1	TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED MEETING		
2		OF	
3	CLETS	ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING	
4			
5		JUNE 30, 2022	
6]	ELK GROVE, CALIFORNIA	
7			
8			
9	Present:		
10	MARIA CRANSTON, CLETS Executive Secretary MILAD DALUIL Legal Counsel		
11			
12	KORY HONEA, Californ	dlifornia State Sheriffs' Association gue of California Cities	
13	ANDREW WHITE, California Peace Officer's Association RAY DIGGINS, California Highway Patrol DON O'KEEFE, Office of Emergency Services JAIMIE TACKETT, Department of Justice		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	Transcribed by: C	ristina Willis,	
21	F	oothill Transcription Company	
22	J	ULY 6, 2022	
23	E	lk Grove, California	
24		000	
25			

Chief Dominic: Hello, everyone. We're going to go ahead and call to order, and I want to apologize for being late to the committee and everyone that's here. I had a little issue we had to deal with at the department. Okay. Good morning. I would like to call the meeting to order. I appreciate everyone making the drive and attending and thank you all for coming. I know some of you had to drive in, and this is -- again, it's hard to get back to in-person meetings, so I appreciate everybody making that effort. Maria, can we go ahead and please take the roll call?

Ms. Cranston: Yes. Sheriff Kory Honea?

Sheriff Honea: Present.

14 | Ms. Cranston: Chief Mark Bonini will not be with 15 | us today. Chief Andrew White?

Chief White: Present.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Cranston: Chief Rick Hillman?

Chief Hillman: Present.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Donald O'Keefe?

Chief O'Keefe: Present.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Ray Diggins?

Chief Diggins: Present.

| Ms. Cranston: Greg Park?

Mr. Park: Present.

Ms. Cranston: And Chief and Chair Joe Dominic?

Chief Dominic: Present. Thank you, Maria. So, I'd just like to mention a few housekeeping items. This is our second meeting here at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers, so I would like to remind everyone where the restrooms are located. When coming in from the lobby, go straight to the back; men to the left and women to the right. I would like to ask for all members to identify themselves before speaking or reading a motion or second for the transcript — transcript. Also, for the audience members that would like to make a comment, please use the microphone. For the Chairman's Report, I would like to introduce two new members on the committee. The first is Chief Raymond Diggins with the California Highway Patrol. He is replacing Chris Childs, who was promoted. And with that, Maria, could you please read the bio?

Ms. Cranston: Yes.

2.3

Chief Dominic: Thank you.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Diggins has been a member of the California Highway Patrol for 27 years, serving in a variety of assignments, which has included road patrol, supervision, and management within the Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, and Imperial Counties. He was assigned as the commander of the San Onofre Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility and the Capistrano area and was also assigned as a Critical Incident Investigation Team

leader, CAL FIRE incident management team law enforcement liaison, Protective Services detail coordinator, and Special Response Team commander for Border Division. As a member of the Dignitary Protection Section, he was responsible for the security of California's elected officials.

In his staff assignments, he has been involved in the CHP's recruitment, hiring, and applicant background investigations, as well as conducting inspections and investigations for the department. He has served as the assistant division commander of Border Division, and on January 1st, 2022, he was promoted to chief of the Information Management Division.

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria, and please join me in welcoming Chief Diggins to the committee. Welcome.

Multiple Voices: Welcome.

2.3

Chief Dominic: Next, we have Chief Donald O'Keefe with the California Office of Emergency Services Law Enforcement Branch. He is replacing Mark Pazan, who has retired. Maria, please read the bio.

Ms. Cranston: Chief O'Keefe is a 42-year veteran of city, county, state, and federal law enforcement. He started his law enforcement career with the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office before retiring at the rank of captain. He then became the police chief for the City of

Half Moon Bay. Prior to his tenure with Cal OES, he was a U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of California, having been appointed by President Barack Obama, after receiving unanimous consent from the United States Senate.

2.3

2.5

In 2022, Chief O'Keefe was appointed by Governor -California -- Newsom -- Gavin Newsom -- I'm sorry -- by
California Governor Gavin Newsom to be the chief of the
Law Enforcement Branch of the Office of Emergency
Services and Homeland Security. In that role, he is
responsible for coordinating all law enforcement mutual
aid within the state. Other responsibilities include
providing trained search and rescue personnel to locate
missing and lost individuals and coordinating state
coroners and medical examiners at mass fatality events.
Finally, he is the Governor's point person on authorizing
the deployment of the California National Guard to law
enforcement-related incidents.

Chief O'Keefe holds a bachelor's degree in human services from the College of Notre Dame in Belmont,
California, and a master's degree in public
administration from the University of San Francisco. He
is a graduate of the FBI National Academy, Naval
Postgraduate School, POST Command College, National
Executive Institute, and the Los Angeles Police

Department's Westpoint Leadership Program.

2.3

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria. Please join me in welcoming Chief O'Keefe to the committee.

Chief O'Keefe: Thank you -- thank you.

Chief Dominic: We also will be replacing Thomas
Wilson, representing the Department of Motor Vehicles.
Unfortunately, we were unable to get the new chief sworn
in prior to this meeting, so hopefully, we can introduce
her at the next meeting. We also have new legal counsel,
Milad Dalju -- help me if I said that --

Deputy Attorney General Dalju: That's good.

