

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

--o0o--

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PROCEEDINGS

CLETS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Held on

JULY 6, 2017

1:00 p.m.

at

FOLSOM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

50 NATOMA STREET

FOLSOM, CA 95830

Transcribed by: MARY ELLEN EDD, CSR 9755

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS
1107 2nd St., Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-498-9288

A P P E A R A N C E S

--o0o--

JAMES MELE, Tuolumne County Sheriff, California State Sheriff's
Association, Chair

LEE SEALE, California State Association of Counties, Vice Chair

SCOTT HOWARD, California Highway Patrol, Chief, Information
Management Division

CYNTHIA RENAUD, California Police Chiefs Association, Chief,
Folsom Police Department

MARK PAZIN, Government Office of Emergency Services, Chief, Law
Enforcement Branch

MIKE CARROLL, California Peace Officers Association, Chief,
Newark Police Department

MARC SHAW, California Peace Officers Association, Assistant
Chief, Inland Division, California Highway Patrol

FRANK ALVAREZ, Department of Motor Vehicles, Chief, Investigations
Division

EVERT PALMER, League of California Cities, City Manager, Folsom

JOE DOMINIC, Department of Justice, Chief, California Justice
Information Services Division

MICHELLE M. MITCHELL, DAG, Legal Counsel, CLETS Advisory Committee

KEITH DANN, CLETS Executive Secretary

1 FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA, JULY 6, 2017

2 --o0o--

3 MR. DANN: ... Police Officers Association, Newark Police
4 Department Chief Mike Carroll, congratulations.

5 MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

6 MR. DANN: For the California Department Justice,
7 California Justice Information Services, Chief Joe Dominic?

8 MR. DOMINIC: Here.

9 MR. DANN: And for the California Highway Patrol, Chief
10 Information Officer, Chief Scott Howland.

11 MR. HOWLAND: Present.

12 MR. DANN: For the Office of Emergency Services, Chief
13 Mark Pazin?

14 MR. PAZIN: Here.

15 MR. DANN: For the California State Association of
16 Counties, Vice Chair, Sacramento Chief Probation Officer Lee Seale.

17 MR. SEALE: Here.

18 MR. DANN: For the California Peace Officers Association,
19 Assistant Chief Marc Shaw.

20 MR. SHAW: Here.

21 MR. DANN: Chair Mele, we have a quorum.

22 MR. MELE: Thank you. Again, congratulations Chief
23 Carroll on your new job. It's fantastic.

24 MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

25 MR. MELE: You want to say something about that?

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. CARROLL: Not really. No. I just got appointed
3 Police Chief for the City of Newark , been there 26 years and
4 worked my way up. Most recently commander of -- like I say, pretty
5 much under the department for the last five years, and
6 (unintelligible).

7 MR. MELE: Well, congratulations again. Thank you for
8 being part of our committee also. Thank you.

9 So, a little housekeeping rules. The restrooms are out
10 these doors to the right and make another right, and you'll see
11 them on your left-hand side.

12 Those that will be addressing either from the committee
13 from the dais or from the pulpit down here, please use your
14 microphone and, if you would, please identify yourself before
15 speaking.

16 At this time, we'd like to -- if you would like --

17 MS. MITCHELL: Pardon me. I'd just like to remind
18 everybody that identifying themselves is optional.

19 MR. MELE: Optional, yes. Thank you very much.

20 So at this time, it is optional if you would like to
21 introduce yourself. And we'll start here.

22 MR. BLAIR: My name is Chris Blair, and I just recently
23 started working for the CLETS Administration Section as an analyst.

24 MR. KENNEDY: Steve Kennedy, CLETS Administration
25 Section.

1 MS. CRANSTON: Maria Cranston, CLETS Administration
2 Section.

3 MS. MITCHELL: Michelle M. Mitchell, Deputy Attorney
4 General.

5 MR. VAUTRIN: David Vautrin, Captain, El Monte Police
6 Department.

7 MR. (UNINTELLIGIBLE): (Unintelligible), City of El
8 Monte.

9 MR. IBBOTSON: Todd Ibbotson, California Department of
10 Justice.

11 MR. SPINELLI: Dave Spinelli, IT manager, Contra Costa
12 County Sheriff's Office.

13 MR. PARK: Greg Park with the Livermore Police
14 Department.

15 MS. LOPEZ: Jody Lopez, Department of Motor Vehicles.

16 MS. TODD-MILLER: Deirdre Todd-Miller, Department of
17 Motor Vehicles.

18 MS. LANG: Wendy Lang, Department of Motor Vehicles.

19 MS. DICKY: Janelle Dicky (phonetic), Department of Motor
20 Vehicles IT.

21 MR. MANCA: Bob Manca, System Exchange vendor
22 representing Peak Performance.

23 MS. FISHER: Connie Fisher, Special Agent in Charge of
24 the Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Justice Services.

