTO.
	2011-RIV-110		0			The intercept order was never initiated due to the target subject abandoning use of the device.
	2011-RIV-111	66	5,246	30	70	No comment.
	2011-RIV-112	2	2,023	25	75	Interceptions were necessary in obtaining information on key personnel within the DTO, as well as identifying other possible location and vehicles.
	2011-RIV-113	11	749	5	95	Case is still pending.
	2011-RIV-114	66	5,700	25	75	Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-115	10	250	78	22	Case pending.
	2011-RIV-116	7	140	19	81	The target subject discontinued using this telephone; this investigation continues.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-117	30	1,538	10	90	Case is still pending.
	2011-RIV-118	0	0			The intercept order was abandoned when it was determined the target subject abandoned use of the device.
	2011-RIV-119	4	0	0	0	The purpose of intercepting communications between the suspected parties was to further identify additional coconspirators involved in distributing and supplying large amounts of cocaine into the United States via the port of entry in Mexico.
	2011-RIV-120	68	3,167	34	66	This intercept order provided critical information that led to the seizure of approximately 22 kilograms of cocaine, one firearm and \$200,900 in currency.
	2011-RIV-121	45	1,406	20	80	The target subject discontinued using this phone; this investigation continues. Agents seized one pound of methamphetamine and two weapons as a result of interceptions. Charges are pending.
	2011-RIV-122	19	655	16	84	This interception order provided further intelligence related to the activities within the DTO, and was terminated when the target subject abandoned use of the device.
	2011-RIV-123	6	50	60	40	Interception of wire and electronic communications is necessary to enable investigators to achieve the objectives to identify the full scope, extent and personnel of the narcotics trafficking conspiracy, and to specifically identify the role of narcotics suppliers, coconspirators, role and identity of main customers, and the management and disposition of proceeds generated by the DTO.
	2011-RIV-124	8	210	5	95	Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-125	17	650	23	77	Case is pending; investigator for target telephones (2 and 3) (target telephone 3 installed but not used).
	2011-RIV-126	114	2,263	35	65	Case is pending and there are no results/comments to report at this time.
	2011-RIV-127	37	284	50	50	Case is pending and there are no results, comments or assessment notes at this time.
	2011-RIV-128		0			This affidavit was denied by the judge and therefore was never installed.
	2011-RIV-129	16	2,637	15	85	Case is ongoing and this number is still being intercepted.
	2011-RIV-130	23	849	45	55	Information gathered during the wiretap interception lead to the seizure of \$194,785 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-131	66	3,186	12	88	One subject was arrested for possession of narcotics from the monitoring of this wiretap.
	2011-RIV-132	42	1,359	43	57	Information leading to the later seizure of narcotics and narcotics proceeds and other subjects identified for conspiracy.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-133	22	433	42	58	A search warrant was utilized using information from this wiretap interception: five pounds of methamphetamine, two firearms were seized and two subjects were arrested.
	2011-RIV-134	3	3	0	100	This wiretap interception led to the arrest of three individuals and the seizure of six kilograms of cocaine, one pound of crack cocaine, two vehicles and \$46,596 of narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-135	18	856	42	58	No arrests were made related to this wiretap interception order.
	2011-RIV-136	113	3,426			The monitoring of this wiretap resulted in the arrest of 2 subjects, both for possession of large amounts of narcotics and the seizure of \$280,527.00 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-137	45	1,590	29	71	No arrests were made relative to this intercept order. A seizure of \$277,730 was made reference to this intercept order.
	2011-RIV-138	71	1,749	24	76	From this wire intercept investigators were able to identify a load vehicle and the driver. A subsequent seizure resulted in 18 pounds of methamphetamine and a vehicle with a hidden compartment.
	2011-RIV-139	24	852	32	68	From the above intercept investigators were able to determine a long-haul truck driver was going to transport the proceeds of narcotics sales from Ohio back to California. Investigators were able to intercept the truck and driver which subsequently resulted in a seizure of \$194,785.
	2011-RIV-140	22	746	37	63	No arrests were made relative to this intercept order.
	2011-RIV-141	33	187	39	61	From the above intercept order investigators were able to determine a long-haul truck driver was going to transport the proceeds of narcotic sales from Ohio back to California. Investigators were able to intercept the truck and driver which resulted in a seizure of \$194,785.
	2011-RIV-142	69	1,701	48	52	From the above intercept order investigators were able to determine the subject, who was the primary target of the interception, was in possession of several pounds of methamphetamine. Police Department - Narcotics were advised, a search warrant for the residence was issued and investigators were able to seize four pounds of methamphetamine, one pound of marijuana, along with three semi-automatic handguns.
	2011-RIV-143	828	2,199	12	88	Case is pending and there are no results or comments at this time.
	2011-RIV-144	606	1,290			Case is pending and there are no results/comments at this time.
	2011-RIV-145	58	6,684	22	78	This intercept order provided critical information that led to the seizure of approximately 24 kilograms of cocaine as well as further insight into the DTO.
	2011-RIV-146	34	1,269	33	66	No arrests/convictions to report under this intercept order.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-147	50	1,553	19	81	Interceptions led to the seizure of approximately 11,667 pounds of marijuana; As a result of the interception, the DTO has been disrupted.
	2011-RIV-148	3	225	0	100	Through interceptions of target telephones law enforcement has been able to identify additional members and/or telephone numbers for the DTO that have led to additional electronic wire communications for this specific case.
	2011-RIV-149		0			Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-150	0	0	0	0	Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-151	19	655	16	84	This interception order provided further intelligence related to the activities within the DTO and was terminated when the target subject abandoned use of the device.
	2011-RIV-153		0			Interception of this phone was not initiated. No pertinent information was obtained.
	2011-RIV-154	541	188	27	73	Case is pending.
	2011-RIV-155	1	6	0	100	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-156	30	3,083	11	89	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars in illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-157	75	9,542	22	78	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars in illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-158	185	11,362	19	81	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-159	0	3	0	100	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-160	41	1,468	17	83	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-161	60	4,977	6	94	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-162	47	7,919	9	91	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-163	19	2,635	7	93	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-164	4	1,304	2	98	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-165	96	10,087	5	95	Use of this wiretap investigation assisted agents with the arrest of individuals distributing narcotics in Riverside County and assisted agents with the seizure of numerous pounds of methamphetamine, kilos of cocaine, and thousands of dollars of illegally obtained narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-166	1,254	2,917	17	83	Interception of this target telephone assisted agents with further identification of this DTO. As this case is ongoing, search warrants have not been served and no arrests have been made. Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-167	113	3,426	26	74	The monitoring of this wiretap resulted in the arrest of two subjects, both for possession of large amounts of narcotics and the seizure of \$280,527 in narcotics proceeds.
	2011-RIV-169	20	75	48	52	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire DTO.
	2011-RIV-170	37	2,038	22	78	Case pending investigation.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-171	0	0	0	0	Phone was not used during attempted interceptions.
	2011-RIV-172	51	3,966	16	84	
	2011-RIV-173	41	3,029	48	52	Case pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-174	4	9	89	11	Case pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-176	23	373	47	53	Case pending investigation results.
	2011-RIV-177	93	2,327	10	90	During the interception, the target subjects spoke a lot about drug trafficking; however, agents were unable to seize any narcotic proceeds from the target subject during the interception. Agents identified other members of the DTP; the case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-178	98	5,059	24	76	During the interception of target telephone agents seized approximately 37 kilos of cocaine, 40 pounds of methamphetamine, multiple vehicles and arrested six suspects for drug trafficking charges. This case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-179	191	2,897	20	80	In June 2011, agents intercepted conversations over target telephones which found that courier was going to remit an unknown amount of narcotic proceeds to Mexico. Agents established mobile surveillance which resulted in the seizure of \$230,000 of narcotic proceeds and an arrest. Narcotics proceeds were located in vehicle. This case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-180	24	2,917	17	83	During the interception, the target subjects spoke a lot about drug trafficking; however, agents were unable to seize any narcotics or narcotics proceeds for the target subject. Agents identified other members of the DTO. The case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-181	23	994	34	66	In November 2011, intercepted conversations over target telephone used by target subject indicated that target subject had turned over an undisclosed amount of narcotic proceeds to target subject's Riverside County-based source of supply. Agents established surveillance of source of supply's residence which resulted in the seizure of approximately \$170,000 of narcotics proceeds and the arrest of source of supply. This case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-182	98	1,506	20	80	Intercepted conversation over target telephone by subject who indicated that one of his New York-based narcotics customers had arrived at stash house in Riverside County and was seeking to purchase kilos of cocaine. Agents established mobile surveillance of subjects and customer, which resulted in the seizure of approximately \$300,000 of narcotics proceeds, two vehicles and the arrest of target subject and customer. The case is ongoing.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-183	107	1,414	27	73	Intercepted conversations over target telephone used by target subject indicated target subject and courier were going to deliver kilograms of cocaine to an unknown customer in Santa Barbara, CA. Agents established surveillance of subjects which resulted in the seizure of kilograms of cocaine that was recovered from a vehicle target subjects were driving. This case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-184	78	10,208	11	89	During the intercepts of the target telephone agents served a state search warrant of target subject's residence; which resulted in the seizure of approximately \$170,000 of narcotics proceeds. Subject was arrested for drug trafficking related charges. This case is ongoing.
	2011-RIV-185	11	77	55	45	No comment.
	2011-RIV-186	13	352	82	18	No comment.
	2011-RIV-187	21	645	21	79	Intercepted and arrested one individual based on the information that we received on this wiretap.
	2011-RIV-188	47	1,283	17	83	Intercepted and arrested two individuals based on the information that we received on this wiretap.
	2011-RIV-191	0	0	0	0	All target subjects stopped using phones and no calls were intercepted and no data was collected.
	2011-RIV-192	40	2,955	14	86	Case pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-193	20	279	19	81	During the intercepts, the target subjects spoke a lot about drug trafficking; however, agents were unable to seize any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Agents identified other members of the DTO. The case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-194	18	215	18	82	During the interception of this wire, the target subjects spoke alot about drug trafficking; however, agents were unable to seize any narcotics or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Agents were able to identify other members of the DTO. Case pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-195	32	1,941	13	87	
	2011-RIV-196	18	130	25	75	
	2011-RIV-197	58	8,347	23	77	
	2011-RIV-199	165	10,242	7	93	
	2011-RIV-200		0			
	2011-RIV-201	15	15	27	73	The inteceptions confirmed that our target was in fact trafficking kilograms of cocaine before he discontinued the use of the cell phone. This confirmation led to multiple arrests and the identification of multiple DTO cell groups operating in Southern California.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-202	27	2,068	15	85	Interceptions assisted in the seizure and forfeiture of over \$700,000 and identification of multiple members of a DTO operating throughout Southern California, which are still being actively pursued today.
	2011-RIV-203	9	367	31	69	Interceptions assisted in the seizure and forfeiture of over \$700,000 and identification of multiple members of a DTO operating throughout Southern California, which are still being actively pursued.
	2011-RIV-204	141	1,447	20	80	Case spun to a higher source. No arrest.
	2011-RIV-205	203	1,893	15	85	Case spun to a higher source. No arrests.
	2011-RIV-206	88	2,392	16	84	Based on the interception and surveillance, 156.6 grams of methamphetamine was seized.
	2011-RIV-207	134	1,715	26	74	This interception lead to additional phones being utilized by the organization and other coconspirators. Based on intercepted phone conversations, approximately three pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
	2011-RIV-208	121	2,316	32	68	The use of interceptions will be able to show the primary target's involvement in the narcotics trafficking in the United States; the identity and location of stash houses and identity/location of whom narcotics are destined for in the United States.
	2011-RIV-209	207	2,299	37	63	The use of interception will be able to show the primary target's involvement in narcotics trafficking in the U.S.; the identity and location of stash houses and identity/location of whom narcotics are destined for in the U.S.
	2011-RIV-210	88	1,631	12	88	The use of interceptions show primary target's involvement in narcotics trafficking in the U.S., the identity/location of stash houses and the identity/location of who the narcotics are destined for in the United States.
	2011-RIV-211	22	185	57	43	The use of wire interceptions show primary target's involvement in the narcotics trafficking in the U.S.; the identity/location of stash houses and identity/location of who the narcotics are destined for in the United States.
	2011-RIV-212	109	793	32	68	The use of interceptions will be able to show the primary target's involvement in the narcotics trafficking in the United States; the identity location of stash houses and the identity/location of who the narcotics are destined for in the U.S.
	2011-RIV-213		0			The use of interceptions will be able to show the primary target's involvement in the narcotics trafficking in the U.S., the identity/location of stash houses and identity/location of who the narcotics are destined for in the U.S. However, prior to the signing/installation of this wiretap, the cellular telephones were disconnected by the user/target.
	2011-RIV-216	44	1,263	22	78	This wiretap led to the identification of several Riverside County-based narcotics DTOs.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-217	20	250	11	89	Case is pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-218	15	1,097	13	87	Case is pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-219		0			The target subject discontinued using this phone. Case is pending investigation.
	2011-RIV-220	29	2,917	3	97	During the interception, the target subjects spoke a lot about drug trafficking; however, agent were unable to seize any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from this target subject. Agents identified other members of the DTO. Case is pending further investigation
	2011-RIV-221		0			Wiretap was never installed.
	2011-RIV-223	16	426	29	71	The target subject discontinued using this phone; case pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-224	29	720	23	77	The target subject discontinued using this phone. Case is pending further investigation. In November 2011, agents seized five kilograms of cocaine and four pounds of methamphetamine as a result of interceptions. Charges will be filed on a later date.
	2011-RIV-228	75	18,942	3	97	Interceptions proved valuable in seizing the narcotics/guns related to this investigation, and related conversations obtained was evidence of guilt.
	2011-RIV-229	34	2,922	31	69	
	2011-RIV-230	26	1,166	12	88	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-231	18	2,922	31	69	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-232	5	27	0	100	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-233	11	196	78	22	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-234	27	377	6	94	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-235	25	196	100	0	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-236	34	2,922	31	69	Case is pending further investigation.
	2011-RIV-248	231	460	20	80	
	2011-RIV-249	1	1,020	16	84	
	2011-RIV-250	1	521	17	83	
	2011-RIV-251	1	129	37	63	
	2011-RIV-252	1	903	22	78	
	2011-RIV-253	1	119	21	79	
	2011-RIV-254	1	2,206	14	86	
	2011-RIV-257	2	1,649	2	98	
	2011-RIV-258	1	0	0	0	
	2011-RIV-259	1	3,033	18	82	
Sacramento	2011-SAC-32	3	4,993	5	95	This wiretap led to solid felony arrests regarding guns and robbery.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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	
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)		
Sacramento (cont'd)	2011-SAC-33	4	2,126	1	99	Suspects were disciplined with their conversations so nothing specifically incriminating was said; however, the nature of the calls themselves and when the calls were made in connection with contacting certain people in the case show that certain individuals are likely involved.	
	2011-SAC-34	4,129	6,086	4	96	Investigators had been working this case for four years. The intercept helped investigators determine how people were related to one another and determine additional witnesses to be interviewed which helped to advance the case.	
	2011-SAC-35	227	3,147	1	99	Without the interceptions, the murder suspect would not have been located and apprehended.	
	2011-SAC-36	3	1,198	5	95	There were no eye witnesses to the Penal Code § 187, thus making a case on the suspect all but impossible without the use of a wiretap. The suspect refused to be interviewed or polygraphed in regards to his involvement in the Penal Code § 187.	
	2011-SAC-37	371	1,169	3	97		
	2011-SAC-38	120	153	1	99	Investigators had been working this case for four years. The intercept helped investigators determine how people were related to one another and determine additional witnesses to be interviewed which helped to advance the case.	
	2011-SAC-39	3,267	5,088	1.6	98	Investigators had been working this case for four years. The intercept helped investigators determine how people were related to one another and determine additional witnesses to be interviewed which helped to advance the case.	
	2011-SAC-40	28	146	2	98	Without the interceptions, the murder suspect would not have been located and apprehended.	
	San Bernardino	2011-SBD-1	269	5,757	9	91	No criminal prosecution.
		2011-SBD-2	52	4,391	3	97	In November 2010, traffic stop of tractor-trailer headed to Mexico and seizure of 12,150 rounds of high caliber ammunition.
2011-SBD-3		19	2,415			In December 2010, arrest of suspect and seizure of \$219,620 from vehicle and \$8,000 from residence.	
2011-SBD-4		0	115			In December 2010, arrest of two suspects for Health and Safety Code § 11352 and seizure of 10 pounds of methamphetamine.	
2010-SBD-14		156	8,696	4	96	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.	
	2011-SBD-43	31	1,411			No criminal charges; however, intercepted communications assisted with identification of additional target subjects and target telephones.	
	2011-SBD-45	6	14			During a 15-day wiretap investigation, there were no narcotic related seizures or arrests. No criminal charges.	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2011-SBD-47	4	401			In January 2011, search warrant served. Four suspects were arrested and approximately \$50,000 was seized.
	2010-SBD-48	97	1,832	8	92	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-49	4	62	36	64	
	2011-SBD-116	58	3,167	23	77	No arrests, no seizures, and no criminal prosecution as a result of this intercept (wiretap) order. However, the intercepted communications assisted in identification of additional target telephones and target subjects.
	2011-SBD-117	131	12,604	12	88	This wiretap assisted in the investigation of the DTO and resulted in the arrest of suspects and the seizure of narcotics.
	2011-SBD-118		0			No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-120	527	3,801	5	95	Arrest of six suspects and seizure of 20 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-SBD-121	818	34,701	3	97	This wiretap assisted in the investigation of the DTO and resulted in the arrest of suspects and the seizure of narcotics.
	2011-SBD-122	0	0			County funded only.
	2011-SBD-131	21	2,236	17	83	No arrests, no seizures, and no criminal prosecution as a result of this intercept (wiretap) order. However, the intercepted communications assisted in identification of additional target telephones and target subjects.
	2011-SBD-132	68	2,113	20	80	This wiretap assisted in the investigation of the DTO and resulted in the arrest of suspects and the seizure of narcotics.
	2011-SBD-133	59	8,293	15	85	
	2011-SBD-134	27	1,556	21	79	In February 2011, arrest of suspects at border and seizure of 90 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2011-SBD-135		0			Never installed.
	2011-SBD-136	109	1,278	14	86	No criminal charges; however, intercepted communications assisted with identification of additional target subjects and target telephones.
	2011-SBD-137	170	12,501	14	86	Traffic stop in Orange County, seizure of five ounces of heroin and arrest of two suspects.
	2011-SBD-138	51	2,807	12	88	No arrests, no seizures, and no criminal prosecution as a result of this intercept (wiretap) order. However, the intercepted communications assisted in identification of additional target telephones and target subjects.
	2011-SBD-139	12	75	0	100	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-140	19	1,507	22	78	
	2011-SBD-141	36	1,237	13	87	No arrests, no seizures, and no criminal prosecution as a result of this intercept (wiretap) order. However, the intercepted communications assisted in identification of additional target telephones and target subjects.
	2011-SBD-142	15	78	46	54	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2011-SBD-143	1	32	0	100	No arrests, no seizures, and no criminal prosecution as a result of this intercept (wiretap) order; however, the intercepted communications assisted in identification of additional target telephones and target subjects.
	2011-SBD-144		0			
	2011-SBD-145		0			
	2011-SBD-146		0			
	2011-SBD-147	44	6,369	1	99	No criminal prosecution.
	2011-SBD-148	98	5,579	9	91	
	2011-SBD-149	110	3,367	12	88	No criminal charges; however, intercepted communications assisted with identification of additional target subjects and target telephones.
	2011-SBD-150		0			Not installed.
	2011-SBD-151	68	1,487	31	69	No criminal prosecution.
	2011-SBD-152	165	2,065	5	95	
	2011-SBD-153	10	29	10	90	
	2011-SBD-154	74	1,299	20	80	No criminal prosecution.
	2011-SBD-155	96	6,157	17	83	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-156	62	1,357	4	96	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-157	5	158	1	99	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-168	0	0			
	2011-SBD-215	63	1,780	17	83	Seizure of \$82,000.
	2011-SBD-216	64	1,123	27	73	Interception of this target telephone resulted in the identification of the target subject's source of supply.
	2011-SBD-217	125	8,643	4	96	County funded.
	2011-SBD-218	75	1,620	2	98	County funded.
	2011-SBD-219	23	2,609	25	75	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-267	17	379	32	68	
	2011-SBD-291	1,764	3,518	12	88	Interception of the target telephones assisted Police Department investigators with identification of suspects and potential witnesses to a homicide in 2011. Arrest of seven suspects.
	2011-SBD-308	167	2,418	7	93	The interception of the target telephones assisted Police Department investigators with identifying suspects and potential witnesses to a homicide which occurred in 2011.
	2011-SBD-316	28	2,045	7	93	In May 2011, seizure of \$185,810.
	2011-SBD-317	67	1,014	5	95	
	2011-SBD-320	54	4,293	21	79	
	2011-SBD-321	131	14,320	21	79	
	2011-SBD-322	31	1,483	2	98	City funded.
	2011-SBD-323	43	813	1	99	City funded.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2011-SBD-324	113	2,440	18	82	No criminal charges directly resulted from the interceptions obtained pursuant to this intercept (wiretap) order; however, the intercepted communications were material in obtaining additional wiretaps and furthering the investigation.
	2011-SBD-325	74	4,664	13	87	
	2011-SBD-330	419	7,181	5	95	In April 2011, traffic stop and arrest of target subject and passenger in Riverside County and seizure of 60 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-SBD-339	490	15,632	25	75	
	2011-SBD-341	471	1,387	9	91	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-342	123	3,932	17	83	
	2011-SBD-343	219	13,304	7	93	
	2011-SBD-344	108	2,985	8	92	Federally funded. Monitoring the phone lines gave the ability to track the narcotic sales taking place by the primary target. Due to the target discontinuing the use of phone there were only a minimal amount of transactions monitored.
	2011-SBD-345	187	871	45	55	
	2011-SBD-346	70	3,001	13	87	Intercepted communications have assisted with continuing inter-state investigation.
	2011-SBD-347	6	92	40	60	In July 2011, arrest of one suspect and seizure of 16 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-SBD-354	0	4	0	100	
	2009-SBD-359	86	779	26	72	
	2011-SBD-360	72	2,065	13	87	
	2011-SBD-361	18	1,170			During this period of interception, members of the target organization, as well as multiple stash locations used by members of the target organization, were identified by law enforcement.
	2011-SBD-363	84	14,287	4	96	Seized over one pound of methamphetamine, six guns, recovered one stolen gun.
	2011-SBD-364	20	2,414	8	92	Seized over one pound of methamphetamine, six guns, recovered one stolen gun.
	2011-SBD-365		0			Kidnapped victim was recovered prior to the interception of any communications.
	2011-SBD-366	8	233	2	98	
	2011-SBD-367	23	633	2	98	
2011-SBD-368	19	3,779	33	67	Approximately two kilos of cocaine seized as a result of this intercept order.	
2011-SBD-369	47	538	24	76	County funded. The intercept allowed us to arrest one individual who was smuggling a large quantity of marijuana from Mexico into the Southern California region. The case is pending conclusion of the ongoing investigation which includes investigating a distribution cell located in the Orange County region of Southern California.	
2011-SBD-370	56	681	1	99	City funded.	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2011-SBD-376	256	5,556	11	89	In September 2011, arrest of one and seizure of 16.2 kilograms of marijuana.
	2011-SBD-377	0	0			The user of this target telephone traveled into Mexico during this interception period; therefore no persons or pertinent calls were intercepted.
	2011-SBD-378	18	2,477	48	52	Approximately seven kilograms of cocaine and five pounds of methamphetamine were seized as a result of the intercept order.
	2011-SBD-379	0	8			There were eight intercepted calls but no audio sessions have been intercepted over target telephone.
	2011-SBD-380	97	1,248	3	97	
	2009-SBD-391	83	924	11	89	Intercepted calls established the target subjects as conspirators in the distribution of methamphetamine.
	2011-SBD-392	2,044	7,450	5	95	
	2011-SBD-393	110	2,421	12	88	
	2011-SBD-394	219	2,959	11	89	In June 2011, arrest of one suspect and seizure of 18.5 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2011-SBD-395	100	288	14	86	
	2011-SBD-396	32	1,633	32	68	In September 2011, seizure of \$490,000.
	2011-SBD-397	62	5,573	4	96	City funded. Case is still active.
	2011-SBD-398	121	6,344	1	99	Case is still active.
	2011-SBD-399	96	1,236	7	93	Through the interception of wire communications, investigators identified several members of an organization involved in criminal street gang activities that included: narcotics sales, identity theft and burglary (residential and commercial).
	2011-SBD-400	0	0	0	0	
	2011-SBD-401		0			
	2011-SBD-402	0	0	0	0	
	2011-SBD-403	34	2,003	5	95	No criminal prosecution.
	2011-SBD-404	85	1,928	3	97	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-405	259	10,907	5	95	Through the interception of wire communications, investigators identified several members of an organization involved in criminal street gang activities that included: narcotics sales, identity theft, and burglary (residential and commercial).
	2011-SBD-406	185	6,645	28	72	Four subjects arrested criminal cases pending.
	2011-SBD-407	24	187	18	82	No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-408		0			No criminal charges.
	2011-SBD-409	1	2	100	0	
	2011-SBD-410	42	5,588	6	94	
	2011-SBD-411	194	69,622	88	12	Federal funded.
	2011-SBD-412	371	487	10	90	No criminal charges.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2011-SBD-413	38	2,680	7	93	
	2011-SBD-414	426	1,533	5	95	Two subjects arrested. Criminal case pending.
	2011-SBD-415	86	1,007	21	79	
	2012-SBD-419		0			
	2012-SBD-421		0			
	2012-SBD-425		0			Federally funded. County.
San Diego	2010-SD-73		0			
	2011-SD-81	80	6,651	23	77	Investigation into methamphetamine transportation between Mexico and into California and Nevada. During this wire, intercepts targets were arrested in Mexico with 213 kilograms of methamphetamine and 96 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-SD-82	63	6,968	40	60	Ongoing investigation of transport of narcotics thru California via various manners, including potential underground tunnel being dug through the border.
	2011-SD-83	45	7,772	22	78	Ongoing investigation into methamphetamine transportation from Mexico into California. This target was eventually arrested in Mexico with 213 kilograms of methamphetamine and 96 kilograms of cocaine.
	2011-SD-84	317	11,853	19	81	This investigation monitored information about tunnels being dug between Mexico and the U.S. that were to be used to smuggle narcotics. Based on information from this investigation US and Mexican officials located two different tunnels that were in the process of being built, along with tools being used.
	2011-SD-85	10	112	2	98	
	2011-SD-86	100	9,607	10	90	One individual arrested and turned over to ICE. In addition, one pound methamphetamine and an undetermined amount of USC was seized (pending official count).
	2011-SD-87	43	1,155	23	77	Source of supply for pound amounts of methamphetamine was identified.
	2011-SD-88	121	2,450	30	70	
	2011-SD-89	22	135	2	88	Due to lack of usage on this target device, interception was discontinued.
	2011-SD-90	89	1,550	29	71	The interceptions assisted agents in disrupting and dismantling the DTO.
	2011-SD-91		0			
	2011-SD-92	273	7,205	11	89	Targeted telephones on this wire identified sources of multi-pound methamphetamine trafficking and identified additional target subjects within the narcotics trafficking organization.
	2011-SD-93		0			