Chief Dominic: -- name, or -- thank you very much
-- who is replacing Deputy Attorney General Deborah Yang.
Maria, can you please read the bio? And welcome.

Deputy Attorney General Dalju: Thank you.

Ms. Cranston: Deputy Attorney General Milad Dalju is assigned to the Government Law Section of the Attorney General's Office, where he advises internal and external clients regarding compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, the Political Reform Act, California Public Records Act, and a variety of other areas of public agency laws. Prior to joining the Attorney General's Office in 2018, Milad was the deputy director and chief of enforcement at the City of Oakland Public Ethics Commission, where he was responsible for interpreting and

enforcing local and state laws regarding ethics, campaign finance, lobbying, open meeting, and public records, as well as advising the commission, its staff, other city officials, and the public on ethics matters, including local and state government ethic -- ethics laws, conflicts of interest, gift limits, statements of economic interests and revolving door laws. Before that, Milad was counsel in the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission, where he was responsible for interpreting and enforcing the campaign finance and ethics provisions of the California Political Reform Act, handling various stages of investigation, prosecution, and settlement.

2.3

2.5

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria. Welcome, Milad Dalju. Okay. So, for the Executive Secretary -Executive Secretary's Report, I would like to turn it over to Maria.

Ms. Cranston: Thank you. Thank you. I'll be presenting the CLETS Advisory Committee's Executive Secretary's Report for the meeting.

So, the three topics that we'll be covering include the CLETS traffic, misuse statistics, and action items.

So, for CLETS Traffic Statistics, First Quarter, from January 1st through March 30th, total messages inbound were over 230 million messages. Outbound was over 231 million

messages. The monthly average is almost 76 million inbound, and outbound is almost 80 million. The daily average for both inbound and outbound is a little over 2.5 million, and the peak day for both inbound and outbound is over 3.1 million messages. Thank you.

So, at a previous committee meeting, the committee requested that we report CLETS connections that fall below 95 percent. For the last several quarters, there were two that consistently fell below that 95 percent. The first one is a connection for the Merced County Sheriff's Department. Half of their users were using this connection, while the other half were using a different connection.

Male: Uh-huh. Okav.

2.3

Ms. Cranston: The staff reached out to the agency because there were a few downstream agencies that were impacted by this connection. It's a legacy system that kept dropping. So after we had worked with the agency, they had migrated all of the existing downstream agencies and their own employees off of the old system and onto the other CLETS connection. And since then, they have disconnected the system, as well as that line, so all users are now behind their other connection, and that line is maintaining a hundred percent up time.

The second agency is Santa Barbara County Sheriff's

Department. The only users behind this line are Santa Barbara Sheriff's employees. They also have another point of CLETS access, which is their primary access, so this is just some individuals' access behind this system. The agency intends to upgrade the system, but unfortunately, other projects have taken precedence. Again, there is no impact to any other agency. It's just a little bit slower for some of their own staff. And hopefully, by next meeting, they'll have upgraded the system. And they're working on submitting an application at this time to upgrade the system.

2.3

For the CLETS misuse statistics -- every year in February, agencies are supposed to report their misuse investigations for the prior year. So what was due February 1st, 2022 was for the year 2021; any investigations conducted in 2021. We're giving you a comparison of what was reported for 2020 as well as 2021.

So, this year there were a total of 1,778 agencies that reported. 1,722 reported no misuse, 56 agencies reported there were misuse investigations. A total of 173 investigations were investigated. Misuse was found in 97 instances, 22 of the cases are still pending and the outcome for those found -- where misuse was founded, 36 individuals were counseled, 13 were reprimanded, 45 had to be retrained, 12 were suspended, 14 individuals

resigned, 9 were terminated.

2.3

2.5

And there were four other instances, and those included salary reductions, employee retired, or they left the department before the investigation could be completed. There was one instance where no action was taken and that was because the employee retired prior to discipline being imposed.

So, this line depicts a comparison for a full year in 2021 and 6 months in 2022. This is where local agencies request assistance from DOJ for their misuse investigations, and they request a journal search to be run. CLETS records all traffic incoming and outgoing for three years. So far this year, there were 23 journal searches to assist local agencies with misuse investigations. No misuse was found in 13 of the cases and the remaining 10 are still pending.

Next, we'll go into the action items from the last meeting. The first action item is to reconvene the Standing Strategic Planning Subcommittee or also known as the SSPS. The SSPS has been reconvened and will be discussed later in today's agenda. I know at the last meeting there was a lot of discussion on things the committee -- or subcommittee could look at, so I did send a copy of the strategic plan and the transcript from the last meeting to the Chair for informational purposes.

The second action item from the last meeting was for agencies that are reporting for noncompliance issues to have each agency include a mitigation plan in their reports. So, for the agencies that are reporting, we have requested they submit a mitigation plan as to how they will be helping to mitigate the risks and protecting the information until they become compliant.

And that is all I have today.

2.3

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria. Any questions from the committee members?

