

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
For April 12, 2018 Meeting

Department of Consumer Affairs
1747 North Market Boulevard
Sacramento, CA 95834

Industry Members Present

Marcelle L. Egley (Repossessor Industry)
Frank Huntington III (Private Investigator Industry)
Matthew J. Lujan (Private Patrol Operator/Security Guard Industries)
Roy Rahn (Proprietary Private Security Industry)

Public Members Present

Anton Farmby
Todd Inglis
Lynn Mohrfeld
Nancy Murrish
Eli Owen
Stanton Perez

Department of Consumer Affairs Representatives

Anthony Pane- Assistant Chief Counsel

Bureau Staff Present

Laura Alarcón- Chief
Clarisa Serrato-Chavez- Deputy Chief
Samuel Stodolski- Deputy Chief
Antoine Hage- Policy & Administration Manager
Karissa Huestis- Policy Analyst
Nicole Ishiura- Policy Analyst
Cha Xiong- Policy Analyst

Minutes Taken By

Nicole Ishiura

1. Call Meeting to Order

Meeting called to order by Bureau Chief Laura Alarcón at 10:08 AM.

2. Roll Call/Establish Quorum

Roll was taken and 10 committee members were present. Quorum was established and Chief Alarcón noted the meeting official start time as 10:08 AM.

3. Approval of Minutes from January 11, 2018

Member Anton Farmby, who is a public member, made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee Meeting. Member Roy Rahn, who represents the Proprietary Private Security Industry, seconded the motion (inaudible 2:54 - 3:01). The motion to approve the minutes passed on a 10-0 vote.

Committee Comment on the Approval of Minutes from January 11, 2018:

None

Public Comment on the Approval of Minutes from January 11, 2018:

None

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

Licensing Update: Chief Alarcón began her update by sharing that between July 2017 and February 2018, the bureau received 47,683 initial applications for licensure and over 62,750 applications for renewal, which is an average of roughly 5,960 initial and 7,800 renewal applications each month. These numbers reflect a 2% increase in the monthly rate of initial applications received. She noted that the bureau has not seen an increase in the rate of renewal applications received. Approximately 83% of initial and 55% of renewal security guard applications were submitted online in BreEZe, which aligns with data from the previous fiscal year and data from the previous online licensing system for security guards (OLPL). Chief Alarcón asserted that the online participation rate for security guards in BreEZe had now normalized at approximately 83% for initial and 50% for renewal security guard applications.

During the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee meeting, Chief Alarcón noted that the Alarm Agent participation rate in BreEZe from July to December of 2017 reflected an increase of 120% for initial and 25% for renewal applications. According to data from July 2017 to February 2018, the BreEZe participation rate for Alarm Agent applications also appears to have normalized at 65% for initial and 52% for renewal applications. BreEZe participation rates for other license types have not changed since soon after the launch. Locksmith employees submitted approximately 60% of initial and 30% of renewal applications in BreEZe. Proprietary private security officers submitted roughly 50% of initial and renewal applications in BreEZe. Repossession agency employees, who are ineligible to apply for initial licensure in BreEZe, submitted less than 40% of renewal applications in BreEZe. The Chief emphasized the use of BreEZe for renewing a license, registration, permit, or certificate as it renews in real-time.

The Chief then noted that Private Patrol Operators submitted 20% of initial and about a third of renewal applications in BreEZe; Alarm companies submitted less

than 20% of initial and about 30% of renewal applications in BreEZe. Locksmith companies submitted comparable initial and renewal applications as Alarm companies in BreEZe. Chief Alarcón requested a higher BreEZe participation rate from the Private Investigator Industry because the data reflected that only 17% of initial and 25% of renewal applications were submitted online in BreEZe. She once again emphasized the benefits of submitting an application through BreEZe-reducing the processing timeframe by approximately two weeks by bypassing the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) Cashiering Office.

Chief Alarcón continued by stating that a third of initial and renewal application for Firearms Training Facilities were submitted in BreEZe. The Chief noted that the bureau would also like to work with Baton Training Facilities to increase participation rates for initial application submission rates because no initial baton training facility applications were submitted in BreEZe during the specified timeframe. However, 44% of Baton Training Facilities submitted renewal applications in BreEZe. Alarm Company Qualified Managers submitted approximately 40% of both initial and renewal applications in BreEZe. Repossession Agency Qualified Managers submitted 10% of initial and 50% of renewal applications in BreEZe. Chief Alarcón once again noted her desire to work with the Industry to increase the BreEZe participation rate for the Repossession Industry. She noted that company and the qualified manager initial applications submitted in BreEZe do not have the same breadth of benefits as those for registrants- specifically, the system's ability to automatically approve an application if the information is complete, clear, and matches that provided by the Live Scan. However, she noted that the company and qualified manager applications for initial licensure submitted in BreEZe do have a 2-3 week reduction in processing time as the application does not go through the Cashiering Office.

Member Marcelle Egley, who represents the Repossessor Industry, stated that she reached out to the Industry who had previously believed the application could not be submitted in BreEZe. Member Egley stated that she is continuing to inform the Industry that an individual applying for certification as a Repossession Agency Qualified Manager may apply online in BreEZe.

Chief Alarcón then noted that Firearm Training Instructors submitted approximately 30% of initial and almost half of their renewal applications in BreEZe. In comparison, Baton Training Instructors submitted roughly 40% for both initial and renewal applications in BreEZe. The Chief reminded attendees that the bureau removed the firearms transactions from BreEZe due to the high deficiency rates in which applicants were not uploading the required firearms application attachment. She noted that the bureau is currently working in a strictly paper environment for firearms applications. The Chief also stated that the bureau has also seen a reversal of a historically downwards trend for the submission of initial

firearms applications. Based on a straight-line projection of initial firearms applications submitted from July 1, 2017 to February 2018, the bureau anticipates an 8% increase in firearms applications from last year. Since July 2017, the bureau received approximately 1,000 firearms applications per month. With this data, the bureau anticipates just short of 13,000 firearm applications to be submitted in the 2017/18 fiscal year. The Chief then stated that the bureau received 11,783 firearms applications last year.