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-94	8	200	11	89	The wiretap assisted in gathering and identifying valuable evidence in the investigation of a major Mexican cartel member's directions to several CA residents (members of the Mexican cartel) to hire a CA street gang for murder. The investigation is believed to have disrupted the cartel's activity in CA, and saved lives. Also, incidental to the arrests of the CA residents, law enforcement served a search warrant and seized \$40,000 cash, two assault rifles, one hand-gun, and over 2,000 rounds of ammunition. Further, as a result of this investigation, the major Mexican cartel member is now in custody in Mexico. This arrest has opened several U.S. and Mexican government investigations. Trial is pending.
	2011-SD-95	37	865	21	79	Intercepts monitored coordinator for Mexican-based narcotics traffickers shipping methamphetamine thru San Diego County. Intercepts led to arrest of two individuals and several seizures of methamphetamine.
	2011-SD-96	24	884	43	57	During the course of this investigation, approximately three pounds of methamphetamine and nearly \$70,000 in drug proceeds were seized. This investigation is ongoing and prosecution still pending.
	2011-SD-97	144	9,505	26	74	This wire investigation assisted in identifying a source of supply located in Mexico. In addition, the intelligence obtained assisted officers in identifying a number of drug couriers and drug activities occurring within the northern area of San Diego County.
	2011-SD-98	40	7,804	18	82	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-99	50	7,114	19	81	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-100	80	25,227	17	83	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-101	80	16,233	14	86	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-102	60	9,685	16	84	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-103	50	15,765	15	85	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-104	50	15,647	14	86	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-105	25	7,070	16	84	This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-106		0			This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-107		0			This wire investigation is targeting one of the Mexican DTO's currently in operation. Throughout the numerous wire intercepts obtained during this investigation DEA agents have been able to target high level members of this organization which has led to significant drug seizures and arrests throughout CA. These seizures and arrests have significantly reduced the availability of illegal drugs in CA and other distribution points throughout the U.S. The multiple arrests have also taken violent drug offenders out of our communities, ultimately reducing the crime in those areas.
	2011-SD-108	31	460	9	91	The interceptions provided incriminating evidence that corroborated witness statements and physical evidence left at the scene of the murder. This evidence is invaluable and will assist in obtaining convictions for the three defendants charged in the murder.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-109	114	3,098	13	87	Interceptions provided significant incriminating evidence against the arrested and charged defendant for this first degree murder case. Sixteen calls were admitted as evidence at trial and were considered by the jury. Calls dealt with the defendant's use, possession and sale/furnishing of various controlled substances. The calls provided evidence of the defendant's motive to kill the victim in the charged case. Following deliberations in the first trial, the jury was unable to return a unanimous verdict. A mistrial was declared and it is anticipated the case will be re-tried in Spring 2012.
	2011-SD-110	114	331	10	90	Interceptions provided significant incriminating evidence against the arrested and charged defendant for this first degree murder case. Sixteen calls were admitted as evidence at trial and were considered by the jury. Calls dealt with the defendant's use, possession and sale/furnishing of various controlled substances. The calls provided evidence of the defendant's motive to kill the victim in the charged case. Following deliberations in the first trial, the jury was unable to return a unanimous verdict. A mistrial was declared and it is anticipated the case will be re-tried in Spring 2012.
	2011-SD-111	41	3,684	63	37	The intercepts of target telephones provided agents with information of narcotics smuggling from Mexico into the U.S. The target in this investigation resided in Mexico. During the course of this investigation, agents seized approximately the following: nine pounds methamphetamine, 21 pounds cocaine ,and \$1,900 .
	2011-SD-112	94	5,951	49	51	The intercepts of target telephones provided agents with information of narcotics smuggling from Mexico into the U.S. The target in this investigation resided in Mexico. During the course of this investigation, agents seized approximately the following: nine pounds methamphetamine, 21 pounds cocaine ,and \$1,900.
	2011-SD-113	56	2,178	60	40	
	2011-SD-114	250	1,999	13	87	
	2011-SD-115	39	786	21	79	
	2011-SD-116	55	573	49	51	
	2011-SD-117	203	7,840	19	81	