Mr. Park: Greg Park. Secretary Cranston, thank you very much for the report, very informative. And I also want to thank you and staff for the work that you've done between meetings to get transcripts to us in a timely fashion from your transcript provider. It's been very helpful. Thank you for that. On the misuse section, just wanted to clarify. I know that law enforcement is a primary review set of agencies, but does that also include our justice partners, such as DAs offices, Probation, Federal, Judicial -- do all of those potential agencies accessing CLETS also report misuse --

Ms. Cranston: Yes.

Mr. Park: -- or is just law enforcement?

Ms. Cranston: It would be all agencies with access to CLETS, including DAs, Probation, courts.

Mr. Park: Excellent. Thank you very much.

Ms. Cranston: You're welcome.

2.3

Chief White: The Chair, I just had a follow-up at the last meeting, and I had suggested and I would just renew the request that I think we should look at amending the policies, practice, procedures, with regards to misuse to mandate anybody who is found to misuse that they have to recertify through the DOJ-provided training. So, for a future meeting and just comment on the misuse. Thank you.

Chief Dominic: Thank you for that recommendation.

In fact, what you just said is going to be a part of the FBI's new policy that they're working on, their modernized policy, which is going to require any time there's an incident or breach or misuse that an individual have training. So, thank you for that.

So regarding the Standard Strategic Planning
Subcommittee, as mentioned at the last meeting, known as
SSPS, I requested Asish Kakkad or Yosh (phonetic) as most
of us know him, to chair the subcommittee, and he
accepted. Thank you.

Chair Kakkad: Yep.

Chief Dominic: Yosh is the chief technology officer with the San Diego County Sheriff's Department. I would like to invite Yosh to introduce himself and his plans

for the SSPS. Please come forward, Yosh, and thank you for making it out from San Diego. We really appreciate it.

2.3

Chief White: I'm sorry, Chair. Can we provide opportunity for public comment for the last item?

Chief Dominic: Sure. Thank you. With that, let's go ahead and open it up for the last item that was discussed for public comment. Anyone wish to make any comments? Hearing none -- and thank you for reminding us for that

-- making sure we're following Bagley-Keene. Yes, Yosh. Please come back up. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Sorry for the delay.

Chair Kakkad: Oh, it's absolutely okay. Hello.

Good morning everyone. I just want to introduce myself.

I'm Yosh. I'm a CIO/CTO for the San Diego County

Sheriff's Department. I want to thank the chair and the entire board for reinstating, especially from the locals' perspective for getting the SSPS started again. Years ago, I was part of SSPS, and it was extremely valuable to have that as we engage in this new integration of SSPS.

I just -- before we get any kind of business or (inaudible) plans, I wanted to come in front of the board and get some guidance and feedback from you all to see what you guys would like us to focus on as we start. You

know, it's really crucial for us to have that balance between the view that this group has, as well as the view that locals have and make it valuable and beneficial for all involved. I think -- you know, I think this is huge. It's extremely critical for us to focus on this. So with that, I just wanted to hear some feedback and some guidance and ideas from the group here and see what we would like to focus on before we formally launch SSPS and launch our first meeting.

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Yosh. With that, I'll open it up to the committee to share any thoughts that they have. And then later, Yosh, if you -- I know that you also received the previous Standing Strategic Plan, and what are your thoughts in reviewing that? And just kind of providing that feedback would be great, too.

Chair Kakkad: Yeah. Absolutely.

Chief Dominic: So

2.3

2.5

Chair Kakkad: Should we open it up first?

Chief Dominic: Yeah. Go ahead. And let's open it up for questions or thoughts that we'd like to share -- what we'd like to see SSPS kind of undertake. Committee?

Mr. Park: Greg Park. Welcome, Yosh. It's great to have you with us. As Chairman Dominic mentioned, taking a look at the Standing Strategic Plan, I think, and evaluating where that either has been completed or we

still need to work toward, I would suggest a goal of CLETS 2025. What would we like to accomplish in the next two to three years? We've seen the legislature continue to pass opportunities for DMV to test digital identification and various new forms of digital-based auto registration components, and so, it'd be very interesting to hear from your committee on one, where is that going? Where is the State of California leading in that type of technology? And how could that interface with not only local systems, but is the CLETS system as it exists today ready and capable of taking on that new technology -- making it seamless and safe for our deputies and officers on the street to manage that new opportunity? Thank you.

Chair Kakkad: Thank you.

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Greg. Anyone else?
Please.

Chief White: Andrew White and sorry to the transcription person that I didn't say my name before. Thank you, Yosh, for stepping up and doing this.

Obviously, you're well respected within the industry, and I think you're the perfect person for this job. Some things that I've brought up before, and I think would be appropriate for the SSPS to address is, first of all, there's a lot happening with Next Gen 9-1-1 and the

robust network that they're building out. But equally so, I think there's, you know, they want to partner -- I know Chief Dominic mentioned the interest of partnering, but obviously, balancing that against security. So, I think it would be appropriate for the group to look at ways we can leverage that without compromising anything. I think to look at -- again, a balance, but security versus progress -- that we find new ways to continue to address security issues without blocking progress. A lot has changed, and I think that the way that the network currently operates could use improvement to better serve our users of this system. I think looking at efficiencies, so ways that we can make the system better serve the front line men and women that are out there performing the job every day to keep our community safe. I think there's a lot of information available, but sometimes accessing it isn't the most user-friendly.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

