Public Safety Committee Agenda

Friday, December 20, 2019
1 to 3 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

Agenda Highlights

• ARJIS Update: California Senate Bill 54
• ARJIS Update: California Assembly Bill 1215
• 2020 Census Complete Count

Please silence all electronic devices during the meeting

You can listen to the Public Safety Committee meeting by visiting our website at sandag.org

Mission Statement

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Public Safety Committee (Committee) on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form located in the lobby. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to the Clerk of the Committee via clerk@sandag.org. Please include the meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the meeting should be received by the Clerk no later than 5 p.m. two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official public record and will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for email notifications at sandag.org/subscribe.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to the SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.如有需要，我 们 可以把SANDAG 们们们们 翻成其他语言.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>The Public Safety Committee is asked to approve the minutes from its October 18, 2019, meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Public Safety Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a Request to Comment form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Public Safety Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Public Safety Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director's Report Hasan Ikhrata, SANDAG An update on key programs, projects, and agency initiatives, including San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan, will be presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Report from Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee Chief Neil Gallucci, Carlsbad Police Department A report on recent meetings of the Chiefs'/Sheriff’s Management Committee will be presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Report from the San Diego County Fire Chiefs’ Association Chief Don Butz, Lakeside Fire Protection District A report on recent meetings of the San Diego County Fire Chiefs’ Association will be presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Grant Funding: Criminal Justice Research Sandy Keaton, SANDAG +6A. Proposed FY 2020 Program Budget Amendment: Drug Policy Gap Analysis and Evaluation The Public Safety Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the FY 2020 Program Budget to accept $90,000 from the San Diego-Imperial High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) program to fund a study to evaluate the most important drug policy questions for local stakeholders and then compile data to answer these questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6B. Criminal Justice Evaluation Projects Overview

An overview of two criminal justice evaluation projects that have been added to the FY 2020 Program Budget due to new grant funding will be presented.

7. 2020 Census Complete Count

*Darlanne Hoctor Mulmat, SANDAG*

As the Regional Census Data Center, SANDAG is coordinating outreach for the 2020 Census. An overview of 2020 Census and local efforts to ensure that every person is counted once, only once, and in the right place, will be presented.

8. FAST Act Performance Management Rule 1 Target Setting

*Rachel Kennedy, SANDAG*

Information on target setting efforts for Performance Management Rule 1, which include measures related to fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, will be presented.

9. ARJIS Update: California Senate Bill 54

*Ken Amerige, ARJIS*

California Senate Bill 54 (De León, 2018) (SB 54) limits state and local law enforcement assistance in immigration enforcement in the State of California. An update on efforts taken by ARJIS to implement SB 54, based on guidance from the California Attorney General regarding SB 54 and in coordination with the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, will be presented.

10. ARJIS Update: California Assembly Bill 1215

*Caroline Stevens, ARJIS*

California Assembly Bill 1215 (Ting, 2019) (AB 1215) places a moratorium on the use of biometric surveillance systems in connection with officer cameras until 2023. An update on AB 1215 and the Tactical Identification System program will be presented.

11. Continued Public Comments

If the five-speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

12. Upcoming Meetings

The next Public Safety Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 17, 2020, at 1 p.m.

13. Adjournment

*next to an item indicates an attachment*
October 18, 2019, Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Alejandra Sotelo-Solis (South County) called the meeting of the Public Safety Committee (PSC) to order at 1:03 p.m.

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Approve)

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Jack Feller (North County Coastal) and a second by Councilmember Caylin Frank (North County Inland), the PSC approved the minutes from its September 20, 2019, meeting. Yes: Vice Chair Sotelo-Solis, Deputy Mayor Feller, Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego), Councilmember Frank, Chief Neil Gallucci (County Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Association – Seat A), Chief Stephen Abbott (Regional Fire/Emergency Medical Services), Chief Investigator Jorge Duran (San Diego County District Attorney’s Office), and Undersheriff Mike Barnett (San Diego County Sheriff’s Office). No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: East County, City of San Diego, County Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Association – Seat B, and San Diego Police Department.

2. Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

None.

Reports

4. Report from the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee (Information)

Chief Gallucci reported on the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee meeting held on October 2, 2019.

Action: Information only.

5. Report from the San Diego County Fire Chiefs’ Association (Information)

Chief Abbott reported on the San Diego County Fire Chiefs’ Association meeting held on October 3, 2019.

Action: Information only.

6. Alternatives to Detention Evaluation Overview (Information)

Sandy Keaton, Senior Research Analyst, presented an overview of the evaluation of the San Diego County Alternatives to Detention program.

Action: Information only.

7. Juvenile Diversion Efforts in the San Diego Region (Information)

7A. San Diego Police Department Juvenile Diversion Programs

Assistant Chief Keith Lucas and Lieutenant Kevin Mayer, San Diego Police Department, presented an overview of San Diego Police Department juvenile diversion programs and activities.
7B. San Diego County Sheriff’s Department Juvenile Diversion Programs
Detective Jason Rouse and Deputy Dustin Nelson, San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, gave an overview of San Diego County Sheriff’s Department juvenile diversion programs.

7C. San Diego County Probation Department Achievement Centers and Choice Program
Executive Deputy Chief Scott Huizar, San Diego County Probation Department, and Marc Regier, Chief of Contracts and Programming for Youth Development and Community Support Service, presented an overview of the San Diego County Probation Department Achievement Centers and Choice Program.

7D. San Diego County District Attorney’s Office: Efforts to Prevent Youth Involvement in Drug Trafficking
Lisa Weinreb and Mary Loeb, San Diego County District Attorney’s Office, gave an overview of efforts by the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office to prevent youth involvement in drug trafficking.

Action: Information only.

3. Executive Director’s Report (Discussion)
Director Hasan Ikhrata provided an update on key programs, projects and agency initiatives, including San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan and the Airport Connectivity Subcommittee.

Action: Discussion only.

