



Bureau of Security and Investigative Services

Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

For February 17, 2022 Meeting

WebEx Teleconference Meeting

Industry Members Virtually Present

Brian Boeglin (Alarm Company Industry)
Phil Chachere (Training Facilities Industry)
Frank Huntington III (Private Investigator Industry)
Mark Miller (Private Patrol Operator Industry)
Chris Sayers (Proprietary Security Employer Industry)
Glenn Younger (Locksmith Industry)
Leon Scroggins (Repossessor Industry)

Public Members Virtually Present

Anton Farmby
Darren Morgan
Nancy Murrish Eli Owen
Stanton Perez

Bureau Staff Virtually Present

Lynne Andres – Chief
Gloriela Garcia – Deputy Chief, Licensing and Policy
Samuel Stodolski – Deputy Chief, Enforcement
Antoine Hage – Manager, Policy and Administration Unit

DCA Staff Virtually Present

Carrie Holmes – Deputy Director, DCA Board and Bureau Relations

Minutes Taken By

Jayme Richards – BSIS Policy Analyst

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by Chief Lynne Andres. She reviewed the use of technology during the meeting. BSIS Policy Manager (PM), Antoine Hage, called roll.

A quorum was established with 9 members virtually present. *Members Phil Chachere, Darren Morgan, and Glenn Younger joined the meeting after roll call.*

2. Review and Approval of Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes from October 21, 2021

Member Frank Huntington motioned to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2021 meeting at 10:04 am. Member Eli Owen seconded the motion. PM Hage called roll to pass the motion to approve the minutes; the motion passed 9 – 0.

3. DCA Executive Update

At 10:05 am, Carrie Holmes, Deputy Director (DD) of DCA's Board and Bureau Relations (BBR), provided a Departmental update. She shared that DCA appreciates the service of the committee members and staff during the pandemic. DD Holmes reviewed the state public health order that has removed universal mask requirements for vaccinated individuals as of February 16. There are a few settings such as public transit and health care facilities that may still require universal masking regardless of vaccination status, and local orders will also be observed. She reiterated that as state representatives, staff and committee members are all expected to adhere to state and local orders while carrying out their duties.

DD Holmes shared that Governor Newsome has signed an executive order to extend the allowance for virtual meetings of boards and committees through March 31, 2022 (as permitted by Assembly Bill 361)¹. She also announced that AB 1733 (Quirk)² has been introduced in the legislature to permanently allow boards and committees to meet remotely, while also providing a simultaneous physical meeting option for the public to participate. If signed by the governor, this would take effect immediately.

DD Holmes provided an update on DCA's "enlightened licensing" project. A workgroup was formed in 2021, utilizing licensing subject matter experts from across DCA. The group's purpose is to help individual boards and bureaus streamline and make their licensing processes more effective and efficient by utilizing best

¹ To view the full text of the legislation, visit
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB361

² To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1733

practices, information technology, and cost-saving measures. The first review was by the Board of Registered Nursing, and a report will be released in March with recommendations that can be used by all boards and bureaus to improve their processes.

DD Holmes shared that DCA Director Kimberly Kirchmeyer continues to lead the department towards continual improvement and excellent service. She announced that Tonya Corcoran will start on March 2 as the department's first compliance and equity officer. This position will oversee DCA's SOLID training and planning solutions, organizational improvement office, equal employment opportunity office, and internal audit office. DD Holmes concluded her remarks by mentioning that Board & Bureau Relations is available to help.

Chief Andres asked if Members had any questions for DD Holmes. Seeing no questions, Chief Andres opened comments and questions to the public.

Member Farmby spoke up for clarification regarding remote work expiring on March 31. DD Holmes stated that this would be for remote meetings of boards and committees only. Chief Andres mentioned that the Bureau's Disciplinary Review Committees (DRCs) would be resuming in-person meetings in April.

Seeing no additional comments or questions, Chief Andres thanked DD Holmes for providing department updates.

