

COUNTYWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 17, 2007 MEETING

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street, Room 739

Los Angeles, California 90012

MEMBERS PRESENT

Acting Chair: Steve Cooley, Los Angeles County District Attorney

Mark Arnold, Judge, Superior Court

Ray Fortner, County Counsel

Janice Fukai, Los Angeles County Alternate Public Defender

Karl Henry, Indigent Criminal Defense Appointments Program

Anthony Hernandez, County Department of Coroner

Michael Judge, Los Angeles County Public Defender

Lakshmanan Sathyavagiswaran, Los Angeles County Coroner

Robert Taylor, Los Angeles County Chief Probation Officer

ALTERNATES

Clayton Anderson for Jeanne Kennedy, County Quality & Productivity Commission

Mark Arnold for J. Stephen Czuleger, Presiding Judge, Superior Court

Mark Arnold for Steven Van Sicklen, Supervising Judge of Criminal, Superior Court

Kenneth Brazile for Larry Waldie, Undersheriff

Ed Brekke for John Clarke, Superior Court Executive Officer

Randy Budd* for Margaret York, County Office of Public Safety

Doyle Campbell for William Fujioka, County Chief Executive Officer

Marv Cavanaugh for Lee Baca, Los Angeles County Sheriff

Joseph Charney for Zev Yaroslavsky, County Supervisor for the Third District and Chair
of the County Board of Supervisors

Chris Contreras* for Marvin Southard, County Department of Mental Health

Thomas Eckert for Greg Savelli, South Bay Police Chiefs' Association

Xiomara Flores-Holguin for Trish Ploehn, Department of Children and Family Services

Jay Glassman for Cynthia Banks, Department of Community & Senior Services

Briane Grey for Tim Landrum, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration

Pamela Hamanaka for Edmund Brown, California Attorney General

Hayward Harris for Dennis Tafoya, County Office of Affirmative Action Compliance

David McGill* for William Bratton, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department

Nancy McNamara* for J. Stephen Tidwell, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Sally Meloch for Thomas O'Brien, U.S. Attorney's Office

William Montgomery for Dave Lambertson, County Internal Services Department

Patrick Ogawa for Jonathan Fielding, County Department of Public Health

Steven Olivas for Antonio Villaraigosa, Mayor, City of Los Angeles

Robert Philibosian for Ronald Ikejiri, Economy and Efficiency Commission

Wilson Poon for Karen Sisson, Los Angeles City Chief Administrative Officer

Wendell Roberts* for John Torres, U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms

Buren Simmons for David Brewer, Los Angeles Unified School District

***Not a designated alternate**

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

Rockard Delgadillo, Los Angeles City Attorney
Gary Dominguez, California Highway Patrol
Sally Flowers, California Contract Cities Association
Jon Fullinwider, Los Angeles County Chief Information Officer
Gabriella Holt, County Probation Commission
Roger Johnson, San Gabriel Valley Police Chiefs' Association
Sean Kennedy, Federal Public Defender
Richard Kirschner, Judge, Superior Court
Loretta Martin, U.S. Probation Department
Michael Nash, Supervising Judge, Juvenile Court
Don Pedersen, County Police Chiefs' Association
Richard Propster, Peace Officers' Association of Los Angeles County
Darline Robles, County Office of Education
Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles City Council, 11th District
Stephanie Sautner, Judge, Superior Court
Patricia Schnegg, Judge, Superior Court
Robert Todd, Southeast Police Chiefs' Association
Robin Toma, County Human Relations Commission
Adam Torres, U.S. Marshall
Michael Tynan, Judge, Superior Court
Frank Venti, Independent Cities' Association
Mike Webb, County Prosecutors' Association

CCJCC STAFF

Mark Delgado, Executive Director
Kenna Ackley
Vincent Holmes
Cynthia Machen
Craig Marin

GUESTS/OTHERS

Larry Blanton, LAPD Crime Lab
Keith Bushey, District Attorneys Office Law Enforcement Liaison
Beth Hansen-Owens, LAPD
Michael Hillmann, LAPD Management Training Bureau
Jitahadi Imara, Probation Department
Lisa Kahn, District Attorney's Office Forensic Science Advisor
Steve Kawamura, County Chief Executive Office
Dennis Kottel, LAPD Management Training Bureau
Anthony Marsh, Children's Planning Council
Greg Matheson, LAPD Crime Lab
Bruce Staniforth, Economy and Efficiency Commission
Robert W. Taylor, Sheriff's Department Crime Lab
John Thompson, District Attorney's Office

I. CONVENE / INTRODUCTIONS

Steve Cooley, Los Angeles County District Attorney

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 noon by Los Angeles County District Attorney Steve Cooley, Acting Chair of this meeting of CCJCC.