25 MR. STOKES: Floyd Stokes and my wife, Blue Lake Police

1 Department, CLETS Officer under Bureau of Indian Affairs.

2 MR. MELE: Thank you. Thank you all for introducing
3 yourself. And at this time, we'll go ahead and have the executive
4 secretary's report.

5 MR. DANN: Okay. From, actually, two meetings ago, we
6 were going to do a comparison of 2015 and 2016. In December, we
7 weren't able to have all of the 2016 data yet. It wouldn't present
8 well, so we're going to go ahead and move forward with that.

9 This section right here, 1.10.1 is when a local law
10 enforcement agency requests the DOJ to do a general search as part
11 of an investigation. They ask us for various reasons. They do
12 diagnostic testing. But of the ones that they reported to us in
13 2015, there was 79 that were done specifically for potential CLETS
14 misuse. In 2016, that number dropped to 46.

15 As you can see, for the no CLETS misuse, there was 72 in
16 2015 and 34 in 2016, and we still have one pending from 2016. Some
17 people might ask why, after seven months, something will still be
18 pending. But as each of you know, within your department, when
19 you're conducting an investigation, sometimes it takes a long time
20 to figure out.

21 Of the CLETS misuse found, there was 7 in '15, and 11 in
22 2016. And, as you can see, those are the actions that were taken
23 by that department for those incidents. As is noted at the bottom,
24 there can be more than one action for each of those. You can
25 counsel somebody and reprimand them, so they don't necessarily

1 always add up.

2 1.10.1 is a report that is to be submitted in February --
3 is it February, Steve, of each year --

4 MR. KENNEDY: February 1st.

5 MR. DANN: -- for law enforcement identifying their
6 investigations they had for the prior year. They are supposed to
7 turn in a report even when there is no misuse found. As you can
8 see, in 2015, we had 845, and in 2016, we had 738, which is
9 obviously a reduction.

10 Just for everybody's edification, we start noticing law
11 enforcement via CLINTERS, which, for a layman, is a notification
12 that drops to their station at different drop printers. And we
13 start that in December, and we submit that weekly to all local law
14 enforcement that they need to turn in this report. They have until
15 March to turn it in. We continue to solicit from agencies, but we
16 don't always get compliance on this.

17 We also post it on CLEW, the form, and we try and let our
18 clients know continuously that they need to fill out this form
19 every year.

20 That being said, of the forms turned into us in 2015, we
21 had 715 no CLETS misuse and 653 in 2016. For CLETS misuse founded,
22 there was 86 agencies that submitted in 2015 and 85 in 2016 which,
23 as you can see, is fairly consistent. Of those, the investigations
24 performed, you can see there were 175 to 185 in 2016, and the
25 actual CLETS misuse founded is the exact same for both years, 117.

1 Now, to put this all in context and, like I said, you can
2 see all the actions there, and they don't necessarily add up,
3 'cause there can be more than one action per misuse found.

4 To put this into context, we ran some other numbers. The
5 next page.

6 The statewide sworn and non-sworn personnel, the
7 statistic that is provided to the Criminal Justice Statistics
8 Center on an annual basis. These are all the law enforcements
9 throughout the State that could potentially have access to CLETS.
10 Of that amount of officers, you can see the inbound message
11 inquiries request. There was 966,000,000 in 2015, and 999,000,000
12 in 2016.

13 So to put this into context, of the general searches that
14 the DOJ performed, there were CLETS misuse found, there was 7 in
15 '15, 11 in 2016. Of the ones where they turn in the form, there
16 was 117 from each year, giving us a grand total of CLETS misuse
17 founded persons, 124 in 2015 and 128 in 2016. And to put that into
18 context, because there's been a lot of public newspaper articles
19 about how bad CLETS misuse is going on by local law enforcement.