4. Bureau Chief's Introduction, Welcome Remarks, and Bureau Updates

At 10:11 am, Chief Andres thanked Committee Members for their attendance and for volunteering their time. She mentioned that for 2023, the advisory committee meeting typically held in February will be moved to March to accommodate the February deadline to introduce bills. This will allow the Bureau time to provide a more thorough analysis of pending legislation before the meeting.

Chief Andres introduced the new staff member, Jayme Richards, who will be the liaison for advisory committee activities. She encouraged members to reach out to her in addition to other BSIS staff.

Chief Andres mentioned that the committee is almost at full capacity but does have a vacancy for a member of the public. She encouraged members to refer any interested individuals that do not hold any licenses with BSIS.

The Chief also shared that there are numerous openings on Disciplinary Review Committees for both licensed industry leaders and members of the public. She also referenced that these announcements would be released on social media as well. She encouraged members to refer anyone interested to the Bureau for information and assistance, as it is a gubernatorial appointment.

Chief Andres commented that the Bureau has been busy implementing new legislation that went into effect on January 1, 2022, and alluded to updates forthcoming from the licensing and enforcement units. She shared that BSIS staff are still operating in a hybrid format both in the office and through telework, and this will continue for the foreseeable future.

The Chief revisited the note that Disciplinary Review hearings would be returning to a face-to-face format, as the virtual hearings have provided several challenges. Technical issues have persisted for both committee members and appellants, and the Bureau is anxious to get back to the smoother format of in-person hearings.

Chief Andres mentioned that she encourages all licensees, no matter what type, to apply and renew online for faster, easier processing. It also prevents many of the errors that are seen in paper applications. She noted that one of the significant bills to go into effect on January 1 was AB 830³, which mandated that alarm company operators must apply online only; paper applications would no longer be accepted (*later in the meeting, Chief Andres corrected her comment to reflect that AB 830 will go into effect July 1, 2022*). She noted that the Bureau has already seen a significant decrease in paper applications for this group. The Chief shared that one advantage of the online process is that it does not allow erroneous information to be entered, so this reduces deficiencies and the need for additional communication between the applicant and the Bureau. It also takes out the step of working with DCA cashiers, which builds in additional delays.

Chief Andres opened the discussion for questions from the committee. Member Brian Boeglin inquired as to whether he could join a Disciplinary Review Committee while also serving on the Advisory Committee. The Chief clarified that one could serve on either committee, but not both.

Member Frank Huntington asked for clarification regarding a return to in-person meetings of the Advisory Committee. Chief Andres stated that it is only the DRCs that are returning to in-person meetings at this time. Member Huntington asked a

³ To view the full text of the legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB830

follow-up question regarding AB 1733⁴ and whether it would require meetings to always be remote. The Chief expanded that the bill in its current format would require simultaneous in-person and virtual options. She shared that this would be problematic for DRC meetings since it would require the Bureau to transport AV equipment to any in-person meeting sites.

Member Huntington asked if it is the Bureau's goal to return to in-person Advisory Committee meetings. Chief Andres said that she would take the preferences of the committee into consideration when it came time to make that decision, as the virtual format is less burdensome to the members, who are volunteers.

Seeing no other questions from the Committee, questions and comments were opened to the public. Upon no response, the Q&A panel was closed by the moderator.

5. Update on the Bureau's Licensing Unit

At 10:20 am, Chief Andres introduced Deputy Chief of Licensing (DC-L), Gloriela Garcia, for a licensing update. DC-L Garcia began by stressing how helpful the online application process has been for licensees and Bureau staff alike, for both initial applications and renewals. The online process is typically 2 weeks faster than paper applications.

DC-L Garcia also encouraged applicants and licensees to contact the Bureau via email instead of by phone. The staff aims for a 24-48 hour turnaround on email responses, and email allows for a more thorough and comprehensive response.