Chief Alarcón noted that the bureau committed to enhance the overall operational efficiencies while in negotiations for the fee increase bill (Senate Bill 547, Chapter 429). An audit was conducted that confirmed and validated the need to increase fees; additionally, the audit determined that the bureau needs work to become more efficient and effective. In response, the bureau revised applications to facilitate the transition to the new licensing fees that enhanced usability and provided important information in the application document itself such as the application process, the responsibilities associated with holding a license, and reporting requirements. She also stated that the bureau has been working on creating new forms that will facilitate certain business processes.

Chief Alarcón announced that both the initial and renewal firearm applications have been completely revamped. To assist permit holders in meeting the renewal requirements, a suggested range qualification schedule has been included in the updated application. Additionally, the instructions include a reminder to training instructors on the correct scoring of the written exam. She explained that the bureau had received many renewal applications with incorrect exam passage scores. As permit holders who submitted the incorrectly scored applications experienced delayed processing timeframes due to the application deficiency, the bureau decided to include detailed scoring instructions for clarity and transparency.

Chief Alarcón also announced that renewal applications for all bureau license types were updated to facilitate the transition to the new fees. The new renewal applications now have two fees listed except for Private Investigator applications (which were not affected by the fee increase). She noted that instruction on each application directs licensees to look at the expiration date of his/her license, registration, permit, or certificate to determine the renewal fee. Additionally, detailed information was added to the renewal applications for the delinquent renewal fees for company and training facilities. Chief Alarcón explained that because company and training facilities are given a three-year delinquency period, the bureau has seen high deficiency rates for individuals who submit the incorrect fee amount. Given the complex nature of determining the correct fee amount for delinquent company renewals, the bureau created a dedicated email account which is noted on the renewal application, for those companies whose licenses lapsed for more than one renewal cycle.

Chief Alarcón then described the new firearms association form that allows a firearms permit holder to associate additional qualifying licenses that s/he holds between his/her renewal period. The Chief noted that as a result of the legislation that required every security guard who was seeking to obtain an initial firearms permit to complete an assessment to demonstrate appropriate judgement, restraint and control for the purposes of carrying a firearm, the bureau had to review its business processes to ensure there were no opportunities for individuals to circumvent the requirement. She explained the bureau's prior business process, which entailed the issuance of a firearms permit associated to a single qualifying license even if the individual held multiple qualifying licenses. Upon review, it was determined that the firearms permit needed to list every qualifying license that was officially associated with the permit. In order to facilitate the process for those individuals who hold a permit that lists one qualifying license but who have been using the permit to perform armed services for more than one qualifying license type, the bureau developed the form to allow individuals to request the bureau to associate the qualifying license(s) prior to his/her renewal. She noted that there is no fee to associate additional qualifying license(s); however, there is a fee to issue a new firearms permit. Given the permit holder would want a new firearms permit that reflected the updated qualifying license(s), the bureau decided to combine the request to associate and request for replacement permit forms.

Member Frank Huntington III, who represents the Private Investigator Industry, asked where the form was located. Chief Alarcón stated that the form was still in development at the bureau and would be posted on the website shortly.

Chief Alarcón also explained the bureau's efforts to update the replacement license forms by separating the form by license type. She noted that bureau staff have been working with Cashiering staff in anticipation of the transition to the new fees with internal staff updating tables to assist and facilitate Cashiering staff to determine which renewal fee is due. Additionally, bureau staff worked with the Cashiering Office to update all of their insufficient funds letters, which are mailed to an individual with the returned application and payment. The previous letters stated that the individual submitted an underpayment but did not clearly explain how to remedy the situation. The new letters include explicit instructions on how much is owed.

Member Farmby asked the Chief if she would reconsider allowing individuals to submit firearms applications online in BreZE given the increased submission rates.

Chief Alarcón emphasized that the deficiency rate of 50%, which necessitated the removal from BreZE, was a direct result of applicants failing to attach the paper application when submitting it. Chief Alarcón stated that she does not believe that

bringing the firearms application back to BreZE is possible in the near future given the impact on the bureau and its potential to create additional backlogs. She noted that the firearms application is unique from other applications as it requires the firearm instructor's attestation in writing.

Enforcement Update: Chief Alarcón noted that between July 1, 2017 and February 28, 2018, the bureau initiated 124 and conducted 53 compliance inspections. Of the 53 inspections that were conducted, 43% were Private Patrol Operators, 23% were Firearm Training Facilities (all of which were newly licensed in accordance with the new law), 15% were Alarm Company Operators, 13% were Repossession Agencies and 5% were Baton Training Facilities. She noted that during the same time period, the bureau received 735 complaints, opened 330 investigations, closed 400 investigations (16 of which were conducted by the Division of Investigation), and closed roughly 200 complaint resolution cases. With regard to the bureau's disciplinary activities, from July 2017 to February 2018, 50 citations were issued, 22 licenses were revoked, and 25 accusations were filed by the California Attorney General's Office to take formal disciplinary action against a licensee.

Legislative Update: Chief Alarcón noted that while this is the second year of the legislative term, it is a new year so a new round of bills are being introduced. She then provided a summary of the Assembly Bills (ABs) and Senate Bills (SBs) that have been introduced that are related either to the industries regulated by the bureau or the bureau itself:

1. AB 1247 is a two-year bill that was introduced last year. It is currently in the Senate Business and Professions Committee and has no hearing date set as of today (April 12, 2018). The bill would amend the Vehicle Code (not the Business and Professions Code) and would impact the activity of the Repossession Industry as it relates to the reliefs of impounded vehicles to Repossession Agencies and their agents.
2. AB 2067 requires every school district to have an armed Security Guard or school resources officer in place at each school when children are present. On April 3, 2018, the Security Guard provision was amended out of the bill. The bill passed through the Assembly Education Committee on an unanimous vote on March 21, 2018 and was heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee on April 11, 2018 where it was put on the suspense file (i.e. bill is on hold until Committee determines whether the bill will have a fiscal impact). The Chief noted that the bureau will continue to monitor this bill.
3. AB 2603 would make changes to the Private Security Services (PSS) Act. The bill was amended on April 11, 2018, which removed most of the provisions that

were going to be discussed at this meeting. Currently, the bill would make technical changes to the PSS Act as it relates to firearms permits. The Chief anticipates further amendments to the bill based on the current version. The bill is currently in the Assembly Business and Professions Committee and is scheduled to be heard on April 17, 2018.

