

COUNTYWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2011 MEETING

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 739
Los Angeles, California 90012

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

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

*Kirk Albanese for Charles Beck, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department
*Francesca Anello for Marvin Southard, Director, County Department of Mental Health
Richard Barrantes for Paul Tanaka, Undersheriff
Ronald Brown, County Public Defender
Betty Chu, Director, Independent Cities Association
Steve Cooley, District Attorney
Xiomara Flores-Holguin for Philip Browning, Director, County Department of Children
and Family Services
Maria Franco for Matthew Cate, Secretary, California Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation
Janice Fukai, Alternate Public Defender
*Jon Goldberg for Tim Landrum, Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Drug Enforcement
Administration
Anthony Hernandez, Director, County Department of Coroner
Christa Hohmann for Gigi Gordon, Directing Attorney, Post Conviction Assistance
Center
Joe Leonardi, President, South Bay Police Chiefs Association
Edward Medrano for Tim Jackman, President, Los Angeles County Police Chiefs
Association
Don Meredith, President, County Probation Commission
William Montgomery for Tom Tindall, Director, County Internal Services Department
Steven Olivas for Antonio Villaraigosa, Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Andrea Ordin, County Counsel
Earl Perkins for John Deasy, Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District
Robert Philibosian for Isaac Barcelona, Chair, County Economy and Efficiency
Commission
Jerry Powers, County Chief Probation Officer
Bruce Riordan for Andre Birotte, U.S. Attorney
Timothy Robbins, Field Office Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
*Christopher Rogers for Lakshmanan Sathyavagiswaran, County Coroner – Medical
Examiner
Patricia Schnegg, Supervising Judge, Criminal, Superior Court
David Singer, United States Marshal
William Sullivan, Chair, County Quality & Productivity Commission
Robin Toma, Executive Director, County Human Relations Commission

*Robin Toma for Cynthia Banks, Director, County Department of Community & Senior Services

Carmen Trutanich, Los Angeles City Attorney

*David Turla for William Fujioka, County Chief Executive Officer

John Viernes for Jonathan Fielding, Director, County Department of Public Health

Mike Webb, County Prosecutors Association

Lance Winters for Kamala Harris, California Attorney General

*Aaron Zapata for John Torres, Special Agent in Charge, U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives

***Not a designated alternate**

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

Lee Baca, Sheriff and Vice Chair of CCJCC

Steve Beeuwsaert, Chief, Southern Division, California Highway Patrol

Michelle Carey, Chief U.S. Probation Officer

Jorge Cisneros, President, Southeast Police Chiefs Association

John Clarke, Superior Court Executive Officer

Paul Cooper, President, San Gabriel Valley Police Chiefs Association

Arturo Delgado, Superintendent, County Office of Education

Lee Smalley Edmon, Presiding Judge, Superior Court

Mitchell Englander, Los Angeles City Council, 12th District

Lois Gaston, California Contract Cities Association

Sean Kennedy, Federal Public Defender

George Lomeli, Assistant Supervising Judge, Criminal, Superior Court

Steve Martinez, Assistant Director in Charge, Los Angeles Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Michael Nash, Supervising Judge, Juvenile, Superior Court

Charlaine Olmedo, Supervising Judge, North Valley - San Fernando, Superior Court

Ezekiel Perlo, Directing Attorney, Indigent Criminal Defense Appointments Program