The other part is, I know, obviously, you're involved with the data sharing task force, so I'm sure there's some cross-over in there. And I won't waste time going through it and all of that, but to look at those things. And then really, most importantly is just to, you know, kind of look down the road to see what's coming. There's a lot changing with laws, but there's also increasing community expectations that we have to

meet. And I think there's a lot of areas where the technology can help us. And so hopefully, the SSPS can provide suggestions to the board, to DOJ, to better meet those, both what we know now and what we foresee coming down the road in the future. Thank you, Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Chief Andrew. Anyone else before I have a few comments? Okay. Thank you all very much. Yeah, Yosh. The only thing I would just say is, you know -- and when we look at CLETS, specifically, right, and what CLETS is responsible for doing and responding to -- providing criminal justice information to law enforcement, right? And also, our national databases that we have -- not only to the DMV, right, but also to the national level. You know, the current security policy, which is CJIS Security Policy Version 5.9 -- the FBI is undertaking a new version of policy. They're modernizing the entire CJIS security policy, which is going to be, I think it's, like, Version 6 is what they're calling it. I'm not able to share that because they're working on that, but basically, it's going to realign to (inaudible) 853. Right? And when we say 853 it's all of the attributes of 853. So, it's going to be -- you know, there's a lot to consider. So, going back to the comment that you had made, it's that, you know, we as a community, when we talk about

safeguarding this data, having integrity, confidentiality, should be thinking about incorporating those things. And we can talk a little bit more about that, but just making sure that the security integrity of the system is intact because the FBI requires that, right? And we are audited by the FBI, and as you know, we audit the locals, and they audit the locals. And those things are coming. So, as we talk about these things -- all those other kinds of security frameworks that need to be placed around these systems, and the modernization, right, around these systems. So I just would like SSPS to also keep that in the forefront -- that information security should be a goal of looking at the current policies. And then when we can share from the FBI, this committee -- I will share that through this committee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. That's all I have. Thank you very much,
Yosh. And if you want to share any final thoughts about
what your thoughts are in reviewing the Search Team Plan
or any thoughts that you have into some of the comments
that were made today.

Chair Kakkad: Yeah, absolutely, and I truly appreciate you folks sharing the ideas and especially on the security side as we're sort of balancing security against a forward momentum. That's always an extremely

tricky balance. And thank you for sharing the details on what's coming around the corner as much as you can. That really frames the discussion and conversation really well for us. And going back to the previous SSPS I was in, I'll be honest, you know, I'm a little biased on that because I was part of that. I think we did a phenomenal job of that, and it will be a great experience for me to really look at the rearview mirror and see how much ground we've covered, and be realistic about where the gaps are, right? We didn't get everything right, and this is the opportunity for us to get things done better. So, I really appreciate, you know, all the ideas, and all the guidance that the group has shared. I think it's valuable.

2.3

There's a lot happening, and the expectations are incredible from every aspect of this. And you have my commitment that, you know, I see my role as within this — with this chair as something that's going to deliver value to move things forward, and would that — ultimately that forward needs will be decided collectively, right? So that's my commitment to the group. Outside of that, I really appreciate you guys doing all — as supporting this effort. I know we're all very, very busy and getting pulled in multiple direction. And I'm absolutely excited to be part of this, so.

Chief Dominic: All right. Thank you, Yosh --

Chair Kakkad: Thank you, all --

2.3

Chief Dominic: -- very much. I appreciate it --

Chair Kakkad: -- I appreciate it.

Chief Dominic: -- and I look forward to hearing from you. I'm going to now open up to public comment with the item we just discussed. Hearing none, we'll go to the next agenda item. Thank you.

So, this is an update on CLETS Message Header Changes-Assembly Bill 1747, and Jaimie Tackett will be leading that conversation who manages that area. Welcome, Jaimie.

Ms. Tackett: Good morning. Please bear with me one second. I have a few different connections going because we're going to be having some agencies joining us virtually here shortly.

Good morning. Again, my name is Jamie Tackett. I'm the manager over DOJ's AB 1747 section, and I'm here to give you a brief update on 1747 compliance to date. Let me type in this.

So, today I'll be going -- just a brief overview of the requirements of the statute, the compliance statistics, and we'll be receiving updates from non-compliant agencies.

As a reminder, there are four components of AB 1747.

One prohibits CLETS subscribers from using information other than criminal history submitted through the system for immigration enforcement purposes. A second prohibits CLETS subscribers from using the system for purposes of investigating violations of Section 30 -- or I'm sorry, 1325 of Title 8 of the United States Code if a violation of that section is the only criminal history in an individual's record. Third, CLETS users must include a purpose code with each CLETS inquiry. The options are C for criminal justice, I for immigration enforcement, and U for investigating violations of the specified United States Code. And, lastly, it authorizes DOJ to conduct audits to ensure compliance with the statute.

2.3

To date, DOJ's main focus has been ensuring that CLETS subscribing agencies have implemented solutions capable of submitting purpose codes and that their CLETS users have been submitting valid purpose codes with each applicable transaction.