Encouraging the disclosure of applicant emails, DC-L Garcia share that a new efficiency is available that will send an email to initial applicants when the license is issued (provided that an email was included on the application). The Bureau plans to add this feature for renewals soon, along with other efficiencies as they are allotted by DCA.

DC-L Garcia issued a reminder to Alarm (ACO) and Private Investigator (PI) entities that operate as LLCs to submit a record of insurance claims for the 2021 calendar year. The form is available on the Bureau's website.

The Deputy Chief went on to review the licensing data provided on page 2 of the BSIS Staff Report. The first chart is a comparison of applications, licenses issued, and renewals before and during the pandemic. She highlighted specific license types that saw either a notable increase or decrease between the 2018-19 and

⁴ To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1733

2020-21 fiscal years. In summary, the data showed a slight decrease in total applications received and licenses issued (-2% and -4%, respectively), but an increase of 7% in licenses renewed.

Chief Andres interjected to address a public question that was received after the last Q&A period. The commenter was inquiring as to where hearings are held for the Disciplinary Review Committee for Private Investigators. Chief Andres shared that historically these are held in either Sacramento or L.A., depending on where the majority of the cases are coming from.

DL-Garcia returned to sharing licensing data from July 1 to December 31, 2021, as depicted in the chart on page 3 of the Staff Report. This includes the number of applications received, approved, and deficient in that time period, as well as a percentage of applications that were deficient. She highlighted license types with low and high deficiency rates, explaining that lower rates result in a faster turnaround time. Applications for companies tend to have a higher deficiency rate. The Bureau is analyzing this data to determine how to decrease some of these deficiencies, with online applications and more outreach being possible solutions.

DL-Garcia provided a summary of recently enacted changes in BreZE, including the previously mentioned BMO 413 to allow for emails upon issuance of the license for those who include their email address. New reinstatement fees were added for companies without active tax entity status. Finally, the online initial firearms permit application was updated to reflect the new process requiring assessment before application.

DL-Garcia shared that she along with Chief Andres presented to the Alarm Company Association conference in San Francisco in December 2021. Chief Andres chimed in that the Bureau leadership appreciates being included in industry events and is always willing to attend.

Chief Andres expanded on the BreZE updates to share that the Bureau must jockey for IT updates along with DCA's other 36 boards and bureaus. Thus, technical change is slow, even if it is mandated by legislation. All DCA entities must share the resources, so it is not as simple as noticing an issue and asking for a fix; these changes can take months to move forward, which is why it is exciting when these updates are implemented. The change to email communication is crucial as postal mail is unreliable due to licensee address changes.

Chief Andres asked for questions from the committee for DC-L Garcia. Member Huntington shared that he used the online process to renew his license last August and was pleased with the rapid outcome.

Member Boeglin commented, on behalf of the alarm industry, that the Bureau's engagement and cooperation are valued and appreciated. He asked if the Bureau publishes a list of deficiencies by license type. This information would be useful in letting industry members know which issues to look out for. DC-L Garcia responded that since the alarm industry is moving all applications online, Bureau leadership is reviewing alarm statistics and will be updating FAQs. She will consider adding common deficiencies to this information. The alarm industry is the priority with the July 1 implementation of new requirements, and similar information for other license types may follow. Member Boeglin noted that there is one more major industry event before July and he is trying to be proactive with the switch to online applications.

Member Boeglin also shared that he has heard from industry members that deficiency letters are often lost by US mail. He's wondering if deficiency letters can be changed to an email delivery similar to the new procedure for license notifications. Since licensees are not receiving the letters, it's driving a high call volume to the DCA. He also noted that because of remote work during the pandemic, mail that is sent to commercial addresses is not being received or reviewed promptly.

Chief Andres agreed that electronic communication would be ideal for all license types, but due to previously mentioned limitations on BreZE updates, it has not happened yet. DC-L Garcia added that it is in the Bureau's vision for all licensees to view all information to be accessed online and communicated via email. All applicants can now view their deficiencies on BreZE, but the communication piece will take time to implement.