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-118	203	7,338	14	86	This wiretap investigation was crucial in infiltrating the family members and associates of a large DTO, due to their sophisticated trafficking and distribution techniques. Total seizures for this wiretap investigation is approximately 65 kilograms of cocaine, 26 pounds of methamphetamine, one kilogram of heroin, 40 pounds of marijuana, \$319,450 in U.S. currency and \$36,020 in personal property.
	2011-SD-119	207	7,153			The interception of these cell phones proved critical to the arrest of nine conspirators and members of a San Diego-based cocaine trafficking organization. Three defendants are being prosecuted in San Diego, four defendants are being prosecuted in the Commonwealth of Virginia and two were not charged. Intercepted communications of these phones allowed law enforcement to to dismantle this cocaine trafficking organization and seize 3.5 kilograms of cocaine, 56 grams of cocaine base, 100 tablets of ecstasy, 19 pounds of marijuana and \$2,555 of drug proceeds. Agents also provided information which directly led to a controlled delivery of a package sent from California to Virginia. This controlled delivery led to the arrest of the four defendants and the seizure of the box which contained 126 grams (1/4 pound) of cocaine. These arrests and seizures were a direct result of intelligence gained from this wiretap.
	2011-SD-120	99	10,043	17	83	
	2011-SD-121	22	2,414	21	79	The interceptions obtained from these wiretaps were instrumental in obtaining intelligence allowing investigators to determine the extent of criminal activities of this gang-related DTO. Investigators were able to learn of the drug connections within the gang, as well as sources in Mexico. Further, the intercepts, in conjunction with surveillance, allowed investigators to obtain critical evidence relating to the ongoing drug sales within the gang which led to the arrest and prosecution of those responsible. Additional arrests based on this wire investigation are expected in 2012.
	2011-SD-122	103	2,626	8	92	This wiretap was instrumental in the investigation of a DTO that used local criminal street gangs as part of their organization. The wiretap helped discern the organizations structure, tracked methamphetamine and cocaine sales and uncovered active firearms-selling business. After the conclusion of the wider investigation, a significant amount of drugs and firearms were removed from the streets. This project and wiretap were a joint effort between local police department and DEA. Most of the subsequent cases were prosecuted Federally. Additional arrests are expected in 2012.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-123	132	4,505	25	75	
	2011-SD-124	108	1,093	7	93	This wiretap was initiated to prevent the kidnap and murder of a drug partner of a DTO. Police officers were able to help monitor and then thwart final plans. This wiretap was one of three in a year-long investigation into this particular drug trafficking organization and was used in conjunction with other investigatory measures.
San Joaquin	2011-SJ-5	250	637	39	61	Interceptions were integral in obtaining incriminating statements of coconspirators in order to disrupt, dismantle and disorganize this criminal street gang.
	2011-SJ-6	250	12,466	13	87	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-7	250	1,923	36	67	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-8	250	763	12	88	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-9	250	4,875	9	91	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-10	250	506	54	46	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-11	250	2,005	24	76	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-12	250	251	38	62	See 2011-SJ-5.
	2011-SJ-13		5,838	5	95	A young woman disappeared from her family while visiting in Stockton. Electronic intercepts were necessary to determine what happened to her, identify the individual responsible, and rescue her if possible.
San Luis Obispo	2011-SLO-1	16	457	7	0	
	2011-SLO-2	16	928	4	60	
San Mateo	2011-SM-5	9	51,451	11	89	The interception was necessary to obtain evidence to prove the identity of principals and accessories in the shooting of three people in Daly City, and six people (three of which were fatal) in South San Francisco in December 2010. The impact on the community, particularly in South San Francisco, was enormous, with the death of three youths. Evidence indicates that the shootings were gang related, and there has been concern about retaliation. With few witnesses who would talk, and little physical evidence as to the identity of the perpetrators from the crime scene, based on the drive-by nature, an interception was crucial to obtaining needed evidence to bring the perpetrators to justice.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Mateo (cont'd)	2011-SM-6	1	933	15	85	The interception was necessary to obtain evidence to prove the identity of principals and accessories in the shooting of three people in Daly City, and six people (three of which were fatal) in South San Francisco in December of 2010. The impact on the community, particularly in South San Francisco, was enormous, with the death of three youths. Evidence indicates that the shootings were gang related, and there has been concern about retaliation. With few witnesses who would talk, and little physical evidence as to the identity of the perpetrators from the crime scene, based on the drive-by nature, an interception was crucial to obtaining needed evidence to bring the perpetrators to justice.
	2011-SM-7	1	2,031	5	95	The interception was necessary to obtain evidence to prove the identity of principals and accessories in the shooting of three people in Daly City, and six people (three of which were fatal) in South San Francisco in December of 2010. The impact on the community, particularly in South San Francisco, was enormous, with the death of three youths. Evidence indicates that the shootings were gang related, and there has been concern about retaliation. With few witnesses who would talk, and little physical evidence as to the identity of the perpetrators from the crime scene, based on the drive-by nature, an interception was crucial to obtaining needed evidence to bring the perpetrators to justice.
Santa Barbara	2011-SBA-20	76	4,668	10	90	This was a significant operation in our community. Over the course of this investigation over seven pounds of methamphetamine, six ounces of cocaine, 13 firearms including three assault weapons, and over \$30,000 in cash was recovered.
	2011-SBA-21	14	263	8	92	This was a part of the same investigation as SM10-006, please see comments from that form.
	2011-SBA-22	5	1,074	11	89	This was a part of the same investigation as SM10-006, please see comments from that form.
	2011-SBA-23	32	1,587	14	86	This is the extension of SM10-006, please see SM10-006 form for comments.
	2011-SBA-24	64	17,152	10	90	This is the same investigation as SM10-006, please see SM10-006 form for comments.
	2011-SBA-25	64	17,152	10	90	This is the extension of 11-001 and a part of the same investigation as SM10-006. See SM10-006 form for comments.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Santa Barbara (cont'd)	2011-SBA-26	11	1,075	8	92	This case involved a large-scale dealer of methamphetamine in the city of Santa Maria that was using a retail store to launder money. The intercepted calls identified the source of supply in Los Angeles. The officers recovered approximately one-half pound of methamphetamine.
	2011-SBA-27	7	1,487	6	93	A part of the investigation in SM10-006, see SM10-006 form for comments.
	2011-SBA-28		0			This wiretap resulted in the apprehension of 19 individuals in a multi-jurisdictional DTO (16 individuals charged). In addition to dismantling this DTO, over 12 pounds of methamphetamine, one pound cocaine, five firearms, and approximately \$200,000 in cash was seized.
	2011-SBA-29	94	2,542	33	66	This wiretap investigation led to the arrest and apprehension of four individuals involved in a multi-jurisdictional drug trafficking conspiracy. In addition to dismantling this trafficking organization, over two and one-half pounds of cocaine, over two ounces of methamphetamine, approximately four ounces of heroin, 15 pounds of marijuana, five firearms, and approximately \$60,000 in cash was seized.
	2011-SBA-30	52	2,142			The wire tap provided critical pieces of evidence that enabled the District Attorney's Office to file a gang-murder case that occurred in 2007. If we had not obtained the additional information the case would still remain an unsolved cold case homicide.
	2011-SBA-31	26	348			Methamphetamine distribution continues to be a plague on the County of Santa Barbara. The intercepts allowed the monitoring of the target's efforts to set up the brokering of large quantities of methamphetamine to be sold in the community.
	Santa Clara	2011-SCL-7	2	8,010	1	99
2011-SCL-8		75	8,010	7	93	Investigation is ongoing. Substantial leads have been obtained.
2011-SCL-9		0	0	0	100	See Santa Clara County wiretap WT 11-07 for results of the investigation (Cross reference to WT 11-05, WT 11-07, WT 11-09 and WT 11-15.)
2011-SCL-10		75	609	3	97	Cold homicide investigation is ongoing. Substantial leads were obtained.
2011-SCL-11		85	3,269	21	79	See WT 11-07 for a complete summary of the results for this investigation. (Cross reference to WT 11-03, WT 11-07, WT 11-09, WT 11-15.)

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Santa Clara (cont'd)	2011-SCL-12	311	17,233	12	88	Since 2010, DEA agent has been conducting an investigation into a Mexico-based DTO in California. The targets of the investigation were responsible for a triple homicide. The wiretap was critical in obtaining key evidence of five participants in the homicide as well as in the shipment of narcotics and drug proceeds to and from Mexico to California. The take down resulted in arrest warrants and/or arrests of 16 persons for charges ranging from murder to transportation and manufacturing of methamphetamine. The investigation also resulted in the seizure of over 55 pounds of methamphetamine, six pounds of marijuana, two ounces of cocaine, three methamphetamine conversion labs, five vehicles with hidden compartments, over \$130,000 in cash. (Cross reference WT 11-07 with WT 11-03, WT 11-05, WT 11-09 and WT 11-15.)
	2011-SCL-13	25	5,667	5	95	The interceptions have provided valuable intelligence regarding multiple individuals involved in the trafficking of narcotics in the San Francisco Bay Area, California and in neighboring states. Unfortunately, the individuals targeted were unable to access narcotics from suppliers during the period of time the wiretap was operational.
	2011-SCL-14	28	459	34	66	Results of this wiretap investigation is summarized in WT 11-07. (Cross reference with WT 11-03, WT 11-05, WT 11-07 and WT 11-15.)
	2011-SCL-15	34	3,477	20	80	The interceptions have provided valuable intelligence regarding multiple individuals involved in the trafficking of narcotics in the San Francisco Bay Area, California and in neighboring states. Unfortunately, the individuals targeted were unable to access narcotics from suppliers during the period of time the wiretap was operational.
	2011-SCL-16	389	19,635	20	80	Wiretap resulted in the arrest and prosecution of 26 members of a Gilroy-based criminal street gang. Wiretap led to the arrest and prosecution of the entire command structure of the gang including the top four gang leaders. The arrest and take down culminated with the execution of 12 search warrants and 10 probation/parole searches and arrest of 26 gang members. Santa Clara County Criminal Complaint charges 67 counts ranging from shooting into an inhabited and occupied dwelling, narcotics trafficking, guns sales, and assault with a deadly weapon (all charges included enhancements pursuant to Penal Code § 186.22).

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Santa Clara (cont'd)	2011-SCL-17	389	19,635			Wiretap resulted in the arrest and prosecution of 26 members of a Gilroy-based criminal street gang. Wiretap led to the arrest and prosecution of the entire command structure of the gang including the top four gang leaders. The arrest and take down culminated with the execution of 12 search warrants and 10 probation/parole searches and the arrest of 26 gang members. Santa Clara County Criminal Complaint charges 67 counts ranging from shooting into an occupied dwelling, narcotics trafficking, gun sales, and assault with a deadly weapon (all charges include STEP act gang enhancement).
	2011-SCL-18	20	15,795			2004 cold gang homicide solved by evidence obtained during the interception of electronic communication.
	2011-SCL-19	83	1,715	50	50	Cross reference results for WT 11-15 to WT 11-07. (See also WT 11-03, WT 11-05, WT 11-07, WT 11-09 and WT 11-15.)
	2011-SCL-21	19	1,690	49	51	The interceptions have provided valuable intelligence regarding multiple individuals involved in drug trafficking activities in the Bay Area.
	2011-SCL-23	38	1,196	46	54	Investigation is pending.
	2011-SCL-24	65	1,528	20	80	Case is ongoing—other reference wiretaps related to this investigation—WT 11-11, WT 11-13, WT 11-16, WT 11-17, WT 11-20 and WT 11-22.
	2011-SCL-25	234	3,430	30	70	Case is ongoing—other reference wiretaps related to this investigation—WT 11-11, WT 11-13, WT 11-16, WT 11-17, WT 11-20 and WT 11-22.
	2011-SCL-26	23	474	22	78	Case is ongoing—other reference wiretaps related to this investigation—WT 11-11, WT 11-13, WT 11-16, WT 11-17, WT 11-20 and WT 11-22.
	2011-SCL-27	48	1,148	20	80	Case is ongoing—other reference wiretaps related to this investigation—WT 11-11, WT 11-13, WT 11-16, WT 11-17, WT 11-20 and WT 11-22.
	Sonoma	2011-SON-2	170	2,530	36	64
2011-SON-3		45	545	47	53	One of the primary targets of the DTO was arrested, convicted, and sentenced to eight years in prison. Additional information which led to additional wiretaps was also gained from this wiretap.
2011-SON-4			0			

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Sonoma (cont'd)	2011-SON-5	183	3,089	48	52	This investigation culminated in the seizure of over six pounds of methamphetamine, approximately one pound of cocaine, a firearm, several vehicles with false compartments, and arrest of persons engaged in the sale of multiple ounces of methamphetamine on school grounds. A warrant is currently out on the leader of a DTO that has a lucrative source of supply from Mexico.
Stanislaus	2011-STA-16	36	268	10	22.8	Agents were able to identify some of the individuals responsible for smuggling H&S from Mexico to California and Illinois. Case is still pending.
	2011-STA-17	59	642	9.3	24.7	One and one half pound of methamphetamine seized. One suspect arrested and released because of notification requirements. Case still pending.
	2011-STA-18	10	36	0.07	6.7	Established the structure of the DTO/smuggling from Mexico to Illinois and California. Application on the same date of/ and related to 11-03B.
	2011-STA-19	60	401	12.9	56	11-01, 11-02, 11-03 & 11-04 all part of the same investigation under agency number N11-05.
	2011-STA-20	28	391	2905	14.8	Established a DTO smuggling drugs from Mexico to Illinois and California. Case is pending however, two suspects will be indicted for money laundering. Application date is the same/ related to 11-03A.
Ventura	2011-VE-19	68	1,572	43	57	This investigation is ongoing. Several individuals identified during this order became subjects of several subsequent wiretaps. This wiretap led to some arrests and searches, one of which resulted in a seizure of more than one kilogram of narcotics. Once this investigation concludes, this interception should result in at least seven subjects facing charges related to narcotics trafficking.
	2011-VE-20	112	2,271	19	81	This investigation is ongoing. This interception led to the identification of multiple additional targets for monitoring in subsequent wiretaps. Once the investigation concludes, at least eight subjects will likely be facing narcotics related charges arising out of this wiretap.
	2011-VE-21	86	3,396	26	74	This investigation is ongoing. This wiretap allowed us to identify a significant number of subsequent targets, and several spin-off investigations resulted in the seizure of more than 50 pounds total of methamphetamine.
	2011-VE-22	48	9,291	5	95	This wiretap, and related orders, resulted in the arrest of the final suspect in a homicide investigation. Also, several firearms were seized, and a source of illegal traffic in firearms to gang members was arrested.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Ventura (cont'd)	2011-VE-23	178	11,450	9.6	90.4	This wiretap investigation included multiple seizures of methamphetamine, one seizure of cocaine, and the seizure of over \$54,000 in cash. Further, it led to the identification and arrest of significant narcotics traffickers and the dismantling of a methamphetamine lab.
	2011-VE-24	16	2,914	4	96	This wiretap, and related orders, resulted in the arrest of the final suspect in a homicide investigation. Also, several firearms were seized, and a source of illegal traffic in firearms to gang members was arrested.
	2011-VE-25	32	6,827	4	96	This wiretap, and related orders, resulted in the arrest of the final suspect in a homicide investigation. Also, several firearms were seized, and a source of illegal traffic in firearms to gang members was arrested.
	2011-VE-26	138	7,767	12.5	87	This wiretap investigation led to multiple seizures of methamphetamine, cocaine, and cash. It also led to the dismantling of a methamphetamine lab.
	2011-VE-28	4	2,910	3	97	Numerous pertinent intercepts have led to better knowledge of suspect and associates.
	2011-VE-29	420	19,533	2	98	Interception of communications allowed investigators to corroborate witness statements, identify the location of witnesses and determine that suspect fled the jurisdiction. An arrest warrant for murder is pending.
	2011-VE-30		0			
	2011-VE-31	37	1,060	57	43	This wiretap is related to ongoing investigations, and will likely result in a number of narcotics related offenses.
	2011-VE-32	46	651	53	47	This wiretap is related to ongoing investigations, but will likely result in a number of narcotics related offenses.
	2011-VE-33	14	384	5	95	This case is ongoing. Several seizures have been made. There are numerous targets that have been identified, and multiple arrests will be made at the conclusion of the investigation.
	2011-VE-34	114	509	4	96	Interception of communication allowed investigators to corroborate witness statements, identify the locations of witnesses, and determine that the suspect fled the jurisdiction. An arrest warrant for murder is pending.
	2011-VE-35	6	160	8	92	Interception of communications allowed investigators to corroborate witness statements, identify the location of witnesses, and determine that the suspect had fled the jurisdiction. An arrest warrant for murder is pending.
	2011-VE-36	43	2,797	17	83	This case is still ongoing. Several seizures have been made, and a significant number of targets have been identified for arrest once the investigation concludes.

**Table 4**  
**Description of Communications Obtained and**  
**Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

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
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Ventura (cont'd)	2011-VE-37	156	5,083	7	93	This wiretap resulted in the arrest of nine gang members for crimes involving assault with a deadly weapon, sex assault, and unlawful possession of firearms. Multiple guns have been removed from the streets, and a serious stabbing crime committed by gang members was solved.
	2011-VE-38	387	6,657	5	95	This case is an ongoing investigation. There is a pending homicide arrest to be made in the future.
	2011-VE-39	170	10,378	3	97	This wiretap resulted in the arrest of nine gang members for crimes involving assault with a deadly weapon, sex assault, and unlawful possession of firearms. Multiple guns have been removed from the streets, and a serious stabbing crime committed by gang members was solved.
	2011-VE-40	65	248	1.6	98	This case is an ongoing investigation. There is a pending arrest.
	2011-VE-41	46	328	8	92	This case is still ongoing, and there will likely be more arrests in the future.

