

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
For July 13, 2017 Meeting

Department of Consumer Affairs
1625 North Market Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95834

Industry Members Present

Simon M. Cruz, Jr. (Firearm/Baton Training Facilities)
Marcelle L. Egley (Repossessor Industry)
Sandra L. Hardin (Locksmith Industry)
Matthew J. Lujan (Private Patrol Operator/Security Guard Industries)
Tim B. Westphal (Alarm Industry)
Roy Rahn (Proprietary Industry)

Public Members Present

Nancy Murrish
Stan Perez
Eli Owen
Anton Farmby

Department of Consumer Affairs Representatives

Dean R. Grafilo - Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs
Shela Barker - Legal Counsel

Bureau Staff Present

Laura Alarcon -Chief
Clarisa Serrato-Chavez -Deputy Chief
Samuel Stodolski -Deputy Chief
Antoine Hage-Policy & Administration Manager
Tammy Gasper –Enforcement Manager
Adrienne Avitia -Policy Analyst
Cha Xiong- Policy Analyst
Justina Binsfeld-Staff Services Analyst

Minutes Taken By

Adrienne Avitia

1. Call Meeting to Order

Meeting called to order by Bureau Chief Laura Alarcon.

2. Introduction and Swearing in of Advisory Committee Member Eli Owen, Anton Farmby and Roy Rahn by Department of Consumer Affairs Deputy Director Dean Grafilo.

DCA Director Dean Grafilo administered the Oath of Allegiance and swore in Eli Owen and Anton Farmby as the new public members and Roy Rahn as the new industry member, representing the proprietary private security industry, to the Committee.

3. Roll Call/Establish Quorum

Roll was taken and 10 committee members were present. Quorum was established and Chief Alarcon noted the meeting official start time as 10:22 AM.

4. Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2017

Matthew Lujan made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 12, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting. Stan Perez seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed on a 10-0 vote.

Committee Comment on the Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2017:

None

Public Comment on the Approval of Minutes from January 12, 2017:

None

5. Bureau Chief's Welcome Remarks/Bureau News and Updates

Licensing Update: Chief Alarcon began her update by sharing that in fiscal year (FY) 2016/2017, BSIS received approximately 79,000 initial applications for licensure and nearly 100,500 applications for renewal, which equated to an average of about 6,500 initial applications and 9,300 renewal applications each month. She noted that approximately 80% of Initial Security Guard applications and 52% of Renewal Security Guard applications were on BreEZe. Chief Alarcon noted the BreEZe participation rates for other Bureau license types were much lower, but that there has been a steady increase from the last calendar year.

Chief Alarcon spoke about the benefits of BreEZe and noted that, in general, individuals who submit their applications via BreEZe are licensed sooner than those who submit paper applications. The shorter timeframes are attributable to such factors as eliminating the need for the fee payment to be processed by the Department's Cashiering Office, and Department of Justice/FBI fingerprint responses being able to synchronize automatically with the application if the applicant has no criminal history records and the personal identifier information entered by the Live Scan Operator matches the personal identifier information entered by the applicant into BreEZe.

While the average processing time for an employee registration application is 60 days, in the case of a BreEZe application that has no inconsistencies between the Live Scan information and the application information and the applicant has no criminal history record, the issuance of the registration can occur in a couple of days. Chief Alarcon also noted that a significant BreEZe benefit for both company and employee renewal applications is the ability for the BreEZe system to renew the license/registration in real time.

Chief Alarcon also shared that the Firearms Permit Initial Application and Firearms Permit Renewal Application had been updated and were scheduled to be released during the month.

She noted that the revisions were to prepare for the new requirement that goes into effect on January 1, 2018, relating to security guards seeking an initial firearms permit completing a written assessment, as well as the changes in regulations relating to the prohibition of firearms simulators for initial qualification and limitation of firearms simulators for the qualifications required to renew a firearms permit. Chief Alarcon stated the Bureau issued letters to all firearm training facilities and instructors advising them of the changes in the applications and requirements.

Enforcement Update: Chief Alarcon stated that since January, the Bureau's Enforcement staff have conducted over 60 compliance inspections of Private Patrol Operator, Alarm Company Operator and Repossession Agency licensees, and Firearms Training Facility certificate holders. She noted the Bureau was still compiling FY 2016-17 data, but that based on a cursory review the Bureau received approximately 1,300 complaints, opened 760 investigations, closed 200 complaints, and closed 660 investigations. The investigation closure data included investigations closed by both Bureau Enforcement staff and the Department's Division of Investigation.