20 So to put that into context, we compared what the misuse
21 would be by officer and, actually, by inquiry. And to do that,
22 basically, there is one violation or one officer that is counseled,
23 reprimanded in any of those actions for every 955 for officers in
24 2015, and every one in 930 officers in 2016. Of their queries, you
25 can see there, there's one violation in every 7.8 million inquiries

1 in 2015, and the same amount in 2016 basically, out of those
2 999,000,000 CLETS inquiries that are done every year, one in 7.8
3 million turns into a founded CLETS misuse. I think those are
4 pretty dramatic differences.

5 So that's the report we have for 2015, 2016.

6 In December when we meet, because the form is not turned
7 in until March of the following year, I don't think it would
8 behoove us to have this same report for the December meeting. But
9 we can take a look and see what we can, based on what we know
10 that's coming this year, to present to you.

11 Any questions?

12 (No audible response.)

13 MR. DANN: Thank you.

14 MR. MELE: Thank you. Item 6. Item 6 is upgraded
15 applications. These applications have already been approved by the
16 Department of Justice. However, these applications -- and these
17 applications will not be voted on but are being presented as an
18 information item only.

19 So following agencies, Brentwood Police Department,
20 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Arson
21 Protection, Elk Grove Police Department, Kern County Sheriff's
22 Office, Los Banos Police Department, Orange County Sheriff's
23 Department, San Jose Police Department, Santa Clara County
24 Sheriff's Office, Tehachapi Police Department, Tulare Police
25 Department, Tuolumne County Sheriff's Office, Walnut Creek Police

1 Department.

2 Item 7. This is a new service application. I will be
3 referring it over to CAS manager, Maria Cranston, for a report on
4 this.

5 MS. CRANSTON: Thank you. We currently have two new
6 service applications on the agenda today. The first one is for the
7 United States Department of the Army Satellite Communications, Camp
8 Roberts Police Department. This is a Class-3 agency and authorized
9 through Federal Regulations 10 USC 2672 as well as the U.S. Army
10 Regulation 190-10. This unit's primary function is to provide law
11 enforcement and security to Camp Roberts Satellite Earth Terminal
12 Station at Camp Roberts, California. They're looking to have only
13 one device for two officers, and they are requesting inquiry access
14 to most of the data bases, and staff recommends approval.

15 MR. MELE: Thank you. Board discussion?

16 (No audible response.)

17 MR. MELE: And any public comment on this item?

18 (No audible response.)

19 MR. MELE: Okay. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and have
20 you vote.

21 MR. PAZIN: Do we need a roll call, Mr. Chairman?

22 MR. MELE: No, we do a roll call by member.

23 MR. DANN: Sheriff James Mele?

24 MR. MELE: Yes.

25 MR. DANN: Chief Mike Carroll?

1 MR. CARROLL: Yes.

2 MR. DANN: Chief Joe Dominic?

3 MR. DOMINIC: Yes.

4 MR. DANN: Chief Scott Howland?

5 MR. ALLEN: Yes.

6 MR. DANN: Chief Mark Pazin?

7 MR. PAZIN: Yes.

8 MR. DANN: Chief Lee Seale?

9 MR. SEALE: Yes.

10 MR. DANN: Chief Marc Shaw?

11 MR. SHAW: Yes.

12 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. Item B.

13 MS. CRANSTON: Okay. The second agency is the United

14 States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office

15 of Justice Services, Blue Lake Tribal Police Department.

16 They are applying as a Class-3 agency and qualify under

17 USC 25 2803 as well as 25 CFR, Chapter 1, Subpart C. Their primary

18 function is the enforcement of applicable Federal laws within the

19 exterior boundaries of Blue Lake Rancherias, any other Blue Lake

20 Rancheria property held in trust by the United States. They

21 currently would have two officers accessing CLETS that are SLEC

22 officers and which is a special law enforcement commissioned

23 officers, and they are requesting inquiry access. Staff recommends

24 approval.

25 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. Any discussion from the

1 Board?

2 MR. PAZIN: Question, Mr. Chair. What's the
3 connection --

4 MR. MELE: Would you turn your mic on, please?

5 MR. PAZIN: Mark Pazin, Cal OES, Homeland Security.
6 What is the connectivity with the Humboldt Sheriff?

7 MS. CRANSTON: The connectivity with the Humboldt
8 Sheriff.

9 MR. PAZIN: I mean, are they cross-deputized? Are
10 they -- is this going to be an independent system?

11 MS. CRANSTON: They would be accessing behind the
12 Department of Justice's LEAWEB. But we do have representatives
13 here today. You can come up. In case you have additional
14 questions.