4. SB 904 would extend the provisions in the Alarm Company Act that provide for an Alarm Company Operator licensee to be held by a Limited Liability Company (LLC). The bill passed the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee on April 9, 2018 and is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 24, 2018.
5. SB 1217 would make changes to the Private Investigator (PI) Act. Under current law, the activities governing a PI licensee obtaining an initial, renewing a current, or the bureau's authority to revoke a firearms permit held by a PI licensee is by cross reference to these provisions in the PSS Act. This bill would strike out the references to the PSS Act and bring all the provisions for obtaining a BSIS firearms permit into the PI Act itself. The bill is scheduled for the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee on April 23, 2018.
6. SB 1170 would clean up a technical drafting error resulting from last year's SB 559, which related to the ability of a PI license to be assigned. SB 1170 is an urgency bill which means it requires a 2/3rds vote and would go into effect the date it is signed into law. The bill is scheduled to be heard in the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee on April 16, 2018.

Member Farmby asked whether the provision in AB 2067 that required the contracting of a security guard had been removed.

The Chief confirmed that the provision had been removed from the current version of AB 2067 and noted that the current iteration of the bill requires a school resource officer, which cross-references Penal Code 830, which means the individual will have peace officer status.

Implementation Efforts on New Firearms Permit Assessment per BPC 7583.47

Chief Alarcon stated that the bureau is continuing with its efforts to implement the requirement that a BSIS-registered Security Guard applying for an initial BSIS firearms permit must successfully complete an assessment as a condition for the issuance of the firearms permit. Specifically, the way the current law is written, the bureau is required to have the assessment in place by no later than July 1, 2018. An applicant for an initial BSIS firearms permit who is a security guard on or after July 1, 2018 must complete the

assessment. Given that the bureau is currently in negotiations with a potential vendor, Chief Alarcón was unable to provide specific information but was able to say that an assessment instrument was selected and the bureau is on track to have the assessment program up and running as required by law. She noted that the potential vendor has the infrastructure in place that is needed to administer the assessment in various locations throughout the State and at a cost to the applicant that has been deemed reasonable by the bureau. The Chief noted that all BreEZe configurations and changes relating to the assessment program have been made, tested, and ready for use. Bureau staff are currently working on adding the assessment information onto the bureau's website, updating the initial firearms application to reflect the assessment requirement, and developing correspondence that will be issued to applicants (e.g. notification once all application requirements have been satisfied and s/he is eligible to schedule an appointment to take the assessment). Chief Alarcón conveyed that all of the groundwork needed to rollout the firearms assessment effective July 1, 2018 is on track.

Update on BSIS Fee Adjustment

Chief Alarcón stated that efforts are moving along as planned for the implementation of the new licensing fees relating to the Private Security Services (PSS) Fund, which go into effect on July 1, 2018. BreEZe programming changes have been made and tested thoroughly to ensure the applications reflect the correct fee amounts and that everything is ready to go live on July 1, 2018. Renewal coupons, which are generated by the BreEZe system, are being issued this month (April 2018) for licenses expiring in July and will reflect the new fee amounts. Information has been posted on the bureau's website, under the alert items, detailing the new fee amounts and an explanation on when they go into effect. The Chief reiterated that the fee amounts for initial applications is driven by the submission date- if the application is paid for in BreEZe or in-person at the Cashiering Office or postmarked on or after July 1, 2018 the new fee will apply. The driving force for renewals on whether the current or new fee applies is if the license, registration, permit, or certificate expires before or after July 1, 2018. If the license, registration, permit, or certificate expires before July 1, 2018 then the current fee applies, if it expires on or after July 1, 2018, the new fee applies regardless of when the fee is paid.

Chief Alarcón reiterated that the paper applications have been updated to reflect the two fee amounts for the transition period. Updated renewal applications for all BSIS license types are now available on the bureau's website. She said the bureau is now working on updating initial applications and wants to prioritize the company applications as they experience a high deficiency rate but due to the time limitations (July 1 deadline) the robust changes necessary to reduce deficiencies may not be seen in the updates of the initial applications. However, the Chief noted that the updated applications will have the two fee amounts on each initial application. She anticipates the updated initial applications will be posted to the bureau's website in June 2018.

Despite the bureau's planning efforts, the Chief anticipates issues with the submission of incorrect fee amounts and is working with the Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) Cashiering Office to identify means to mitigate these issues. Chief Alarcón noted that between today (April 12, 2018) and July 1st, the bureau will be periodically sending out informational email blasts through the BSIS Interested Parties List about the new fees and the firearms assessment and encouraged individuals to sign up on the bureau's website to receive notifications from the bureau.

Chief Alarcón concluded her updates by announcing that she will be retiring on September 1, 2018. She was appointed as Chief of the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services in May of 2013. Given the upcoming change, she explained that certain measures have been made to allow the Chief to provide assistance in facilitating the transition.

Committee Comment on the Bureau Chief's Welcome Remarks/Bureau News and Updates:

None

Public Comment on the Bureau Chief's Welcome Remarks/Bureau News and Updates:

Jerry Desmond acknowledged Chief Alarcón's accomplishments in her tenure at the bureau. On behalf of the associations of licensees that are regulated by the bureau, Mr. Desmond thanked the Chief for her "forward-thinking leadership, dedication, and commitment that [she] has given to this bureau. It's outstanding and thank you very much."

Chief Alarcón thanked Mr. Desmond for his comment.

5. Discussion of Technical Updates to the Firearms Training Manual and Firearms Training Written Examination

Chief Alarcón directed Members to review that the handout in their meeting materials and then reminded members about the information provided by the bureau's Deputy Chief Sam Stodolski at the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee meeting. In the previous meeting, Deputy Chief Stodolski provided information regarding the clean-up efforts to the Firearms Manual. The committee brought forth two issues that the bureau determined needed additional consideration and formed a subcommittee dedicated for this purpose. Chief Alarcón gave the floor to Deputy Chief Stodolski to elaborate on the two issues, the outcomes of those efforts, the final determinations that were made, and the outreach efforts about the updated manual and revised exam score sheet.