Chief Alarcon highlighted three cases where the Bureau worked with the Department's Division of Investigation to successfully pursue criminal charges against individuals for carrying out unlicensed activities. The first case, which involved a BSIS Security Guard registrant operating as a Private Patrol Operator (PPO) without a license, was referred to the Stanislaus County District Attorney's office for prosecution May. The second case involved an individual who had his PPO license revoked in 2015. Upon the Bureau becoming aware that the individual was continuing to provide unlicensed PPO services, it worked with the Division of Investigation to have the Contra Costa District Attorney's Office file criminal charges against the individual. The third case involved an individual who was providing private investigator (PI) services without a PI license after he was issued an administrative fine and citation. Upon learning the individual was continuing to operate unlicensed, the Bureau sought the assistance of the Division of Investigation to issue the individual multiple misdemeanor citations.

Lastly, Ms. Alarcon shared that the Bureau opened about 120 cases with the Attorney General to take formal disciplinary action on a licensee and revoked 176 licenses through the administrative process. Additionally, 1,853 applications for licensure were denied, primarily due to criminal convictions issues, and 462 licenses were automatically suspended or revoked.

Legislative Update: Chief Alarcon provided a summary of the assembly bills and senate bills moving through the legislative process that impact the Bureau and/or the industries regulated by the Bureau.

1. Assembly Bill 290 would make permanent the exemption for dealers of agricultural and construction equipment to carry out repossession activities without holding a Repossession Agency license, under specified conditions. The exemption was first

established in 2013 by AB 1877 and scheduled to be repeated on January 1, 2018.

2. Assembly Bill 580 would authorize a Private Patrol Operator license to be held by a business organized as a Limited Liability Company. Ms. Alarcon noted that the legislation had been designated a two-year bill, which meant that no further action would be taken on the bill in 2017.
3. Assembly Bill 1616 would prohibit a city or county to assess a civil penalty or fine against an alarm company operator or alarm agent for a false alarm if the cause of the false alarm is not attributable to the alarm company or agent improperly installing the alarm system, or a defective alarm system. The bill would not require the Bureau to investigate or adjudicate any cause of action relating to penalties imposed by local jurisdictions against an Alarm Company or its employees.
4. Senate Bill 420 would clarify that criminal history information provided by the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to specified authorized entities includes sentencing information, if applicable. Ms. Alarcon noted that the legislation was introduced in response to a DOJ determination in March 2016 that that law did not provide the explicit authority for the release of sentencing information. She also noted that the Bureau is authorized by law to receive criminal history information from the DOJ on its applicants for licensure.
5. Senate Bill 559 would extend the sunset date for the authorization of a Private Investigator (PI) license to be held by an entity organized as a Limited Liability Company (LLC) until January 1, 2021. In addition, the bill would add new reporting requirements for PI licensees organized as an LLC relating to claims pending and paid on their insurance policy, and would require every PI licensee at the time of license renewal to indicate if they intend to reorganize as an LLC during the next-year term of the license. It also would require the Bureau to post the claim data information and the PI licensee's intent to reorganize as an LLC on the Department's public License Search website. Lastly, the bill would clarify the education credits that could be applied toward the experience requirements for eligibility to take the PI Qualified Managers Examination.
6. Senate Bill 800 would make various changes to the Business and Professions Code including several relating to the Practice Acts regulated by the Bureau. It would eliminate the requirement that the expiration date of the Bureau qualifying license/certificate/registration associated with a Bureau firearms permit be synchronized with the expiration date of the firearms permit. Second, it would clarify that the automatic renewal disclosure that must be provided to consumers entering into an alarm agreement only applies to residential agreements.

Senate Bill 1196 Budget Change Proposal: Chief Alarcon noted that SB 1196, which was signed into law in 2016, had a provision that goes into effect on January 1, 2018. Specifically, a security guard applying for an initial firearm permit will need to complete a written assessment to demonstrate they possess appropriate judgement, restraint and self-control for the purposes of carrying a firearm while on duty. The Bureau submitted a legislative budget change proposal (BCP) for additional staff to handle the new workload and it was approved as part of state's 2017-18 budget process. The BCP provides the Bureau with the authority and funding for two Program Technician II positions and one Staff Services Analyst position. The two Program Technicians will monitor applicants' firearm assessment activities and the Staff Services Analyst will serve as the liaison with the third-party vendor to administer the assessment and perform activities relating to appeals from applicants regarding assessment results.