Richard Propster, Peace Officers Association of Los Angeles County

Richard Sanchez, County Chief Information Officer

Miguel Santana, Los Angeles City Chief Administrative Officer

David Wesley, Assistant Presiding Judge, Superior Court

CCJCC STAFF

Mark Delgado, Executive Director

Cynthia Machen

Craig Marin

GUESTS/OTHERS

Kenna Ackley, County Chief Executive Office

Haroon Azar, Department of Homeland Security

Dr. James Barger, Department of Public Health, SAPC

Hellen Carter, Probation Department
Joseph Charney, Third District, County Board of Supervisors
Richard Fajardo, Second District, County Board of Supervisors
Maryam Fatemi, Department of Children and Family Services
John Gutierrez, Los Angeles School Police
Sharon Harada, Probation Department
Scott Henderson, Aladdin Bail Bonds
Denise Herz, California State University, Los Angeles
Alex Johnson, Second District, County Board of Supervisors
Victoria Lane, Quality and Productivity Commission
Cookie Lommel, AFSCME Local 685
Desiree Crevecoeur-MacPhail, UCLA-ISAP
Ted Marquez, U.S. Attorney's Office
Jorge Morales, First District, County Board of Supervisors
Cal Remington, Probation Department
Jorge Reyes, City of Los Angeles, Mayor's Office
John Ruegg, Information Systems Advisory Body
Jose Sanchez, Aladdin Bail Bonds
Gary Schram, Los Angeles City Attorney's Office
Elan Shultz, Third District, County Board of Supervisors
Peter Shutan, L.A. City Attorney's Office and Probation Commission
Cheri Thomas, Los Angeles Unified School District
Jaclyn Tilley Hill, Quality and Productivity Commission
Michael Tynan, Judge, Superior Court
Curtis Woodle, Los Angeles Police Department
Steven Zipperman, Los Angeles School Police

I. CONVENE/INTRODUCTIONS

Zev Yaroslavsky, County Supervisor, Third District

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 noon by Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chair of CCJCC.

Supervisor Yaroslavsky thanked the members and staff of CCJCC for their participation and commitment. He noted that this committee has made significant contributions to the county and the criminal justice system in the past 30 years, and he congratulated all of the individuals that have been a part of this success.

In the coming year, the county criminal justice system will continue to address the challenges posed by implementation of public safety realignment. Supervisor Yaroslavsky stated that this will be an important issue for him during his tenure as chair of CCJCC.

Supervisor Yaroslavsky introduced new Los Angeles County Chief Probation Officer Jerry Powers. He also introduced Lance Winters, Senior Assistant Attorney General representing California Attorney General Kamala Harris.

Self-introductions followed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Zev Yaroslavsky, County Supervisor, Third District

There were no requests for revisions to the minutes of the November 2, 2011 meeting. A motion was made to approve the minutes.

ACTION: The motion to approve the minutes of the November 2, 2011 meeting was seconded and approved without objection.

III. LOS ANGELES COUNTY CROSSOVER YOUTH INITIATIVE

Sharon Harada, Deputy Chief, Juvenile Field Services Bureau, Probation Department

Sharon Harada, Deputy Chief in the Juvenile Field Services Bureau of the County Probation Department, appeared before CCJCC to provide an update on the Los Angeles County Crossover Youth Initiative.

Ms. Harada thanked Supervisor Yaroslavsky and the County Board of Supervisors for their leadership and support with this project. She also thanked each of the partner agencies that have worked with the Probation Department on the Crossover Youth Initiative.

Ms. Harada introduced Densise Herz, Ph.D., of the California State University Los Angeles School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics. Professor Herz served as the program researcher for this project.

Crossover youth are those youth who experience maltreatment and engage in delinquency (also known as Dually-Involved Youth). They are more likely to penetrate deeper into the delinquency system than non-crossover youth and they have poorer outcomes as well.

Assembly Bill 129 (AB 129), which passed in 2005, allows counties to develop a local dual-jurisdiction protocol to designate certain youth as having dual status; that is, dependency and delinquency concurrent jurisdiction.

Section 241.1 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) provides statutory authority for the joint assessment and dual supervision process.

Since 2008, the county has worked with Georgetown University in the implementation of a crossover youth practice model. This joint effort is referred to as the Georgetown Collaborative.

To implement the Crossover Youth Initiative, Judge Michael Nash, Supervising Judge of Juvenile, convened a Crossover Committee consisting of the Probation Department, Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, Children's Law Center, and the County Counsel. Judge Nash serves as chair of the committee.

Dr. Herz reported that a sample of 163 crossover youth in the county revealed that they were evenly split between males and females. Among African-Americans, 56% were females. Throughout the country, there are generally a higher percentage of females among crossover youth than in delinquency alone.