Self-introductions followed.

II. REVIEW / APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Steve Cooley, Los Angeles County District Attorney

There were no requests for revisions to the minutes of the meeting on September 19, 2007. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

ACTION: The motion to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2007 meeting was seconded and approved without objection.

III. PROPOSITION 69 IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

Lisa Kahn, Forensic Science Advisor, District Attorney's Office

Lisa Kahn, Forensic Science Advisor of the District Attorney's Office and Chair of the Proposition 69 Implementation Task Force, appeared before CCJCC to request that a proposed revision to the use of the Proposition 69 DNA Reimbursement Fund be submitted to the County Board of Supervisors for approval.

When Proposition 69 (DNA Fingerprint, Unsolved Crime and Innocence Protection Act) was approved by California voters in November 2004, the new law established a County DNA Reimbursement Fund (Government Code Section 76104.6) that receives one of every 10 dollars collected on every fine, penalty, or forfeiture imposed for criminal offenses (including Vehicle Code violations, but excluding parking tickets).

During the first two years of implementation, the State of California received 70% of the fees collected under Proposition 69. Currently, 50% of the collections deposited into the DNA Reimbursement Fund remain with the County (about \$3 million), and this will increase to 75% (about \$4.5 million) next year and will remain at that percentage each year thereafter.

The local funds available through the DNA Reimbursement Fund may be used for the collection of offender samples and the processing, analysis, tracking, and storage of DNA crime scene samples.

Until now, the funds have been used exclusively to reimburse local law enforcement agencies for the cost of collecting DNA samples (at a rate of \$30 per sample). However, as the amount of local revenue available increases, there will be more funds available.

At the October 3, 2007 meeting of the Proposition 69 Implementation Task Force, the members voted to approve a new proposal for the use of local DNA Reimbursement Funds. The key provisions are as follows:

1. Law enforcement agencies and the Probation Department will continue to be reimbursed \$30 for each sample that they collect. (Estimated Amount: \$1.3 - \$1.8 million per year.)
2. The Information Systems Advisory Body (ISAB) will receive up to \$250,000 per year to cover maintenance fees for the DNA Offender Tracking System (DOTS). This includes the following:
 - a. Database server (hardware and software);
 - b. Application server (hardware and software);
 - c. EMC Centera storage for RAP Sheets (hardware and software); and
 - d. Programming and application support (personnel).
3. The remainder of the funds will be divided equally between the Sheriff's Department and Los Angeles Police Department crime labs for costs associated with the analysis of DNA evidence. These costs may include equipment, training, reagents and supplies, contractual services, DNA evidence storage, and personnel. (Estimated Amount: \$2 - \$2.5 million per year.)

A question was raised as to whether revenue from the DNA Reimbursement Fund can be used to support training in DNA cases for judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. Ms. Kahn stated that the funding could not be used for this purpose as the law is currently written.

A motion was made to approve the new proposal for the use of DNA Reimbursement Funds for submission to the County Board Of Supervisors.

ACTION: The motion to approve the new proposal for the use of DNA Reimbursement Funds for submission to the County Board of Supervisors was seconded and approved without objection.

IV. VIRGINIA TECH MASS SHOOTINGS

Deputy Chief Michael Hillmann, Los Angeles Police Department

Deputy Chief Michael Hillmann of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) appeared before CCJCC to make a presentation on lessons learned from the Virginia Tech killings that occurred earlier this year.

On April 16, 2007, a student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) killed 32 people and wounded 17 others on campus. At the request of the Governor of Virginia, a commission was created to assess the emergency response to this incident. Much of the presentation today has been taken from that commission's findings, but Deputy Chief Hillmann also visited the college himself and met with local officials.

Virginia Tech consists of 2,600 acres, 329 major buildings (150 on the main campus), 28,000 registered students (9,000 residing in campus housing), and 13,000 full/part-time employees.

The student that committed the killings, Seung-Hui Cho, was 23 years old, South Korean, an undergraduate English major, and he lived on campus. He used two firearms in the shootings; one was purchased online and another was purchased from a local gun store.

Mr. Cho killed the first two people at a dorm facility at 7:15 a.m. and the remaining victims at a second building across campus over two hours later. Based on initial reports, the Virginia Polytechnic Police Department (VTPD) and Blacksburg Police Department (BPD) investigated the first shooting as a possible domestic violence incident.

In between shootings, Mr. Cho mailed a video of himself and written statements to NBC News. During the shootings at the second building, Mr. Cho shot and killed himself.