8. Continued Public Comments
None.

9. Upcoming Meetings
The next PSC meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 15, 2019, at 1 p.m.

10. Adjournment
Vice Chair Sotelo-Solis adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.
## Confirmed Attendance at SANDAG Public Safety Committee Meeting

**October 18, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Member/Alternate</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East County</strong></td>
<td>Hon. John Minto, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Steve Goble</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County Coastal</strong></td>
<td>Hon. Jack Feller</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Priya Bhat-Patel</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Diego</strong></td>
<td>Hon. Vivian Moreno</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Chris Ward</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of San Diego</strong></td>
<td>Supervisor Nathan Fletcher</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North County Inland</strong></td>
<td>Hon. Amanda Rigby</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Caylin Frank</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South County</strong></td>
<td>Hon. Alejandra Sotelo-Solis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Mark West</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Association</strong></td>
<td>Chief Neil Gallucci</td>
<td>Member–Seat A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Craig Carter</td>
<td>Member–Seat B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Walt Vasquez</td>
<td>Alternate–Seat A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Michael Marquez</td>
<td>Alternate–Seat B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Fire/ Emergency Medical Services</strong></td>
<td>Chief Don Butz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Stephen Abbott</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego County District Attorney</strong></td>
<td>District Attorney Summer Stephen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Investigator Jorge Duran</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Chief Investigator Joe Cargel</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego County Sheriff</strong></td>
<td>Sheriff William D. Gore</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undersheriff Mike Barnett</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego Police Department</strong></td>
<td>Chief Dave Nisleit</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exec. Assistant Chief Todd Jarvis</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Chief Chris McGrath</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Member/Alternate</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Public Safety</td>
<td>Adolfo Gonzales</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruben Leyva</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Matthew Crews</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michial Michalovich</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Public Safety</td>
<td>Gregory J. Archambeault</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert S. Brewer, Jr.</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Connon</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven C. Stafford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Brunner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen I. Flowers</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>Katherine Jackson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Porter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit</td>
<td>Jaime Becerra</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manuel Guaderrama</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Robert H. Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leia Arviso</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Public Safety</td>
<td>Chief Omar Watson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Chief Ray Diggins</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview

As part of the Criminal Justice Clearinghouse, SANDAG partners with local stakeholders on grant-funded research projects. The San Diego-Imperial High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) program selected SANDAG to receive funding to conduct a one-time study to help inform public safety stakeholders regionally by conducting a drug policy-related gap analysis and subsequent evaluation to fill identified information gaps.

Key Considerations

Over the past several years, several legislative and voter-backed initiatives have significantly impacted public safety in the State of California, including Assembly Bill 109 (Ting, 2019), Proposition 47, and Proposition 64 (Prop 64). With methamphetamine use at a 19-year high among local arrestees, anecdotal information is the primary source of information regarding the effect these laws may have in San Diego County.

As part of this effort, SANDAG would work with local public safety partners to conduct a two-part study. The first part would take approximately six months and entail determining what the most important information needs are related to local drug use and crime, what information gaps exist, and how these gaps could potentially be filled. Potential topics to be explored include how marijuana distribution networks have changed since the passage of Prop 64, the connection between drug use and mental health issues, and the community cost of drug-related crime. During the second part, which could take 6 to 18 months, a research design that is informed by the gap analysis would be finalized and implemented. Examples of methodologies that would be used during this evaluation stage could include mapping, surveys and interviews, archival data analysis, case studies, and cost-evaluations. Final products will include presentations and a summary report.

Next Steps

Upon approval by the Public Safety Committee, SANDAG will contract with HIDTA and begin to work with local partners to finalize the scope of work for this effort.

Cindy Burke, Director of Research and Program Management
Key Staff Contact: Sandy Keaton, (619) 699-6933, sandy.keaton@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. 2346700 Budget Amendment – Drug Policy Gap Analysis and Evaluation
WORK ELEMENT: 2347000 NEW - CJAM - Drug Policy Gap Analysis and Evaluation
FY 2020 BUDGET: $0 $25,000
AREA OF EMPHASIS: Modeling and Research

Amendment Title: Drug Policy Gap Analysis and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Hours: 0

OBJECTIVE
The objective of this work element is to provide drug policymakers with timely and local information to better understand how legislative and other public safety initiatives, such as Prop 47, AB 109, and Prop 64, have influenced or altered crime, drug, and mental health issues facing our communities. Emphasis in FY 2020 will be to conduct a formative evaluation to pinpoint key issues of interest, followed by a summative evaluation to answer the identified questions developed from the formative evaluation.

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS
In addition to ARD's current research efforts on Prop 47 and AB 109, staff have been conducting interviews with adult and juvenile arrestees since 1987 gathering information on substance use and trends among this population. These efforts have established ARD staff as experts in these areas and a reliable source of information for policy makers in the area of drugs and its effects, especially as it pertains to the criminal justice system.

Project Manager: Keaton, Sandy
Committee(s): Public Safety Committee
Working Group(s):
## PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 10          | Task Description: Meetings with stakeholders  
Product: Informed research design plan.  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020 |
| 2        | 30          | Task Description: Conduct a formative evaluation  
Product: Report of recommendations for the summative evaluation.  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020 |
| 3        | 5           | Task Description: Design summative evaluation  
Product: Research plan  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020 |
| 4        | 20          | Task Description: Create data collection tools and gather data  
Product: Data collection instruments and data set.  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020 |
| 5        | 35          | Task Description: Clean, analyze, and summarize results.  
Product: Final report  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020 |

### FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Note: The Applied Research Division (ARD) will conduct a formative evaluation and gap analysis to inform drug policy decision makers in the San Diego county.

#### Digital Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Approve Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andre Douzdjian</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/21/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Traynor</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/21/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Burke</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/21/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandi Craig</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/21/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Keaton</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Grant Funding: Criminal Justice Research – Criminal Justice Evaluation Projects Overview

As a normal business practice, the Criminal Justice Clearinghouse partners on grant applications with local partners to improve public health and public safety in the San Diego region. As a result of these efforts, SANDAG recently received funding for a combined total of $47,143.74 for two criminal justice evaluation projects.

Key Considerations

The new funding described below, and related project elements, have been added to the FY 2020 Program Budget. An update of these projects is shared for informational purposes to keep the Public Safety Committee apprised of current activities.

**CAT+ Extended Evaluation (2352900)**

Since 2012, SANDAG has been the research partner with the community-based non-profit San Diego Youth Services (SDYS) as it implemented two federally-funded grants aimed at reducing risky behavior and teen pregnancy among at-risk youth in the San Diego region. SDYS was awarded a third federal grant focused on a smaller and more rural target area with emphasis on conducting an implementation evaluation to demonstrate feasibility and readiness to conduct an outcome evaluation in future years. SANDAG has entered into a one-year agreement with SDYS for $30,000, with future funding pending the results of the analysis and award of additional grant years to conduct an outcome evaluation.

**North County Life Line Project Life Evaluation (2346900)**

SANDAG’s prior work with North County Life Line providing technical support and analysis on its two federally funded grants to help victims of human trafficking leave and begin to recover, has led to SANDAG being asked to provide a retrospective evaluation of their Project Life program since its inception. The $17,143.74 will be used to document the characteristics, the services received by, and the outcomes of all participants enrolled between October 1, 2011, and September 30, 2019. Little information exists on the needs of this population and the final product will be a summary report and infographic to be shared with possible funders and other service providers in the field.

**Next Steps**

The funding will allow SANDAG to continue to support our partners via these evaluation activities in North County and rural San Diego.