Quick update. In our last meeting, we were at about 88 percent compliance. We are currently at 95 percent of CLETS subscribing agencies are submitting purpose codes with all applicable transactions, which is phenomenal. We have two percent of agencies who are submitting purpose codes with some transactions, but not all. And, we have about three percent who have not yet started

submitting purpose codes but are actively working on it.

In late May, we reached out to the approximately five percent of agencies that are not yet compliant for an update. We asked them to explain the compliance delay and provide an update on implementation efforts, including estimated completion date, by either appearing today or providing an implementation plan letter. We have three agencies who are joining us virtually today. This is where I'm going to ask you to -- to bear with me as I get them situated.

I want to obviously, take the time to thank all of them for taking the time to present. The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department set up their virtual meeting for us, so we are going to start with them. Now, bear with me while I get everybody up here. I'm going to be using a speaker. The room is not set up for virtual meetings, so kind of had to patch some things together. Okay. Okay. What's up? Okay. Let me see. Acting Captain Peterson, can you hear us?

Captain Peterson: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Tackett: Lovely. Okay. I am going to try and put you up to the microphone of the speaker, and we'll put you (inaudible) have feedback. Okay. If you want to go ahead and get started. And Acting Captain Peterson with Los Angeles Police Department, we would very much

appreciate it. So take it away.

2.3

Captain Peterson: Thank you, Jaime, and good morning, everyone. My name is James Peterson. I'm the acting captain for the LA Sheriff's Department's IT Section. And I'm also the agency CLETS coordinator for our agency. I'd like to introduce Captain David Saum (phonetic) and Lieutenant Marshall Yelbertson (phonetic). They manage our Communication Fleet Management Bureau, which oversees our CAD system and (inaudible) system (inaudible) progress with the modernization (inaudible).

Ms. Tackett: Are you still there? Did we lose
you?

Captain Peterson: Yeah, I'm still there. I'll -
(Call-in Speaker was Inaudible)

Ms. Tackett: We're not going to be able to hear
you guys on our side. Would you mind just --

(Call-in Speaker was Inaudible)

Ms. Tackett: Would it be easier if we started with another agency?

Captain Peterson: Yeah, you might as well do that, and we'll figure out what's going on on their end and we'll get you updated on (inaudible).

Ms. Tackett: Okay. Great. Los Angeles School

Police Department is next. Here we have Deputy Chief and
Technology Sergeant (inaudible).

Good morning. (Inaudible) Deputy Chief and Male: Technology Sergeant with Los Angeles School Police Department, and I oversee our Administrative Services Bureau. I'm not sure if our (inaudible) sergeant is on, but I can provide you updates on our status. And in the (inaudible) you're compliant with (inaudible) our department contacted our current systems manager to try to access or update our existing systems. Due to the (inaudible) system, we are unable to upgrade the purpose code sections that are required by mandate. And then we have gone with a new vendor what are in the current stages of making sure that we do have connection and functionality (inaudible) would be (inaudible). expected timeline to have that complete was July of 2022. We are currently not at that mark yet with the vendor. They are in the second (inaudible) by September of 2022.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Tackett: Wonderful. Thank you so much. I'm sorry. I had to find (inaudible) the right -- to unmute myself. Thank you very much. Just to reiterate the (inaudible) -- just to reiterate, they expect to be compliant by the end of September. Do you have any questions for Los Angeles School Police Department?

Sheriff Honea: Kory Honea for the California State
Sheriff's. Just because I couldn't hear -- so, if I
understand correctly, their current system won't support

it, so they are in contract with a new vendor to provide 1 2 a new system that will support it? Tackett: Correct. 3 Ms. 4 Sheriff Honea: Okay. Thank you. 5 Ms. Tackett: You're welcome. Okay. Thank you --Chief Dominic: Jamie, I just have one --6 Tackett: -- very much, Deputy Chief. 7 Ms. Male: Thank you. 8 9 Tackett: Acting Captain Peterson, would you Ms. 10 like to try again? 11 (Call-in Speaker was Inaudible) 12 Chief Dominic: You know what you could do, Jamie? 13 (Call-in Speaker was Inaudible) Chief Dominic: Excuse me? Jamie? 14 15 Ms. Tackett: Yes? Male: Great, thank you, Deputy Sheriff. 16 17 Ms. Tackett: Hold -- hold -- hold on just one 18 second. We're having some trouble hearing you, so we actually -- give us just one second here. 19 20 Chief Dominic: Jamie, since we're having 21 difficulties hearing them, and I see that we have two in 22 writing from City of Glendale and the City of Napa Police 23 Department --24 Tackett: Uh-huh. Ms.

Chief Dominic: -- with the exception of Los Angeles

25

2.3

-- was it Sheriff? Just kind of reiterated what we suspected they're doing --

Ms. Tackett: Uh-huh.

Chief Dominic: -- I think that suffices, and I'll open that up to the committee and let them know -- LA to send us the letter so we have it in writing what their plan is like we have for both of these. I think that would suffice.

Ms. Tackett: Okay.

Chief Dominic: But I'm going to open it up for comments with the committee on the two letters that we have here.

Ms. Tackett: Okay.

Chief Dominic: Because we're having trouble hearing.

Ms. Tackett: I'm just going to let them know
(overlapping).

Chief Dominic: Oh, there's more than two for all the letters that we have here.