Chief Andres noted that email communication is always encouraged, especially in place of phone calls, since these are routed to a general DCA call center. She shared the preferred address (BSIS@DCA.CA.GOV) and emails will be responded to promptly with thorough information, including copies of deficiency letters if applicable.

Chief Andres read aloud a question received from the public. Jody Arens writes that she finds the PI license application to be confusing, and asks if there are plans to make it more user-friendly. Chief Andres responded that the Bureau is always looking for ways to improve and invited her to email in with suggestions for specific parts of the application that are problematic. She noted that any revisions to an

application are not simple, as they take multiple levels of approval and are limited by statutes.

Member Huntington asked if there are specific email addresses for each license type. Chief Andres encouraged him to use the “contact us” feature on the website, which routes messages by area.

Public member Curtis Streeter asked if there is a way to remove a former ACO principal in BreEZe. Chief Andres referred him to the “contact us” page, and PM Hage demonstrated how to use the tool⁵. This requires the individual to provide specific information that will cut down the amount of back and forth that results from providing a direct email.

Member Huntington asked for clarification on the use of the tool and turnaround time. Chief Andres said that the emails are routed to the “company desk,” and as most problems are more complicated, it can take longer. She read a comment from a member of the public stating that it took two weeks for him to receive a response. She apologized for that delay, and DC-L Garcia clarified that it can take some time since there is currently only one staff member for the PI desk. Member Huntington clarified the general email address and stated he will share this with his membership along with the contact page on the website.

Member Leon Scroggins asked where the licensing statistics would be available to the members. Chief Andres said that the information is on the website, but would send a link to all committee members, and that they were also included in the meeting invite.

Member Chris Sayers thanked the licensing team for their help with expanding and reopening at Disney, as they had a high volume of applications and renewals recently. Chief Andres thanked him for the feedback.

Seeing no additional questions from the members, questions and comments regarding licensing were opened to the public. Upon no response, the Q&A panel was closed by the moderator.

6. Update on the Bureau’s Enforcement Unit

At 10:53 am, the Chief introduced Deputy Chief of Enforcement (DC-E), Samuel Stodolski. He referred to the enforcement update that was included in the Staff Report.

⁵ <https://www.bsis.ca.gov/webapps/contact.php>

DC-E Stodolski shared that SB 607⁶ changed the law effective January 1, 2022, requiring firearms applicants to pass an assessment before applying for the permit. The previous process, which put the assessment and denial later in the application process, was very expensive for the Bureau due to the number of cases referred to the Attorney General's (AG) office. The Bureau has been working with the AG's office to redirect these previous denials to re-take the assessment. The change in the law allows a re-take after 6 months (previously was 12 months). DC-E Stodolski explained that they are working with individuals to withdraw their appeals and follow the new process. Currently, the number of appeals has dropped from 160 to 129.

DC-E Stodolski explained the other major change recently enacted, which is expanded incident reporting for private security (under AB 229⁷). Previously, the Bureau would typically receive about 5 incident reports per week, as the scope of what needed to be reported was ambiguous. Since January 1, the Bureau has received 526 incident reports in the first 6 weeks. A majority have to do with medical restraints and need no action from an enforcement perspective except to ensure that appropriate training has been received by the licensee. DC-E Stodolski is working with the industry to streamline the reporting and make the workload manageable.

Regarding enforcement, DC-E Stodolski stated that the target goal for completed investigations is 120 days, which is mandated by DCA; the actual duration is currently 72 days. He shared data regarding unlicensed activity and that the Bureau is working on sharing this information on the website. Information about citations by license type was provided in the Staff Report per the previous committee request.

Member Huntington inquired as to what the PI complaints typically involve. DC-E Stodolski explained that most complaints are consumer complaints from those that are unhappy with the work product. There are also many allegations of unlicensed activity against employees of PIs who are not actual licensees. Other frequent complaints include flat fee agreements and reasonable expectations of services provided.