Deputy Chief Samuel Stodolski noted the two issues brought forth by the committee at the previous Advisory Committee Meeting: transporting a firearm and when it is considered a concealed carry and how to score headshots on targets for

qualifications. When examining the transportation of a firearm, the bureau looked at the language that existed in the Manual. The updated language reiterates that the exemption that exists in Penal Code (PC) 26030(a)(10) is specific to exposed carry. Specifically, the bureau wanted to convey to armed security guards that, as a result of feedback given from the subcommittee, wearing a jacket or if s/he is concealing a firearm, law enforcement may no longer consider the firearm to be exposed. Therefore, the bureau added language that specifies that any clothing worn that covers a firearm could be considered, by law enforcement, as a weapon being concealed. Additionally, the bureau included an instructor explanation beneath the added language that urges instructors to explain that the exemption for armed guards in PC 26030(a)(10) is specific to exposed firearms and not concealed firearms. He emphasized that instructors should reiterate to students the need to practice caution when wearing clothing that could lead a peace officer to believe the firearm is concealed. The bureau then provides the example of a jacket or coat that covers the firearm. The language was sent to the subcommittee, who reviewed and approved the changes to the Manual.

Chief Alarcón noted that the subcommittee was comprised of Member Simon Cruz, who represents the Training Facilities Industry, and Todd Inglis, who is a public representative. She then thanked both members for their assistance and time in updating the Firearm Manual.

Deputy Chief Stodolski asked the Committee if they had any questions regarding the first change to the Firearm Manual.

Member Stanton Perez, who is a public representative, asked why the section that noted that a guard may not make any stops while en route to and from work had been crossed out.

Deputy Chief Stodolski stated that the bureau had no authority to opine on that particular item. Current law does not prevent armed guards from stopping on the way home but the exemption specifies that it is to and from work. Therefore, the previous language exceeded the bureau's authority and was removed from the updated version of the Firearm Manual.

Member Huntington III noted that he has anecdotally seen an armed guard on his way to work in full uniform and carrying a weapon in Starbucks. He said he believed this behavior was against the rules because that is not his place of work.

Deputy Chief Stodolski reiterated that the exemption states that it is en route to and from work so that's the parameters the bureau is allowed to work within.

Chief Alarcón added that when the bureau is taking on and putting a requirement that exceeds what the statutory authority provides, then the bureau is creating an underground regulation.

Deputy Chief Stodolski emphasized that the exemption is in the Penal Code for a violation of carrying a firearm in public; therefore, the determination will be made by law enforcement and not the bureau.

Chief Alarcón asked Member Inglis, who is associated with the Ventura County Sheriff's Office, if he could comment on the issue at hand given his participation in the subcommittee.

Member Inglis noted that the Penal Code does not state a "direct route" but rather "en route" to employment to and from the residence. Therefore, there was no reason to add the language to the manual if law enforcement is unable to hold a permit holder responsible if s/he are stopped, which ultimately puts law enforcement at a disadvantage.

Deputy Chief Stodolski then discussed the second issue presented by the committee at the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee meeting with regards to the Firearm Manual: headshot scoring for firearm qualifications. The recent changes to the firearms training regulations were based off of an analysis of the targets that were being used to qualify on the range. He said the old regulations were specific to a very specific target, which was not easily obtainable and the bureau received multiple reports of price gouging with different facilities. Upon review of the POST standards, it was determined a standard target was not required; rather, a silhouette target could be used with certain parameters. One of the changes that are currently in production is to only score within the seven ring on the target. At the previous meeting, it was brought to the bureau's attention that the scoring of headshots needed to be addressed because a lot of Training Facilities were still scoring headshots because instructors felt that a headshot was a clean shot. However, the new regulations do not allow for the scoring of headshots; therefore, language was added that explicitly specifies that any shot outside the seven-ring is not to be scored. This language was determined to address the concern brought forth by the Committee and was approved by the subcommittee to be added to the Firearm Manual.

Deputy Chief Stodolski then presented the updates to the Firearms Training Written Examination, which was briefly discussed in the previous Advisory Committee meeting in January 2018. The firearms test consists of a multiple-choice section and two diagrams, the latter of which requires the student to correctly identify all of the parts of a pistol/revolver and automatic handgun. The way the former answer sheet was formatted showed it being out of a total of 76

points as it included all parts of each diagrams. However, the entire exam consists of 52 points with each diagram worth 1 point each. He noted that all parts of the diagram must be labeled correctly to receive the full point. The formatting of the exam sheet, however, allowed room for 76 points so a lot of facilities were getting confused on how to score the exam and needed clarification on the proper scoring. Deputy Chief Stodolski presented the changes to the scoring sheet to the Committee, noting the change in numbering from the widespread Western Arabic numerals to Roman numerals and broke up the answer keys so that it's more specific and clear for instructors that the examination is out of 52 and not 76 points. Deputy Chief Stodolski noted that this was a non-substantive change and was made to be more user-friendly.

Chief Alarcón added that the change to the exam scoring sheet was also made as a result of the bureau's commitment to reduce deficiencies. She reminded individuals that by law an applicant must pass the written exam with a score of 85% or more, which is problematic when the score is skewed when the number of potential points rises from 52 to 76. She noted Business and Professions Code (BPC) 7585.6, states that an applicant who does not pass the written examination with a score of 85% must complete the whole classroom instruction again. The Chief stated that despite the Firearm Manual detailing the correct means to score the exam, there was still sufficient confusion amongst the instructors to make changes to the Manual and add detailed instructions in the firearms applications for the Firearms Training Instructors on how to score and calculate the percentage.

Deputy Chief Stodolski stated that the new changes to the Manual will be made and it will be uploaded to the bureau's website. Additionally, he said a letter will be sent out to all of the Training Facilities that will explain all of the updates, a link to the new Firearm Manual and a copy of the new answer key.

Chief Alarcón noted that the Firearm Manual will be available online but the actual answer key will be mailed out to the training facilities.

Chief Alarcón noticed that the Committee did not formally make a motion to adopt the changes to the Firearm Manual although it did adopt the manual in the previous meeting with the two outstanding issues. She recommended that a motion be made to adopt the new Manual with the three changes: carrying of the weapon, scoring, and the exam scoring sheet/diagrams. Member Huntington III made the motion that the three revisions to the Firearm Manual be adopted and Member Eli Owen, who is a public representative, seconded the motion.

Member Matthew Lujan, who represents the Private Patrol Operator Industry, suggested renaming the "answer key" on page 3 of the new Firearm Written Examination to the "answer sheet." He also suggested adding an area at the

bottom of the page where the instructor lists his/her name, training instructor certificate number, and the student's passing score in the format of a percentage.

Chief Alarcón stated that the key was not brought to the meeting as it is only shared with firearm training instructors; however, she stated that the bureau will make Member Lujan's suggested changes- changing the page from answer key to answer sheet, adding an area for the instructor's name, signature, and instructor certificate number, and percentage correct/score.