Cindy Burke, Director of Research and Program Management

Key Staff Contact: Sandy Keaton, (619) 699-6933, sandy.keaton@sandag.org

Attachments: 1. 2352900: Budget Amendment – NEW CAT+ Extended Evaluation
2. 2346900: Budget Amendment – NEW Project Life Evaluation
WORK ELEMENT: 2352900 NEW - CJAM - CAT+ Extended Evaluation

FY 2020 BUDGET: $0 $30,000

AREA OF EMPHASIS: Modeling and Research

Amendment Title: Extended Evaluation for CAT+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice - Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | $0 | $30,000 | $0 | $30,000 |

Note: Department of Health and Human Services funding passed through San Diego Youth Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,178</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | $0 | $30,000 | $0 | $30,000 |

Staff Hours: 0-1,160

**OBJECTIVE**

The Applied Research Division (ARD) will conduct a formative and outcome evaluation of SDYS's implementation of the evidence-based curriculum Positive Prevention Plus, in rural areas of the San Diego Region. Emphasis in FY 20 will be to track program implementation and measure change over time, as well as begin the formative evaluation process.

**PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

ARD has partnered with SDYS on three previous CAT+ projects. This project is focused on conducting a formative evaluation to assess the feasibility of conducting random control trial of CAT+ services. SDYS currently has a two-year federal contract to both implement services in the rural areas of the region and also support ARD evaluation efforts.

**Project Manager:** Keaton, Sandy

**Committee(s):** Public Safety Committee

**Working Group(s):**
PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/25</td>
<td>Task Description: Meet with program staff to design an experimental research project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product: Evaluation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/50</td>
<td>Task Description: Track attendance, fidelity, and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product: Summary report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0/25</td>
<td>Task Description: Clean and summarize data for bi-annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product: Completed bi-annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Date: 1/1/1900-6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Note: This is a revenue contract to provide a formative and outcome evaluation for CAT+ Services (provided by San Diego Youth Services (SDYS)).

Digital Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Approve Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andre Douzdjian</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Burke</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandi Craig</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Keaton</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/6/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Detail</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD</th>
<th>Period Expenses</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Total EXP &amp; ENC</th>
<th>Available Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td>Administration-Labor</td>
<td>29,178.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td>Mileage/Parking</td>
<td>822.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>822.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Period Revenue</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2352900-75430001</td>
<td>Federal Grants-Other Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Comments:
Department of Health and Human Services funding passed through San Die
Amendment Title: Project LIFE Evaluation

### Funds Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice - Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>$0 $17,144</td>
<td>$0 $17,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0 $17,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0 $17,144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: MOU with North County Lifeline, Inc.*

### Funds Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>$0 $16,782</td>
<td>$0 $16,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$0 $362</td>
<td>$0 $362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0 $17,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0 $17,144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Hours: 0-700

**OBJECTIVE**

Conduct a retrospective study of North County Lifeline’s (NCL) Project LIFE program. Emphasis in FY 20 will be to conduct a process and outcome study on all clients who have been served through Project LIFE since 2011.

**PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

The Applied Research Division (ARD) is the current research partner on NCL’s Office of Victim Services (OVC) grant to provide services to an traditionally underserved victims of human trafficking. In addition, ARD was the research partner on a previous OVC grant that ended in 2018 and because of the work on that project, NCL asked if ARD could conduct further analysis of their program Project LIFE’s outcomes.

**Project Manager:** Keaton, Sandy  
**Committee(s):** Public Safety Committee  
**Working Group(s):**
# PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 20          | **Task Description:** Clean data.  
Product: Clean datasets.  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-12/31/2019 |
| 2        | 30          | **Task Description:** Analyze data  
Product: program scripts and outputs  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-2/2/2020 |
| 3        | 10          | **Task Description:** Meet with program partners.  
Product: partner meetings  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-3/31/2020 |
| 4        | 40          | **Task Description:** Summarize findings  
Product: Final report and infograph  
Completion Date: 1/1/1900-4/5/2020 |

## FUTURE ACTIVITIES

There are no future activities.

Note: This is a revenue contract to conduct a retrospective study of Project LIFE outcomes.

## Digital Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Approve Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andre Douzdjian</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Burke</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandi Craig</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Keaton</td>
<td>Data, Analytics, and Modeling</td>
<td>11/6/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2346900  CJAM - Project Life

**EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Detail</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD Budget</th>
<th>Period Expenses</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Total EXP &amp; ENC</th>
<th>Available Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td>Administration-Labor</td>
<td>16,782.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td>Mileage/Parking</td>
<td>362.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>362.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 17,144.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 17,144.00

**REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Revenue</th>
<th>Period Revenue</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2346900-92060001</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Project Revenue</td>
<td>17,144.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** 17,144.00 0.00
2020 Census Complete Count

Overview
For more than 200 years, the U.S. Census Bureau has counted every resident in the nation to determine the number of seats each state has in the U.S. House of Representatives and distribute federal funding to local communities (e.g., public transportation, road rehabilitation and construction, Head Start programs).

On March 22, 2019, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved a resolution for SANDAG to enter into an agreement with the California Complete Count – 2020 Census Office to coordinate outreach efforts throughout the San Diego region in collaboration with the United Way. Local efforts and coordination are currently underway to ensure that every person is counted once, only once, and in the right place.

Key Considerations
The work is fast paced, with 2020 Census less than a year away. The U.S. Census Bureau will mail postcards in March 2020 providing an option to respond online, by mail, or over the phone, with data collection continuing through April 2020. Before that time, the outreach effort will raise awareness to encourage residents to respond to the postcards and letters when they arrive, particularly in hard-to-count communities. Examples of these communities include people without broadband internet access (because the census will be completed online for the first time), children under the age of 5 (who are historically undercounted), and individuals with limited English proficiency.

There are four primary organizations actively working in the San Diego region to support and encourage a complete count of every resident. 1) The U.S. Census Bureau conducts the count by administering the survey. 2) The California Complete Count – 2020 Census Office provides funding as appropriated by the State legislature for outreach ($187 million statewide). 3) SANDAG serves as the fiscal agent for $1.56 million from the State and provides data and mapping resources to support identification of hard-to-count communities. SANDAG 2020 Census Complete Count Stakeholder Working group is the oversight body for local outreach efforts. 4) The United Way (the Administrative Community-Based Organization, or ACBO) administers $1.66 million from the State for grassroots outreach by convening Count Me 2020, a coalition comprised of over 100 community-based organization and civic groups. To date, the Strategic Plan has been approved and applications for funding received from local jurisdictions.

Next Steps
Educational outreach underway will continue after the first of the year motivating and activating participation in the Census, culminating with a final report to the State in September 2020.

Ray Traynor, Chief Planning and Innovation Officer
Key Staff Contact: Darlanne Hector Mulmat, (619) 699-7326, darlanne.mulmat@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. How the 2020 Census will invite everyone to respond
How the 2020 Census will invite everyone to respond

Every household will have the option of responding online, by mail, or by phone.

Nearly every household will receive an invitation to participate in the 2020 Census from either a postal worker or a census worker.

95% of households will receive their census invitation in the mail.