Member Boeglin asked for clarification about denials based on criminal convictions. His industry often asks what types of crimes would bar someone from receiving a license, versus ones that are not a problem. DC-E Stodolski

⁶ To view the full text of the legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB607

⁷ To view the full text of the legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB229

emphasized that the regulations focus on “substantial relationship” criteria and whether the conviction is related to security. The recency of convictions, serious felonies, and elapsed time are all weighed in the decision; there is not a “master list” of criteria since every review is unique. He stated that the Bureau receives “simple” RAP sheets with recent convictions that clearly have a relationship to the industry, as well as complex RAP sheets that span a longer time frame and may have mitigating factors. Violent crimes and recent crimes are typically cause for denial. DC-E Stodolski referenced a recent bill that was introduced in the legislature (AB 1662⁸) that would create a process for potential licensees to have a predetermination of eligibility before applying.

Member Boeglin thanked the deputy chief for his input and expressed that this is the information he typically gives out to industry members, but wished there were more resources for the gray areas. DC-E Stodolski suggested referencing AB 2138⁹, as it is very specific about types of crimes and the time frames that impact license denial. Chief Andres noted that applicants who are denied will have the chance to appeal to the DRC and give details about the circumstances of their criminal records. The DRC overturns about 40% of initial Bureau decisions. She also noted that BSIS has one of the lowest rejection rates among the Department of Consumer Affairs. DC-E Stodolski added that the Bureau receives 16,000-20,000 rap sheets each year, so the rate of 3000 denials per year is relatively low.

At this point, Chief Andres recognized that Member Phil Chachere had joined the meeting, and addressed a question he had at the October 2021 meeting regarding the background check process with DOJ for transgender individuals. DOJ conveyed that there are several personal identification points that they use, and gender is not one of them, so it is not a big issue to match up records. Member Chachere reported that the applicant he was working with submitted information about their name change and was able to receive a permit.

Member Chachere brought up an issue he has heard about with regards to baton permits and the availability of public records. Chief Andres noted the concern and said she will follow up with him directly.

Seeing no additional enforcement questions from members, Chief Andres opened the discussion to questions from the public. Upon no response, the Q&A panel was closed by the moderator.

⁸ To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1662

⁹ To view the full text of the legislation, visit
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB2138

7. Update on Legislation Impacting the Bureau and the Private Security Industries

At 11:13 am, PM Hage provided an update on enacted legislation from 2021.

A. Assembly Bill 107 (Salas, Chapter 693, Statutes of 2021)¹⁰

This allows for temporary licenses for legal partners of active duty military. Implementation will focus on creating a separate online application for “temporary” versions of the licenses in BreEZe, which will require qualifying documentation. This is not in effect until July 2023, so the Bureau will be discussing the process for paper applications.

B. Assembly Bill 229 (Holden, Chapter 697, Statutes of 2021)¹¹

PM Hage shared that this is the most impactful bill of the year, since it requires adding “appropriate use of force” topics to security guard training. The Bureau is in the process of developing the regulations package, and once that is approved, the “power to arrest” training manual will be updated with the use of force topics; will also update baton and firearm training manuals. BSIS is working with POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training) and a committee of SMEs (subject matter experts).

C. Assembly Bill 830 (Flora, Chapter 376, Statutes of 2021)¹²

This was previously discussed by Chief Andres as requiring alarm industry licensees to file applications online. PM Hage reported that the Bureau is working with the IT team and is on track for this to be implemented on July 1, 2022.

D. Assembly Bill 1096 (Luz Rivas, Chapter 296, Statutes of 2021)¹³

PM Hage explained that this was a slight change in verbiage to use the term “immigration” in place of “alien” in California Codes. This has been updated in the Firearms Training Manual, and facilities can obtain updated copies from the Bureau.