Chief Alarcón requested a new motion from the Committee to adopt the new Manual with Member Lujan's suggested changes. Member Huntington III made a motion to adopt the updated Firearm Manual with the three changes to the manual along with the changes suggested by Member Lujan. The motion was seconded by Member Owen.

Public Comment on the Discussion of Technical Updates to the Firearms Training Manual and Firearms Training Written Examination:

Phil Chachere, a BSIS firearms instructor since 1993, stated that he has observed students cheating on the test at different facilities. He mentioned that the bureau previously had two different exams. He then described a foreign student who came and asked to take the exam before taking the course. He gave him the second test and the student got 100% *incorrect*; he then compared it to the first test and he was 100% *correct*. He noted the student was unable to read and could barely speak English. He also stated that he noticed that someone is selling the answers to the test. He said that he has seen the purchase and selling of exam answers and also mentioned that when students would assist the instructors in scoring each other's exams, individuals would record the correct answers on a separate sheet of paper. He suggested changing the order or phrasing of the questions every 3-5 years or creating two separate test booklets to reduce cheating.

Chief Alarcón asked if the two tests that were previously used consisted of the same questions in a different order.

Mr. Chachere stated that the questions were completely different and required the student to know the material.

Chief Alarcón noted that she is concerned that two tests with different sets of questions would allow for the disparate treatment of applicants.

Member Huntington III noted that if there were two tests with the same questions in a different order it would not be disparate treatment, with which Chief Alarcón agreed.

Chief Alarcón asked if Mr. Chachere had filed a complaint with the bureau about what he observed. He stated that he submitted a complaint a few years prior and was told by the individual in charge of the firearm division that the bureau was updating the firearms application and requested that he assist the bureau in developing the new application. However, he never received a call from the bureau. She then asked if the complaint was submitted prior to 2013, which is when Chief Alarcón was appointed to the bureau. Mr. Chachere confirmed that the complaint was filed prior to the Chief's appointment.

The Chief instructed Mr. Chachere to file a complaint if he sees something that he deems suspicious. She also stated that his suggestion to reorder the exam to prevent cheating is something that the bureau will consider and possibly bring back before the Committee.

Upon no further comment from the public, the roll was called and the motion passed on a 10-0 vote.

6. Discussion on How Employers Can Help Their Employees Avoid Application Processing Delays

Chief Alarcón noted that this agenda item was raised by Member Farmby at the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee meeting. She explained that the information provided is available on the bureau's website but the information contained in the member's packet provides further explanations. She then introduced Deputy Chief Clarisa Serrato-Chavez to further discuss this agenda item.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated that the information that she was presenting was similar to that found on the bureau's website but that it went into more detail. She then stated that the information presented to the committee may be added to the website as time permits.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez said the most important means employers can assist their employees avoid application processing delays is to ensure the application submitted is the most current version. She explained that a large portion of submitted applications are outdated and do not include information or questions that were updated as a result of new legislation or regulations. For this reason the bureau is unable to accept the outdated application and must send the applicant a deficiency letter along with a new application with a request to resubmit their application. Additionally, she suggested that employers ensure that any employees that they are assisting with the application process complete the application accurately and in full. She noted that the bureau often receives applications without the applicant's full date of birth, social security number, or signature. She also suggested that employers help to ensure that employees are submitting the correct application fee especially given the transition in July 2018 to

the new fees. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated that the bureau anticipates licensees will submit the incorrect fee amounts for renewals if an outdated application is used; however, she emphasized that the Cashiering Office will be returning those applications and payments back to the licensee and will guide them to the correct application and fee amount. She noted that in these cases the bureau will most likely not have a record that the application was received as Cashiering will immediately return it to the individual.

Chief Alarcón added that the bureau has noticed a common deficiency in which the employers, especially in the Alarm Industry, photocopy an application and give it out to their employees without verifying that the application is the current version. She reiterated that submitting the most current version of an application ensures that all requirements under current law are being satisfied.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez then discussed application processing delays that are a result of illegible fingerprints or fingerprint rejects. She explained that the Department of Justice (DOJ) will notify the bureau that there is a reject, which means that they were unable to get a good read of the fingerprints. The bureau will then notify the applicant of the fingerprint reject and will direct him/her to go back and get fingerprinted again. She noted that there are some instances in which the bureau receives a second reject notice, in which case the bureau submits an FBI name check. The DOJ then attempts to complete the background check based on the FBI name check process. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez explained that there are also instances in which the bureau is notified that the fingerprint results of an individual have yet to be received after multiple months. In these cases, a bureau liaison will contact the DOJ to receive clarification on why the bureau has yet to receive a response on the individual's background check. Similarly, another common application processing delay is the receipt of a DOJ delayed background check response. She noted that the bureau confirmed with the DOJ that an individual may receive a delayed response even if the individual does not have any criminal offender record information (CORI). She emphasized that the DOJ background check response time is outside of the bureau's control. However, when the bureau does receive criminal history information, the application processing timeframe increases as bureau staff must review the rap sheet and make the determination if it is substantially related to that application.

Chief Alarcón noted that the submission of a complete and correct application is the most pivotal aspect in which employers can assist their employee(s) avoid application processing delays. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez agreed and furthered the conversation by discussing how applications are delayed when information on the application and the Live Scan results do not match. The Deputy Chief emphasized the bureau's goal to have online applications sync with an applicant's fingerprint responses, which does not require bureau staff's manual intervention.

Chief Alarcón asked Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez how the fingerprint responses sync to paper/hardcopy applications. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez noted that BreEZe requires bureau staff to manually work a paper/hardcopy application. Chief Alarcón then emphasized that the applicant information supplied on the paper application must match that entered on the Live Scan form. If the information does not match, the Live Scan responses will not automatically sync to his/her application, which will further extend the application processing timeframe. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez disagreed, noting that the discrepancy between the application and Live Scan data is not as impactful as it is for online applications because staff can review the discrepancies while they are manually entering the information into the system.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez then detailed reasons why an applicant's Live Scan results do not sync to his/her application. Firstly, the applicant's first and last name must match identically to the application. She then explained that the social security number and date of birth of the applicant listed on the application must also match that entered by the Live Scan Operator. Lastly, if an individual completes the wrong Live Scan form to apply for a specific license type, the responses will not sync. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez noted that a high error rate is seen with Proprietary Private Security Officer (PSO) applicants submitting Security Guard Live Scan forms and vice versa. She explained that the system will not automatically sync because it is looking for the application type; for example, if an individual applies online for a Security Guard registration but Live Scans for a PSO, BreEZe will attempt to sync the Live Scan results to the PSO (not Security Guard) application.