Almost 5% of households will receive their census invitation when a census taker drops it off. In these areas, the majority of households may not receive mail at their home’s physical location (like households that use PO boxes or areas recently affected by natural disasters).

Less than 1% of households will be counted in person by a census taker, instead of being invited to respond on their own. We do this in very remote areas like parts of northern Maine, remote Alaska, and in select American Indian areas that ask to be counted in person.

Note: We have special procedures to count people who don’t live in households, such as students living in university housing or people experiencing homelessness.
How the 2020 Census will invite everyone to respond

What to Expect in the Mail

When it’s time to respond, most households will receive an invitation in the mail. Every household will have the option of responding online, by mail, or by phone.

Depending on how likely your area is to respond online, you’ll receive either an invitation encouraging you to respond online or an invitation along with a paper questionnaire.

Letter Invitation

- Most areas of the country are likely to respond online, so most households will receive a letter asking you to go online to complete the census questionnaire.
- We plan on working with the U.S. Postal Service to stagger the delivery of these invitations over several days. This way we can spread out the number of users responding online, and we’ll be able to serve you better if you need help over the phone.

Letter Invitation and Paper Questionnaire

- Areas that are less likely to respond online will receive a paper questionnaire along with their invitation. The invitation will also include information about how to respond online or by phone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT WE WILL SEND IN THE MAIL</th>
<th>You'll receive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On or between</strong></td>
<td><strong>March 12-20</strong> An invitation to respond online to the 2020 Census. (Some households will also receive paper questionnaires.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 16-24</strong> A reminder letter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you haven't responded yet:</strong></td>
<td><strong>March 26-April 3</strong> A reminder postcard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 8-16</strong> A reminder letter and paper questionnaire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 20-27</strong> A final reminder postcard before we follow up in person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We understand you might miss our initial letter in the mail.

- Every household that hasn't already responded will receive reminders and will eventually receive a paper questionnaire.
- It doesn't matter which initial invitation you get or how you get it—we will follow up in person with all households that don't respond.
FAST Act Performance Management Rule 1 Target Setting

Overview

Since 2015, the Federal Highway Administration has issued a number of Final Rules that establish performance requirements for states and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Performance Management Rule 1 (PM 1) focuses on transportation safety on all public roads regardless of ownership or maintenance responsibility. An overview of the performance measures, calculations, and data sources is included in Attachment 1.

State Departments of Transportation are required to set PM 1 targets by August 31 of each year for the subsequent calendar year. MPOs have 180 days from that date to either establish regional targets or agree to support the state targets. For 2018 and 2019, the Board of Directors elected to support the statewide targets.

Key Considerations

Consistent with the previous two rounds of safety target setting, Caltrans developed its 2020 PM 1 statewide targets to include aspirational goals related to decreasing fatalities and serious injuries. The 2020 targets are consistent with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan,¹ which is data-driven, multidisciplinary, and the principal statewide traffic safety planning document.

San Diego County contains approximately 8.4% of the state population and approximately 8.4% of the crash fatalities/serious injuries in California occur in San Diego County (it is a little lower for some categories of incidents and slightly higher for others). Since fatality and serious injury crash statistics for the San Diego region track closely with statewide trends, staff recommends that SANDAG support the 2020 statewide safety targets outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2020 Statewide Targets (5 year rolling average)</th>
<th>Percent Reduction for 2020 Statewide Targets²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>3,518.0</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Fatalities (per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled [VMT])</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>13,740.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>4,147.4</td>
<td>3.03% for fatalities and 1.5% for serious injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Strategic Highway Safety Plan is the principal statewide traffic safety planning document.
² Annual percent reduction with a target of reaching zero fatalities by 2050.
Next Steps

This information will be shared with the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors in January 2020. Pending approval, SANDAG will submit PM 1 2020 target setting documents to Caltrans in advance of the February 28, 2020, deadline.

Programming efforts that support the targets are summarized as part of the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and in San Diego Forward: The 2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan, Appendix D. Progress toward the targets will be reported on as part of San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan. Safety data will be compared to past targets once available. It is anticipated that 2018 safety data will be available to be analyzed in 2020.

Coleen Clementson, Director of Regional Planning

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. Safety Performance Management Targets for 2020
Safety Performance Management Targets for 2020

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), is required to set five annual Safety Performance Management Targets (SPMTs) for all public roads in the State of California by August 31 of each year. This is pursuant to the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21, P.L. 112-141). The Safety Performance Management Final Rule adds Part 490 to Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations to implement the performance management requirements in 23 U.S.C. 150.

Caltrans set SPMTs for the 2020 calendar year by August 31, 2019. Caltrans and OTS have adopted aspirational goals consistent with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>5-Yr. Rolling Average Target for 2020</th>
<th>Percent Reduction for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>3518.0</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>FARS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>13,740.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>SWITRS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Severe Injuries</td>
<td>FARS &amp; SWITRS</td>
<td>4147.4</td>
<td>3.03% for Fatalities and 1.5% for Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The targets highlighted in gray are set in coordination with OTS.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose to achieve a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads and focuses on performance. The HSIP regulation under 23 CFR 924 establishes the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) HSIP policy, as well as program structure, planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting requirements for States to successfully administer the HSIP. The overarching highway safety plan for the State of California is the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). In September 2015, California updated its SHSP, which is “a statewide coordinated safety plan that provides a comprehensive framework for reducing highway fatalities and severe injuries on all public roads” (SHSP, 5). It further states that the “SHSP is a multi-disciplinary effort involving Federal, State, and local representatives from the 4Es of safety [i.e. engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency services]” (SHSP, 2015-2019, 34). In support of a data-driven and strategic approach, the HSIP Final Rule contains major policy changes related to: (1) the HSIP report content and schedule, (2) the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) update cycle, and (3) the subset of the model inventory of roadway elements (MIRE), also known as the MIRE fundamental data elements (FDE).
The Safety Performance Measures (PM) Final Rule supports the data-driven performance focus of the HSIP. The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures to carry out the HSIP: the five-year rolling averages for: (1) Number of Fatalities, (2) Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), (3) Number of Serious Injuries, (4) Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT, and (5) Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries. These safety performance measures are applicable to all public roads regardless of ownership or functional classification. The Safety PM Final Rule also establishes a common national definition for serious injuries.

States must establish statewide targets for each of the safety performance measures. States also have the option to establish any number of urbanized area targets and one non-urbanized area target for any, or all, of the measures. Targets are established annually. For three performance measures (number of fatalities, rate of fatalities and number of serious injuries), targets must be identical to the targets established for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Highway Safety Grants program that is administered by OTS. The State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) must also coordinate with their Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in their States on establishment of targets, to the maximum extent practicable. States will report targets to the FHWA in the HSIP report due in August of each year.