E. Senate Bill 607 (Min and Roth, Chapter 367, Statutes of 2021)¹⁴

¹⁰ To view the full text of the legislation, visit

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB107

¹¹ To view the full text of the legislation, visit

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB229

¹² To view the full text of the legislation, visit

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB830

¹³ To view the full text of the legislation, visit

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1096

¹⁴ To view the full text of the legislation, visit

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB607

This is the bill previously referenced by DC-E Stodolski regarding the firearms permit assessment process. PM Hage shared that this is beneficial to applicants because it allows them to determine their eligibility via assessment before applying, going through training, and incurring related fees. The Bureau worked with PSI to implement the necessary changes.

PM Hage asked for any questions at this point regarding the 2021 enacted legislation. Member Darren Morgan asked if security officers not employed by a third-party PPO can be armed with batons (in his case, a hospital employer). PM Hage answered that there is a pathway and the Bureau can work with the employer to obtain a PPO license so they can continue to employ armed guards.

PM Hage then addressed several new items of legislation that had been introduced since the initial meeting agenda was created in January 2022. The Bureau has no comments on pending legislation but wants to make the Advisory Committee aware of these bills.

- **AB 1812 (Voepel)¹⁵**

Current law requires firearm permit holders to requalify on the range and pass a written exam. This bill would allow firearms training facilities to teach a portion of the refresher course online.

- **AB 1733 (Quirk)¹⁶**

This bill primarily impacts DRC hearings, and would require boards and bureaus to always offer a teleconference option, even if the primary hearing is held face-to-face.

- **AB 1662 (Gipson)¹⁷**

This would allow prospective applicants who have been convicted of a crime to submit a pre-application to determine if they will potentially qualify for licensure.

Member Boeglin asked whether AB 1662 would apply to ACEs (Alarm Company Employees); PM Hage responded that this would apply to all license types. Boeglin asked if this would mean that prospective ACEs would not have to be associated with an alarm company. PM Hage said that this is an entirely new pre-

¹⁵ To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1812

¹⁶ To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1733

¹⁷ To view the full text of the proposed legislation, visit
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1662

license, pre-application process. The pre-determination would indicate whether licensing would be *likely* based on the information provided. This is voluntary, self-reported information and does not involve the Live Scan process.

8. Update on Enacted or Pending Regulations

At 11:24 am, PM Hage updated the Committee on the enacted or pending regulations.

A. Private Investigator Fee Increase (SB 385) – Section 639 of Division 7 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

This allows the Bureau to enact the \$4 charge for the private investigator photo ID card. This regulation was approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on February 9, 2022, and the text is available on the BSIS website.¹⁸

B. Firearms Qualification Card Training - Section 632 of Division 7 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

This was projected to be noticed in Spring 2022, but will be delayed due to the pending regulations package for AB 229. These regulations will require firearms training to be completed within the six (6) months before the licensing application, as it is a diminishing skill.

C. Badge, Patch, and Cap Insignia Criteria – New Sections to be added to Division 7 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

Similarly, this regulations package has been delayed due to the workload associated with AB 229. The Bureau is in the process of developing the language for this regulation.

D. AB 229 - Course of Firearm Training, Skills Training Course for Security Guards, and Skills Training Course for Proprietary Private Security Officers – Sections 635, 643, and 645 of Division 7 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

This bill requires the Bureau to update the security guard training course to include “appropriate use of force” topics. Once the regulations package is passed, the Bureau will update the power to arrest training manual.

E. Disciplinary Guidelines – Private Patrol Operators – Section 610 of Division 7 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations

These regulations are also paused to prioritize AB 229, which is statutorily mandated. These regulations will hopefully be passed in the next two years.

¹⁸ Documents regarding the Private Investigator Fee regulation is available at https://www.bsis.ca.gov/about_us/laws/approved_regs2022.shtml

The Chief asked the Committee if they had any questions on the Bureau's regulations. She reviewed the need for regulations and the typical year-long process of development and implementation.