Chief Alarcón stated that BreEZe was configured to allow for an automatic approval of the application and issuance of a license if the applicant's personal identifier information (e.g. name, social security number, date of birth, etc.) matches that contained in the Live Scan results and there is no criminal history. She explained this is why individuals may hear anecdotally that s/he was issued a license in a couple of days. However, she emphasized that approximately 15-20% of applications (roughly 750-1000 applications per month) have different personal identifier information on their applications and Live Scan forms. She noted that some examples of these errors include variations of a name (e.g. Donald versus Don) or a transposed birth or social security number. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez then reiterated that the three fields that must match in order for the responses to sync to the application in BreEZe are the individual's first and last name, date of birth, and social security number.

Member Huntington III asked the degree of specificity for the Live Scan required fields. He questioned, specifically, whether an individual's middle name and/or

suffix that is listed on a BSIS application must match the name listed on the Live Scan form.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated that in order for BreEZe to match the Live Scan results to the application, the first and last names must match. She noted that if the applicant's suffix was added to the last name field on the Live Scan form, then in order for the Live Scan results to sync to the application, the suffix must also be entered in the last name field in BreEZe. Chief Alarcón asked for clarification on whether a suffix field is available on the Live Scan form. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez was not certain; therefore, Chief Alarcón cautioned individuals when applying and completing the Live Scan form.

Member Farmby asked the difference between the PSO and Security Guard Live Scan form. He noted that the Industry has moved towards replacing the title of Security Guard with security officer as a means to combat the negative connotation often associated with the term Security Guard and as a means to professionalize the Industry. He then asked whether the bureau is seeing a high Live Scan error rate between the PSO and Security Guard Live Scan forms or whether issues relating to incorrect personal identifier information is more prevalent. Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez explained that discrepancies in personal identifier information is the most prevalent Live Scan processing delay.

(Member Farmby statement/comment inaudible- 1:22:14 - 1:22:25).

Chief Alarcón noted that the DOJ distributes an Originating Reporting Agency Identifier (ORI) for each separate Live Scan form. When the background results are received, they are synchronized based on the ORI code and the applicant's personal identifier information. She then reemphasized the importance of completing the correct Live Scan form. She also noted that the bureau may include additional information about which Live Scan form is to be completed and submitted when updating the initial applications.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez explained that not all of the bureau's license types have their own Live Scan form. For example, some Live Scan forms are shared by certain license types- Alarm Company Operator, Alarm Agent, Alarm Company Operator Qualified Manager. She emphasized the importance of visiting the bureau's website to determine which Live Scan form to use.

Member Lujan, whose company offers Live Scan services, informed the Committee that the Live Scan form has a field for a suffix; however, he noted that there isn't a field for a suffix on the bureau's Security Guard application. He also mentioned that there isn't an area to enter an apartment number on the application. He noted that if an applicant does not enter his/her apartment number on the

application, if the license is issued, it will be returned. He suggested the bureau add fields on the bureau's applications and forms for a suffix and apartment number.

Chief Alarcón expressed concern about adding a suffix field. Instead, she suggested educating the licensing and applicant population to enter the same information on the application and the Live Scan form. She noted that the bureau may be able to add "apartment/suite number" to the address field on the initial applications but would not be able to edit the renewal applications as the updated applications had already been posted to the website.

Member Lujan also suggested adding the correct Live Scan form after the paper application itself. He argued that aggregating the forms by license type would be helpful.

Chief Alarcón discussed the bureau's plan to redesign the website by license type- an individual would click on a link for the license type in which s/he was applying. The link would then direct the individual to a page with additional links to all available applications, forms, and fact sheets available for each license type. She noted that the bureau planned on creating a single page for each license type rather than a single application packet. She then asked Member Lujan's opinion on the bureau's vision. He stated that the bureau's plan was a positive step forward.

Member Lujan mentioned that entering an individual's social security number is not a required field for a Live Scan Operator if it is not entered on the Live Scan form. He stated that a social security number is required for a Live Scan for teacher credentialing and suggested that the bureau require a social security number on its Live Scan forms.

Chief Alarcón stated that agencies that state the requirement of a social security number are only allowed to do so because they have statutory authority to request that information. She noted that the bureau may add to this information to the Live Scan instructions. She then thanked Member Lujan for his suggestions.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez then discussed how individuals may work with a web print-out after his/her initial application has been approved. She noted that this list varies slightly to those license types eligible to work after a *renewal* application has been approved. She emphasized that only an armed security guard, private patrol operator, or private patrol operator qualified manager may work with a web print-out after his/her initial firearms application has been approved. She urged individuals to carefully review which license type may work with a web printout.

She then discussed application deficiencies for renewal applications. According to Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez, the most common delay in application processing is a late renewal. She emphasized that registrants (security guards, alarm agents, repossession agents, and locksmith agents) are required by law to submit their renewal applications 60 days prior to expiration. She noted that the bureau does not see many registrants following this provision of the law. The bureau suggests other license types, which are not required by law to submit renewals 60 days prior to expiration, to submit within that same timeframe. She urged licensees to renew online, if possible, because s/he would be renewing in real time- once the payment is processed, the application will be approved, and s/he will receive a new expiration date. Additionally, the fees are automatically calculated when renewing online- so licensees are able to pay the delinquency fee (if paid after expiration) and/or pay the new renewal fee (if the license expires after July 1, 2018). Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated that licensees submit the most current version of the renewal application, which were recently updated and are currently posted on the bureau's website.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez explained that another delay in the processing of a renewal application is the licensee's failure to notify the bureau in a timely manner of an address change despite the licensee's legal requirement to report the change to the bureau. She reminded individuals that if they do not update their address with the bureau, their renewal coupon will be mailed to their old address and they will need to print out a paper application from the bureau's website or renew online. Additionally, she noted that if a licensee changes his/her address on the renewal coupon, the processing of the renewal application will be delayed. When an address change is marked on a renewal coupon, a hold is placed on the renewal as bureau staff must manually enter the address change before issuing the license. She urged employers and facilities to inform their employees and students that if they submit an address change at the time of renewal, the processing of his/her renewal application will be delayed. Chief Alarcón added that the address cannot be updated until the application is distributed to the corresponding staff after being received at the bureau from the Department's Cashiering Office. Chief Alarcón urged licensees to notify the bureau within 30 days of a change of address as required by law to prevent avoidable application processing delays.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez reiterated the importance that licensees submit the correct renewal fees with the transition to the new licensing fees in July 2018. She also identified licensees' failure to sign a renewal application or coupon as a common reason for application processing delays. She reemphasized that any form or application that an individual submits to the bureau should be completed in full, including a signature. She added that the bureau's licensing technicians review who signed the company renewal applications to validate whether s/he is principal and is therefore authorized to sign on the licensee's behalf. Deputy Chief