N/A-Not applicable

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Butte	2011-BU-1	Ramsey, DA	Hon. Howell	(Inventory due) 8/2/2011			
	2011-BU-2	Ramsey, DA	Hon. Howell	(Inventory due) 8/2/2011			
	2011-BU-3	Ramsey, DA	Hon. Savage	(Inventory due) 8/2/2011			
	2011-BU-4	Ramsey, DA	Hon. Howell	(Inventory due) 8/2/2011			
Contra Costa	2011-CC-1	Peterson, DA	Hon. Laettner	(Inventory due) 5/17/2011			
Imperial	2010-IM-10	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 3/21/2012			
	2011-IM-18	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-19	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-20	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-21	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-22	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-23	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-IM-24	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-25	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-26	Unzueta, SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-27	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-28	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-29	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-30	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-31	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	3/9/2012			
	2011-IM-32	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	2/4/2012			
	2011-IM-33	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	3/9/2012			
	2011-IM-34	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-35	Carney, ASAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-36	Benner, SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-37	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	4/12/2012	1/13/2012		
	2011-IM-38	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 1/5/2012			
	2011-IM-39	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 2/9/2012			
	2011-IM-40	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 2/9/2012			
	2011-IM-41	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 7/9/2011			
	2011-IM-42	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 8/26/2011			
	2011-IM-43	Jennings, Asst. SAC	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 9/1/2011			
	2011-IM-44	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 5/5/2011			
	2011-IM-45	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 5/25/2011			
	2011-IM-46	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 6/7/2011			
	2011-IM-47	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 7/9/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-48	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 8/9/2011			
	2011-IM-49	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 8/19/2011			
	2011-IM-50	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 9/10/2011			
	2011-IM-51	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 9/24/2011			
	2011-IM-52	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 11/4/2011			
	2011-IM-53	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 12/8/2011			
	2011-IM-54	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 12/8/2011			
	2011-IM-55	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 1/5/2012			
	2011-IM-56	Colon, Police Chief	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 1/12/2012			
Kern	2011-KE-14	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	2/2/2012	11/2/2011		
	2011-KE-15	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	8/9/2011	11/9/2011		
	2011-KE-16	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	7/10/2011		7/21/2011	
	2011-KE-17	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	2/2/2011	11/2/2011		
	2011-KE-18	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	2/1/2012	11/1/2011		
	2011-KE-19	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	2/2/2012	11/2/2011		
	2011-KE-20	Green, DA	Hon. Somers	2/1/2012	11/1/2011		
	2011-KE-21	Green, DA	Hon. Lewis	11/17/2011	11/9/2011		
Los Angeles	2011-LA-215	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	5/15/2011		7/21/2011	39

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-216	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/18/2011		4/22/2011	80
	2011-LA-217	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2011	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-218	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/21/2011		11/14/2011	65
	2011-LA-219	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2011	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-220	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/3/2011		
	2011-LA-221	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/13/2011		11/2/2011	53
	2011-LA-222	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/5/2012	11/7/2011		
	2011-LA-223	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/10/2011		7/21/2011	670
	2011-LA-224	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/10/2012	10/12/2011		
	2011-LA-225	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-226	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/14/2011		11/23/2011	1818
	2011-LA-227	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/6/2011		11/23/2011	1818
	2011-LA-228	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2012	11/30/2011		
	2011-LA-229	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/16/2011			
	2011-LA-230	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/5/2011		11/23/2011	1818
	2011-LA-231	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/31/2012	11/2/2011		
	2011-LA-232	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/3/2011		
	2011-LA-233	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/3/2011		12/2/2011	37

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-235	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-236	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/14/2012	11/16/2011		
	2011-LA-237	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-238	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-239	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/16/2011		11/2/2011	53
	2011-LA-240	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/8/2011		
	2011-LA-241	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/14/2011			
	2011-LA-242	Harlan, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2012	11/7/2011		
	2011-LA-243	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/29/2011		7/21/2011	39
	2011-LA-244	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/14/2011	11/16/2011		
	2011-LA-245	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/1/2011		5/31/2011	253
	2011-LA-246	Harlan, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-247	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/20/2012	11/22/2011		
	2011-LA-248	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/26/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-249	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/1/2011			
	2011-LA-250	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-251	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/28/2011			
	2011-LA-252	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2012	11/30/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-253	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/7/2011		10/27/2011	27
	2011-LA-254	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/8/2011		6/29/2011	8
	2011-LA-255	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/16/2011			
	2011-LA-256	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/6/2011		7/21/2011	670
	2011-LA-257	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-258	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-259	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/3/2011		11/23/2011	1818
	2011-LA-260	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-261	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/28/2011		9/6/2011	32
	2011-LA-262	Harlan, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2012	11/7/2011		
	2011-LA-263	Johnson, DDA		(Inventory due) 6/8/2011		6/28/2011	44
	2011-LA-264	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/17/2011			
	2011-LA-265	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/27/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-266	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/21/2011	9/22/2011		
	2011-LA-267	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2012	11/30/2011		
	2011-LA-268	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/9/2011		11/2/2011	53
	2011-LA-269	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/25/2011		10/27/2011	27
	2011-LA-270	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2011	9/20/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-271	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/31/2011			
	2011-LA-272	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-273	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/6/2011			
	2011-LA-274	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/8/2011			
	2011-LA-275	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/25/2011		9/6/2011	32
	2011-LA-276	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/11/2011		11/14/2011	38
	2011-LA-277	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-278	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/15/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-279	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-280	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/28/2011			
	2011-LA-281	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/10/2011			
	2011-LA-282	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/15/2011			
	2011-LA-283	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/18/2011		7/28/2011	17
	2011-LA-284	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/14/2011		
	2011-LA-285	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/10/2011		11/2/2011	53
	2011-LA-286	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-287	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-288	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/14/2011		9/29/2011	42

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-289	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/12/2011		
	2011-LA-290	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/31/2011		9/29/2011	42
	2011-LA-291	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/12/2011		
	2011-LA-292	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/24/2012	10/28/2011		
	2011-LA-293	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/24/2012	10/26/2011		
	2011-LA-294	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/1/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-295	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/27/2011			
	2011-LA-296	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/30/2011			
	2011-LA-297	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/8/2011		
	2011-LA-298	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2011	9/22/2011		
	2011-LA-299	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/11/2011	11/16/2011		
	2011-LA-300	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2012	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-301	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/9/2011		
	2011-LA-302	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/9/2011		11/23/2011	1818
	2011-LA-303	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/4/2011		12/22/2011	35
	2011-LA-304	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-305	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2012	11/15/2011		
	2011-LA-306	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/11/2011		11/18/2011	4

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-307	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/20/2012	11/22/2011		
	2011-LA-308	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-309	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/2/2011			
	2011-LA-310	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	8/11/2011			
	2011-LA-311	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-312	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2011	12/19/2011		
	2011-LA-313	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-314	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/6/2012	10/7/2011		
	2011-LA-315	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/9/2012	12/9/2011		
	2011-LA-316	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/29/2012	12/1/2011		
	2011-LA-317	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/9/2012	12/9/2011		
	2011-LA-318	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/5/2011		12/9/2011	184
	2011-LA-319	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/17/2012	10/19/2011		
	2011-LA-320	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/12/2011	9/14/2011		
	2011-LA-321	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/17/2011		11/30/2011	3
	2011-LA-322	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	9/29/2011		10/7/2011	258
	2011-LA-323	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/19/2011	9/20/2011		
	2011-LA-324	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-325	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/26/2011	9/27/2011		
	2011-LA-326	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/4/2011		9/15/2011	1
	2011-LA-327	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-328	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2012	11/30/2011		
	2011-LA-329	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/7/2011	11/7/2011		
	2011-LA-330	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/5/2011			
	2011-LA-331	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/17/2012	10/17/2011		
	2011-LA-332	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/14/2012	11/16/2011		
	2011-LA-333	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-334	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/13/2011		12/19/2011	611
	2011-LA-335	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-336	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-337	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 12/10/2011			
	2011-LA-338	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/14/2011		
	2011-LA-339	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2012	10/12/2011		
	2011-LA-340	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2011	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-341	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/16/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-342	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012	12/19/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-343	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/12/2011		
	2011-LA-344	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/6/2012	10/7/2011		
	2011-LA-345	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2012	10/25/2011		
	2011-LA-346	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2012		1/31/2012	478
	2011-LA-347	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2012	10/14/2011		
	2011-LA-348	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012	12/19/2011		
	2011-LA-349	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/3/2012	10/5/2011		
	2011-LA-350	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/22/2011			
	2011-LA-351	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2012	11/30/2011		
	2011-LA-352	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-353	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-354	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/1/2012	11/3/2011		
	2011-LA-355	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/8/2012	11/8/2011		
	2011-LA-356	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2012		1/31/2012	478
	2011-LA-357	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/9/2012	10/11/2011		
	2011-LA-358	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/15/2011	11/17/2011		
	2011-LA-359	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/22/2011			
	2011-LA-360	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/30/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-361	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/22/2011			
	2011-LA-362	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012	12/19/2011		
	2011-LA-363	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2011			
	2011-LA-364	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/22/2012	11/22/2011		
	2011-LA-365	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/16/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-366	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2012		1/31/2012	478
	2011-LA-367	Street, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012	12/19/2011		
	2011-LA-368	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012	12/19/2011		
	2011-LA-369	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/1/2012	12/2/2011		
	2011-LA-370	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/29/2011			
	2011-LA-371	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	11/16/2011		11/29/2011	185
	2011-LA-372	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012			
	2011-LA-373	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/13/2011			
	2011-LA-374	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2012			
	2011-LA-375	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/16/2011			
	2011-LA-376	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2011			
	2011-LA-377	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/29/2011			
	2011-LA-378	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/27/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-379	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/23/2012			
	2011-LA-380	Street, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012			
	2011-LA-381	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/13/2011		12/19/2011	611
	2011-LA-382	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/25/2012			
	2011-LA-383	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2012	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-384	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012			
	2011-LA-385	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/1/2012			
	2011-LA-386	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2011			
	2011-LA-387	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2011			
	2011-LA-388	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/11/2012			
	2011-LA-389	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/13/2011		12/19/2011	611
	2011-LA-390	Street, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2012		1/12/2012	8
	2011-LA-391	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/25/2012			
	2011-LA-392	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/23/2012			
	2011-LA-393	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2011	11/29/2011		
	2011-LA-394	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/30/2012			
	2011-LA-395	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/9/2012			
	2011-LA-396	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/14/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-LA-397	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2012			
	2011-LA-398	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 2/25/2012			
	2011-LA-399	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/30/2012			
	2011-LA-400	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/1/2012			
	2011-LA-401	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/3/2012			
	2011-LA-402	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/2/2012			
	2011-LA-403	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2012			
	2011-LA-404	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2012			
	2011-LA-405	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/10/2012			
	2011-LA-406	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/9/2012			
	2011-LA-407	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/29/2012	12/1/2011		
	2011-LA-408	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 2/28/2012			
	2011-LA-409	Miyata, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/8/2012			
	2011-LA-410	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	4/16/2012			
	2011-LA-411	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/3/2012			
	2011-LA-412	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 12/21/2011			
	2011-LA-413	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/24/2012			
	2011-LA-414	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Madera	2011-MAD-1		Hon. Rigby	2/2/2012			
	2011-MAD-2		Hon. Rigby	2/29/2012			96
Merced	2012-MER-3	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2012-MER-4	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/26/2012			
	2012-MER-5	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2012-MER-6	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2012-MER-7	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2011-MER-8	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2011-MER-9	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	2/16/2012			
	2011-MER-10	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/6/2011		9/6/2011	115
	2011-MER-11	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-12	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-13	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-14	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-15	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-16	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-17	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115
	2011-MER-18	Goold, CDDA	Hon. McCabe	9/5/2011		9/5/2011	115

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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	2010-OR-29	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	4/9/2011			
	2011-OR-41	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/23/2011		12/23/2011	27
	2011-OR-42	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/8/2011		11/16/2011	5
	2011-OR-43	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/23/2011		12/23/2011	2
	2011-OR-44	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	7/2/2011	11/8/2011		
	2011-OR-46	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	7/7/2011	12/22/2011		
	2011-OR-47	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	8/13/2011	11/1/2011		
	2011-OR-48	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	(Inventory due) 7/4/2011			
	2011-OR-49	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	8/13/2011	11/8/2011		
	2011-OR-50	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	8/24/2011	11/8/2011		
	2011-OR-51	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	8/29/2011	11/30/2011		
	2011-OR-52	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	9/17/2011	1/4/2012		
	2011-OR-53	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	9/23/2011	11/8/2011		
	2011-OR-54	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	10/1/2011	12/20/2011		
	2011-OR-55	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	10/12/2011	11/8/2011		
	2011-OR-56	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	10/21/2011	1/4/2012		
	2011-OR-57	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	10/26/2011	11/30/2011		
	2011-OR-58	Rackaukas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/5/2011	11/8/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-OR-59	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/8/2011		11/21/2011	7
	2011-OR-60	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	(Inventory due) 6/18/2011		12/22/2011	2
	2011-OR-61	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Donahue	11/16/2011	12/21/2011		
	2011-OR-62	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Donahue	11/16/2011		11/30/2011	9
	2011-OR-63	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/21/2011		11/30/2011	13
	2011-OR-64	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/29/2011	12/21/2011		
	2011-OR-65	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/21/2011		11/30/2011	22
	2011-OR-66	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/30/2011	12/20/2011		
	2011-OR-67	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	3/31/2012			
Placer	2011-PLA-1	Owens, DA	Hon. Wachob	1/3/2012			
Riverside	2011-RIV-76	Mitchell, ADA	Hon. Luebs	12/7/2011		12/8/2011	4
	2011-RIV-77	Bennett, DDA	Hon. Luebs	6/17/2011			0
	2011-RIV-78	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/2/2011			0
	2011-RIV-79	DA	Hon. Luebs	6/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-80	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/26/2011			
	2011-RIV-81	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/16/2012			
	2011-RIV-82	Breaseon, SA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/7/2012			
	2011-RIV-83	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/1/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-84	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-85	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/10/2011			0
	2011-RIV-86	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/22/2011			
	2011-RIV-87	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-88	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/19/2011			
	2011-RIV-90	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/2/2011			
	2011-RIV-91	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-92	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-95	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/24/2011			
	2011-RIV-96	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/24/2011			
	2011-RIV-97	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/30/2011			
	2011-RIV-98	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/2/2011			
	2011-RIV-99	Zellerbach, DA		10/20/2011			
	2011-RIV-100	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/26/2011			
	2011-RIV-101	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	10/28/2011			
	2011-RIV-102	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	10/19/2011			
	2011-RIV-103	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/2/2011			
	2011-RIV-104	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/31/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-105	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/19/2011			
	2011-RIV-106	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/16/2012			
	2011-RIV-107	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/18/2012			
	2011-RIV-108	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/17/2011			
	2011-RIV-109	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/2/2012			
	2011-RIV-110	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/1/2011			
	2011-RIV-111	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/5/2012			
	2011-RIV-112	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/17/2012			
	2011-RIV-113	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-114	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/2/2012			
	2011-RIV-115	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-116	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/11/2012			
	2011-RIV-117	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/17/2012			
	2011-RIV-118	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/27/2012			
	2011-RIV-119	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/28/2012			
	2011-RIV-120	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/25/2012			
	2011-RIV-121	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/28/2011			
	2011-RIV-122	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/16/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-123	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/28/2011			
	2011-RIV-124	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/17/2012			
	2011-RIV-125	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-126	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/6/2011			
	2011-RIV-127	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/23/2011			
	2011-RIV-128	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/3/2011			
	2011-RIV-129	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-130	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-131	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/13/2011			
	2011-RIV-132	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/7/2011			
	2011-RIV-133	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/28/2011			
	2011-RIV-134	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-135	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/5/2012			
	2011-RIV-136	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-137	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-138	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/23/2012			
	2011-RIV-139	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-140	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/4/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-141	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/13/2011			
	2011-RIV-142	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/20/2011			
	2011-RIV-143	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-144	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/18/2012			
	2011-RIV-145	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-146	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	5/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-147	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-148	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/25/2012			
	2011-RIV-149	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 3/19/2012			
	2011-RIV-150	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/14/2011			
	2011-RIV-151	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/16/2011			
	2011-RIV-153	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 11/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-154	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-155	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/24/2011			
	2011-RIV-156	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/3/2011			
	2011-RIV-157	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/3/2011			
	2011-RIV-158	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/22/2011			
	2011-RIV-159	Zellerbach, DA		12/30/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-160	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	1/14/2012			
	2011-RIV-161	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/30/2012			
	2011-RIV-162	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/13/2012			
	2011-RIV-163	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/27/2012			
	2011-RIV-164	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/7/2012			
	2011-RIV-165	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/8/2012			
	2011-RIV-166	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/22/2012			
	2011-RIV-167	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-169	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/25/2011			
	2011-RIV-170	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-171	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/13/2011			
	2011-RIV-172	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-173	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/3/2012			
	2011-RIV-174	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/28/2012			
	2011-RIV-176	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/3/2012			
	2011-RIV-177	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/31/2011			
	2011-RIV-178	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/17/2011			
	2011-RIV-179	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/25/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-180	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/22/2012			
	2011-RIV-181	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/26/2012			
	2011-RIV-182	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/24/2012			
	2011-RIV-183	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/1/2012			
	2011-RIV-184	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/29/2012			
	2011-RIV-185	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-186	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/8/2012			
	2011-RIV-187	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-188	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/13/2011			
	2011-RIV-191	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/2/2011			
	2011-RIV-192	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/22/2012			
	2011-RIV-193	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-194	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/29/2011			
	2011-RIV-195	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2012			
	2011-RIV-196	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/17/2011			
	2011-RIV-197	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/8/2012			
	2011-RIV-199	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	5/17/2011			
	2011-RIV-200	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 5/15/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-201	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/30/2011			
	2011-RIV-202	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/16/2011			
	2011-RIV-203	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	1/15/2012			
	2011-RIV-204	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/2/2011			
	2011-RIV-205	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/6/2011			
	2011-RIV-206	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	5/18/2011			
	2011-RIV-207	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	6/20/2011			
	2011-RIV-208	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/1/2012			
	2011-RIV-209	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/9/2012			
	2011-RIV-210	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/9/2012			
	2011-RIV-211	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2012			
	2011-RIV-212	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	11/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-213	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	(Inventory due) 10/12/2011			
	2011-RIV-216	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2012			
	2011-RIV-217	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/4/2011			
	2011-RIV-218	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-219	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Webster	(Inventory due) 9/8/2011			
	2011-RIV-220	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/20/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-221	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-223	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/25/2012			
	2011-RIV-224	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	3/7/2012			
	2011-RIV-228	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-229	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-230	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/19/2011			
	2011-RIV-231	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/20/2011			
	2011-RIV-232	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/22/2011			
	2011-RIV-233	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/13/2011			
	2011-RIV-234	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/19/2011			
	2011-RIV-235	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/25/2011			
	2011-RIV-236	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/5/2011			
	2011-RIV-248	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/11/2011			
	2011-RIV-249	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	7/29/2011			
	2011-RIV-250	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/15/2011			
	2011-RIV-251	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/27/2011			
	2011-RIV-252	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/16/2011			
	2011-RIV-253	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	10/17/2011			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-RIV-254	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/9/2012			
	2011-RIV-257	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/6/2012			
	2011-RIV-258	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/31/2011			0
	2011-RIV-259	Zellerbach, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/20/2012			
Sacramento	2011-SAC-32	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	6/14/2011		6/10/2011	120
	2011-SAC-33	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	11/17/2011		11/10/2011	75
	2011-SAC-34	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	1/17/2012		1/17/2012	8000
	2011-SAC-35	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	1/12/2012		12/15/2011	111
	2011-SAC-36	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	12/29/2011		12/29/2011	31
	2011-SAC-37	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	(Inventory due) 1/17/2012			
	2011-SAC-38	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	1/14/2012		1/14/2012	8000
	2011-SAC-39	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	1/17/2012		1/17/2012	8000
	2011-SAC-40	O'Mara, ACDDA	Hon. White	1/12/2012		12/15/2011	22
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-1	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	4/18/2011		4/18/2011	30
	2011-SBD-2	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	4/14/2011		7/18/2011	28
	2011-SBD-3	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	4/7/2011		4/7/2011	4
	2011-SBD-4	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	4/18/2011		4/18/2011	2
	2010-SBD-14	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	6/25/2010		4/25/2011	3