Other characteristics of crossover youth that were found in the sample indicate that 9% of males and 21% of females were not enrolled in school; 49% of males and 59% of females had special education needs (often due to behavioral issues rather than a learning disability); 53% of males and 62% of females had drug use history; 41% of males and 54% of females lived in a group home at the time of arrest; and 41% of males and 42% of females had a violent offense charge (typically assault of some type).

Both the males and females had an average of six years in DCFS care. Males had an average of seven prior placements and females had an average of six prior placements.

The main components of the Crossover Youth Initiative's Enhanced Model include the following:

- Utilization of an enhanced Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) approach to jointly develop recommendations to court in order to determine which status will best serve the interests of the youth, considering community safety and the victim;
- Achievement of an integrated continuum of treatment services and care through the utilization of the enhanced MDT model to coordinate multi-agency case management services;
- Leveraging of resources through cross-systems assessment, case planning, and treatment services delivery;
- Addressing gaps/needs in the current Joint Assessment investigation process; and
- Service linkage navigation predicated on case identified strengths, risks, and needs.

Dr. Herz listed the following intended outcomes of the Enhanced Model:

- A decrease in crossover youth who receive delinquency wardship (WIC 602) and lose their WIC 300 (dependency) status;

- An increase in crossover youth who receive informal probation outcomes or dual status (WIC 300/602);
- No net widening – i.e., no increase in the use of the wardship status (with or without the 300 status);
- Increase in identification of youth/caregiver specific services related to treatment and supervision; identification of service area gaps; and
- A decrease in recidivism.

The results indicate that the Enhanced Model has met the intended outcomes and that the crossover youth being served by the MDT have fared better than comparable crossover youth that have not been served by the MDT.

The MDT made a total of 1,305 recommendations for 165 crossover youth (approximately 8 recommendations per youth). The breakdown of the recommendations were as follows: 27% of the recommendations were related to education; 18% were related to behavioral/social interventions; 15% were related to mental health needs; 12% were related to placement needs; 12% were related to supervision needs; 10% were related to further assessment; and 6% were related to substance abuse.

In terms of recidivism, the MDT crossover youth had a 42% recidivism rate one year post disposition, while comparable non-MDT crossover youth had a recidivism rate of 54%.

Dr. Herz listed the following accomplishment of the program to date:

- Dual status was successfully integrated into disposition options without causing net-widening (i.e., a reduction in informal probation options);
- Improved communication and collaboration across multiple agencies;
- More efficient handling of crossover youth (i.e., one judge in each court is now responsible for all crossover cases); and
- More effective handling of crossover youth (i.e., preliminary evidence that recidivism – new arrests – are reduced for crossover youth who are processed by the MDT compared to those handled traditionally).

The next steps include expansion of the Dual Status Project and Enhanced MDT Model countywide, improve access to appropriate services, improve permanency options for these youth, examine and address issues that account for the correlation between group homes and delinquency referrals, and continue to improve early identification and seamless handling of crossover youth across systems.

Cheri Thomas of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) suggested having a representative from schools on the Crossover Committee and also inquired as to how many juveniles have been served by the program.

Dr. Herz stated that schools have had representation on the Crossover Committee at different times. As the program is expanded into areas covered by LAUSD, she stated that they will ensure that representation from LAUSD is included in the discussions. With respect to the number of juveniles that have been served, there have thus far been just over 200 crossover youth. On average, there are approximately 1,200 crossover youth in the county each year.

Anthony Hernandez, Director, County Department of Coroner, inquired as to whether substance abuse specialists are included in the MDT. Dr. Herz stated that there are a number of challenges to doing this, but that she hopes that substance abuse specialists will be more effectively included in the future.

ACTION: For information only.

NOTE: During this presentation, Supervisor Yaroslavsky left the meeting and Los Angeles County District Attorney Steve Cooley served as Acting Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

IV. PROPOSITION 36 STEERING COMMITTEE

Judge Ana Maria Luna, Chair, Proposition 36 Executive Steering Committee

Judge Ana Maria Luna, Chair of the Proposition 36 Executive Steering Committee, appeared before CCJCC to provide an update on Proposition 36 and current issues affecting the program.