With no questions raised from the membership, she opened the meeting to public comment regarding regulations. Seeing no requests, the Q&A panel was closed.

9. Update Regarding Private Investigator Pocket Cards

At 11:29 am, Chief Andres provided an update on this reoccurring topic. She stated that she hopes it is soon resolved, but problems persist in the process. She apologized for this inconvenience.

She stated that a bill passed about a year and a half ago required high-quality ID cards for private investigators, and the Bureau started issuing these in January 2021. The card is to be issued for only new licenses and renewals, but there has been confusion among licensees regarding when they are eligible to get the card.

There have been ongoing issues with the card vendor, PSI, including significant technological barriers. The current problem involves transaction codes not matching between the Bureau and PSI. Chief Andres stated that the process is slowly improving, but she asked member Huntington for feedback from the PI industry.

Member Huntington stated that he has not received any additional complaints since the ones he forwarded to the Chief several weeks prior. He feels that the biggest issue is with PSI. The process should allow licensees to walk in without any documents needed, since PSI supposedly has access to all needed information through the Bureau. Huntington noted that he and many other PIs have had a smooth experience, but he has heard from other PIs who visited different branches of PSI and were told "we don't have your file." He thinks the problem lies with training and communication at each PSI location.

Chief Andres shared that the PI Desk manager at BSIS is taking all concerns and working with PIs to pinpoint specific problems (what branch was visited, what they were told, outcome, etc.). This will allow the Bureau to identify where specific problems or miscommunication/training holes are occurring. The Bureau is also meeting with PSI regularly to further refine the process.

Chief Andres mentioned that other types of licenses would like to have this type of photo ID, but it will have to wait until the PI process is running seamlessly first. She noted that public comment came in from Ron Wright in the comments, and she apologized for the delays and problems with obtaining his card.

Member Huntington mentioned that he and other industry leaders will be meeting with Chief Andres on this issue, and hopefully it will require less comment in future advisory meetings.

Member Boeglin commented that he had a similar experience with PSI in obtaining a card, and it sounds like it has been a universal issue.

Chief Andres asked for questions and comments from the membership and the public. Seeing none, she closed comments on this agenda item.

10. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

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

At 11:36 am, the Chief opened the meeting to comment on any items not on the agenda from both members and the public.

She commented on the wide diversity and experience brought by the members of the committee, and she appreciates being able to consult with them directly on issues facing their industries. She asked for input on where the membership thinks BSIS can improve and suggestions for the Bureau's strategic plan. She will be sending an email to the committee with this request for future guidance.

Member Huntington brought up the topic of the records retention policy for private investigators. He is the president of the California Association of Investigators (CALI), which has drafted some language with definitions and potential policy. It will be discussed at CALI's March board meeting, and he would like to bring that information for discussion at the next advisory meeting.

Huntington also has a concern about law firms that are conducting workplace investigations without appropriate licensing. Attorneys can conduct investigations as part of work for a client, but not independent of other legal work. He would like to work with PM Hage and DC-E Stodolski on compliance issues and to develop language clarifying the parameters for licensed activity. This could be shared with the Association of Workplace Investigators (AWI).

Chief Andres invited Huntington to submit a report of unlicensed activity so the Bureau can get an idea of what kind of practices are of concern and be better prepared to address the issue.

Chief Andres reiterated that she will follow up directly with Member Chachere regarding his question about baton permits.

Member Huntington thanked Chief Andres for agreeing to speak at a legislative conference he will be attending.

Chief Andres recognized a public inquiry from Curtis regarding a personal licensing issue, and she directed him to contact PM Hage.

The Chief noted that the next meeting of the Advisory Committee would be held in July. She may be adjusting the meeting schedule in the future to optimize the Bureau's ability to provide timely updates.

With no other comments, Chief Andres moved to the next agenda item.

12. Adjournment

At 11:43 am, the Chief adjourned the meeting.