BSIS Outreach Efforts on BSIS Alarm and Locksmith Consumer Brochures: Chief Alarcon commented that an educated and informed consumer is the best defense against being a victim of unlicensed and illegal alarm and locksmith activities and, accordingly, the Bureau continues to seek outreach opportunities to share its Alarm and Locksmith consumer brochures. She noted that the Bureau was scheduled to do presentations and share the brochures during the next northern and southern Assembly District Directors Group and that the Bureau would be reaching out shortly to the Senate Rules Committee shortly to pursue similar efforts in this house.

Staff Updates: Chief Alarcon noted the following staff changes that had occurred since the January 2017 Advisory Committee meeting: Tammy Gasper was hired as the Manager of the Enforcement Unit, Sam Stodolski was promoted to Deputy Chief over the Bureau's Enforcement and Disciplinary Units, and Antoine Hage was promoted to the Manager of the Policy and Administration Unit.

Committee Comment on the Discussion of the Bureau Chief's Remarks/Updates:
None

Public Comment on the Discussion of the Bureau Chief's Remarks/Updates:
None

6. Discussion Regarding BSIS Proposed Fee Adjustments in Response to Independent Audit (Performance and Fee Review – Final Report by CPS HR Consulting)

Chief Alarcon shared that in late 2016, the Department's Budget Office advised the Bureau that the reserve for Private Security Services (PSS) fund, which is supported by license fees from the Locksmith Act, the Proprietary Security Services Act, the Private Security Services Act, and the Alarm Act, was dropping due to the imbalance between license fee revenue collected and the Bureau's expenditures, and was projected to go into the red in two to three fiscal years. She noted that in response the Bureau contracted with CPS HR Consulting to perform an operational audit and that the auditor's findings, which are detailed in the BSIS Performance and Fee Review Audit Report on the Bureau's public website, confirmed a

revenue-expenditure fee imbalance. Specifically, the auditor recommended a 45% overall revenue increase to maintain the solvency of the PSS Fund. Ms. Alarcon noted the factors for the revenue-expenditure imbalance included inflation, the Bureau's costs to carry out new statutory mandates, and the Bureau's costs to transition to BreEZe.

Ms. Alarcon noted the Bureau had been meeting with individuals from the industry associations to discuss the need for the fee increases and the proposed fee amounts. She explained the Bureau was proposing a 35 percent overall revenue increase instead of the 45 percent increase proposed by the auditor. Additionally, the Bureau was proposing a tiered approach for the fee increases, with statutory authority to establish the fees at initial floor amounts and the ability to raise the fees to the ceiling amounts in the future via regulations. Ms. Alarcon commented that for most fees, the proposed floor increase was less than the rate of inflation; in those cases where the proposed fee would be higher than inflation, it was because it needed to be brought into alignment with the fee of comparable license types to ensure one license was not subsidizing another. In a few cases the proposed fee would be less than the current amount.

Committee Comment on the Discussion Regarding BSIS Proposed Fee Adjustments in Response to Independent Audit (Performance and Fee Review – Final Report by CPS HR Consulting):

Member Tim Westphal asked if the proposed fee increases would go into effect on January 2018. Chief Alarcon clarified that if legislation is enacted this year, the Bureau is proposing to have a delayed operative date and the fee amounts would go into effect on July 1, 2018. If legislation is not enacted until 2018, then the fee amounts would go into effect on January 2019.

Member Stan Perez asked about the renewal cycles, and expressed his appreciation for the Bureau's approach to increasing fees. Chief Alarcon clarified the renewal cycles for the predominant number of fees are every two.

Public Comment on the Discussion Regarding BSIS Proposed Fee Adjustments in Response to Independent Audit (Performance and Fee Review – Final Report by CPS HR Consulting):

Robert C. Smith, Nightclub Security Consultants wanted to voice an opposition to the Proprietary Security Employer fee increase, sharing that some Proprietary Security Employers are small business and it will be a challenge.

7. Update Regarding Outreach Efforts for the BSIS Security Guard Guide

Chief Alarcon provided a brief overview of the Bureau's and Committee's efforts last year to develop the BSIS Security Guard Guide (Guide). She added that because of interest in the Guide, the Bureau tweaked it for use by the public. She introduced Deputy Chief Sam Stodolski.