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-43	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	5/6/2011		4/12/2011	3
	2011-SBD-45	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/18/2011		4/26/2011	3
	2011-SBD-47	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/16/2011		5/18/2011	7
	2010-SBD-48	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/31/2010		4/12/2011	3
	2010-SBD-49	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/7/2010		3/29/2011	12
	2011-SBD-116	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/13/2011	4/26/2011		
	2011-SBD-117	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/13/2011		4/25/2011	15
	2011-SBD-118	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	(Inventory due) 5/5/2011			
	2011-SBD-120	Christy, ADA		5/20/2011		4/14/2011	17
	2011-SBD-121	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	5/20/2011		4/14/2011	13
	2011-SBD-122	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/1/2011		5/27/2011	3
	2011-SBD-131	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/26/2011	5/24/2011		
	2011-SBD-132	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	5/20/2011		4/14/2011	7
	2011-SBD-133	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	6/4/2011		4/14/2011	12
	2011-SBD-134	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/26/2011	6/30/2011		
	2011-SBD-135	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	(Inventory due) 5/11/2011			
	2011-SBD-136	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	5/27/2011		4/27/2011	36
	2011-SBD-137	Cristy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/10/2011		8/31/2011	9

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-138	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/10/2011		7/31/2011	9
	2011-SBD-139	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/19/2011			
	2011-SBD-140	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/18/2011		7/31/2011	2
	2011-SBD-141	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/10/2011		7/8/2011	4
	2011-SBD-142	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/27/2011		7/26/2011	2
	2011-SBD-143	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/14/2011		4/18/2011	3
	2011-SBD-144	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/18/2011			
	2011-SBD-145	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	(Inventory due) 5/26/2011			
	2011-SBD-146	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	(Inventory due) 5/26/2011			
	2011-SBD-147	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/17/2011	5/19/2011	8/29/2011	27
	2011-SBD-148	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/11/2011		6/29/2011	42
	2011-SBD-149	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/22/2011	6/30/2011		
	2011-SBD-150	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	(Inventory due) 6/9/2011			
	2011-SBD-151	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/29/2011		4/27/2011	17
	2011-SBD-152	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	6/28/2011		6/24/2011	124
	2011-SBD-153	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/2/2011		6/24/2011	3
	2011-SBD-154	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/1/2011	5/19/2011	8/29/2011	31
	2011-SBD-155	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/2/2011		4/12/2011	5

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-156	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/7/2011		7/8/2011	2
	2011-SBD-157	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/16/2011		7/8/2011	4
	2011-SBD-168	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	8/5/2011		8/8/2011	2
	2011-SBD-215	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/28/2011		5/13/2011	2
	2011-SBD-216	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/24/2011	7/21/2011		
	2011-SBD-217	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	7/29/2011		5/27/2011	17
	2011-SBD-218	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	8/6/2011		5/27/2011	8
	2011-SBD-219	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	8/5/2011		11/21/2011	7
	2011-SBD-267	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	8/31/2011		8/31/2011	10
	2011-SBD-291	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	8/28/2011		7/6/2011	24
	2011-SBD-308	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/8/2011		7/6/2011	16
	2011-SBD-316	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/5/2011			
	2011-SBD-317	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	8/31/2011		7/8/2011	2
	2011-SBD-320	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/24/2011		11/21/2011	15
	2011-SBD-321	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/12/2011		11/21/2011	28
	2011-SBD-322	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/23/2011			
	2011-SBD-323	Chrity, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/7/2011			
	2011-SBD-324	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/17/2011	6/30/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-325	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/22/2011			
	2011-SBD-330	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	9/30/2011			
	2011-SBD-339	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	11/4/2011		8/31/2011	206
	2011-SBD-341	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/21/2011	10/12/2011		
	2011-SBD-342	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/20/2011		8/31/2011	58
	2011-SBD-343	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/22/2011		9/1/2011	126
	2011-SBD-344	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/22/2011			
	2011-SBD-345	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/22/2011	10/13/2011		
	2011-SBD-346	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/22/2011	8/12/2011		
	2011-SBD-347	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/30/2011			
	2011-SBD-354	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	10/31/2011		10/20/2011	1
	2009-SBD-359	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	11/14/2009		8/9/2011	20
	2011-SBD-360	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	11/11/2011		9/1/2011	96
	2011-SBD-361	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	11/23/2011			
	2011-SBD-363	Chrissty, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/3/2011		12/3/2011	
	2011-SBD-364	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/16/2011		12/16/2011	
	2011-SBD-365	Hackleman, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/1/2012			
	2011-SBD-366	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/3/2011	12/15/2011		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-367	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/8/2011		9/27/2011	4
	2011-SBD-368	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/9/2011	12/15/2011		
	2011-SBD-369	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/10/2011	10/13/2011		
	2011-SBD-370	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/9/2011	11/3/2011		
	2011-SBD-376	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/19/2011	10/13/2011		
	2011-SBD-377	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/17/2011			
	2011-SBD-378	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/21/2011	12/15/2011		
	2011-SBD-379	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/25/2011			
	2011-SBD-380	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	12/20/2011			
	2009-SBD-391	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	2/20/2010		10/3/2011	25
	2011-SBD-392	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/1/2012			
	2011-SBD-393	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/2/2012			
	2011-SBD-394	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/21/2012			
	2011-SBD-395	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/5/2012			
	2011-SBD-396	Hackleman, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/30/2012			
	2011-SBD-397	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/13/2012	11/3/2011		
	2011-SBD-398	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/13/2012	11/3/2011		
	2011-SBD-399	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/25/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2011-SBD-400	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/3/2012			
	2011-SBD-401	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	1/22/2012			
	2011-SBD-402	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	1/27/2011			
	2011-SBD-403	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	1/29/2012	12/15/2011		
	2011-SBD-404	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/10/2012			
	2011-SBD-405	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/10/2012			
	2011-SBD-406	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/11/2012			
	2011-SBD-407	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/15/2012			
	2011-SBD-408	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	2/16/2012			
	2011-SBD-409	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/11/2012			
	2011-SBD-410	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/3/2012			
	2011-SBD-411	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/3/2012			
	2011-SBD-412	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/7/2012			
	2011-SBD-413	Fermin, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/9/2012			
	2011-SBD-414	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/12/2012			
	2011-SBD-415	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	3/16/2012			
	2012-SBD-419	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	5/18/2012			
	2012-SBD-421	Ramos, DA	Hon. Pace	5/24/2012			

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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)	2012-SBD-425	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	5/23/2012			
San Diego	2010-SD-73		Hon. Rogers	5/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2011-SD-81	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	12/27/2011	6/29/2011	12/27/2011	58
	2011-SD-82	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	12/27/2011	6/29/2011	12/27/2011	60
	2011-SD-83	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	12/27/2011	6/29/2011	12/27/2011	68
	2011-SD-84	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	11/2/2011		11/2/2011	114
	2011-SD-85	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	11/17/2011		11/17/2011	6
	2011-SD-86	Torres, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	9/22/2011		9/22/2011	25
	2011-SD-87	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	10/13/2011		10/13/2011	42
	2011-SD-88	Torres, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	10/13/2011		10/13/2011	66
	2011-SD-89	Hill, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	9/20/2011		9/20/2011	7
	2011-SD-90	Partridge, SAC	Hon. Daniels	9/1/2011		9/1/2002	113
	2011-SD-91	Partridge, SAC	Hon. Daniels	(Inventory due) 4/28/2011			
	2011-SD-92	Hill, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	10/13/2011		10/13/2011	143
	2011-SD-93	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	(Inventory due) 11/17/2011			
	2011-SD-94	Gaines, Chief	Hon. Daniels	6/24/2011	5/24/2011	6/24/2011	8
	2011-SD-95	Hill, ASAC	Hon. Daniels	9/22/2011		9/22/2011	11
	2011-SD-96	Partridge, SAC	Hon. Daniels	5/5/2011		5/5/2011	147

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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 Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-97	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Rogers	3/16/2012			
	2011-SD-98	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/30/2011	12/6/2011		
	2011-SD-99	Partridge, SAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/15/2011	12/6/2011		
	2011-SD-100	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 8/19/2011	12/6/2011		
	2011-SD-101	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 9/8/2011	9/2/2011		
	2011-SD-102	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 10/1/2011	9/27/2011		
	2011-SD-103	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 1/2/2012	12/27/2011		
	2011-SD-104	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 1/2/2012	12/27/2011		
	2011-SD-105	Torres, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 1/2/2012	12/27/2011		
	2011-SD-106	Sherman, AUSA	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 1/25/2012			
	2011-SD-107	Sherman, AUSA	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 2/20/2012			
	2011-SD-108	Landsdowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 8/22/2011		8/18/2011	31
	2011-SD-109	Gore, Sheriff	Hon. Danielsen	5/6/2011		5/6/2011	114
	2011-SD-110	Gore, Sheriff	Hon. Danielsen	5/6/2011		5/6/2011	114
	2011-SD-111	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Fraser	11/10/2011		11/10/2011	45
	2011-SD-112	Hill, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	11/10/2011		11/10/2011	102
	2011-SD-113	Partridge, SAC	Hon. Danielsen	6/24/2011		11/2/2011	54
	2011-SD-114	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Fraser	11/15/2011		11/15/2011	237

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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 Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-115	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	11/15/2011		11/15/2011	51
	2011-SD-116	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	11/15/2011		11/15/2011	16
	2011-SD-117	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	11/15/2011		11/15/2011	90
	2011-SD-118	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	11/15/2011		11/15/2011	90
	2011-SD-119	Sherman, ASAC	Hon. Danielsen	8/30/2011		8/30/2011	214
	2011-SD-120	McCoy, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	4/7/2011		4/7/2011	98
	2011-SD-121	McCoy, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	5/5/2011		5/5/2011	22
	2011-SD-122	Landsdowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	1/4/2012		1/4/2012	103
	2011-SD-123	Landsdowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	1/4/2012		1/4/2012	132
	2011-SD-124	Lansdowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	1/4/2012		1/4/2012	108
San Joaquin	2011-SJ-5	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	6/25/2011	6/9/2011	8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-6	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	9/9/2011		8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-7	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	7/13/2011	6/9/2011	8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-8	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	8/2/2011	6/9/2011	8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-9	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	8/19/2011	9/9/2011	8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-10	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	8/9/2011	6/9/2011	8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-11	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	9/6/2011		8/23/2011	250
	2011-SJ-12	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	9/9/2011		8/23/2011	250

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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 Joaquin (cont'd)	2011-SJ-13	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Vlavianos	12/12/2011		12/10/2011	
San Luis Obispo	2011-SLO-1	Shea, DA	Hon. Trice	2/29/2012			
	2011-SLO-2	Shea, DA	Hon. Trice	2/29/2012			
San Mateo	2011-SM-5	Wagstaffe, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	2/19/2012	11/21/2011		
	2011-SM-6	Wagstaffe, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	2/19/2012	11/21/2011		
	2011-SM-7	Wagstaffe, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	2/19/2012	11/21/2011		
Santa Barbara	2011-SBA-20	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	7/5/2011	3/30/2011	6/21/2011	76
	2011-SBA-21	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	7/5/2011	3/30/2011	6/21/2011	11
	2011-SBA-22	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Hill	7/5/2011	3/30/2011	6/21/2011	5
	2011-SBA-23	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	7/5/2011	3/30/2011	6/21/2011	32
	2011-SBA-24	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Hill	6/21/2011		6/21/2011	64
	2011-SBA-25	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	6/21/2011		6/21/2011	64
	2011-SBA-26	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	6/21/2011		6/21/2011	11
	2011-SBA-27	Bramsen, CADA	Hon. Garcia	6/21/2011		6/21/2011	11
	2011-SBA-28	Dudley, DA	Hon. Hill	6/28/2011		9/14/2011	19
	2011-SBA-29	Dudley, DA	Hon. Hill	6/28/2011		9/14/2011	128
	2011-SBA-30	Dudley, DA	Hon. Garcia	2/3/2012			
	2011-SBA-31	Dudley, DA	Hon. Garcia	12/27/2011		1/13/2012	8

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Santa Clara	2011-SCL-7	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 5/25/2011			
	2011-SCL-8	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 5/25/2011	2/25/2012		
	2011-SCL-9	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	2/5/2012	11/5/2011		
	2011-SCL-10	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 5/25/2011			
	2011-SCL-11	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	1/9/2012	10/9/2011		
	2011-SCL-12	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	12/29/2011		12/29/2011	623
	2011-SCL-13	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	1/8/2011	1/8/2011	1/8/2011	17
	2011-SCL-14	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	2/7/2012	2/7/2012		
	2011-SCL-15	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 7/26/2011		1/12/2012	17
	2011-SCL-16	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	1/21/2012	1/21/2012		
	2011-SCL-17	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 1/19/2012	1/21/2012		
	2011-SCL-18	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	3/12/2012	3/12/2012		
	2011-SCL-19	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	2/15/2012	2/15/2012		
	2011-SCL-21	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	(Inventory due) 8/26/2011		1/12/2012	17
	2011-SCL-23	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	3/7/2012	3/7/2012		
	2011-SCL-24	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	2/12/2012	2/12/2012		
	2011-SCL-25	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	3/18/2012	3/18/2012		
	2011-SCL-26	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	4/13/2012	4/13/2012		

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Santa Clara (cont'd)	2011-SCL-27	Rosen, DA	Hon. Pennypacker	1/20/2012	1/20/2012		
Sonoma	2011-SON-2	Ravitch, DA	Hon. Nadler	3/8/2011	3/8/2011	5/10/2011	487
	2011-SON-3	Ravitch, DA	Hon. Nadler	5/24/2011		5/10/2011	487
	2011-SON-4	Ravitch, DA	Hon. Nadler	(Inventory due) 5/10/2011			
	2011-SON-5	Ravitch, DA	Hon. Nadler	6/9/2011		5/10/2011	487
Stanislaus	2011-STA-16	Fladager, DA	Hon. Ashley	5/7/2011			
	2011-STA-17	Fladager, DA	Hon. Ashley	11/4/2011	11/4/2011		
	2011-STA-18	Fladager, DA	Hon. Ashley	11/29/2011	11/4/2011		
	2011-STA-19	Fladager, DA	Hon. Richard	1/12/2012	11/4/2011		
	2011-STA-20	Fladager, DA	Hon. Ashlee	11/29/2011	11/4/2011		
Ventura	2011-VE-19	Ward, SA	Hon. McGee	2/13/2012	11/15/2011		
	2011-VE-20	Ward, SA	Hon. McGee	2/13/2012	11/15/2011		
	2011-VE-21	Ward, SA	Hon. McGee	2/13/2012	11/15/2011		
	2011-VE-22	Mora, Detective	Hon. DeNoce	1/30/2012	9/16/2011		
	2011-VE-23	Chips, Detective	Hon. McGee	12/7/2011	9/9/2011	12/8/2011	69
	2011-VE-24	Mora, Detective	Hon. DeNoce	1/30/2012	9/16/2011		
	2011-VE-25	Mora, Detective	Hon. DeNoce	1/30/2012	9/16/2011		
	2011-VE-26	Chips, Detective	Hon. McGee	12/7/2011	9/9/2011	12/8/2011	69

**Table 5**  
**Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	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
Ventura (cont'd)	2011-VE-28	Munger, Detective	Hon. DeNoce	9/28/2011		9/28/2011	4
	2011-VE-29	Young, Detective	Hon. O'Neill	2/9/2012			
	2011-VE-30	Eckman, Detective	Hon. Murphy	(Inventory due) 11/30/2011			
	2011-VE-31	Eckman, Detective	Hon. Murphy	2/13/2012	11/15/2011		
	2011-VE-32	Eckman, Detective	Hon. DeNoce	2/14/2012			
	2011-VE-33	Shadinger, Detective	Hon. O'Neill	3/29/2012			
	2011-VE-34	Young, Detective	Hon. White	2/9/2011			
	2011-VE-35	Young, Detective	Hon. White	2/9/2012			
	2011-VE-36	Shadinger, Detective	Hon. Cloninger	2/17/2012			
	2011-VE-37	Tenessen, Detective	Hon. Cloninger	3/2/2012	12/14/2011		
	2011-VE-38	Tenessen, Detective	Hon. White	3/2/2012	12/14/2011		
	2011-VE-39	Tenessen, Detective	Hon. Cloninger	3/2/2012	12/14/2011		
	2011-VE-40	Tenessen, Detective	Hon. White	3/2/2012	12/14/2011		
	2011-VE-41	Tenessen, Detective	Hon. O'Neill	10/6/2011		10/6/2011	46

ACDDA - Assistant Chief Deputy District Attorney  
 ADA - Assistant District Attorney  
 CADA - Chief Assistant District Attorney  
 CDDA - Chief Deputy District Attorney  
 DA - District Attorney  
 DDA - Deputy District Attorney