As background, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (SACPA), known as Proposition 36, went into effect on July 1, 2001. This change in law allowed criminal defendants who are convicted of a non-violent drug offense to be placed in drug treatment as a condition of probation.

UCLA-ISAP Report

UCLA Integrated Substance Abuse Programs (UCLA-ISAP) recently released a study on Proposition 36 that covers the two Fiscal Years 2008 through 2010. Judge Luna reviewed the following key findings from this report:

- A total of 13,241 sentenced participants were sentenced by the Court, ordered by Parole, or referred from out-of-county to participate in Proposition 36.

- A total of 15,635 defendants were given assessment and treatment referral services by the CASCs (this does not count the participants that returned to the CASCs). The difference in the numbers was that this total includes people who were previously sentenced but hadn't made it to the CASC.
- 13,992 individuals were admitted to community-based programs for treatment services. The overall show rate for treatment during those two years was 89.5%.
- The approximate relative proportion of participants by gender has remained steady over the years with males over 75% and females under 25%.
- With respect to ethnicity/race of participants, Hispanics/Latinos were the largest participant group, followed by Whites and African Americans.
- Methamphetamine was the primary drug of choice reported by participants, with 39.4% in FY 2008-09 and 42.6% for FY 2009-10.
- Throughout the two fiscal years, the largest number of participants were assessed and provided treatment services in SPA3 (San Gabriel Valley, with 20.2% for FY 2008-09 and 21.6% for FY 2009-10).
- Of 6,614 participants completing treatment, a total of 5,701 (86.2%) also petitioned the Court and had their cases dismissed.
- The report concluded that significant and meaningful improvements in client outcomes (e.g., drug use behaviors, medical problems and treatment, illegal activities and involvement in the criminal justice system, psychiatric illness and treatment, and engagement in social support) were noted for this population across two fiscal years.
- Overall, treatment appears to reduce drug use and its negative effects (like physical health problems), as well as improve areas that may help to promote the health of the participant (like medication compliance) or increase the likelihood of the maintenance of the positive results obtained through treatment (e.g., social support activities).
- A drop in funding for treatment during the two years of the study did not seem to impact the outcomes for this population. Rather, the only impact of this decrease in funding was a reduction in the number of individuals who were able to take advantage of the services, particularly among clients who were homeless at treatment admission.

The full report can be found online at: http://www.ccjcc.info/cms1_169882.pdf.

Funding Reductions

Judge Luna stated that one of the issues affecting Proposition 36 is that of funding reductions.

The drop in funding noted in the UCLA-ISAP report increased since the years covered by the study. Initially, the law creating Proposition 36 provided that \$120 million for treatment services be allocated annually, statewide, for five years. During this time, total SACPA funding for Proposition 36 in this county was about \$30 million per year.

However, following those initial five years, Proposition 36 received a number of budgetary cuts and state funding allocated to the counties for SACPA was eliminated in July 2009. As a direct result of the budget cuts, dedicated Proposition 36 courts in the county were also eliminated in 2009.

Substance Abuse Offender Treatment Program (OTP) funding was made available through the Byrne/Justice Assistance Grant (JAG), but that funding ended September 30, 2011.

PC 1210 Program

As of October 1, 2011, due to the sunset of state funding, Los Angeles County uses a client-fee based system to fund SACPA treatment services. This is referred to as the Penal Code 1210 (PC 1210) program.

The PC 1210 program is self-supporting through the collection of participant fees. There are no state or county funds available for this program.

The standard enrollment fee is adjusted as recommended by Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (SAPC) and participants may be charged based on their ability to pay. Fees may be waived for participants who are deemed to be indigent.

The maximum number of days for primary treatment remains at one-hundred-eighty (180) days with no continuing care. Treatment services have been reduced to two levels (outpatient and intensive outpatient). If a participant required residential services or detoxification services, the CASC may provide a referral for such services, but the cost of these services is the responsibility of the participant, unless he/she is deemed indigent and/or placed under an alternative funding source.

Judge Luna stated that it has been reported that after weeks of not being able to successfully place PC 1210 participants in treatment, some Judges are apparently sentencing PC 1210 participants to 20 Narcotics Anonymous meetings or some other alternative which, upon completion, the Court may consider closing the participant's case.