Ms. Tackett: Okay. We're having technical
difficulties on our side, so I'm going to touch base with
you guys after the meeting --

Chief Dominic: Give me this one.

Ms. Tackett: -- LA Sheriff and LAPD, I'm very sorry, but we are having a lot of trouble hearing you

guys on our side, so is it okay if I follow you -- follow up with you after the meeting and we can talk? All right. Sorry about that. We tried.

2.3

Okay. I do have information about the agencies that provided an Implementation Plan Letter. We received letters from five agencies, which I will show here.

Okay. We received them from Glendora PD, Monrovia PD,

Mountainview PD, Napa PD, and San Gabriel PD. We also received one from LA School PD who did speak, but you'll -- we also have their information in writing. That is not yet on the Attorney General's website because we received it a little bit late, but we will be posting it on the website within the next few days for both the letters from LA School PD and Napa PD. The rest are currently available on the Attorney General's website at the link that's listed up here.

Today I would just like to highlight a few things.

Glendora, Monrovia, and San Gabriel have technical issues with specific forms. This means that most of their queries have been submitted with purpose codes and they are only missing purpose codes on specific types of queries. They became aware of these issues only recently and immediately started working with their vendors.

Glendora expects to remedy the issue by the end of August, Monrovia by the end of September, and San Gabriel

is still waiting for an estimated completion date from their vendor.

2.3

Mountain View and Napa have been working diligently with their vendors as well, and they are close to implementing their system solutions that will enable them to submit purpose codes, which they have not yet been doing. As noted here, Mountainview expects to implement this week and Napa by the end of July.

DOJ will be following up with each agency as the estimated completion dates pass, and each non-compliant agency will also be asked to submit a progress update quarterly, which will be shared at the CAC meetings. With that being said, thank you all for your time. Do you have any questions for me?

Chief Dominic: Please share.

Sheriff Honea: Yes, Kory Honea. So, first off, with reference to the City of Glendora's letter --

Ms. Tackett: Uh-huh.

Sheriff Honea: -- in the second paragraph, it states, this is the first time we were informed that we were not in compliance after testing with JDIC Los Angeles County connection and through our CAD RMS vendor, Spillman, the same group that AB 1747 had informed us that we were in compliance in July of 2021. I know how disconcerting it is when you're the head law enforcement

agency to receive notice that you're not in compliance --

Ms. Tackett: Of course.

2.3

Sheriff Honea: -- especially when you weren't previously aware of the issue, so I'm wondering if you can speak to why they were making the assertion that they weren't given advanced notice and where that miscommunication lies, so that if there's an area that can be improved upon, we can do that?

Ms. Tackett: Absolutely.

Sheriff Honea: Yeah.

Ms. Tackett: So, we rely on reports that we're able to pull through CLETS. We look at transactions that are coming through for set periods of time. We run general searches on them to see how the purpose codes are coming in, if they're coming in, and whether they're valid. So, at the time -- as we run reports, as we go along, Glendora had not had issues, up until -- we discovered the issue in, I believe, early May -- late April, early May. And we reached out to them as well as the other three agencies that had just become aware of it -- Monrovia and I don't remember -- San Gabriel.

Sheriff Honea: Uh-huh.

Ms. Tackett: And because they were isolated -they were buried, the forms were buried in their coding,
it only presented within that April and May time is when

the issue popped up. And so, as soon as we became aware 1 of it, we let them know and included them in this round of compliance updates. We're doing that regularly, and 3 we'll continue to do that to make sure that if issues are arising with agency systems, we are flagged on it so that 6 we can let the agencies know about it. 7 Sheriff Honea: Okay. So --Tackett: Because the agencies just weren't 8 aware because it was such specific forms. 10 Sheriff Honea: Okay. So if I understand correctly, 11 it was working fine for a while --12 Ms. Tackett: Yeah. 13 Sheriff Honea: -- and then it stopped working and that's when you notified them? 14 15 Ms. Tackett: Yes. 16 Sheriff Honea: And is that the same with regard to 17 Monrovia Police Department? 18

Tackett: Yes, Monrovia and San Gabriel.

Sheriff Honea: Okay. So this could -- and we're dealing with technology --

Tackett: Yes. Ms.

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Sheriff Honea: -- and what we saw a moment ago how fragile --

Temperamental --Tackett:

Sheriff Honea: -- technology can be.

1 Tackett: -- yes. Ms. 2 Sheriff Honea: And so this could happen to anybody 3 Tackett: Uh-huh. 4 Ms. 5 Sheriff Honea: -- where you think everything's 6 going fine, and then an issue comes up. So, in no way 7 should it be considered, you know, punitive for us to notify them that we need to fix a problem. 8 9 Tackett: Agreed. Ms. 10 Sheriff Honea: Okay. Thank you. Tackett: Yes. We just -- we want to kind of 11 Ms. 12 act as a pointer for you guys, too. Sheriff Honea: Sure. 13 14 Tackett: If there's any issues, we just want 15 to be kind of a backup to help you notice. 16 Sheriff Honea: We appreciate that. Thank you. 17 Ms. Tackett: Yeah. You're welcome. 18 Chief Dominic: And I thank you, Sheriff. And with that, Jamie, I would say, you know, the contents is 19 20 important. 21 Tackett: Yeah. Ms. 22 Chief Dominic: You know, there's non-compliance and 23 having a plan to get there versus something that just 24 happened like this --

25

Ms.