ASAC - Acting Supervising Agent in Charge  
 Asst. SAC - Assistant Special Agent in Charge  
 SAC - Special Agent in Charge  
 SA - Special Agent

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Butte	2011-BU-1	4 monitors, 1 installer, 1 transcriber	268,933	5,000	273,933
	2011-BU-2	Costs related to 2011-BU-1			
	2011-BU-3	Costs related to 2011-BU-1			
	2011-BU-4	Costs related to 2011-BU-1			
<b>Butte Total</b>			<b>268,933</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>273,933</b>
Contra Costa	2011-CC-1	10 agent/monitors and 1 technician	18,200	3,000	21,200
<b>Contra Costa Total</b>			<b>18,200</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>21,200</b>
Imperial	2010-IM-10	Cost not available			
	2011-IM-18	14 total personnel	177,546	7,986	185,532
	2011-IM-19	3 monitors + 2 agents	37,382	1,406	38,788
	2011-IM-20	11 monitors, 2 agents	157,672	6,640	164,312
	2011-IM-21	9 monitors, 2 agents	126,064	5,384	131,448
	2011-IM-22	11 monitors, 2 agents	157,642	6,670	164,312
	2011-IM-23	9 monitors, 2 agents	125,974	5,474	131,448
	2011-IM-24	1 monitor, 3 agents	39,792	4,000	43,792
	2011-IM-25	4 monitors, 3 agents	119,376	6,000	125,376
	2011-IM-26	5 monitors, 3 agents	188,794	8,576	197,370
	2011-IM-27	1 monitor, 3 agents	39,792	4,000	43,792
	2011-IM-28	4 monitors	99,480	9,000	108,480
	2011-IM-29	2 monitors	54,605	1,288	55,893
	2011-IM-30	2 monitors	73,896	2,675	76,571
	2011-IM-31	1 monitor	31,645	3,456	35,101
	2011-IM-32	3 monitors	138,043	3,540	141,583

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Imperial (cont'd)	2011-IM-33	4 monitors	126,581	1,753	128,334
	2011-IM-34	2 monitors	50,000	1,285	51,285
	2011-IM-35	1 monitor	54,054	1,285	55,339
	2011-IM-36	1 monitor	50,000	1,285	51,285
	2011-IM-37	2 monitors	59,688	6,000	65,688
	2011-IM-38		20,000	1,000	21,000
	2011-IM-39		20,000	1,000	21,000
	2011-IM-40		40,000	2,000	42,000
	2011-IM-41		20,000	1,000	21,000
	2011-IM-42		20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-IM-43		40,000	4,000	44,000
	2011-IM-44	Cost not available			
	2011-IM-45		40,000	4,000	44,000
	2011-IM-46		60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-IM-47		60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-IM-48		60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-IM-49		50,000	5,000	55,000
	2011-IM-50		20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-IM-51		50,000	5,000	55,000
	2011-IM-52		60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-IM-53		70,000	7,000	77,000
	2011-IM-54		60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-IM-55		60,000	6,000	66,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Imperia (cont'd)	2011-IM-56		60,000	6,000	66,000
<b>Imperial Total</b>			<b>2,718,026</b>	<b>163,703</b>	<b>2,881,729</b>
Kern	2011-KE-14	10 agents	48,000	10,000	58,000
	2011-KE-15	12 agent, 4 monitor	72,000	9,000	81,000
	2011-KE-16	16 detectives	20,000	1,800	21,800
	2011-KE-17	Costs related to 11-01			
	2011-KE-18	12 agents, 4 monitors	155,500	9,000	164,500
	2011-KE-19	Costs related to 11-01			
	2011-KE-20	Costs related to 11-05			
	2011-KE-21	5 agents, 3 monitors	77,652	5,200	82,852
<b>Kern Total</b>			<b>373,152</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>408,152</b>
Los Angeles	2011-LA-215	2 monitors per day	72,000	2,000	74,000
	2011-LA-216	7 monitors	21,000	9,500	30,500
	2011-LA-217	1 monitor per day	4,400	4,000	8,400
	2011-LA-218	2 monitors per day	47,300	2,263	49,563
	2011-LA-219	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-220	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-221	monitors, tech, Phone Co.	23,800	1,700	25,500
	2011-LA-222	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,600	22,600
	2011-LA-223	18 monitors per day	324,000	43,200	367,200
	2011-LA-224	2 monitors per day	20,338	1,286	21,624
	2011-LA-225	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-226	Deputy Sheriffs - 17	340,000	18,873	358,873

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-227	Deputy Sheriff's - 17	170,000	0	170,000
	2011-LA-228	2 monitors per day	92,198	9,000	101,198
	2011-LA-229	2 monitors per day	20,338	1,800	22,138
	2011-LA-230	Deputy Sheriffs - 17	85,000	0	85,000
	2011-LA-231	6 monitors	37,000	4,000	41,000
	2011-LA-232	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-233	6 monitors per day	21,000	1,200	22,200
	2011-LA-235	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-236	install and monitors - paid by Federal	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-LA-237	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-238	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-239	monitors, tech, phone co.	18,300	3,400	21,700
	2011-LA-240	2 interpreters per day	17,114	625	17,739
	2011-LA-241	Cost not available			
	2011-LA-242	2 monitors per day	40,676	2,800	43,476
	2011-LA-243	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-244	install, monitor - paid by DEA/Fed.	160,000	10,000	170,000
	2011-LA-245	18 monitors	180,000	5,000	185,000
	2011-LA-246	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-247	2 monitors per day	20,316	1,286	21,602
	2011-LA-248	1 installer, 2 monitors/Federal	19,171	2,000	21,171
	2011-LA-249	Cost not available			
	2011-LA-250	2 monitors per day	3,400	3,000	6,400

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-252	2 monitors per day	14,915	1,800	16,715
	2011-LA-253	2 monitors per day	19,886	1,800	21,686
	2011-LA-254	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-255	2 monitors per day	19,000	2,600	21,600
	2011-LA-256	5 monitors per day	25,000	4,500	29,500
	2011-LA-257	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,100	21,100
	2011-LA-258	1 monitor per day	4,200	2,500	6,700
	2011-LA-259	Deputy Sheriffs - 17	170,000	0	170,000
	2011-LA-260	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-261	3 monitors/transcripts	30,000	2,200	32,200
	2011-LA-262	4 monitors per day	81,357	5,600	86,957
	2011-LA-263	8 DEA Agents/2 monitors	42,014	60,346	102,360
	2011-LA-264	4 monitors per day - Federal	72,000	12,000	84,000
	2011-LA-265	1 installer/2 monitors - Federal	19,171	2,000	21,171
	2011-LA-266	2 monitors per day	20,316	1,286	21,602
	2011-LA-267	2 monitors per day	16,948	1,800	18,748
	2011-LA-268	2 monitors per day	4,745	1,286	6,031
	2011-LA-269	3 monitors per day	27,794	3,772	31,566
	2011-LA-270	4 monitors per day	19,200	4,000	23,200
	2011-LA-271	1 monitor per day	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-LA-272	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-273	2 monitors per day - Federal	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-LA-275	3 monitors/transcriptions	30,000	2,016	32,016

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-276	2 monitors per day	18,900	2,500	21,400
	2011-LA-277	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-278	2 monitors per day	20,316	0	20,316
	2011-LA-279	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,100	21,100
	2011-LA-280	8 DEA Agents/2 monitors	42,014	2,000	44,014
	2011-LA-283	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-284	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-285	monitors, tech, phone co.	20,337	1,286	21,623
	2011-LA-286	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-287	2 monitors per day	20,640	2,500	23,140
	2011-LA-288	5 monitors	87,792	6,150	93,942
	2011-LA-289	2 monitors per day	22,800	0	22,800
	2011-LA-290	5 monitors	87,987	6,944	94,931
	2011-LA-291	2 monitors per day - Federal	22,800	0	22,800
	2011-LA-292	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,100	21,100
	2011-LA-293	2 monitors per day	15,000	4,000	19,000
	2011-LA-294	1 installer, 2 monitors per day	38,340	4,000	42,340
	2011-LA-295	2 monitors per day/Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-LA-296	2 monitors per day/Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-LA-297	2 monitors per shift	1,100	18,600	19,700
	2011-LA-298	monitors, tech, Sprint/Nextel	20,337	1,286	21,623
	2011-LA-299	2 monitors per day/Federal wire	90,000	6,800	96,800
	2011-LA-300	2 monitors per day	20,640	2,500	23,140

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-301	2 monitors per day	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-302	Deputy Sheriffs – 17	85,000	0	85,000
	2011-LA-303	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-304	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-305	2 monitors per shift	20,800	1,100	21,900
	2011-LA-306	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-307	2 monitors per shift	2,200	18,600	20,800
	2011-LA-308	4 monitors per day	5,000	2,500	7,500
	2011-LA-310	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-311	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-312	4 monitors per day - Federal	60,000	6,000	66,000
	2011-LA-313	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,100	21,100
	2011-LA-314	2 monitors per shift	41,600	2,200	43,800
	2011-LA-315	2 monitors per day	210,000	24,000	234,000
	2011-LA-316	2 monitors per day	89,774	1,400	91,174
	2011-LA-317	3 monitors per day	20,338	1,100	21,438
	2011-LA-318	Costs related to 11-167			
	2011-LA-319	1 installer, 2 two monitors	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2011-LA-320	2 monitors per day	20,600	1,100	21,700
	2011-LA-321	2 monitors per day - Federal	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-LA-322	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-323	2 monitors per day	20,316	1,286	21,602
	2011-LA-324	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-325	4 monitors	5,000	2,500	7,500
	2011-LA-326	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-327	2 monitors per day	20,800	1,100	21,900
	2011-LA-328	1 monitor per day	0	4,950	4,950
	2011-LA-329	2 monitors per day	19,000	3,000	22,000
	2011-LA-331	2 monitors per day	20,337	1,286	21,623
	2011-LA-332	4 monitors per day	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-LA-333	2 monitors per day	20,600	1,100	21,700
	2011-LA-334	6 monitors & 1 tech per day	200,000	4,000	204,000
	2011-LA-335	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-336	2 monitors per shift	20,800	1,100	21,900
	2011-LA-337	2 monitors per day	20,338	2,600	22,938
	2011-LA-338	2 monitors per day	20,600	1,100	21,700
	2011-LA-339	12	120,000	13,200	133,200
	2011-LA-340	2 monitors per day	1,100	18,600	19,700
	2011-LA-341	2 installers, 6 monitors - Federal	101,690	5,800	107,490
	2011-LA-342	2 monitors per day - Federal	22,000	4,000	26,000
	2011-LA-343	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-344	2 monitors per day	20,600	1,100	21,700
	2011-LA-345	4 monitors	5,000	2,500	7,500
	2011-LA-346	16 monitors/3 investigators	226,084	14,000	240,084
	2011-LA-347	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-348	2 monitors per day - Federal	22,000	2,000	24,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)	
Los Angeles	2011-LA-349	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000	
	2011-LA-351	1 monitor per day	0	4,950	4,950	
	2011-LA-352	4 monitors per day	10,000	5,000	15,000	
	2011-LA-353	2 monitors per day	2,200	18,600	20,800	
	2011-LA-354	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000	
	2011-LA-355	2 monitors per day	2,200	18,600	20,800	
	2011-LA-356	Costs related to 11-130				
	2011-LA-357	4 monitors	20,000	2,200	22,200	
	2011-LA-358	2 monitors per day	40,000	6,000	46,000	
	2011-LA-359	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000	
	2011-LA-360	1 monitor per day	0	3,300	3,300	
	2011-LA-361	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000	
	2011-LA-362	2 monitors per day - Federal	20,000	2,000	22,000	
	2011-LA-363	LEO - 6, monitors - 4, install - 3	20,000	1,200	21,200	
	2011-LA-364	2 monitors per day	1,100	18,600	19,700	
	2011-LA-365	2 monitors per day	21,300	1,400	22,700	
	2011-LA-366	Costs related to 11-130				
	2011-LA-367	2 monitors per day	36,000	4,000	40,000	
	2011-LA-368	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000	
	2011-LA-369	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,000	22,000	
	2011-LA-370	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000	
	2011-LA-371	2 installers - 4 monitors	40,676	2,800	43,476	
	2011-LA-372	2 monitors per day	36,000	4,000	40,000	

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-373	2 monitors per day	2,200	18,600	20,800
	2011-LA-374	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-376	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-377	Cost not available			
	2011-LA-378	2 monitors per shift	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-379	Cost not available			
	2011-LA-380	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-381	Costs related to 11-116			
	2011-LA-382	2 monitors per day	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-383	4 monitors	40,000	2,200	42,200
	2011-LA-384	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-385	2 monitors per day	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-386	LEO - 6, monitors - 4, install - 3	20,000	1,200	21,200
	2011-LA-387	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-388	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-389	Costs related to 11-116			
	2011-LA-390	2 monitors per day	3,000	1,200	4,200
	2011-LA-391	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-392	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-393	4 monitors	40,000	2,200	42,200
	2011-LA-394	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-395	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,200	22,200
	2011-LA-396	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles	2011-LA-397	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-LA-398	Cost not available			
	2011-LA-399	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-400	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-401	2 monitors per day	20,338	1,486	21,824
	2011-LA-402	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-403	2 Spanish speaking linguists	18,600	1,100	19,700
	2011-LA-404	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-405	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-406	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-LA-407	2 monitors per day	1,500	59,905	61,405
	2011-LA-409	2 monitors per day	6,101	1,600	7,701
	2011-LA-410	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-LA-411	2 monitors per day	180,000	35,000	215,000
	2011-LA-413	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2011-LA-414	2 monitors per day	61,014	4,458	65,472
<b>Los Angeles Total</b>			<b>6,591,706</b>	<b>844,412</b>	<b>7,436,118</b>
Madera	2011-MAD-1		213,000	10,000	223,000
	2011-MAD-2		96,000	15,000	111,000
<b>Madera Total</b>			<b>309,000</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>334,000</b>
Merced	2012-MER-3	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	3,250	2,800	6,050
	2012-MER-4	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	3,250	2,800	6,050

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Merced (cont'd)	2012-MER-5	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	3,250	2,800	6,050
	2012-MER-6	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	5,850	2,800	8,650
	2012-MER-7	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	12,350	2,800	15,150
	2011-MER-8	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	24,700	2,800	27,500
	2011-MER-9	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	12,350	2,800	15,150
	2011-MER-10	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-11	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-12	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-13	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-14	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	27,000	2,500	29,500
	2011-MER-15	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-16	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-17	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
	2011-MER-18	12 agents, 9 monitors/interpreters, 1 tech	26,700	2,500	29,200
<b>Merced Total</b>			<b>305,600</b>	<b>42,100</b>	<b>347,700</b>
Orange	2010-OR-29	2 monitors	19,500	1,900	21,400
	2011-OR-41	linguistic support - 2	20,310	625	20,935
	2011-OR-42	11 monitors	20,500	1,200	21,700
	2011-OR-44	2 Monitors per day.	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-46	2 monitors per day	2,300	1,500	3,800

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Orange (cont'd)	2011-OR-47	2 monitors per shift	20,337	2,900	23,237
	2011-OR-49	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-50	2 monitors per day.	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-51	2 monitors per shift	20,337	1,200	21,537
	2011-OR-52	10 monitors.	35,000	5,800	40,800
	2011-OR-53	Cost not available			
	2011-OR-54	4 monitors per shift	40,674	5,075	45,749
	2011-OR-55	2 monitors per day.	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-56	2 installers, 21 monitors, 1 preparer	22,638	400	23,038
	2011-OR-57	2 installers, 21 monitors, 1 preparer	25,502	625	26,127
	2011-OR-58	2 monitors per day.	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-59		20,500	1,200	21,700
	2011-OR-60	2 monitors and 1 technician	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2011-OR-61	2 monitors per day	30,000	1,285	31,285
	2011-OR-62	4 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-OR-63	2 monitors per shift, 3 transcribers	21,000	3,500	24,500
	2011-OR-64	11 monitors	100,000	8,275	108,275
	2011-OR-65	2 monitors per shift, 3 transcribers	21,000	3,500	24,500
	2011-OR-66	6 officers and monitors, 1 technician	18,900	2,500	21,400
	2011-OR-67	Cost not available			
<b>Orange Total</b>			<b>576,498</b>	<b>56,485</b>	<b>632,983</b>
Placer	2011-PLA-1		39,600	1,765	41,365
<b>Placer Total</b>			<b>39,600</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>41,365</b>

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside	2011-RIV-76	16 Hours of monitors per day.	19,000	2,000	21,000
	2011-RIV-77	198 detectives; 4 monitors and 1 civilian	66,540	2,252	68,792
	2011-RIV-78	miscellaneous personnell used re installation, monitors and transcription	35,000	1,285	36,285
	2011-RIV-79	7 persons used re installation, monitoring, interpret and prepare transcripts	15,000	2,000	17,000
	2011-RIV-80	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2011-RIV-81	13 persons used to install, monitor and prepare transcripts.	10,846	1,900	12,746
	2011-RIV-82	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-83	3 DEA, 8 non-DEA, 2 monitors	29,204	1,600	30,804
	2011-RIV-84	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-RIV-85	personnel used for installation, monitoring, interpreting and preparation of transcripts	70,192	4,170	74,362
	2011-RIV-86	13 personnel used to monitor, install, interpret or prepare transcripts	4,309	2,100	6,409
	2011-RIV-87	8 detectives, 2 monitors and 1 civilian	66,540	1,246	67,786
	2011-RIV-88	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	130,562	4,300	134,862
	2011-RIV-90	3 DEA, 8 non DEA, 2 monitors	12,847	1,600	14,447
	2011-RIV-91	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	38,388	3,900	42,288
	2011-RIV-92	Costs related to No costs to report at this time.			
	2011-RIV-95	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-96	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-97	Cost not available			