In addition, many indigent PC 1210 participants are placed onto “alternative sources of funding” (General Relief, Drug Medi-Cal, Block Grant funds, and CalWORKs). SAPC and providers project that by early Spring some of these alternative funding sources will be exhausted and will no longer be able to accept any new participants for the balance of the fiscal year.

Impact of Funding Reductions

As an example of the impact on Proposition 36 from funding reductions, Judge Luna noted that there were 10,358 admissions in the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 and 4,802 admissions in Fiscal Year 2009-2010. This represents a reduction of 53.6% in admissions between the two years.

Impact of Public Safety Realignment

Another issue that may affect the future of all substance abuse treatment service programs in the county is public safety realignment, which went into effect on October 1, 2011.

Under realignment, many sentenced individuals are no longer facing a state prison sentence. Instead, non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders that would previously have been sentenced to state prison are sentenced locally to county jail or alternative custody.

Non-violent drug offenders that have been the target population for Proposition 36, drug court, and specialized drug court programs may opt for custody over drug treatment if they believe custody time will be limited.

While information is mostly anecdotal at this time, it does appear that the number of individuals opting for drug treatment programs – including Proposition 36, Drug Court, the Co-Occurring Disorders Court, and the Women’s Reentry Court – is being affected by realignment.

Judge Luna stated that the Proposition 36 Steering Committee, along with the Drug Court Oversight Committee and the committees overseeing the specialized drug courts, will be carefully monitoring referral rates in the coming months to determine what impact public safety realignment is having on participation. CCJCC will be kept regularly informed on this issue.

Mr. Cooley made a motion that the Proposition 36 Executive Steering Committee and the Drug Court Oversight Committee, which are both standing subcommittees of CCJCC, convene a joint working group to develop recommendations for addressing the declining referrals to drug treatment programs in the county.

ACTION: The motion to convene a working group consisting of both the members of the Proposition 36 Executive Steering Committee and the members of the Drug Court Oversight Committee was seconded and approved without objection.

V. IMPROVEMENTS IN MEDICATION ASSISTED THERAPY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSERS

John Viernes, Jr., Director, Substance Abuse Prevention and Control,
Department of Public Health

John Viernes, Director of Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (SAPC) of the Department of Public Health, appeared before CCJCC to make a presentation on medication assisted therapy for substance abusers.

Medication assisted therapy for substance abusers began in the 1960's with the introduction of Methadone. Other medications have been attempted for use but until recently most have not been prescribed for addictions treatment. In addition, the reviews for Methadone have been mixed and many treatment providers do not use it due to the potential for abuse.

During the past 18 months, SAPC has had a pilot program in which the medication Vivitrol has been used to treat alcohol and opioid dependence. Vivitrol, which is manufactured by Alkermes Pharmaceutical Company, was initially used for alcohol addiction, which it received approval for in 2006. However, it was subsequently approved for opioid addictions as well in October 2011.

UCLA-ISAP has reviewed and evaluated the pilot program. Mr. Viernes introduced Desiree Crevecoeur-MacPhail, Ph.D., from UCLA-ISAP to provide more information.

Dr. MacPhail stated that Vivitrol is an opioid receptor antagonist that blocks the mu-opioid receptors in the brain. Mu-opioid receptors are responsible for the "high" or "buzz" individuals feel when the alcohol is consumed. Vivitrol is an injectable extended release version of Naltrexone.

The injection of Vivitrol is performed once a month by a medical professional and does not require any further action on the part of the individual until the next injection. This provides an advantage over other medications that require the individual to take a pill daily; specifically, the individual may forget to take the pill or may choose to stop taking the medication.

Documented benefits of Vivitrol include reducing the number of risky and heavy drinking days as well as general improvement in quality of life.

In evaluating the pilot project, UCLA-ISAP investigated whether clients remained on Vivitrol beyond the first dose and whether staff knowledge and attitudes toward medication assisted treatment improved. Dr. MacPhail noted that Naltrexone tends to

have low continuation rates due to side effects.

During the 18 month pilot, Vivitrol was used at the Tarzana Treatment Center, Behavioral Health Services, and Prototypes.