Tackett: Yeah.

Chief Dominic: -- which is more of a, you know, it happened after they were already doing what they were supposed to be. So, thank you for that. I appreciate that.

Ms. Tackett: Okay.

2.3

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Jamie.

Ms. Tackett: Yep.

Chief Dominic: Appreciate the update.

Ms. Tackett: Sure.

Chief Dominic: And I also want to make sure that I ask, is there any public comment to that agenda item we just discussed? Okay. Hearing none, we'll go to the next. Thank you. Thanks again, Jamie.

So, we have a new service application that will require a vote on today's agenda, so, Maria, can you please present the application?

Ms. Cranston: Yes, thank you. We received an application for the Lathrop Police Department, which was initially supposed to take effect July 1st. Then, later, it was July 28th. They moved it up a couple days. But it's for the City of Lathrop, the police department in San Joaquin County.

They are qualifying as a Class One Agency, which means their primary function is law enforcement. And they qualify under California Code -- Penal Code § 830.1.

And their primary functions are civil authority of government responsible for maintaining public order and safety, enforcing all laws, and preventing, detecting, and investigating criminal activities within the City of Lathrop. They do have peace officers and are proposing to have a total of 33 peace officers. They will access CLETS behind the Ripon Police Department's message switch, and they are applying for access with Mobiles, CAD, and RMS system. They are only requesting two mnemonics because they will be pooling their mnemonics, and they are asking for full access and entry and inquiry-level access for all of their databases. And staff recommends approval.

Chief Dominic: Approval for this agency requires a vote. Is there any discussion from the members surrounding this agency? Hearing none, before we ask for a motion, is there any specific public comment? Okay. Hearing none, do we have a motion from the committee?

Sheriff Honea: A motion -- Honea.

Chief Dominic: Thank you.

Chief Hillman: Hillman second.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. We have a second.

Maria, please initiate a roll call for the -- for this application.

Ms. Cranston: Okay. Sheriff Honea?

Sheriff Honea: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Andrew White?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Chief White: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Hillman?

Chief Hillman: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Donald O'Keefe?

Chief O'Keefe: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Ray Diggins?

Chief Diggins: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Greg Park?

Mr. Park: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: And Chief and Chair Joe Dominic?

Chief Dominic: Yes.

14 Ms. Cranston: Okay. Motion passes.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. We also have upgrade applications approved by DOJ. For the next item on the agenda, I'll turn over to Maria to present the upgrade applications that have been approved by DOJ.

Ms. Cranston: Okay. I'll read off the list of applications that DOJ has approved. They do not require a vote, as DOJ has already approved them, but it's being presented for informational purposes only.

We had Apple Valley Unified School District Police

Department in San Bernardino County, the Dos Palos Police

Department in Merced County, Hesperia Unified School

District Police Department in San Bernardino County, the
Lodi Police Department, San Joaquin County, Modoc County
Sheriff's Office in Modoc County, Pomona Police
Department in Los Angeles County, San Francisco County
District Attorney's Office, San Francisco County
Sheriff's Office, and San Francisco Police Department,
all three in the San Francisco County. San Joaquin
District Attorney's Office in San Joaquin County, the
South Pasadena Police Department in Los Angeles County,
and lastly, the Yolo County Health and Human Services
Special Investigations Unit in Yolo County.

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria. Any public comment regarding that or -- I probably should ask for the members first. Any comments from the committee members? Any public comment? Hearing none, we'll go to Client Reports.

Maria, please provide us with the Client Reports' information.

Ms. Cranston: Thank you.

We have two Client Reports for open session.

The first one is the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office. This agency was non-compliant with encryption requirements, as they did not encrypt criminal justice information that was in transit to the Coroner's Office, the Probations Office, and the District Attorney's

Offices. As of December 20th, 2021, this agency has installed the required encryption on the network for the three sites. Agency is now compliant and will be removed from future agendas. A copy of their final compliance letter has been included in each member's folders.

2.3

And then the second agency is the Solano County
Sheriff's Office. This agency was found to be noncompliant in six areas. At the last meeting, two had
remained -- event logging and encryption between the jail
management system, traffic traversing of land link
between the sheriff's remote locations and their Claybank
(phonetic) campus. As of November 2021, a security
information and event management system was implemented,
which resolves the event logging issue, and the work to
encrypt the jail management system traffic between the
server and the user was also completed. The agency is
now compliant in both areas and will be removed from
future agendas. A copy of their final compliance letter
is included in each member's folders.

Chief Dominic: Thank you, Maria. Any comments from the committee members? Any public comment? Hearing none, before we go into closed session, Maria, please present the information about the closed session.