Serrato-Chavez then referenced the license types listed on the handout that may work with a web print-out after approval of his/her renewal application. She noted that only a firearm associated with a security guard registration may work with a web print-out after an approved renewal.

Member Farmby thanked Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez for the information she provided and stated that he will provide the information with the employers with whom he works. He also noted that the information is only useful if it is being utilized.

Chief Alarcón agreed with Member Farmby's sentiment regarding the knowledge and utilization of the provided materials and asked whether Training Facilities would be willing to inform students about the various tools made available to them by the bureau.

Member Lujan stated that his Training Facility currently informs students of the various tools available through the bureau and pushes the online services of BreEZe. He said that he could work with Member Roy Rahn, who represents the Proprietary Private Security Industry, to disseminate the information.

Member Rahn said that he would be willing to work with Member Lujan. He mentioned that CALSAGA, the California Association of Licensed Security Guards, Agencies and Associates, forwards information provided by the bureau in its email blasts to its membership. To aid in disseminating the information, he stated that CALSAGA would be willing to send out to its membership the information provided in the meeting.

Public Comment on the Discussion on How Employers Can Help Their Employees Avoid Application Processing Delays:

None

7. Discussion on How Employers Can Use the BreEZe License Notification Subscriptions Tool to Monitor Licensure Status of their Employees

Chief Alarcón noted that this information has been provided at the request of Member Farmby, who previously suggested that it be included in a future meeting. She emphasized that this tool within BreEZe is incredibly useful as employers are able to track whether employees have not renewed or are suspended.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez provided an overview of the two step-by-step guides provided: *How to Subscribe to License Notifications* and *How to Create a BreEZe VO Account*. She noted that a BreEZe account is required to receive license notifications. If an employer subscribes to all of its employees' registrations, it will receive an email whenever there is a status change to any one of the subscribed

registrations. For example, if a registration passes expiration and becomes delinquent/expired, suspended, or cancelled, the employer will receive an email notification.

On page 8 of *How to Subscribe to License Notifications*, Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez pointed out the two items of import under Additional Activities: “Add Authorized Representative” and “License Notification Subscriptions.” She said that the first activity allows the licensee to select an individual to access his/her license on his/her behalf. The second activity allows any individual to receive license notifications about a bureau licensee. She stated that if users follow the steps provided in the guide, they will be able to subscribe to license notifications and/or become an authorized representative. If, however, users encounter difficulties, she suggested they email the bureau and the staff will provide further assistance.

She then provided an overview of the information included in the second step-by-step guide, *How to Create a BreEZe VO Account*. She noted that the second guide also includes information provided in *How to Subscribe to License Notifications*. However, *How to Create a BreEZe VO Account* includes additional information on how to onboard or link your license to your BreEZe account.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez said that she is working with staff to upload both guides to the bureau’s website. Currently, however, the bureau does provide BreEZe video tutorials.

Committee Comment on the Discussion on How Employers Can Use the BreEZe License Notification Subscriptions Tool to Monitor Licensure Status of their Employees:

Member Stanton Perez, who is a public representative, asked about BreEZe’s average timeframe for license notifications.

Deputy Chief Serrato-Chavez said that once the license status is updated in the system, BreEZe will send out a notification email within a day to anyone subscribed to the individual’s license notifications. Chief Alarcón disagreed, stating BreEZe works in real-time; therefore, once the license status changes, an email notification is sent.

Member Perez thanked bureau staff for diligently working on this feature, adding that this is a great benefit for the Industry.

Public Comment on the Discussion on How Employers Can Use the BreEZe License Notification Subscriptions Tool to Monitor Licensure Status of their Employees:

None

8. Discussion on Schedule for Future Advisory Committee Meetings

During the January 11, 2018 Advisory Committee meeting, Chief Alarcón proposed reducing the meeting frequency from four meetings per year due to historically canceled meetings. On average, the Committee met approximately twice a year; therefore, at the January meeting, the Committee discussed the possibility of meeting three times a year with consideration made for the operational needs of the bureau to focus on the transition to the new fees and firearms assessment and made the determination to formally cancel the July meeting.

The Chief then asked the Committee their opinions on the optimal number of Advisory Committee meetings to take place per year.

Member Farmby asked if the Committee had landed on holding Advisory Committee meetings three times a year.

Chief Alarcón stated that it was discussed but a motion was never taken to formally determine the meeting frequency and schedule. She mentioned that Members also considered maintaining the meeting frequency at four times per year with the potential of cancelling a meeting based on the operational needs of the bureau. The Chief recollected that one of the final discussions at the previous meeting centered around the elimination of the bureau's need to cancel further meetings if the frequency of Advisory Committee meetings was reduced from four to three times a year. She stated that multiple proposals were brought forth but the Committee never agreed on a single proposal or motion.

Member Huntington III made a motion that the Advisory Committee meet three times per year. Member Lynn Mohrfeld, who is a public representative, seconded the motion.

Member Farmby noted that the proposed meeting schedule was sound but wanted further clarification on the cancellation of meetings. He argued that the operational needs of the bureau often require the cancellation of meetings and a provision is needed to grant the bureau the authority to cancel a meeting if necessary. He then contemplated the ramifications of reducing the meeting frequency on the Advisory Committee itself. He reiterated that the bureau should be able to cancel a meeting if operational needs dictate it; however, he expressed concern about reducing the frequency of the Advisory Committee meetings.

Chief Alarcón asked Member Farmby if he was stating that his concern stemmed from the bureau's pattern of cancelling two meetings in a calendar year, which would effectively result in a single meeting as opposed to if the bureau spaced out the meetings further apart then the bureau may not need to cancel meetings.