Treatment Outcome Data was collected from the Los Angeles County Participant Reporting System (LACPRS). Information on patient responses to Vivitrol was collected through the Medically Assisted Treatment Survey (MATS) and Urge to Drink Scale (UDS). A Counselor Attitude Survey was used to determine whether views had changed regarding the use of medication assisted therapy.

Dr. MacPhail reported that counselor attitudes did improve over the course of the project and that many who initially reported neutral or negative attitudes towards medication-assisted treatment in general or Vivitrol in particular reported positive attitudes on the follow-up survey.

Participant demographics reveal that over half (53%) of participants were white, 32% were Hispanic/Latino, and nearly 10% were African American. The number of males and females was roughly equal.

Overall, 41.1% (164) of participants received one dose only, 22.6% (90) received two doses only, 12.3% (49) received three doses only, and 24% (96) received four or more doses. The maximum number of doses that were received was 12.

The study found that Vivitrol significantly reduced the urge to drink between the first and second week, and then the urge continued to decrease through week four.

Most of the side effects (i.e., fatigue, headache, injection site reaction, and nausea) occurred in the second week. The side effects significantly declined in the weeks thereafter.

Dr. MacPhail stated that the study showed positive medication continuation rates. Other findings showed a notable reduction in primary drug use between admission and discharge (in past 30 days), higher abstinence rates among Vivitrol treatment clients compared to the county average, higher engagement rates among Vivitrol treatment clients compared to the county average, and higher completion rates among Vivitrol treatment clients compared to the county average.

Elan Shultz from the Office of the Third District of the County Board of Supervisors inquired as to whether the county average includes all treatment providers. Dr. MacPhail confirmed that it does.

Dr. MacPhail discussed several anecdotal success stories of individuals that have successfully ended their addictions with the help of Vivitrol.

She listed the following conclusions from the pilot program:

- Vivitrol increased the number of clients who complete treatment in detoxification, outpatient counseling, and residential treatment programs;
- Vivitrol decreased substance use in outpatient counseling and residential treatment; and
- Vivitrol increased treatment engagement (outpatient and residential) and treatment continuance for residential treatment.

A next step in the study will be to assess these findings against a non-equivalent comparison group. This involves looking at outcomes of clients with a similar background and comparing them to the Vivitrol group. An additional next step is to assess urges once Vivitrol is no longer being taken. This will examine how clients fare in treatment once they are no longer taking the medication.

Dr. James Barger of SAPC responded to a question about Naltrexone by noting that taking it orally on a daily basis has a low continuation rate due to the side effects. One of the advantages that Vivitrol has over this method is that the once a month injection reduces the frequency of the side effects.

Mr. Viernes stated that Vivitrol is not yet available through the Court ordered alcohol programs. SAPC just recently received a grant to implement Vivitrol in the drug courts.

Dr. Barger emphasized that the injections must be performed by medical personnel. Treatment providers that do not have medical staff on site may need to contract with those that do. He also noted that Vivitrol is not recommended as a “magic bullet,” but rather is to be used in conjunction with existing treatment.

ACTION: For information only.

VI. EMPOWERING LOCAL PARTNERS TO PREVENT VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Bruce Riordan, Special Counsel to the U.S. Attorney, Central District of California

Bruce Riordan, Special Counsel to the U.S. Attorney, Central District of California, appeared before CCJCC to present a White House report entitled, “Empowering Local Partners To Prevent Violent Extremism In The United States.”

Mr. Riordan reminded the committee that this region of the country is a target for international terrorism. An example of this was the foiled millennium plot to bomb LAX. National Security is therefore an issue of concern for national, state, and local entities working in this county.

Outreach and prevention on the local level is an important part of the country's national security strategy. This report, released August 2011, details approaches for how federal, state, and local governments can work together in this effort.

Mr. Riordan stated that his office stands ready to assist this committee on any matters of national security that it seeks to address.

The report can be found online at: http://www.ccjcc.info/cms1_170211.pdf.

ACTION: For information only.

VII. OTHER MATTERS/PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no additional matters or public comments.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.