

**HICAAP PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE
July 14, 2004**

Notes

In attendance:

Lt. Mico Robles, LASD, IRC, Chair John Aerts, LASD & ISAB Henry Arevalo, LASD, Records Cpt. Anthony Argott, LASD, IRC Peter Bokots, LAPD Larry Bryant, LASD Tyrone Colgrove, Sup. Crt.	Gary Cooper, Calif. Dept. of Justice Lori Dery, District Atty. Andrew Goldman, Alt. PD Laura Hickman, RAND Dan Jeffries, LA City Atty. Jan Maurizi, District Atty.	Anna Pembedjian, 5 th District Dominic Rivetti, District Atty. Peggy Shuttleworth, CCJCC Doug Smith, Calif. Dept. of Justice Mark Tajima, CAO LaCarla Williams, Probation Craig Marin, CCJCC
---	--	--

I. CONVENE/INTRODUCTIONS

Lieutenant Mico Robles convened the meeting. Self-introductions were made.

II. HICAAP PROCESS

Flowchart

At the last meeting, a flowchart was distributed that depicts the HICAAP process for situations where the defendant is Self-Declared Foreign Born (SDFB), and those situations where the defendant is Non-Declared Foreign Born (NDFB). The flowchart was created in response to the meeting that John Aerts and Peggy Shuttleworth had with the Law Enforcement Services Center (LESC).

LAPD

The LAPD appears to be receiving all of the appropriate notifications with both SDFB inmates and NDFB inmates. One reason why this is working effectively is that the LAPD has a Central Records Unit.

The electronic detainer goes to the booking facility, so they know that they have a hold. The response that comes back on an NDFB inmate goes into the Central Records location for the LAPD, and that response informs the recipient that the LESL should be contacted in order to obtain the detainer. The Central Records office is doing that, and they are notifying the Records and Identification Unit to enter the hold into the booking system.

Prosecutor

One issue that still needs to be resolved is that of notifying the District Attorney's Office that there is a hold in place. There is nothing in the filing packet that states that there is a federal detainer on the individual.

III. AUTOMATED CHANGES / ENHANCEMENTS

Since the last HICAAP meeting, the California Department of Justice has removed the flag that indicates that the defendant is a previously deported criminal alien. Therefore, the State rap sheet no longer contains that flag, but it does contain the arrest information and the charge that Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) submitted to the State of California. This is registered in the Consolidated Criminal History Reporting System (CCHRS).

As of June 15, 2004, the State of California has started sending automated fingerprints straight through the Federal Automated Fingerprint Information System (IAFIS). The result is that information on a person arrested locally will be in the local, state, and federal fingerprint databases.

IV. RAND PROCESS EVALUATION

RAND is in the process of revising the initial draft of the Process Evaluation. Members who have not responded with comments on the draft were asked to do so. It was also advised that, as the report is not yet final, the draft should not be distributed outside of this steering committee.

V. PROSECUTION UPDATE

This item was tabled until a future meeting.

VI. MOU – SHERIFF / BICE

The Board of Supervisors has not yet voted on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would allow the Sheriff's Department to conduct ICE interviews. The vote has been reset to August 3rd. There are a number of questions from the Board that the Sheriff's Department is preparing answers for.

If it is approved, the Sheriff's employees who will be conducting the interviews will have to pass a background check required by the federal government.

VII. DAX ACCESS

If the MOU is approved, the Sheriff's employees who will be doing the interviews will need to get DAX access from ICE. This is an issue that will need to be worked out among the participating agencies.

VIII. DISPOSITION OF ICE INTERVIEWS

An effort is being made to improve our understanding of when voluntary removals, formal deportations, and federal prosecutions occur with respect to the individuals who are referred to ICE.

A second issue concerning this is the ability to collect the information statistically. The Sheriff's Department does not receive the disposition, although each subject can be manually reviewed in DAX. ICE will be contacted to determine if they collect this information, or, alternatively, if they have disposition forms that can be reviewed.

IX. LAW ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Thus far, only LAPD's procedures have been reviewed. The Chair of the Police Chiefs' Association (PCA) has stated that he is willing to send a letter (drafted by CCJCC staff) to all PCA members requesting that they designate an individual to work with the HICAAP Steering Committee. These individuals will assist us in revising the procedures of all 47 police agencies.

X. OPEN DISCUSSION

Several suggestions were made for determining the percentage of detainers that are issued automatically versus those that require a telephone call to the LESC. One suggestion is to contact all 47 police agencies to find out. However, this may be very time consuming. A second suggestion is to ask LESC to collect this information for a period of one month. A third suggestion is to compare the automated holds that the Sheriff's Department receives with the notices that tell the Sheriff's Department to call LESC. These various options will be further investigated to determine which method is the most efficient means for obtaining the information.

XI. ADJOURN/NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 11, 2004, at 2:00 p.m., in Room 739 of the Hall of Administration.