Member Farmby agreed that the Chief's summary of his statement was correct and reiterated that if the bureau reduced the number of meetings to three per year, it may reduce the need to cancel a meeting.

Member Owen suggested adding an amendment to Member Huntington III's motion to include a provision that allows the bureau the ability to cancel a meeting due to operational needs.

Member Huntington III accepted Member Owen's amendment.

(Member comment inaudible: 1:55:18 – 1:55:26)

Chief Alarcón shared her personal experience preparing for the Advisory Committee meetings. She noted that the current meeting had a light agenda, which is typically not the case. She stated that in her experience, the normal Advisory Committee meeting lasts six hours. She mentioned that some agendas may be shorter as a reflection of the operational needs of the bureau.

Chief Alarcón asked whether the motion needed to be amended to establish the day and month of future Advisory Committee Meetings or if "approximate" could be added to the motion with the dates and months scheduled by bureau staff.

Chief Alarcón noted that some Committee Members nodded their heads in recognition that specific day and months should be established for future meetings. She then explained that April meetings have been especially difficult for the bureau as it is in the middle of legislative activities. She also mentioned that in the past, the month of January has been unpopular with Members given its close proximity to the holidays. Chief Alarcón suggested a meeting schedule of March, Summer [sic], and November.

Member Huntington III suggested the Committee vote on the motion to establish the frequency of future Advisory Committee meetings at three times per year and then establish the day and months for which the meetings are to take place.

Chief Alarcón agreed and Chief Counsel Anthony Pane nodded in agreement.

Chief Alarcón reiterated that the motion set before the Committee was to schedule three meetings a year with the discretion of the bureau chief to call a fourth, if based on operational needs/necessity to have the Committee meet [sic]. Member Huntington III originally made the motion and Member Lynn Mohrfeld seconded the motion. Additionally, Member Owen amended the motion, which was approved by Member Huntington III.

There was no further Committee comment on the motion. There was no public comment on the motion.

The motion to schedule three BSIS Advisory Committee Meetings per year with discretion given to the Chief to call a fourth meeting was passed on a vote of 10-0.

Chief Alarcón then asked the Committee on preferred days and months for future Advisory Committee meetings.

Member Farmby suggested scheduling meetings in February, June, and September or October.

Chief Alarcón stated that October would work better for the bureau as the Legislature would be winding down.

Chief Alarcón then asked the Committee for set dates for future meetings.

Member Rahn said that it is easier for him to set his schedule if he knows that the meeting will take place on the second Tuesday of a given month.

Chief Alarcón asked Member Rahn if he was suggesting the second Tuesday. He stated that he randomly picked the day. She then noted that the bureau has been conducting the Advisory Committee meetings on the second Thursday.

(member comments inaudible 2:00:59 – 2:01:09)

Member Rahn asked how many Advisory Committee Members are from Southern California and asked if there was a possibility of having one meeting per year in Southern California.

Chief Alarcón asked if the bureau would be able to webcast the meeting if it was relocated to Southern California. A staff member from the Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Information Services, who conduct the webcasting services, clarified that the bureau would be able to stream its Advisory Committee meeting if relocated.

Chief Alarcón asked if the Committee can make a motion to establish the dates for future meetings and then have another discussion on whether we should alternate the venue.

Chief Alarcón restated the Committee's suggested months of February, June, and October and its preference to retain the meeting date as the second Thursday in the corresponding month. She then asked if she had a motion.

Member Farmby made the motion and Member Lujan seconded the motion. There was no further discussion by the Committee or the public on the motion. The motion passed on a vote of 10-0.

Chief Alarcón stated that the Committee had previously agreed to allow the bureau the time necessary to implement the changes that take effect July 1, 2018. She then asked for a motion to cancel the June 2018 Advisory Committee meeting.

Member Egley made a motion to cancel the June 2018 Advisory Committee Meeting. Member Farmby seconded the motion (inaudible 2:04:31 – 2:04:34). There was no further discussion by the Committee or the public on the motion. The motion was passed on a vote of 10-0.

Chief Alarcón then asked the Committee the preferred month to hold an Advisory Committee meeting in Southern California.

Member Farmby thanked Member Rahn for suggesting the scheduling of a meeting in Southern California because he is from the area.

Chief Alarcón then asked if moving the meeting to Southern California would affect the Northern California Committee Member's attendance.

(Member comments inaudible 2:06:21 – 2:06:31)

Member Egley stated that four Members are from Southern California- Members Farmby, Rahn, Egley, and Cruz. Chief Alarcón noted that the Committee is comprised of thirteen members. Member Egley then stated that she has no problems traveling to Sacramento to attend the meetings.

Member Huntington III asked where in Southern California the Members were located and after they responded with locations dispersed across Southern California, he noted that it would still be a travel day for all of the Southern California Members despite the location of the meeting.

Chief Alarcón confirmed that the Committee will be holding off on further discussions about moving an Advisory Committee meeting to Southern California.

9. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None

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

Member Owen did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item.

Member Farmby did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item.

Member Perez did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. Rather, he thanked Chief Alarcón for everything that she has accomplished at the bureau and was evident in the public's commendation of her dedication and work.

Member Farmby asked if it was Chief Alarcón's last meeting in an official capacity. Chief Alarcón noted that this would officially be her last meeting. He then asked if she would be at the October meeting. She stated that she was unsure whether she would attend the upcoming October Advisory Committee meeting.

Member Inglis did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item.

Member Murrish did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. She reiterated the sentiment expressed by Members Perez and Farmby.

Member Huntington III did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. He jokingly suggested making a motion to require Chief Alarcón to attend the October meeting then tabled the motion.

Member Egley left the meeting early at 12:16 P.M.

Member Mohrfeld did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. He thanked Chief Alarcón for her service.

Member Rahn did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. He echoed the appreciation expressed by the other Members and stated that California has the finest group of regulators in the nation.

Member Lujan did not have a recommendation for a future agenda item. He congratulated Chief Alarcón on her retirement.

Public Comment on the Committee Members' Recommendations for Items for Future Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Items:
None

11. Adjournment

Chief Alarcón requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member Farmby made the motion, which was seconded by Member Lujan. The motion to adjourn the meeting passed on a 9-0 vote and the meeting adjourned at 12:18 P.M.