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-98	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2011-RIV-99	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-100	8 detectives, 2 monitors and 1 civilian	66,540	1,246	67,786
	2011-RIV-101	2 monitors	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-RIV-102	13 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	19,686	1,900	21,586
	2011-RIV-103	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2011-RIV-104	8 detectives, 2 monitors and 1 civilian	38,934	986	39,920
	2011-RIV-105	3 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	13,000	1,300	14,300
	2011-RIV-106	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-107	13 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	99,741	3,700	103,441
	2011-RIV-108	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-109	8 detectives, 2 monitors, and 1 civilian	66,540	1,246	67,786
	2011-RIV-111	13 personnel used re monitoring, installation and preparation of transcripts	85,589	3,700	89,289
	2011-RIV-112	6 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	42,000	2,600	44,600
	2011-RIV-113	3 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,500	1,285	21,785
	2011-RIV-114	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-115	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-116	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-117	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	41,000	3,470	44,470
	2011-RIV-118	1 detective, 4 monitors, and 1 civilian	5,468	1,392	6,860
	2011-RIV-119	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-120	8 detectives, 2 monitors, and 1 civilian	12,852	986	13,838
	2011-RIV-121	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-122	8 detectives, 2 monitors, and 1 civilian	40,150	1,146	41,296
	2011-RIV-123	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	8,812	2,000	10,812
	2011-RIV-124	2 persons used re installation, monitoring and/or preparation of transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-125	2 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-126	2 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-127	2 persons used re installation, monitoring and/or preparation of transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-129	4 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,422	1,900	22,322
	2011-RIV-130	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and/or preparation of transcripts	63,090	2,600	65,690
	2011-RIV-131	13 persons used re installation, monitoring, and preparation of transcripts	14,602	2,600	17,202
	2011-RIV-132	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	66,090	2,000	68,090

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-133	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	77,000	4,400	81,400
	2011-RIV-134	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	1,800	1,800	3,600
	2011-RIV-135	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	41,375	2,400	43,775
	2011-RIV-136	13 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	80,792	3,000	83,792
	2011-RIV-137	3 persons used re installation, monitoring, and preparation of transcripts	50,375	3,600	53,975
	2011-RIV-138	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts.	20,306	1,800	22,106
	2011-RIV-139	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	49,997	1,800	51,797
	2011-RIV-140	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	49,997	1,800	51,797
	2011-RIV-141	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,338	1,800	22,138
	2011-RIV-142	3 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	40,338	1,800	42,138
	2011-RIV-143	1 technician and 2 monitors	20,338	4,000	24,338
	2011-RIV-144	1 echnician and 2 Monitors	20,338	2,000	22,338
	2011-RIV-145	8 detectives, 2 monitors, and 1 civilian	53,752	1,226	54,978
	2011-RIV-146	16 hours of monitors per day	19,000	2,000	21,000
	2011-RIV-147	6 law enforcement officers, 4 monitors, and 3 installers	36,000	4,800	40,800

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-148	2 persons used re installation, monitoring and/or preparation of transcripts	18,600	2,200	20,800
	2011-RIV-149	1 technician; 2 monitors	20,338	2,000	22,338
	2011-RIV-150	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors	8,557	2,600	11,157
	2011-RIV-151	8 detectives, 2 monitors, and 1 civilian	40,150	1,146	41,296
	2011-RIV-154	1 technician; 2 monitors	12,202	2,000	14,202
	2011-RIV-155	4 personnel used re installation, monitoring and transcription	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-156	4 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-157	6 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,000	4,458	24,458
	2011-RIV-158	4 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcriptions	20,000	2,972	22,972
	2011-RIV-159	4 personnel re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-160	4 persons used re installation, monitoring and preparation of wire transcripts	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-161	4 personnel used re installation, monitoring and preparation of transcripts	20,000	2,972	22,972
	2011-RIV-162	4 personnel used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-163	4 personnel used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-164	4 persons used re installation, monitoring, and transcript preparation	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-RIV-165	6 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	20,000	4,458	24,458

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-166	2 monitors per day	30,000	4,000	34,000
	2011-RIV-167	13 personnel used re installation, monitoring, and transcript preparation	80,792	3,000	83,792
	2011-RIV-169	19 persons used re installation, monitoring, and transcript preparation	22,000	3,000	25,000
	2011-RIV-170	2 Monitors per day - private	18,292	2,600	20,892
	2011-RIV-171	19 Personnel used re installation, monitoring, and/or transcript preparation	18,000	2,600	20,600
	2011-RIV-172	2 monitors per day - private	45,018	2,600	47,618
	2011-RIV-173	2 monitors per day - private	44,926	2,600	47,526
	2011-RIV-174	2 monitors per day - private	25,899	2,600	28,499
	2011-RIV-176	2 monitors per day - private	10,123	2,600	12,723
	2011-RIV-177	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-178	2 monitors per day - Federal	27,000	1,800	28,800
	2011-RIV-179	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-180	2 Monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-181	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-182	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-183	2 monitors - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-184	2 monitors per day - Federal	27,000	1,800	28,800
	2011-RIV-185	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	48,178	3,200	51,378
	2011-RIV-186	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	18,000	2,000	20,000

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-187	8 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	20,000	70,000	90,000
	2011-RIV-188	15 personnel used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	40,000	7,000	47,000
	2011-RIV-191	8 detectives, 6 monitors, and 1 vivilian	14,592	2,898	17,490
	2011-RIV-192	10 Persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	28,303	1,900	30,203
	2011-RIV-193	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-194	2 monitors per day - Federal	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2011-RIV-195	2 monitors per day for 20 days.	13,219	1,500	14,719
	2011-RIV-196	2 monitors for 30 days	20,338	1,500	21,838
	2011-RIV-197	2 monitors for 60 days	40,676	3,000	43,676
	2011-RIV-199	2 monitors per day for 58 days	38,980	1,500	40,480
	2011-RIV-201	metropolitan interpreters - 6	10,000	10,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-202	metropolitan interpreters - 9	15,000	20,000	35,000
	2011-RIV-203	metropolitan interpreters - 9	20,000	20,000	40,000
	2011-RIV-204	3 DEA, 8 TFO's, and 2 interpreters	48,871	2,000	50,871
	2011-RIV-205	3 DEA, 8 TFO's, and 2 interpreters	47,922	2,000	49,922
	2011-RIV-206	15 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	8,435	2,600	11,035
	2011-RIV-207	15 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	21,088	5,200	26,288
	2011-RIV-208	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	38,400	6,587	44,987

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-209	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	55,040	1,585	56,625
	2011-RIV-210	19 personnel used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	36,480	1,500	37,980
	2011-RIV-211	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	11,520	1,584	13,104
	2011-RIV-212	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	38,400	3,900	42,300
	2011-RIV-216	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	20,000	1,100	21,100
	2011-RIV-217	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	25,000	1,250	26,250
	2011-RIV-218	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and/or transcript preparation	25,000	625	25,625
	2011-RIV-220	2 monitors per day	20,338	1,286	21,624
	2011-RIV-223	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-224	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-RIV-228	19 persons used re installation, monitoring and transcript preparation	174,121	4,800	178,921
	2011-RIV-229	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018
	2011-RIV-230	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018
	2011-RIV-231	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018
	2011-RIV-232	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	24,672	2,600	27,272
	2011-RIV-233	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018
	2011-RIV-234	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	46,056	2,600	48,656
	2011-RIV-235	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2011-RIV-236	11 LEO's, 2 monitors	50,418	2,600	53,018
	2011-RIV-248	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-249	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-250	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-251	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-252	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-253	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-254	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-257	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-258	Cost not available			
	2011-RIV-259	Cost not available			
<b>Riverside Total</b>			<b>4,251,224</b>	<b>430,759</b>	<b>4,681,983</b>
Sacramento	2011-SAC-32	14 detectives	45,000	2,718	47,718
	2011-SAC-33	detectives	28,800	2,858	31,658
	2011-SAC-34	35 officers	86,030	11,900	97,930
	2011-SAC-35	6 peace officers	12,000	1,500	13,500
	2011-SAC-36	14 detectives	28,400	2,892	31,292
	2011-SAC-37	Costs related to WT-11-17			
	2011-SAC-38	Costs related to WT-11-17			
	2011-SAC-39	Costs related to WT-11-17			
	2011-SAC-40	Costs related to WT-11-18			
<b>Sacramento Total</b>			<b>200,230</b>	<b>21,868</b>	<b>222,098</b>
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-1	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	53,136	6,000	59,136

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-2	2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	41,000	3,000	44,000
	2011-SBD-3	2 civilian monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-4	2 civilian monitors - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-SBD-14	3 officers, 8 monitors, 2 techs	47,796	3,400	51,196
	2011-SBD-43	2 civilian monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-45	1 sworn officer, 2 civilian monitors, and 1 technician	9,840	2,000	11,840
	2011-SBD-47	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-SBD-48	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-SBD-49	2 monitors	16,000	4,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-116	2 civilian monitors	50,200	2,700	52,900
	2011-SBD-117	1 sworn officer, 8 monitors, 1 technician	78,720	8,000	86,720
	2011-SBD-120	1 sworn officer, 2 monitors, 1 technician	87,248	8,000	95,248
	2011-SBD-121	1 sworn officer, 4 monitors, 1 technician	136,448	16,000	152,448
	2011-SBD-122	5 officers	3,000	300	3,300
	2011-SBD-131	2 civilian monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-132	1 sworn officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	77,408	8,000	85,408
	2011-SBD-133		49,856	6,000	55,856
	2011-SBD-134	10 officers and 2 civilian monitors	35,045	2,016	37,061
	2011-SBD-136	1 officer, 2 monitors, and 1 technician	39,360	4,000	43,360
	2011-SBD-137	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, and 1 technician	115,456	12,000	127,456
	2011-SBD-138	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	27,552	4,000	31,552
	2011-SBD-139	6 deputies	6,721	1,328	8,049

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-140	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, and 1 technician	13,120	2,000	15,120
	2011-SBD-141	2 civilian monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-142	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, and 1 Technician	11,152	2,000	13,152
	2011-SBD-143	2 civilian monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-147	1 sworn officer, 2 civilian monitors, and 1 technician	19,680	2,000	21,680
	2011-SBD-148	5 deputies and 1 monitor	11,319	2,800	14,119
	2011-SBD-149	6 monitors	61,013	4,800	65,813
	2011-SBD-151	1 offer, 2 monitors, and 1 technician	19,680	2,000	21,680
	2011-SBD-152	2 officers and 1 technician	44,800	6,000	50,800
	2011-SBD-153	Costs related to 2011 SBN 008			
	2011-SBD-154		19,680	2,000	21,680
	2011-SBD-155	2 monitors	72,000	8,000	80,000
	2011-SBD-156	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-157	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-168	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	6,560	2,000	8,560
	2011-SBD-215	2 monitors	24,000	0	24,000
	2011-SBD-216	2 monitors	20,338	2,600	22,938
	2011-SBD-217	2 monitors, 1 tech, 1 officer	39,360	3,000	42,360
	2011-SBD-218	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 tech	19,680	1,500	21,180
	2011-SBD-219	1 deputy, 4 monitors and 1 technician	39,360	4,000	43,360
	2011-SBD-267	1 deputy, 2 monitors and 1 technician	5,248	2,000	7,248
	2011-SBD-291	13 monitors	122,028	12,625	134,653

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-308	2 officers and 4 monitors	27,778	1,600	29,378
	2011-SBD-316	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-317	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-320	1 officer and 2 monitors	30,176	4,000	34,176
	2011-SBD-321	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	88,360	6,000	94,360
	2011-SBD-322	1 officer	24,720	625	25,345
	2011-SBD-323	1 officer	7,416	3,350	10,766
	2011-SBD-324	3 monitors and 1 technician	20,300	1,100	21,400
	2011-SBD-325	1 officer, 4 monitors and 1 technician	39,360	4,000	43,360
	2011-SBD-330	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	59,040	6,000	65,040
	2011-SBD-339	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	46,576	8,000	54,576
	2011-SBD-341	2 agents, 2 monitors and 1 technician	16,962	1,750	18,712
	2011-SBD-342	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	59,040	5,600	64,640
	2011-SBD-343	1 officer, 4 monitors and 1 technician	85,000	9,600	94,600
	2011-SBD-344	5 officers, 0 monitors, 0 technicians	15,324	0	15,324
	2011-SBD-345	Cost not available			
	2011-SBD-346	3 monitors and 1 technician	20,338	1,400	21,738
	2011-SBD-347	2 monitors.	20,600	1,100	21,700
	2011-SBD-354	2 monitors, 1 technician.	21,438	1,100	22,538
	2009-SBD-359	9 officers, 7 monitors and 1 technician	18,300	1,800	20,100
	2011-SBD-360	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician	39,360	3,000	42,360

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-361	2 monitors	17,500	1,100	18,600
	2011-SBD-363	10 officers, 1 monitor, 2 technicians	90,000	703	90,703
	2011-SBD-364	10 officers, 1 monitor, 2 technicians	0	500	500
	2011-SBD-365	Cost not available			
	2011-SBD-366	2 monitors	18,600	1,100	19,700
	2011-SBD-367	2 monitors.	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-368	2 monitors	18,600	1,100	19,700
	2011-SBD-369	6 officers, 1 technician	18,900	2,500	21,400
	2011-SBD-370	1 officer	28,428	1,750	30,178
	2011-SBD-376	4 officers and 1 technician	37,800	5,000	42,800
	2011-SBD-377	2 monitors	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2011-SBD-378	2 monitors	18,600	1,100	19,700
	2011-SBD-379	1 monitor	1,100	18,600	19,700
	2011-SBD-380	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician.	39,360	3,000	42,360
	2009-SBD-391	9 officers, 1 tech	6,480	520	7,000
	2011-SBD-392	4 monitors and 1 technician	43,000	2,100	45,100
	2011-SBD-393	1 officer, 4 monitors and 1 technician	59,040	3,800	62,840
	2011-SBD-394	2 officers, 4 monitors and 2 technicians	100,000	4,300	104,300
	2011-SBD-395	4 monitors and 1 technician.	20,338	4,000	24,338
	2011-SBD-396	1 officer, 4 monitors and 1 technician	34,112	4,500	38,612
	2011-SBD-397	1 officer	74,160	943	75,103
	2011-SBD-398	1 officer	37,080	2,000	39,080

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino	2011-SBD-399	7 officers, 1 technician.	5,400	900	6,300
	2011-SBD-400	2 officers, 4 monitors, 1 technician	10,169	2,000	12,169
	2011-SBD-401	Cost not available			
	2011-SBD-402	2 Monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-403	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-404	1 officer, 2 monitors and 1 technician.	20,000	2,200	22,200
	2011-SBD-405	7 officers, 1 technician.	10,800	1,800	12,600
	2011-SBD-406	2 Officer, 4 civilian Monitors	47,778	1,600	49,378
	2011-SBD-407	2 officers, 2 monitors and 1 technician	20,000	1,486	21,486
	2011-SBD-408	Cost not available			
	2011-SBD-409	1 officer 2 monitors 1 technician	6,560	1,500	8,060
	2011-SBD-410	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2011-SBD-411	12 officers, 4 monitors, 1 technician	37,190	6,000	43,190
	2011-SBD-412	1 officer, 4 monitors and 1 technician.	20,338	2,000	22,338
	2011-SBD-413	1 officer 2 monitors 1 technician	19,680	1,500	21,180
	2011-SBD-414	1 officer, 1 civilian monitors, 1 tech	118,080	8,000	126,080
	2011-SBD-415	1 officer 3 monitors	78,760	6,000	84,760
	2012-SBD-419	Cost not available			
	2012-SBD-421	Cost not available			
	2012-SBD-425	Cost not available			
<b>San Bernardino Total</b>			<b>3,429,745</b>	<b>337,696</b>	<b>3,767,441</b>
San Diego	2010-SD-73	Costs related to EICOS 10-SD-70/WIRETAP 10-31			
	2011-SD-81	2 monitors/day at 656 hours total	12,269	3,400	15,669