Each MPO will establish targets for the same five safety performance measures for all public roads in the MPO’s planning area within 180 days after the State establishes each target. The targets will be established in coordination with the State, to the maximum extent practicable. The MPO can either agree to support the State DOT target or establish a numerical target specific to the MPO planning area. MPOs’ targets are reported to the State DOT, which must be able to provide the targets to FHWA, upon request.

A State is considered to have met, or made significant progress toward meeting, its safety targets when at least four of the five targets are met or the outcome for the performance measure is better than the baseline performance the year prior to the target year. Optional urbanized area or non-urbanized area targets will not be evaluated. Each year that FHWA determines a State has not met or made significant progress toward meeting its performance targets, the State will be required to use obligation authority equal to the baseline year HSIP apportionment only for safety projects. States must also develop a HSIP Implementation Plan.
Target Selection Methodology

There are three steps to setting safety performance targets, which are: (1) estimating the existing trends to determine where we are now, (2) determining what external factors will impact the target in order to forecast future trends, and (3) estimating targets based on forecasted fatality reductions from safety plans. In line with these steps, on May 8, 2019, a webinar and telephone conference was held to discuss the 2020 Safety Performance Management Targets with the MPOs and other vested stakeholders. During this workshop four possible scenarios for setting the 2020 Targets were presented. They included: (1) a trend line, which extrapolates the existing changes in fatalities and serious Injuries into the future; (2) a flat line scenario, which assumes that there is no change in the future from the current numbers; (3) a match to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan’s goal of -3% for fatalities and -1.5% for serious injuries; (4) a target line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050.

After receiving feedback from the MPOs from the webinar and telephone conference on May 8, 2019, the consensus was to select the fourth scenario, which uses a target line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050. This scenario is similar to the goals adopted by several States in the nation of Toward Zero Deaths TZD by 2050 (with 2016 numbers as the baseline numbers). The next update of the SHSP will be by 2020 and the TZD goals in this future safety plan will be incorporated in the 2021 SPMTs. The rationale for selecting safety targets based on a comprehensive statewide safety plan is to set “empirically derived targets based on quantitative modeling of potential strategies. With this approach, targets are based on empirical evidence of the selected interventions’ previous effectiveness combined with best estimates of future effectiveness, using a model linking inputs and outcomes” (Performance Management Practices and Methodologies for Setting Safety Performance Targets, Federal Highway Administration, 2011). Since safety performance targets pertain to all public roads, in a practical sense for this to work, local jurisdictions need to develop individual performance measures based on the particular needs of the locality and also target the appropriate strategies. If regional implementation is adopted, this denotes a bottoms-up approach where targets are rolled up from the State and local jurisdictions based on safety effectiveness, supported by research, and are more realistic and achievable, which in turn helps secure political support (Joint Transportation Research Centre of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and International Transport Forum, Towards Zero: Ambitious Road Safety Targets and the Safe System Approach, 2008).

The Number of Fatalities

For 2020, the target for fatalities based on the five-year rolling average is **3518.0** with 3275 fatalities projected for the same year. While referring to Figure 2, the blue bars with red text reflect the data that was available in FARS at the time of the target setting process. For the 2020 targets, the last year that data was available in FARS was the 2017 data. The Number of Fatalities 2020 target is set with a target line to decrease fatalities to zero by the end of December 2049. This is denoted by the blue bars with black text that begin in year 2018. The dark blue line represents the 5-year rolling average from the annual fatality numbers.
Annual Fatality Rate (per 100M VMT)

Statewide traffic volumes are reported in one hundred million vehicle miles traveled (100M VMT). While referring to Figure 3, traffic volumes have been steadily increasing since 2011. For the purposes of safety performance target setting, a 1 percent increase in VMT is forecasted from year-to-year for the years from 2017 to 2020.
The fatality rate is calculated by dividing the number of fatalities by 100M VMT. The same assumptions are relevant for the calculation of the number of fatalities and they are (refer to Figure 4):

- The blue bars denote the current data that is available in FARS (as of June 2019 when the OTS presented their targets to NHTSA);
- The gray bars show a toward zero death target by the of December 2049 from 2017 to 2020.

**FIGURE 4. THE FATALITY RATE**

The dark blue line represents the five-year rolling average from annual fatality rates that reflect the 2015-2019 SHSP goal, which is **1.023** per 100M VMT. The fatality rate for 2020 is 0.951.

**The Number of Serious Injuries**

The serious injury data for the State of California resides in the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). The definition of serious injury corresponds to “A” in the KABCO Scale and the corresponding value in the SWITRS database is coded as “2”. This is explained in Table 2 (below).

**TABLE 2. A COMPARISON BETWEEN KABCO AND SWITRS SERIOUS INJURY DEFINITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KABCO Definition (FHWA)</th>
<th>SWITRS Definition (CHP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K: Fatal Serious Injury</td>
<td>1: Fatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Serious Injury</td>
<td>2: Injury (Severe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Minor Injury</td>
<td>3: Injury (Other Visible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Possible Injury</td>
<td>4: Injury (Complaint of Pain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: Property Damage Only</td>
<td>5: Property Damage Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to Figure 5 below, the blue bars with red text denotes the current data that is available in SWITRS (as of June, 2019). The blue bars with black text shows the number of serious injuries that decrease 1.5% from 2017-2050. The target year for serious injury numbers is 13,542. The dark blue line represents a five-year rolling average and for 2020 it is **13,740.4**.
**FIGURE 5. THE NUMBER OF SERIOUS INJURIES**

**The Rate of Serious Injury**

The serious injury rate is the number of serious injuries divided by 100M VMT. While referring to Figure 6 (below), the blue bars denote the current data that is available in SWITRS and HPMS. The serious injury rate in 2020 is 3.933. The dark blue line represents a five-year rolling average of serious injuries. This concept is incorporated in the SHSP. This is a “vision” based or “aspirational” target. The 2020 target for the serious injury rate is 3.994. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes are increased 1 percent per year from the 2016 levels for the years from 2017 to 2020 (as is the case in calculating the fatality rate).

**FIGURE 6. THE RATE OF SERIOUS INJURIES**
The Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries (Bicycles and Pedestrians)

While referring to Figure 7 (below), the darker blue bars show the number of fatalities for pedestrians and bicyclists combined. In 2017, the number of combined pedestrian bicycle fatalities is 982 as of June, 2019. The lighter blue bars with red text denote the current data that is available in SWITRS for the number of serious injuries for pedestrians and bicyclists combined. In 2017, the number of combined serious injuries for bicycles and pedestrians is 3,273. The dark blue bars depict the decreasing number of fatalities to zero by the end of December 2049. The dark blue line represents the five-year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, which for the target year of 2020 is $4147.4$.