15 MR. DANN: And I just want to confirm, they are POST
16 certified.

17 MR. PAZIN: Okay. I just know from my previous life, I
18 don't know if, Sheriff, if you want to comment, I just want to make
19 sure that everybody was on the same page.

20 MR. DANN: So just some history here. The initial Bureau
21 of Indian Affairs' application for Sycuan --

22 MR. PAZIN: Uh-huh.

23 MR. DANN: -- Police Department was resolved in 2015.
24 There was an amendment to the PPPs that specifically allowed an
25 agency that had POST-certified officers, which was the biggest

1 contention there was, that if a BIA had SLEC officers that were
2 certified POST, that access would be granted.

3 And so the first application for BIA was approved in
4 2015, in December of 2015. So this is just following suit from
5 what this committee did previously.

6 MR. PAZIN: Okay. Prior to my being here. Okay.

7 MR. DANN: Yes.

8 MR. PAZIN: So I'm sure there was continuity.

9 MR. DANN: Yes.

10 MR. MELE: Well, since we do have representation, maybe
11 they can talk about what your original question was with the
12 Humboldt Sheriff.

13 MR. PAZIN: Okay.

14 MS. CRANSTON: Oh, go ahead.

15 MR. STOKES: Floyd Stokes, Chief of Blue Lake Tribal
16 Police, retired Sheriff's Deputy, retired California Police Chief
17 and POST certified.

18 And we're currently in negotiations with the Sheriff's
19 Office for an agreement. Meet with the Sheriff the 12th of this
20 month regarding that. And our access that we're requesting is
21 direct access, not through the Sheriff's Office though.

22 Any other questions on that?

23 MR. PAZIN: Thank you, sir.

24 MR. MELE: Okay. Seeing no other comments from this --

25 UNID. MALE: Mr. Chairman, question?

1 MR. MELE: Yes.

2 UNID. MALE: The last similar application, I know that
3 we've gone through and established some criteria. Does this
4 application meet every single one of those previous criteria, or
5 are there some differences?

6 MR. DANN: It meets the criteria. The only difference
7 with this is they are going to be accessing information via the
8 Department of Justice's LEAWEB, which is the direct interface that
9 allows them. So where before Sycuan went through San Diego, kind
10 of like what you were saying with Humboldt, in this case BIA will
11 be going directly to the information via the DOJ's portal.

12 UNID. MALE: Okay. And is there a difference in
13 information as far as what they can access one direct versus via
14 POST?

15 MR. DANN: There's no difference. But to -- to answer
16 your question, that's the only difference.

17 The other criteria which was a point of discussion was
18 the POST certification.

19 MS. CRANSTON: The only other difference would be through
20 Humboldt County, they would have the ability at some point to
21 possibly have access and mobile access. The LEAWEB, currently,
22 because they're using the desktop version, they don't have that
23 ability. Also, if Humboldt County has any type of county-wide
24 warrants, they would not be able to access that through LEAWEB.
25 Otherwise, it's the same.

1 UNID. MALE: I have one clarifying question. So this is
2 not -- at this point, there's no access through Humboldt. This is
3 strictly through LEAWEB. There's going to be a further discussion,
4 we have to come back then if it goes through Humboldt, or how
5 does --

6 MS. CRANSTON: If -- if they do decide to move toward
7 connectivity behind Humboldt, they would not have to come before
8 the committee. It would just be an upgrade application through
9 DOJ.

10 UNID. MALE: Okay.

11 MR. MELE: Any other questions for the Board? Excellent
12 questions.

13 Any comments from the gallery?

14 (No audible response.)

15 MR. MELE: Okay. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and have a
16 roll call vote.

17 MR. DANN: Sheriff Jim Mele?

18 MR. MELE: Yes.

19 MR. DANN: Chief Mike Carroll?

20 MR. CARROLL: Yes.

21 MR. DANN: Chief Joe Dominic?

22 MR. DOMINIC? Yes.

23 MR. DANN: Chief Scott Howland?

24 MR. HOWLAND: Yes.

25 MR. DANN: Chief Mark Pazin?

1 MR. PAZIN: Yes.

2 MR. DANN: Chief Lee Seale?

3 MR. SEALE: Yes.

4 MR. DANN: Chief Marc Shaw?

5 MR. SHAW: Yes.

6 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. Item 8, is Client Reports.