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-82	4 monitors/day 2624 hours	108,764	5,200	113,964
	2011-SD-83	2 monitors/day 800 hours	33,160	2,000	35,160
	2011-SD-84	foreign language monitors; installation	114,070	8,200	122,270
	2011-SD-85	Costs related to 11-37 (EICOS 2011-SD-86)			
	2011-SD-86	6 monitors	75,000	6,430	81,430
	2011-SD-87	foreign language monitors; installation	19,896	1,400	21,296
	2011-SD-88	foreign language monitors; installation	19,896	250	20,146
	2011-SD-89	foreign language monitors; installation	3,000	1,430	4,430
	2011-SD-90	foreign language monitors; installation	37,140	12,600	49,740
	2011-SD-92	foreign language monitor, installation	19,896	1,650	21,546
	2011-SD-94	monitors/transcriptions	15,000	1,500	16,500
	2011-SD-95	foreign language monitors; installation	8,622	1,400	10,022
	2011-SD-96	5 monitors	17,820	1,400	19,220
	2011-SD-97	2 monitors	39,646	1,460	41,106
	2011-SD-98	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-99	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No.2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-100	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-101	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-102	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-103	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-104	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-105	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2011-SD-106	Costs related to 11-44 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-107)			
	2011-SD-107	Monitors for target telephones	500,000	84,000	584,000
	2011-SD-108	Costs of installation and prep of transcripts	400	400	800
	2011-SD-109	Costs related to 11-11 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-110)			
	2011-SD-110	Multiple DEA and SDO officers and monitors	56,536	235	56,771
	2011-SD-111	12 monitors	104,618	7,000	111,618
	2011-SD-112	Costs related to 11-25 (EICOS 2011-SD-111)			
	2011-SD-113	2 monitors / 2 shifts for 52 days	53,056	3,500	56,556
	2011-SD-114	2 monitors / 2 shifts for 30 days	39,792	2,800	42,592
	2011-SD-115	2 monitors / 2 shifts for 20 days	26,432	4,200	30,632
	2011-SD-116	1 monitor / 2 shifts for 30 days	19,896	2,800	22,696
	2011-SD-117		39,792	2,800	42,592
	2011-SD-118	2 monitors / 2 shifts for 60 days	53,719	3,500	57,219
	2011-SD-119	10 special agents	28,723	1,400	30,123
	2011-SD-120	install - 1, monitors - 28, transcripts - 2	28,803	15,000	43,803
	2011-SD-121	install - 1, monitors - 18, transcripts - 2	11,911	3,000	14,911
	2011-SD-122	Federal and State law enforcement officers, monitors	162,080	0	162,080
	2011-SD-123	Costs related to 11-30 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-122)			
	2011-SD-124	Costs related to 11-30 (EICOS No. 2011-SD-122)			
<b>San Diego Total</b>			<b>1,649,937</b>	<b>178,955</b>	<b>1,828,892</b>
San Joaquin	2011-SJ-5	special agent, monitors, surveillance	300,000	16,000	316,000
	2011-SJ-6	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Joaquin	2011-SJ-7	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-8	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-9	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-10	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-11	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-12	Costs related to 2011-SJ-5			
	2011-SJ-13	monitors plus surveillance.	82,800	0	82,800
<b>San Joaquin Total</b>			<b>382,800</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>398,800</b>
San Luis Obispo	2011-SLO-1	N/A	4,228	400	4,628
	2011-SLO-2	N/A	8,000	1,700	9,700
<b>San Luis Obispo Total</b>			<b>12,228</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>14,328</b>
San Mateo	2011-SM-5	\$140,000	27,000	0	27,000
	2011-SM-6	Costs related to EICOS 2011-SM-5			
	2011-SM-7	Costs related to EICOS 2011-SM-5			
<b>San Mateo Total</b>			<b>27,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,000</b>
Santa Barbara	2011-SBA-20	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-21	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-22	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-23	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-24	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	40,676	625	41,301
	2011-SBA-25	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-26	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Santa Barbara	2011-SBA-27	2 monitors per day, 1 technician to install	20,338	625	20,963
	2011-SBA-28	Cost not available			
	2011-SBA-29	4 monitors	40,674	3,650	44,324
	2011-SBA-30	12 total (10 detectives and 2 LA Clear installation personell)	14,250	2,500	16,750
	2011-SBA-31	2 monitors per day, 8 hrs; 1 person to install	20,337	625	20,962
<b>Santa Barbara Total</b>			<b>258,303</b>	<b>11,775</b>	<b>270,078</b>
Santa Clara	2011-SCL-7	Cost not available			
	2011-SCL-8	Costs related to WT 11-04			
	2011-SCL-9	\$17,000 for monitors and installation costs	15,000	2,000	17,000
	2011-SCL-10	25 sworn, 60 conduit	232,519	1,600	234,119
	2011-SCL-11	8 daily monitors/interpreters	85,000	14,000	99,000
	2011-SCL-12	8 monitors per day	119,000	19,600	138,600
	2011-SCL-13	Costs related to WT 11-10			
	2011-SCL-14	4 monitors and switch costs.	17,000	2,800	19,800
	2011-SCL-15	monitors and switch costs	100,000	15,600	115,600
	2011-SCL-16	63 sworn peace officers and civilian monitors	209,434	8,000	217,434
	2011-SCL-17	sworn and conduit 63	209,434	8,000	217,434
	2011-SCL-18	54 sworn, 60 conduit	50,000	15,000	65,000
	2011-SCL-19	monitors, agents and technicians	17,000	2,800	19,800
	2011-SCL-21	monitors, technicians and agents	100,000	15,600	115,600
	2011-SCL-23	4 monitors	17,398	2,800	20,198
	2011-SCL-24	monitors, agents and technicians	55,843	8,490	64,333

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Santa Clara	2011-SCL-25	technicians, monitors and agents	50,313	8,490	58,803
	2011-SCL-26	monitors, agents and technicians	16,771	2,830	19,601
	2011-SCL-27	monitors, technicians, agents	16,771	2,830	19,601
<b>Santa Clara Total</b>			<b>1,311,483</b>	<b>130,440</b>	<b>1,441,923</b>
Sonoma	2011-SON-2	16 interpreters, 10 agents,	82,400	33,250	115,650
	2011-SON-3	6 interpreters, 6 agents	82,400	33,250	115,650
	2011-SON-4	Cost not available			
	2011-SON-5	6 interpreters, 6 agents	82,400	33,250	115,650
<b>Sonoma Total</b>			<b>247,200</b>	<b>99,750</b>	<b>346,950</b>
Stanislaus	2011-STA-16	5 monitors/agents	15,000	2,300	17,300
	2011-STA-17	3 monitors	16,536	2,000	18,536
	2011-STA-18	3 monitors	0	1,400	1,400
	2011-STA-19	3 monitors	9,000	1,000	10,000
	2011-STA-20	3 monitors	20,222	2,500	22,722
<b>Stanislaus Total</b>			<b>60,758</b>	<b>9,200</b>	<b>69,958</b>
Ventura	2011-VE-19	4 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	44,276	3,500	47,776
	2011-VE-20	8 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	88,360	9,000	97,360
	2011-VE-21	8 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	88,360	9,000	97,360
	2011-VE-22	17 monitors	54,245	1,290	55,535
	2011-VE-23	2 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	73,130	2,975	76,105
	2011-VE-24	17 monitors, 2 agents	13,668	358	14,026
	2011-VE-25	17 monitors, 2 agents	17,780	516	18,296

**Table 6**  
**Costs of Electronic Interceptions**  
**During Calendar Year 2011**

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Ventura (cont'd)	2011-VE-26	2 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	63,493	1,250	64,743
	2011-VE-28	10 monitors, 3 agents, 1 technician	55,790	6,288	62,078
	2011-VE-29	Costs related to 11-18			
	2011-VE-30	Cost not available			
	2011-VE-31	2 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	22,088	1,750	23,838
	2011-VE-32	4 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	44,276	3,500	47,776
	2011-VE-33	2 monitors, 2 agents, and 1 technician	22,088	1,750	23,838
	2011-VE-34	Costs related to 11-18			
	2011-VE-35	23 monitors, 2 agents	91,286	9,240	100,526
	2011-VE-36	2 monitors, 2 agents, 1 technician	22,088	1,750	23,838
	2011-VE-37	4 monitors, 1 agent	50,000	2,000	52,000
	2011-VE-38	10 monitors, 6 agents	100,000	5,000	105,000
	2011-VE-39	Costs related to 11-05			
	2011-VE-40	Costs related to 11-06			
	2011-VE-41	2 monitors, 1 agent	0	1,200	1,200
<b>Ventura Total</b>			<b>850,928</b>	<b>60,367</b>	<b>911,295</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>23,882,551</b>	<b>2,475,375</b>	<b>26,357,926</b>

**Table 7**  
**Jurisdiction Reporting No**  
**Electronic Interception Activity During**  
**Calendar Year 2011**

Alameda	Alpine	Amador
Calaveras	Colusa	Del Norte
El Dorado	Fresno	Glenn
Humboldt	Inyo	Kings
Lake	Lassen	Marin
Mariposa	Mendocino	Modoc
Mono	Monterey	Napa
Nevada	Plumas	San Benito
San Francisco	Santa Cruz	Shasta
Sierra	Siskiyou	Solano
Sutter	Tehama	Trinity
Tulare	Tuolumne	Yolo
Yuba		

**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)
Alameda	2009		09-02			4	Narcotics; Driving Stolen Vehicle					2	Narcotics; Firearms
Contra Costa	2009	5/22/2009	SF BNE 2009-06			3	Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	
Imperial	2010	9/7/2010		2010-IM-17		12	Narcotics	0	0	0	0	0	10
Los Angeles	2007		07-215			1	Sale/Transportation/ Offer to Sale a Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; False Compartment Activity; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime					1	Sale/Transportation/ Offer to Sale a Controlled Substance; False Compartment Activity; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2008	8/15/2008	08-168 and 08-169			4	Murder; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime					1	Murder; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2008	9/30/2008	08-180			3	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance	1				1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2008		Orange County - 08-30			1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Transportation of a Controlled Substance					1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Transportation of a Controlled Substance
	2008	1/17/2008	08-09 and 08-09 Ext. 1			2	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Maintaining a Place for Selling of Using Controlled Substance					1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Maintaining a Place for Selling or Using Controlled Substance
	2008	11/17/2008	08-190; 08-214; 09-10; 09-70; and 09-97			3	Murder; Assault with a Semiautomatic Firearm; Possession of a Firearm by a Felon; Accessory After the Fact;	1				2	Murder; Accessory After the Fact
	2008	2/7/2008	08-07			4	Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime;					1	Transportation of a Controlled Substance

**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)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2008	11/17/2008	08-190; 08-214; 09-10; 09-70; and 09-97			2	Insurance Fraud; Arson of Property of Another					1	Insurance Fraud
	2008	11/17/2008	08-190; 08-214; 09-10; 09-70; and 09-97			3	Attempted Murder; Assault with a Semiautomatic Firearm; Discharge of a Firearm with Gross Negligence; Unlawful Firearm Activity; Possession for Sale of Cocaine Base					2	Def. #1 - Attempted Murder; Assault with a Semiautomatic Firearm Def. #2 - Discharge of Firearm with Gross Negligence; Transportation of a Controlled Substance
	2008		Riverside County - 09-28			2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance;					1	Transportation of a Controlled Substance
	2008		08-195; 08-195 Ext. 1; 08-195 Ext. 2; 08-211; 09-11; 09-26; 09-26 Ext. 1; 09-41; 09-69; 09-80; 09-90; 09-90 Ext. 1; 09-98; 09-216; and 09-188			4	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance					3	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2008	9/5/2008	08-167; 08-179; 08-196; and 08-217			2	Attempted Murder; Murder	1				2	Attempted Murder
	2008		08-95			2	Murder; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime	1				2	Murder; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2009	5/18/2009	09-44			2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000					1	Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000
	2009		09-46			1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000					1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance

**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)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2009		Orange County - 09-48			2	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000; Accessory After the Fact					2	Def. #1 - Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000 Def. #2 - Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Accessory After the Fact
	2009		09-16			1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession of Money or Instruments Over \$100,000; False Compartment Activity;					1	False Compartment Activity
	2009	7/2/2009	09-210			1	Having a Concealed Firearm in a Vehicle; Carrying a Loaded Firearm in a Vehicle in a City; Possession of an Assault Weapon; False Compartment Activity					1	Having a Concealed Firearm in a Vehicle; Carrying a Loaded Firearm in a Vehicle; False Compartment Activity
	2009	1/16/2009	09-05			1	Proceeds Derived from a Controlled Substance; False Compartment Activity					1	Proceeds Derived from Controlled Substance Offenses
	2009	4/21/2009	09-60			3	Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; False Compartment Activity; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possession of Marijuana for Sale;					3	Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance

**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)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2009	11/11/2008	08-195; 08-195 Ext. 1; 08-195 Ext. 2; 08-211; 09-11; 09-26; 09-26 Ext. 1, 09-41; 09-69; 09-80; 09-90; 09-90 Ext. 1; 09-98, 09-126; and 09-188			1	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Sale/Transportation/ Offer to Sell Controlled Substance					1	Sell/Transportation/ Offer to Sell a Controlled Substance
	2009	1/15/2009	Case No. YA075709 - 09-01; 09-15; And 09-32			3	Murder; Attempted Murder	1				3	Murder; Attempted Murder
	2009	1/15/2009	Case No. YA075724 - 09-01; 09-15; and 09-32			2	Murder; Attempted Murder	1				2	Attempted Murder
	2010	1/15/2010	10-04; 10-12; 10-28; 10-51; 10-52; 10-63; and 10-85	2010-LA-2		9	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance					3	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2010		Ventura County - 10-03; 10-04; and 10-07			1	Sale/Transportation/ Offer to Sell Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Transport/Sell of a Controlled Substance					1	Transport/Sell of a Controlled Substance
	2010	1/15/2010	10-04; 10-12; 10-28; 10-51; 10-52; 10-63; and 10-85			1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Carrying a Loaded Firearm in a Vehicle; Possession of an Assault Weapon					1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Carrying a Loaded Firearm in a Vehicle; Possession of an Assault Weapon
	2010	8/19/2010	10-173	2010-LA-173		3	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Home Invasion Robbery; Possession of Marijuana for Sale;					3	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Home Invasion Robbery
	2010	3/5/2010	10-06	2010-LA-31		2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance					1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance

**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)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010		Riverside County - 10-60 and 10-66			3	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Sale/Offer to Sale/Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime;					3	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2010		BA379193			2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Sale/Transportation/Offer to Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possess/Purchase Controlled Substance for Sale; Attempt - Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance					2	Attempt - Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2010	10/14/2010	10-191 and 10-239	2010-LA-187		5	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Sale/Transportation/Offer to Sell Controlled Substance; Maintaining Place for Selling of Using Controlled Substance					5	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Sale/Transportation/Offer to Sell of a Controlled Substance; Maintaining Place for Selling or Using Controlled Substance
	2010		Riverside County			2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Possession of a Controlled Substance with a Firearm					2	Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2010	6/3/2010	Case No. BA389430 - 10-91; 10-147; 10-162; 10-179; 109-182; 10-196; 10-197; 10-209; 10-235; 11-05; 11-40; and 11-61	2010-LA-98		1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Sale/Offer to Sale/Transportation of a Controlled Substance					1	Sale/Offer to Sale/Transportation of a Controlled Substance

**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)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010	6/3/2010	Case No. BA389432 - 10-91; 10-147; 10-162; 10-179; 10-182; 10-196; 10-197; 10-209; 10-235; 11-05; 11-40; and 11-61	2010-LA-98		1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession for Sale of a Controlled Substance; Transportation for Sale of a Controlled Substance					1	Transportation for Sale of a Controlled Substance
	2010	6/3/2010	Case No. BA389437 - 10-91; 10-147; 10-162; 10-179; 10-182; 10-196; 10-197; 10-209; 10-235; 11-05; 11-40 and 11-61	2010-LA-98		2	Possession of Marijuana for Sale; Sale/Offer to Sell/Transportation of Marijuana					2	Possession of Marijuana for Sale; Sale/Offer to Sell/Transportation of Marijuana
	2010	3/5/2010	10-39 and 10-62			1	Attempted Murder; Shooting at an Inhabited Dwelling; Assault with a Semiautomatic Firearm; Possession of a Firearm by a Felon;	1				1	Attempted Murder; Shooting at an Inhabited Dwelling; Assault with a Semiautomatic Firearm; Possession of a Firearm by a Felon
Sacramento	2010	12/15/2010	10-226; 10-226 Ext. 1; and 10-226 Ext. 2			3	Murder; Attempted Murder;	1				2	Murder; Attempted Murder
	2009	5/14/2009	WT-09-08			8	Murder	1	0	0	0	2	First Degree Murder
	2010	9/15/2010	WT-10-16			6	Narcotics	0	0	0	0	5	Conspiracy to Sell Meth; Possession for Sale Meth; Possession of Funds in Excess \$100K
	2010	3/18/2010	WT-10-01			36	Conspiracy to Sell Meth; Transportation Meth; Kidnapping; Armed; Gang Enhancement	0	0	0	0	26	Conspiracy; Guns; Gang Enhancement

**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 Diego	2008		08-22, 08-25, 08-26, 08-33, 08-43, 08-44, 08-49, 08-56, 08-57, 08-60, 08-64, 08-67, 08-69, 08-72, 08-73, 08-76, 08-79, 08-80, 08-83									2	Narcotics
	2010			2010-SD-10		14	Narcotics Trafficking	0	0	0	0	14	Narcotics Trafficking
	2010			2010-SD-47		4	Narcotics Trafficking			4		4	H&S11351/11370.4/11370.6

## 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 Court 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, electronic pager, and electronic cellular telephone 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 approximate nature and frequency of incriminating communications intercepted, (B) the approximate nature and frequency of other communications intercepted, (C) the approximate number of persons whose communications were 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 (8) 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 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, electronic pager, or electronic cellular telephone 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.