**Figure 7. Non-Motorized Targets for Fatalities and Serious Injuries (Combined)**

Summary

For a breakdown of the five SPMTs, refer to Table 1. Appendix A also details the outreach efforts done by Caltrans, OTS, and the FHWA to the MPO’s, counties, and local agencies in order to coordinate and communicate the SMPTs. Further information with regards to the webinars listed in Appendix A is accessible at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/shsp/. Here data is provided from Caltrans, OTS, and the FHWA. For example, traffic volumes from HPMS are broken down by county for 10 years. In addition, the webinars have been recorded and can be accessed from this website.
APPENDIX A: Safety Performance Management Target Setting Outreach Efforts

Background:
Safety Performance Management (Safety PM) is part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) defines as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. The Safety PM Final Rule supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), as it establishes safety performance measurement requirements for the purpose of carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures as the five-year rolling averages to include:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

The Safety PM Final Rule also establishes the process for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to establish and report their safety targets, and the process that the FHWA will use to assess whether State DOTs have met or made significant progress toward meeting their safety targets.

Important Dates/Deadlines:
The overall State targets required by FHWA are due on August 31st, annually, while the MPOs set their targets six months after the State sets its targets. Three of the five safety targets must be coordinated with the Highway Safety Plan administered by the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), which must submit their targets to NHTSA by June 30th of each year.

Performance Targets must also be included in updates to Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plans (LRSTP), metropolitan transportation plans (MTP), state transportation improvement programs (STIP) and transportation improvement programs (TIP) after May 27, 2019.

Engagement Timeline:

- **May 8, 2019** – A workshop took place by webinar and phone conference to discuss the 2020 Safety Performance Management Targets with the MPOs and other vested stakeholders. During this workshop four possible scenarios for setting the 2020 Targets were presented. They included: (1) a trend line, which extrapolates the existing changes in fatalities and serious injuries into the future; (2) a flat line scenario, which assumes that there is no change in the future from the current numbers; (3) a match to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan’s goal of -3% for fatalities and -1.5% for serious injuries; (4) a target line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050. After receiving feedback from the MPOs from the webinar and phone conference, the consensus was to select the fourth scenario.
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ARJIS Update: California Senate Bill 54

Overview
This report presents a summary of Senate Bill (2018, De León) (SB 54), the California Values Act, which amended the California Government Code and Health and Safety Code, and its impact on local criminal justice information systems in San Diego County. Based on guidance from the California Attorney General and in coordination with the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) has also taken steps to implement changes to the ARJIS system which are described in more detail below.

Background
ARJIS is a criminal justice data sharing hub in San Diego County that enables law enforcement agencies to work more efficiently in our region by facilitating interagency cooperation to address crime. Over 5,000 state, local, and federal law enforcement personnel from over 65 agencies use ARJIS through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). The San Diego County Sheriff’s Department is the region’s Controlling Agency monitoring compliance with CLETS policies and procedures.

Senate Bill 54
SB 54 became effective on January 1, 2018, and limits state and local law enforcement assistance in immigration enforcement in the State of California. On October 1, 2018, the Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Division of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) released an Information Bulletin (Attachment 1) providing guidance to law enforcement agencies on best practices regarding the governance of databases affected by SB 54.

In February 2019, the California DOJ CJIS Division released an updated Policies, Practices, and Procedures Manual for use of CLETS. The update included policy changes related to SB 54. The manual outlines the requirements for use of CJIS information, as well as directives for user audits, access, and security.

In implementing changes to the ARJIS system under SB 54, ARJIS coordinated with the CLETS Controlling Agency in the region, the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, and took the following actions:

- **Immigration Records Access Removed:** ARJIS removed access to immigration-related records for all users.

---

1 California Justice Information Services Division, Information Bulletin No. 18-10-CJIS, October 1, 2018
• **Immigration Terms Deleted**: ARJIS removed the ability for agencies to share new data with references to immigration status in its applications, including criminal charges and identification types using terms such as “illegal alien,” “federal immigration,” and “undocumented”.

• **Reason for Search Language**: ARJIS updated its database systems to require that users enter a valid reason, such as a crime case number, for each database search. This makes security audits of user searches easier by confirming each search is conducted for a valid reason.

• **Login Screen Language Updated**: ARJIS added the California DOJ recommended acknowledgment language to the criminal misuse warnings on each of its’ application login screens.

  “Federal, state or local law enforcement agencies shall not use any non-criminal history information contained within this database for immigration enforcement purposes. This restriction does not pertain to any information that is regarding a person’s immigration or citizenship status pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644.”

• **ARJIS Training Updated**: ARJIS updated its training materials to include warnings about misuse of the system for immigration enforcement.

Specific to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) access to the ARJIS database, the California DOJ guidance from October 2018, provided that federal immigration authorities should not be denied access to law enforcement databases solely based on their status as a federal immigration authority. ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) chose not to sign a new CLETS Subscriber Agreement that requires system users to comply with SB 54 and subsequently ARJIS disabled all ICE ERO accounts in October 2019, consistent with a similar action taken by the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department.

**Next Steps**

ARJIS will continue to monitor the implementation of SB 54 and take appropriate steps in collaboration with its member agencies.

**Pamela Scanlon, ARJIS Director**

Key Staff Contact: Kendall Amerige, (619) 533-5173, ken.amerige@sandag.org

Attachment: 1. California Justice Information Services, Information Bulletin, October 1, 2018
TO: ALL CHIEFS OF POLICE, SHERIFFS, and EXECUTIVES OF CALIFORNIA LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

DATABASE GUIDANCE – Senate Bill 54

This Information Bulletin (IB) provides guidance to state and local law enforcement agencies (LEAs) on best practices regarding the governance of databases regarding Senate Bill (SB) No. 54 (De León; 2017-2018 Regular Sessions) ("the Values Act") to ensure information is limited for immigration enforcement purposes to the fullest extent practicable and consistent with federal and state law. The Values Act mandates that the Attorney General, by October 1, 2018, publish "guidance, audit criteria, and training recommendations aimed at ensuring that" databases operated by state and local law enforcement agencies "are governed in a manner that limits the availability of information therein to the fullest extent practicable and consistent with federal and state law, to anyone or any entity for the purpose of immigration enforcement." LEAs are strongly encouraged to review and update their existing database governance policies consistent with this guidance.

This IB is not intended to displace any current policies that are aligned with or provide greater protections than those included herein. Nor does the lack of a particular recommendation necessarily indicate disapproval of any policy. Rather, this IB provides some foundational recommendations and should serve as a resource to enhance current policies with respect to the Values Act’s goal of ensuring that databases are governed in a manner that limits the availability of information to the fullest extent practicable and consistent with federal and state law for the purpose of immigration enforcement.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

In enacting the Values Act, the Legislature determined that "a relationship of trust between California’s immigrant community and state and local agencies is central to the public safety of the people of California." (Gov. Code, § 7284.2.) The Values Act’s core purpose is to ensure effective policing and to protect the safety, well-being, and constitutional rights of all the people of California, regardless of immigration status. The Values Act set the parameters under which LEAs may engage in "immigration enforcement." "Immigration enforcement," as defined by the Values Act, includes any efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law, and also includes any efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry, reentry to, or employment in, the United States.