Deputy Chief Stodolski stated that the Bureau provided the Guide to a Los Angeles Deputy City Attorney who shared it with over 100 Los Angeles County law enforcement officers as part of a routine training program. He also noted that the Guide was shared with the Joint Enforcement Strike Force, which is a coalition of California State agencies, which work in partnership with local and federal agencies to combat the underground economy, and the

California CLETS Users Group (CLETS stands for the California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System). The CLETS Users Group is comprised of about 200 California law enforcement agencies. Lastly, Mr. Stodolski noted that moving forward, the Bureau plans to reach out to other associations related to local and state law enforcement agencies.

Committee Comment on the Update Regarding Outreach Efforts for the BSIS Security Guard Guide:

Member Stan Perez complimented the law enforcement card and stated that he believed it has all of the information that you would need.

Chief Alarcon asked Committee Member Eli Owen if the State Threat Assessment Center (STAC) could assist in the efforts of getting the brochure out to the community. Member Eli Owen noted that STAC has a distribution list comprised of thousands of local law enforcement officers in the state to whom the Guide could be distributed. He also noted that STAC has fusion centers throughout the State where they can provide the opportunity for the Guide to be presented and/or included as part of training that is being offered.

Member Matthew Lujan suggested partnering with California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) program. The program offers an online resource, the POST Learning Portal, to all law enforcement officers which provides valuable training and information.

Member Sandy Hardin asked if the Guide would also cover Locksmith activity, clarifying the license requirements for Law Enforcement. Mr. Stodolski advised that this Guide was specific to security guards. Chief Alarcon took note of the suggestion for possible future discussion.

Public Comment on the Update Regarding Outreach Efforts for the BSIS Security Guard Guide:

None

8. Discussion Regarding Implementation of New Inspection Requirements for BSIS-Certified Firearms Training Facilities per Newly Enacted Business and Professions Code Section 7585.4.1 (SB 1196, Chapter 800 Statutes of 2016)

Chief Alarcon provided a brief statement regarding the new requirement, that went into effect January 1, 2017, for the Bureau to inspect every newly-certified Firearms Training Facility within 120 days of certification. She introduced Enforcement Manager Tammy Gasper.

Ms. Gasper noted that since the new mandate went into effect, the Bureau has carried out compliance inspections on 10 newly-licensed facilities. Ms. Gasper noted that at the time of the inspection most facilities are not conducting business yet or they have provided a few training classes. As a result, the Bureau is using the inspections as an opportunity to educate the facilities on Bureau laws and regulations, as well as respond to any questions the facility

owner/staff may have. She concluded by stating that based on the number of certified firearms training facilities and current number of investigations, the Bureau is targeting to inspect a facility about every three years.

Committee Comment on the Discussion Regarding Implementation of New Inspection Requirements for BSIS-Certified Firearms Training Facilities per Newly Enacted Business and Professions Code Section 7585.4.1 (SB 1196, Chapter 800 Statutes of 2016)

Member Simon Cruz asked how many Bureau staff are present at an inspection. Ms. Gasper responded that staff generally go out alone, unless otherwise assigned. Mr. Cruz also mentioned that indoor ranges do not allow holsters and wanted to know if Bureau-certified firearms training facilities would be penalized for that reason. Deputy Chief Stodolski responded that the Bureau has not seen holsters banned across the board. He added that the Firearms Training Facility Application requires the applicant to specify the shooting range that will be used, and that all Bureau-certified firearms training facilities and instructors are responsible for complying with the laws and regulations relating to firearms qualifications.

Member Stan Perez wanted to know how many current Firearms Training Facility licensees does the Bureau have to-date and how many inspectors are dedicated just to inspections. Deputy Chief Stodolski answered that there are currently approximately 350 licensed facilities and noted that staff is not dedicated only to completing inspections, but are also assigned to investigating complaints. Member Stan asked if under the proposed fee increase the Bureau had any plans to increase enforcement staff to which Chief Alarcon noted that the additional revenue opens up opportunities that have not existed in the past.

Public Comment on the Discussion Regarding Implementation of New Inspection Requirements for BSIS-Certified Firearms Training Facilities per Newly Enacted Business and Professions Code Section 7585.4.1 (SB 1196, Chapter 800 Statutes of 2016):

Bryon Bayer, with SmartGuard Sacramento, commented that it is a licensee's duty to help police its own industry, and that individuals who are aware of licensees or businesses that are not in compliance with Bureau laws and regulations should file a complaint with the Bureau.