7 I'm going to again refer to CAS Manager Maria Cranston on the Brea
8 Police Department.

9 MS. CRANSTON: For the Brea Police Department, through a
10 2016 application, we found them to be noncompliant with formal
11 written procedures for immediate destruction, system use
12 notification, as well as validation process for managing system
13 accounts. They have resolved -- let's see.

14 Well, they are proposing to have everything resolved by
15 September 29th. This is their first time reporting.

16 MR. MELE: Any questions from the Board here?

17 (No audible response.)

18 MR. MELE: Any comments from the gallery here?

19 Okay.

20 UNID. MALE: I guess I do have a question.

21 MR. MELE: Yes.

22 UNID. MALE: Do we know what proposed to have resolved
23 means? Does that mean that they believe that they -- it all will
24 be resolved by that --

25 MS. CRANSTON: Yes.

1 UNID. MALE: -- point in time?

2 MS. CRANSTON: Yes. Based on -- they have procedures but
3 they're not formally written procedures, so they plan on having all
4 of that documented and submitted for us to review as well as the
5 system use notification, having that actually implemented and
6 rolled out throughout their network and as well as having a formal
7 validation process for managing system accounts. So all of that,
8 they plan to have that completed by September 29th.

9 MR. MELE: All right. And that is what this vote is for
10 today is to extend it to -- or for the September 29th, correct, for
11 the September 29th deadline?

12 MS. CRANSTON: Yes. And since it's the agency's first
13 time reporting, we actually don't require a vote on this one.

14 MR. MELE: Okay. Okay. Then I misspoke. I apologize.
15 So then that item is completed; is that correct?

16 MS. CRANSTON: Yes. Hopefully, by the next meeting, they
17 will no longer be reporting.

18 MR. MELE: Okay. So we can move on to Item B, Madera
19 County Sheriff's Department?

20 MS. CRANSTON: Yes. So Madera, through a 2015
21 application, we found three areas of noncompliance. They were
22 noncompliant with security and awareness training, and they have
23 since come into compliance with that, so that is no longer an
24 issue.

25 Their second issue was the documentation of the

1 validation process for managing system accounts. They have also
2 brought that item into compliance.

3 And the third item is their message switching -- uh,
4 testing for their direct line, and they propose on having that
5 completed by August 31st of this year. This is the first time
6 reporting also for this agency, so no vote is required.

7 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. Any questions from the
8 Board?

9 UNID. MALE: Yes. So what does this first-time reporting
10 mean versus second-time reporting?

11 MS. CRANSTON: Okay. The process is, once we, through
12 various means, application, audit, FBI audit, things like that, we
13 find an agency to be noncompliant, we identify the areas of
14 noncompliance. They send us an implementation plan. And it's
15 reported to the committee for the first time. Usually no vote is
16 required unless there's an issue with the time frame for
17 compliance.

18 Second reporting, as long as they're on track, no -- no
19 vote's required. However, if they do want an extension, they are
20 supposed to request that in person, and then a vote is taken at
21 that time.

22 UNID. MALE: Okay. Follow-up question if I may.

23 MR. MELE: Yes, sir.

24 UNID. MALE: Will it take an action by this Board to
25 eventually clear them from whatever status, or is that done at the

1 staff level?

2 MS. CRANSTON: What will happen is, once they are
3 compliant with all outstanding issues, we will report at the next
4 CAC meeting to identify they're now compliant with everything and
5 will no longer be reporting. No vote is required. However, you
6 are informed of the status.

7 UNID. MALE: Thank you.

8 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. At this time, we will -- I
9 will turn the comments over to Executive Secretary Dann, as we are
10 going to be going into closed session.

11 MR. DANN: Okay. Pursuant to Government Code
12 Section 11126(c)(18)(a), a closed session is being conducted in
13 order to review detailed client reports regarding specific matters
14 that pose a threat or potential threat of criminal activity against
15 CLETS and/or CLETS data transmitted between the DOJ and specific
16 client law enforcement agencies. This requires a roll call vote
17 and a two-thirds consensus.