The Values Act generally prohibits LEAs from using agency or department moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, including providing personal information for that purpose. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (a)(1)(D).) The Values Act, however,
permits LEAs to participate in law enforcement task forces, including sharing confidential information pursuant to these task forces, where the primary purpose of the task force is not immigration enforcement. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(3).) And, the Values Act permits LEAs to provide immigration authorities with information about a person’s criminal history accessible through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(2).) The specific requirements for LEAs under the Values Act are set forth more fully in IB 2018-DLE-01, and specific data reporting requirements can be referenced in IB 18-02-CJIS.

Additional principles of state and federal law should also be used to guide LEAs in developing database governance policies that limit the availability of information for purposes of immigration enforcement. Under California law, LEAs are generally prohibited from asking a person about his or her immigration status. (Gov. Code, §7284.6, subd. (a)(1)(A).) Also, LEAs are restricted from sharing personal information about a person that is not available to the public, and that is not attached to a person’s criminal history. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (a)(1)(D), (b)(2).) Notwithstanding that prohibition, consistent with federal law, 8 U.S.C. § 1373, nothing in this IB prohibits or restricts LEAs from sending or receiving information regarding a person’s immigration status or citizen status to or from federal immigration enforcement authorities, or prohibits or restricts LEAs from maintaining information regarding a person’s immigration status. Federal courts have found that Section 1373 only prohibits restrictions on the sharing of immigration or citizenship status information, and not restrictions on the sharing of home and work addresses, and release dates. Courts have also found 8 U.S.C. § 1373 to be unconstitutional under the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, so LEAs should ask their counsel to monitor developments in the law.

Consistent with federal and state law, this IB offers guidance on steps LEAs can take to govern the use of criminal justice information (CJI) that is non-criminal history information. Non-criminal history information contained within databases accessed through CLETS, other DOJ criminal justice information systems, as well as LEAs’ individual databases should not be used for the purpose of immigration enforcement. And, any implementation of the policy recommendations in this IB should be applied to all law enforcement agencies equally, regardless of whether they are federal, state, or local law enforcement. Federal immigration authorities should not be denied access to law enforcement databases solely based on their status as a federal immigration authority, so long as they comply with the policies governing use of the databases.

GUIDANCE SURROUNDING USE OF NON-CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION

All users should agree that they will not use any information for purposes of immigration enforcement, as defined in California Government Code section 7284.4, subdivision (f), with respect to an individual who does not possess a criminal history. Individuals who have a criminal history include those with a prior criminal arrest or conviction. This restriction does not impact persons with criminal records within CJI systems. Users are also not prohibited or restricted from sending to, or receiving from, federal immigration authorities, information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an individual, or from requesting from federal immigration authorities information regarding a person’s immigration status, maintaining such information, or exchanging such information with any other federal, state, or local government entity, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644.

1 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a), (b).
LEAs are encouraged to adopt the following policies surrounding the use of non-criminal history data:

1. As part of any application, memorandum of understanding, or agreement to access any law enforcement databases, LEAs should inquire regarding the purpose for which the LEA intends to use the information contained within the database. Users who state that they will be using the information for immigration enforcement purposes should be required, as a condition for accessing the database, to agree that they will only do so for those individuals with a criminal history, or for information regarding the immigration or citizenship status of any individual. Users should likewise be required to agree they will not use non-criminal history information, aside from information regarding immigration or citizenship status, for immigration enforcement purposes.

2. Database login screens should be updated to include instruction on the proper use of the information contained in the database. Sample language is provided below:

"Federal, state or local law enforcement agencies shall not use any non-criminal history information contained within this database for immigration enforcement purposes. This restriction does not pertain to any information that is regarding a person's immigration or citizenship status pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644."

3. Any policies governing the use of non-criminal history information should include the above-referenced language.

4. Any data sharing agreements, memorandums of understanding, and/or contracts between law enforcement agencies and vendors/service providers should be updated to reflect policies that prohibit the use of non-criminal history information for immigration enforcement purposes.

5. Limit, wherever possible, the collection of personal information of victims and witnesses of crime(s). Further, consider adopting retention periods no longer than is necessary to fulfill the purpose justifying collection of the information.

6. Agencies should survey their databases to determine which databases contain criminal history information, non-criminal history information, and/or both criminal history and non-criminal history information to assist with audits, training, and policy compliance.

TRAINING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NON-CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION

1. Initial security awareness training for new employees and ongoing biannual recertification should be updated to include questions to demonstrate knowledge of the updated governance policies regarding limitations on the use of non-criminal history information for immigration enforcement purposes.

AUDIT CRITERIA FOR NON-CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION

1. When internal database compliance audits are conducted, agencies should ensure database users are in compliance with policies that limit the use of non-criminal history information for immigration enforcement purposes.
2. Agencies should update internal policies regarding the reporting of misuse of non-criminal history information that is used for immigration enforcement purposes.

Sincerely,

JOE DOMINIC, Chief
California Justice Information Services Division

For XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General
ARJIS Update: California Assembly Bill 1215

Overview

On October 8, 2019, Governor Newsom signed into law Assembly Bill 1215 (Ting, 2019) (AB 1215) (Attachment 1), related to law enforcement use of facial recognition and other surveillance, which amended California Penal Code, Section 823.19. This bill places a moratorium on the use of biometric surveillance systems in connection with officer cameras until 2023. Currently, the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) provides local law enforcement agencies with access to biometric facial recognition software on mobile devices through the Tactical Identification System (TACIDS) program. Operation of the TACIDS program will be suspended beginning January 1, 2020, to allow ARJIS and member agencies to fully examine the implications of AB 1215 and explore opportunities for other technology programs.

Background

ARJIS has provided TACIDS facial recognition software to law enforcement agencies in the region through ARJIS mobile devices since 2012. The TACIDS mobile application allows authorized users to photograph detained individuals using the camera on their mobile phone or tablet. Each image is analyzed based on biometric features and compared to images in the San Diego County Sheriff’s booking photo database. Potential matches are returned within 10 to 15 seconds and can be used to aid in determining a detained person’s identity.

ARJIS researched, tested, and procured TACIDS facial recognition software over a six-year period with input from ARJIS member agencies and approval of ARJIS governing bodies. ARJIS developed an Acceptable Use Policy for Facial Recognition in 2013, which was approved by the SANDAG Public Safety Committee and the SANDAG Board of Directors. This policy addresses the technical components of the TACIDS facial recognition system that ARJIS is responsible for, including the secure network infrastructure, technical standards, security and privacy protocols, controlled access, audit capabilities, and system management and accountability.

Operational protocols for how facial recognition technologies are utilized by law enforcement agencies are dictated by individual agencies, California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System Policies, Practices, Procedures, and Statutes (published by the California Department of Justice), and the Criminal Justice Information Services Security Policy (published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation).