It has since been determined that Mr. Cho had shown previous signs of mental problems and maladaptive behavior. For example, in 2005, two female students had made complaints against Mr. Cho for stalking.

In addition, he voluntarily sought counseling in December 2005. A temporary detention order was obtained against him and he was found to be “mentally ill and an imminent danger to himself and others”. However, Mr. Cho was released shortly thereafter on the condition that he seek professional counseling.

The commission appointed by the Governor of Virginia issued a series of recommendations based on their review of Virginia Tech shootings. The recommendations covered the following categories:

1. Emergency Planning
2. Campus Alert
3. Police Training
4. Information Privacy
5. Gun Purchases
6. Murderers In The Dorm
7. Emergency Services
8. Chief Medical Examiner
9. Cho's Mental Health
10. Immediate Aftermath

One of the lessons from a tactical standpoint is the importance of having a unified command so that multiple agencies that arrive and self-deploy are coordinated and utilized effectively. Similarly, adequate communication among all emergency responders is critical in volatile circumstances such as that encountered at Virginia Tech.

One problem that was experienced in response to the shootings was that television media broadcast information that could potentially have compromised the law enforcement response. Media need to be kept out of unsecured areas while law enforcement operations are ongoing.

From a positive standpoint, the establishment of a family collection center where families of victims could be brought together proved to be an effective means of providing information and counseling to loved ones of the victims.

Deputy Chief Hilmann complimented the VTPD and BPD for their quick response to the shootings. He observed that one of the primary means for preventing a repeat of this event is to identify troubled individuals that display warning signs of potential violent behavior. Once identified, treatment and follow-up services need to be provided.

Within the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Police Department is actively involved in Operation Safe Schools. However, there are a number of private schools in the city that may not be adequately prepared for violent incidents on their campuses. This is an issue concerning school safety that will need to be addressed locally.

ACTION: For information only.

V. JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Jitahadi Imara, Deputy Director of Special Services, Probation Department

Jitahadi Imara, Deputy Director of Special Services of the Probation Department, appeared before CCJCC to present the annual report on Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) programs in the County of Los Angeles.

The JJCPA efforts consist of the following three Initiatives:

- (1) Mental Health Services;
- (2) High-Risk/High-Needs Youth Services; and
- (3) School and Community-Based Services

Under these Initiatives are the following eleven programs:

- (1) Inside Out Writers;
- (2) Special Needs Court;
- (3) School-Based Probation Supervision;
- (4) Mental Health Screening & Assessment;
- (5) After-School Enrichment;
- (6) Multi-Systemic Therapy;
- (7) Youth Substance Abuse Intervention;
- (8) High Risk/High Needs;
- (9) Abolish Chronic Truancy;
- (10) Gender Specific; and
- (11) Housing-Based Day Supervision

These programs target youth at different stages of their involvement with the juvenile justice system. As examples, Abolish Chronic Truancy is a pre-arrest prevention program, Youth Substance Abuse Intervention is a post-arrest intervention program, and High Risk/High Needs is an aftercare program.

Under JJCPA, each program is mandated to be measured according to the following six outcomes:

- (1) Increase in the successful completion of probation;
- (2) Increase in restitution payments;
- (3) Increase in community service;
- (4) Decrease in arrests;
- (5) Decrease in incarcerations; and
- (6) Decrease in probation violations

Statistics show that arrests of youth in all JJCPA programs, excluding Mental Health, have been lower in the past three years than a comparison group of non-JJCPA youth. This is also true for incarcerations.

During the past two years, high school participants in JJCPA School-Based programs have had a better attendance rate than a control group used for comparison, as well as a lower rate of probation violations and a higher rate of successful completion of probation (the latter is true for the last three years). Similar trends can also be seen with middle school students in JJCPA School-Based programs.

Finally, while the arrests of high school and middle school students in JJCPA School-Based programs have been close the number for the control group, the recent trend for the JJCPA students is downward. The Probation Department will be working with the RAND Corporation and other JJCPA participating agencies to determine what factors have been determinative in the successful years.

Mr. Imara thanked the County Board of Supervisors, JJCPA agencies and providers, community-based organizations, schools, law enforcement agencies, parents, and members of CCJCC for their continued collaboration with the Probation Department in making the JJCPA programs successful.

ACTION: For information only.

VI. OTHER MATTERS / PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no additional matters or public comments.

VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Steve Cooley adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m. The next CCJCC meeting will be held on **Wednesday, November 21, 2007, at 11:30 a.m. in Room 739 of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration.**