Ms. Cranston: Okay. Pursuant to Government Codes Sections 11126, Subsection C-18, a closed session is

1 being conducted in order to review detailed client 2 reports regarding specific matters that pose a threat or potential threat of criminal activity against CLETS 3 and/or CLETS data transmitted between the DOJ and 4 5 specific client law enforcement agencies. 6 Chief Dominic: Before we take a vote, I just wanted 7 to ask if there's any public comments prior to us doing 8 so? Hearing none, Maria, please initiate a roll call vote. 9 10 Cranston: Okay. We're going to vote to go to 11 12 Male: (Overlapping). Cranston: -- go to closed session. 13 14 Chief Dominic: Good thank you. Cranston: Sheriff Honea? 15 Ms. 16 Sheriff Honea: I vote that we go to closed session. 17 Ms. Cranston: Okay. Chief White? 18 Chief White: Yes. Ms. Cranston: Chief Hillman? 19 20 Chief Hillman: Yes. 21 Ms. Cranston: Chief O'Keefe? 22 Chief O'Keefe: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Greg Park?

Chief Diggins: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Chief Diggins?

2.3

24

25

Mr. Park: Yes.

2.3

2.5

Ms. Cranston: And Chief and Chair Joe Dominic?

Chief Dominic: Yes.

Ms. Cranston: Okay. We're going to go ahead and go into closed session.

(Off the Record)

Chief Dominic: Please re-open the session. Maria, please present the information in for the closed session.

Ms. Cranston: A closed session was held pursuant to Government Code Section 11126, Subsection C-18. The committee received status reports regarding specific matters that pose a threat or potential threat of criminal activity against CLETS and/or CLETS data transmitted between the DOJ and specific client law enforcement agencies, where the disclosure of these considerations could compromise the security of CLETS or the transmitted CLETS data. The committee evaluated the status of compliance efforts and action was taken to resolve the issues.

Chief Dominic: Okay. So, thank you, Maria. And so, we'll go to our next agenda item, Members' Reports. For the Members' Reports, as I call on each member, please provide the report for the agency in which you are representing on the committee. Let's start off with Sheriff Honea.

Sheriff Honea: I have no report, Mr. Chairman.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Chief Bonini? Oh, he's

not here. That's right. Chief White?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Chief White: Nothing to report.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Chief Hillman?

Chief Hillman: Nothing to report.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Chief O'Keefe?

Chief O'Keefe: Nothing to report.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Chief Diggins?

Chief Diggins: Nothing to report.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Greg Park?

Mr. Park: Committee Member Greg Park. Yes, sir.

Chief Dominic: Thank you.

Mr. Park: On behalf of California Police Chiefs and Sheriff's Data Sharing Task Force, we continue to thank DOJ and their support on the California Master Offense Code Development. That working group focused on getting a -- what we call a gold standard for all offense codes in California in one technology database. It continues to progress. The working group that DOJ has put together has completed the Penal Code, and they are very close to completing the Vehicle Code, with significant help from CHP. Thank you. And they'll continue to look at the several other dozen California codes as they progress, but we know that the two major

ones, Penal Code and Vehicle Code are almost fully complete and available for digital download. If you're doing a new RMS system or a new Case Management System, the goal was that this master offense code table would be your source to help us streamline all of the justice data transmissions for offense codes across California. So, again, thank you, Joe, for the work your team does to support this project.

2.3

2.5

Chief Dominic: And thank you, Greg. And thank you for all the work that you did to drive the project. So, I appreciate your force of nature on that to get it done. Thank you very much, Greg. And I have no report. So, good with that, okay.

So, next agenda item, CAC Discussion/Open

Forum/Public Comment. For this next item on the agenda,

I would first like to open it up to the committee to

discuss any other items you may want to discuss related

to CLETS. I'm going to just open that up to you. Yes,

Chief White?

Chief White: Thank you, Chair. Chief White. As Greg mentioned, the Data Sharing Task Force, it's actually been renamed now to the Justice Information Sharing Workgroup. We appreciate DOJ's support. We're getting it back going again, focusing on some items that are related to CLETS.

The second thing is, I wanted to extend my appreciation to you and Maria, and your team for the ASAP to PSAP work. I'm sure we'll discuss it more in the future, but I think it represents the forward-looking nature of you and your staff and will obviously benefit many agencies. So, more to follow on that.

2.3

Another item that I think we should as a committee, be aware of is Next Gen 9-1-1. They're doing some sort of procurement for some data sharing stuff, and I think we're going to continue to see, sort of, the lines blurred between CAD and the phone systems. And so, just something we should be aware about in the future.

Perhaps for a future agenda item, we might invite them back once they've got the results back of that procurement and better understand what's going on so we can maintain this system and obviously support them. And that's all I have. Thank you.

Chief Dominic: Thank you. Great comments. Anyone else? Okay. And now I'd like to give any member of the public an opportunity to comment. Hearing none, the next CAC -- or the next meeting will be scheduled sometime in November or December of this year. Staff are currently looking for a date where we have a quorum.

I move to adjourn the meeting. Thank you all for coming and taking the time to come out and participate

Τ	TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
5) ss.
6	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO)
7	
8	This is to certify that I transcribed the
9	foregoing pages 1 to 42 to the best of my ability from an
10	audio recording provided to me by Department of Justice.
11	I have subscribed this certificate at Elk
12	Grove, California, this 9th day of July, 2022.
13	
14	
15	A : . : 201 1611 in
16	Cristina J. Willis
17	Cristina L. Willis
18	Foothill Transcription Company
19	
20	
21	
22	000
23	
24	
25	