9. Update Regarding BSIS Efforts to Reduce Deficiencies in Licensing Applications

Chief Alarcon briefly commented that in past Committee meetings, the Bureau shared suggestions on how applicants could prevent deficiencies and exceptions on their applications but that, as reflected in the recent operational audit, there continues to be a high rate. She noted that deficiencies and exceptions increase the Bureau's licensing workload and, accordingly, the Bureau's operational costs. For this reason, the Bureau was working on identifying strategies to reduce deficiencies. She introduced Deputy Chief Clarisa Serrato-Chavez.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez began her presentation by noting that initial employee applications have an overall 25% deficiency rate, with Security Guard applications and Firearm Permit applications accounting for 25-35% of all deficiencies. Additionally, Security Guard renewal applications have an overall 25% deficiency rate and Firearm Permit renewal

applications have an overall 50% deficiency rate. Ms. Serrato-Chavez noted that addressing application deficiencies creates an additional workload and affects application processing timeframes. She noted that a complete employee application takes, on average, 35 minutes to process whereas the processing of a deficient employee application takes twice this amount of time. Additionally, a complete Firearm Permit application takes, on average, 45 minutes to process while a deficient Firearm Permit application takes, on average, 110 minutes.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez provided a brief overview of the application deficiency process and commented on what the Bureau is doing to try to reduce the deficiency rates including revising application forms. She highlighted the recent revisions to the firearms initial and renewal applications to provide additional and clearer instructions for the applicant and firearms training instructor, as well as a suggested range requalification schedule. She also noted that the new firearms permit renewal application requires the instructor to indicate whether the person qualified on a firearms simulator or live fire, and clearly states the new regulatory requirement that a simulator can only be used once in a 12-month period.

Ms. Serrato-Chavez also noted that, on average, a company application takes 90-120 days to process with deficiencies extending this timeframe. She commented that most company applications received by the Bureau are deficient, and to help support sound company licensing determinations a team of license analysts was created to provide second-level reviews of the applications.

Committee Comment on the Update Regarding BSIS Efforts to Reduce Deficiencies in Licensing Applications:

Member Anton Farmby asked what the renewal deficiency rate was and Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated the rates she had previously. Member Anton Farmby suggested not being able to move forward in the online license process until each individual section is complete.

Member Matthew Lujan suggested a push for online registrations as a way to help with the deficiency rates. He also suggested that the Security Guard application be created in a fillable pdf format. He also suggested that as an optional field on the online application we could ask for a copy of the applicant's identification card.

Public Comment on the Update Regarding BSIS Efforts to Reduce Deficiencies in Licensing Applications:

Frank Huntington, a licensed Private Investigator, asked if the new Firearms Permit assessment requirement will affect Private Investigators when it is time to renew their Firearm Permits. Chief Alarcon explained that the new assessment only impacts Security Guards seeking an initial Firearm Permit.

10. Review and Approve Revisions to the Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession Industry Brochure

Chief Alarcon shared that during the July 7, 2016 and the January 12, 2017 Committee meetings, Bureau staff shared a draft prototype of the revised BSIS Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession. Due to feedback received during these meetings, the Guide was not adopted and instead directed back to the Bureau for revision. Ms. Alarcon noted that the draft Guide before the Committee reflected input received from stakeholders since the January 12,

2017 meeting, and that the Bureau believed all concerns raised by the industry stakeholders with whom the Bureau had met had been addressed. She requested a motion to adopt the brochure.

Committee Comment on the Review and Approve Revisions to the Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession Industry Brochure:

Committee Member Marcelle Egley commented that there were concerns with the Guide, noting that repossessions are dangerous to the reposessor, and did not believe there had been prior sufficient discussions regarding the Guide in prior meetings.

Public Comment on the Review and Approve Revisions to the Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession Industry Brochure:

Scott Patterson, Owner and Qualified Manager of Patterson Recovery, asked if the Bureau would consider removing the verbiage “ask to see the license/identification card” from the Guide stating that he felt that having the person from whom the vehicle is being repossessed do this could escalate an already stressful situation.

Cody McDaniel, who works for Patterson Recovery, spoke about a gunshot wound he received during a repossession and asked that we reconsider removing the language regarding asking the agent to provide their license/identification during a repossession.

Joey Collins described incidents related to the dangers that repossession agents have in the field and explained why he felt the verbiage related to asking to see an agents license/identification should not be on the Guide. Mr. Collins began to express concerns with other language in the Guide, which not been revised from prior drafts presented to the Committee. Chief Alarcon noted that the Guide had been brought to the committee three previous times, the Guide had been revised based on concerns expressed during stakeholder’s meetings, and that comments were to be limited to the revised language.