Assembly Bill 1215

AB 1215 prohibits law enforcement officers and/or agencies from installing, activating, or using a biometric surveillance system, which includes an automated or semiautomated process that captures or analyzes

---

1 Per ARJIS Facial Recognition Acceptable Use Policy, TACIDS can be used when assisting in the identification of individuals who have been detained based on reasonable suspicion, and are lacking and/or not forthcoming with their identification, or who appear to be using someone else’s identification or a false identification.
biometric data of an individual to identify or assist in identifying an individual, in connection with an officer camera or data collected by an officer camera. This law will take effect on January 1, 2020, and will sunset on January 1, 2023.

As described above, ARJIS provides law enforcement agencies with access to facial recognition software on mobile devices with cameras for officer use. While the TACIDS program does not provide cameras or devices that function autonomously to collect ongoing surveillance information, AB 1215 also prohibits an automated or semiautomated process that analyzes biometric data in connection with data collected by an officer camera. On November 6, 2019, the Chiefs’ and Sheriff’s Management Committee discussed the technical and operational impacts of AB 1215 and supported ARJIS taking steps to address the impacts of the legislation.

Next Steps

To ensure compliance with AB 1215, operation of the TACIDS program will be suspended beginning January 1, 2020. ARJIS will notify all law enforcement partners that TACIDS access will be suspended, which will include removal of the TACIDS Booking Photo interface and all user access to TACIDS systems. ARJIS will continue to provide updates as AB 1215 is implemented and, based on feedback from member agencies and direction from ARJIS governing bodies, will also pursue other programs and/or technologies to assist agencies with tactical identification. ARJIS will continue to provide updates as AB 1215 is implemented, and will also pursue other programs and/or technologies to assist agencies with tactical identification based on feedback from member agencies and direction from ARJIS governing bodies.

Pam Scanlon, Director of ARJIS

Key Staff Contact:  Caroline Stevens, (619) 699-6974, caroline.stevens@sandag.org
Attachment: 1. Assembly Bill 1215 (Ting)
Assembly Bill No. 1215

CHAPTER 579

An act to add and repeal Section 832.19 of the Penal Code, relating to law enforcement.

[Approved by Governor October 8, 2019. Filed with Secretary of State October 8, 2019.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1215, Ting. Law enforcement: facial recognition and other biometric surveillance.

Existing law states the intent of the Legislature to establish policies and procedures to address issues related to the downloading and storage of data recorded by a body-worn camera worn by a peace officer, and requires that those policies and procedures be based on best practices. Existing law requires law enforcement agencies, departments, or entities to consider certain best practices regarding the downloading and storage of body-worn camera data when establishing policies and procedures for the implementation and operation of a body-worn camera system, as specified.

This bill would prohibit a law enforcement agency or law enforcement officer from installing, activating, or using any biometric surveillance system in connection with an officer camera or data collected by an officer camera. The bill would authorize a person to bring an action for equitable or declaratory relief against a law enforcement agency or officer who violates that prohibition.

The bill would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2023.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Californians value privacy as an essential element of their individual freedom, and are guaranteed a right to privacy in Section 1 of Article I of the California Constitution.

(b) Facial recognition and other biometric surveillance technology pose unique and significant threats to the civil rights and civil liberties of residents and visitors.

(c) The use of facial recognition and other biometric surveillance is the functional equivalent of requiring every person to show a personal photo identification card at all times in violation of recognized constitutional rights. This technology also allows people to be tracked without consent. It would also generate massive databases about law-abiding Californians, and may chill the exercise of free speech in public places.
(d) Facial recognition and other biometric surveillance technology has been repeatedly demonstrated to misidentify women, young people, and people of color and to create an elevated risk of harmful “false positive” identifications.

(e) Facial and other biometric surveillance would corrupt the core purpose of officer-worn body-worn cameras by transforming those devices from transparency and accountability tools into roving surveillance systems.

(f) The use of facial recognition and other biometric surveillance would disproportionately impact the civil rights and civil liberties of persons who live in highly policed communities. Its use would also diminish effective policing and public safety by discouraging people in these communities, including victims of crime, undocumented persons, people with unpaid fines and fees, and those with prior criminal history from seeking police assistance or from assisting the police.

SEC. 2. Section 832.19 is added to the Penal Code, immediately following Section 832.18, to read:

832.19. (a) For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

(1) “Biometric data” means a physiological, biological, or behavioral characteristic that can be used, singly or in combination with each other or with other information, to establish individual identity.

(2) “Biometric surveillance system” means any computer software or application that performs facial recognition or other biometric surveillance.

(3) “Facial recognition or other biometric surveillance” means either of the following, alone or in combination:

(A) An automated or semiautomated process that captures or analyzes biometric data of an individual to identify or assist in identifying an individual.

(B) An automated or semiautomated process that generates, or assists in generating, surveillance information about an individual based on biometric data.

(4) “Facial recognition or other biometric surveillance” does not include the use of an automated or semiautomated process for the purpose of redacting a recording for release or disclosure outside the law enforcement agency to protect the privacy of a subject depicted in the recording, if the process does not generate or result in the retention of any biometric data or surveillance information.

(5) “Law enforcement agency” means any police department, sheriff’s department, district attorney, county probation department, transit agency police department, school district police department, highway patrol, the police department of any campus of the University of California, the California State University, or a community college, the Department of the California Highway Patrol, and the Department of Justice.

(6) “Law enforcement officer” means an officer, deputy, employee, or agent of a law enforcement agency.
(7) "Officer camera" means a body-worn camera or similar device that records or transmits images or sound and is attached to the body or clothing of, or carried by, a law enforcement officer.

(8) "Surveillance information" means either of the following, alone or in combination:

(A) Any information about a known or unknown individual, including, but not limited to, a person’s name, date of birth, gender, or criminal background.

(B) Any information derived from biometric data, including, but not limited to, assessments about an individual’s sentiment, state of mind, or level of dangerousness.

(9) "Use" means either of the following, alone or in combination:

(A) The direct use of a biometric surveillance system by a law enforcement officer or law enforcement agency.

(B) A request or agreement by a law enforcement officer or law enforcement agency that another law enforcement agency or other third party use a biometric surveillance system on behalf of the requesting officer or agency.

(b) A law enforcement agency or law enforcement officer shall not install, activate, or use any biometric surveillance system in connection with an officer camera or data collected by an officer camera.

(c) In addition to any other sanctions, penalties, or remedies provided by law, a person may bring an action for equitable or declaratory relief in a court of competent jurisdiction against a law enforcement agency or law enforcement officer that violates this section.

(d) This section does not preclude a law enforcement agency or law enforcement officer from using a mobile fingerprint scanning device during a lawful detention to identify a person who does not have proof of identification if this use is lawful and does not generate or result in the retention of any biometric data or surveillance information.

(e) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2023, and as of that date is repealed.