18 Michelle, what were you going to say?

19 MS. MITCHELL: I was simply going to remind you that a
20 vote is required.

21 MR. DANN: Yes, thank you.

22 Sheriff Jim Mele?

23 MR. MELE: Yes.

24 MR. DANN: Chief Mike Carroll?

25 MR. CARROLL: Yes.

1 MR. DANN: Chief Joe Dominic?

2 MR. DOMINICK: Yes.

3 MR. DANN: Chief Scott Howland?

4 MR. HOWLAND: Yes.

5 MR. DANN: Chief Mark Pazin?

6 MR. PAZIN: Yes.

7 MR. DANN: Chief Lee Seale?

8 MR. SEALE: Yes.

9 MR. DANN: Chief Marc Shaw?

10 MR. SHAW: Yes.

11 MR. DANN: We have a two-thirds consensus, and we'll be
12 going to closed session and coming out shortly.

13 (Closed session.)

14 MR. MELE: Okay. We are now back from our closed
15 session, and I will defer to Executive Secretary Keith Dann to read
16 the following statement.

17 MR. DANN: The closed session was held pursuant to
18 Government Code Section 11126(c)(18)(a). The CAC received status
19 reports regarding specific matters that pose a threat or potential
20 threat of criminal activity against CLETS and/or CLETS data
21 transmitted between the DOJ and specific clients and law
22 enforcement agencies whether the disclosure of these considerations
23 could compromise the security of CLETS through the transmitting
24 CLETS data. The CAC evaluated the status of the compliance efforts
25 and directed dates by which items need to be resolved.

1 MR. MELE: Okay. Thank you. At this time, members
2 report. Let's start with Chief Pazin.

3 MR. PAZIN: I have nothing to report.

4 UNID. MALE: Nothing.

5 MR. MELE: Okay.

6 UNID. MALE: Nothing.

7 UNID. MALE: Nothing.

8 UNID. MALE: I have one item to report.

9 MR. MELE: Yeah, go ahead.

10 UNID. MALE: And that is something that will impact law
11 enforcement from the standpoint of connectivity long term, and that
12 is First Net. And just remind folks that First Net California is
13 currently doing a number of public workshops across the state and
14 just to encourage folks to ensure that the public safety community
15 takes the time to attend and weigh in to ensure all our needs are
16 met.

17 Obviously, security is key to law enforcement to ensure
18 that agencies can meet CJIS compliance moving forward as that
19 system becomes available. I think it's important for folks to
20 weigh in and ensure they have the opportunity to look at the draft
21 plan, provide feedback so that plan can be updated to meet the
22 needs of California.

23 MR. DOMINIC: Yes, follow-up question. Weren't they
24 going to put a RFO out, RFP I think to, prior to going to First Net and
25 AT&T?

1 UNID. MALE: So as part of the process is First Net put
2 their contract out to AT&T, and then California, actually the
3 Governor, gets to make a selection of opting into the First
4 Net/AT&T plan or looking at an alternate plan. So that's still
5 being entertained as far as putting information out about an
6 alternative plan. And then the Governor will have the opportunity
7 to see both plans and make a choice as far as which direction
8 California will go.

9 MR. MELE: Okay, thank you.

10 MR. PAZIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. And go to the Cal-OES
11 website. We have those workshops that are on the -- our site there
12 up and down the State of California to the Chief's comments.

13 MR. MELE: Okay, thank you. Item 11, Discussion/Open
14 Forum/Public Comment. Anybody from the audience have any
15 comments they would like to bring before the Board?

16 (No audible response.)

17 MR. MELE: Okay. Seeing none, we will now adjourn this
18 meeting. And the next CAC meeting will be scheduled in December of
19 this year, 2017, and we'll go ahead and adjourn the meeting at this
20 time. Thank you all for attending.

21 (Meeting adjourned.)

22 --o0o--

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATION AND

2 DECLARATION OF TRANSCRIBER

3
4 I, MARY ELLEN EDD, CSR, and a duly designated
5 transcriber, do hereby declare and certify under penalty of perjury
6 that I have transcribed recording(s) which total one in number and
7 cover a total of pages numbered 1 through 23, and which recording
8 was duly recorded at Folsom, California, on the 6th day of July,
9 2017, and that the foregoing pages constitute a true, complete, and
10 accurate transcription of the aforementioned recording(s) to the
11 best of my ability within the limits of the quality of the
12 recording.

13 I hereby declare that I am a disinterested person in the
14 above-captioned matter and have no interest in the outcome of this
15 meeting.

16 Dated this 31st day of August, 2017, at Sacramento,
17 California.

18
19 /s/ MARY ELLEN EDD

20 MARY ELLEN EDD, CSR NO.9755
21
22
23
24
25