Chief Alarcon stated that she understood and appreciated the safety concerns of the industry and noted that the Guide had been reviewed by the Bureau’s counsel and Bureau staff to make sure the information is in alignment with the practice act requirements, and provides a quick and easy reference for individuals that may be subject to repossession. She also stated clarify that the consumer has the right to ask for identification, however, if a situation escalates and there is a safety concern by the repossession agent that not showing the license was not a violation of the practice act.

Committee Member Stanton Perez commented that he appreciated the information being discussed in the Advisory Committee meeting was posted on the web in advance to provide an opportunity to review prior to the meeting. He also noted that he was sympathetic to the dangerous situations that repossession agents may face.

Member Matthew Lujan suggested revising the “Ask to see the license/identification card” language to “you may ask to see the license/identification card” and inquired if this would alleviate some of the concerns expressed.

Member Marcelle Egley commented that the repossession industry is not technically a consumer industry. She further commented that she agreed with Member Lujan’s suggestion of using the word “may”.

At the conclusion of all discussion and comments, Chief Alarcon requested a motion to replace the “Ask to see the language/identification card” in the second sentence of item 1 of the Guide to “You may ask to see the license/identification card.” Member Mathew Lujan made the motion to amend the language and Member Stan Perez seconded it. The motion to amend the language in the Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession passed on a 10-0 vote.

Chief Alarcon requested a motion to adopt the Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession brochure. Member Stan Perez made the motion and Member Roy Rahn seconded it. The motion to adopt Consumer Guide to Vehicle Repossession brochure passed on a 10-0 vote.

11. Discussion Regarding BSIS Implementation of the Private Investigator Act and Collateral Recovery Act Disciplinary Review Committees

Chief Alarcon explained that legislation enacted in 2015 established two new Disciplinary Review Committees that would become operative on July 1, 2017. Specifically, AB 281 established the Collateral Recovery Disciplinary Review Committee (DRC) and AB 921 established the Private Investigator DRC. She noted that Deputy Chief Sam Stodolski was presenting the item.

Mr. Stodolski explained that DRCs provide an alternate appeal process to administrative hearings for applicants who have been denied licensure or licensees where the Bureau has taken disciplinary action on their license. He noted that DRC appeals are heard within two to three months whereas appeals through the administrative hearing process take nine months or longer. He noted that the current DRCs, related to two other Practice Acts regulated by the Bureau, have been in place for many years. Furthermore, a recent Little Hoover Commission study relating professional licensing and barriers in California, toted the Bureau’s DRC process as a model for other state professional licensing agencies.

Mr. Stodolski commented that the Bureau anticipates the number of appeal hearings annually for the two new DRCs to be around two to three times a year. He also noted that the Bureau had updated the Member Manual for Northern and Southern Private Security Services DRCS, was updating the Manual for the Alarm Company Operator DRC, and creating new Manuals for the Private Investigator and Collateral Recovery DRCs.

Committee Comment on the Discussion Regarding BSIS Implementation of the Private Investigator Act and Collateral Recovery Act Disciplinary Review Committees:

Committee Member Anton Farmby asked when the new DRCs will be in effect. Mr. Stodolski responded that the authorizing law goes into effect July 1, 2017.

Public Comment on the Discussion Regarding BSIS Implementation of the Private Investigator Act and Collateral Recovery Act Disciplinary Review Committees:

None

12. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Robert C. Smith commented about the timeline of the public notifications when an Advisory Committee meeting is cancelled, citing that notifications only 7 days in advance were not sufficient and created hardships for those traveling to Sacramento to attend.

13. Committee Members' Recommendations for Items for Future Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Items

Committee Member Stan Perez requested an update of the Bureau's Enforcement Unit activities relating to firearms training inspections.

Committee Member Roy Rahn requested an update on pending legislation and an update regarding the status and implementation of SB 1196.

Committee Member Simon Cruz requested a discussion regarding SB 1196; specifically, the third-party vendor selected and the fees that would be incurred.

Public Comment on the Committee Members' Recommendations for Items for Future Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Items:

None

14. Adjournment

Chief Alarcon requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Anton Farmby made the motion, which was seconded by Member Tim Westphal. The motion to adjourn the meeting passed on a 10-0 vote and the meeting adjourned at 2:03 PM.