

CALIFORNIA
ELECTRONIC
INTERCEPTIONS REPORT



Annual Report
to the
Legislature
2016

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General



Division of Criminal Law

Appeals, Writs & Trials Section

This annual report is available on the
California Attorney General's website:
<http://oag.ca.gov>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2016.....	3
Table 2: General Description of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2016.....	4
Table 3: Electronic Interception Court Activity During Calendar Year 2016.....	5
Table 4: Description of Communications Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2016.....	6
Table 4A: Previously Unreported Description of Communications Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions	37
Table 5: Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report.....	38
Table 6: Costs of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2016	63
Table 6A: Previously Unreported Costs of Electronic Interceptions.....	86
Table 7: Jurisdiction Reporting No Electronic Interception Activity During Calendar Year 2016.....	87
Table 8: Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions Conducted in Prior Years.....	88
Table 9: List of Electronic Interception Orders Approved But Never Installed or Not Used Calendar Year 2016	91
Appendix A: Penal Code section 629.62 “Report by Attorney General”	92

Executive Summary

The 2016 Attorney General's Electronic Interceptions Report is issued in compliance with Penal Code section 629.62, and can be referenced on the Attorney General's website at: <http://oag.ca.gov>.

Electronic intercepts are legally sanctioned surveillance of electronic communications for law enforcement purposes and continue to be a vital force in the battle against criminal elements. This report contains electronic interception data and describes how electronic intercepts have enhanced the ability of law enforcement to identify and dismantle drug trafficking organizations (DTO), solve serious and violent crimes, and incapacitate criminal street gangs. DTO's, criminal street gangs, and individuals involved in criminal offenses often use telecommunications to advance illegal objectives such as money laundering, drug trafficking, and murder. Through the use of court-authorized electronic intercepts, law enforcement has an effective tool to investigate and prevent crimes.

From intelligence-gathering to arrests, several counties provide examples demonstrating that intercepts are essential tools to combat the ever-changing criminal element

Riverside County (2015-RIV-2228) used electronic intercepts to arrest seven people, and seize \$229,965 in narcotics proceeds, 6.2 pounds of methamphetamine, 45 kilograms of heroin, and 10 kilograms of cocaine.

San Bernardino County (2016-SBD-650, 661, 699, 705) used electronic intercepts to disrupt extensive gang activity and solve multiple murders. These investigations led to the arrests of 74 gang members and the seizure of narcotics and firearms.

San Diego County (2016-SD-232) used electronic intercepts to arrest 17 people and dismantle a sophisticated money laundering organization (MLO). Agents successfully seized two million dollars of narcotics proceeds and a residential property valued at two million dollars.

San Joaquin County (2016-SJ-83) utilized electronic intercepts to arrest 58 gang members, prevent five armed robberies and multiple shootings, discover a human trafficking ring, and solve a homicide.

Santa Clara County (2016-SCL-7) worked with federal agents to dismantle a transnational criminal organization that was responsible for four homicides and illegal gambling. The investigation led to 24 arrests, the seizure of five firearms, 69 illegal gambling machines, and more than one million dollars in narcotics proceeds, and narcotics.

Though the report is divided into separate tables, the tables should be read in conjunction with one another to evaluate the impact intercepts have on public safety. Tables 1, 2, and 3 reflect the statistics of arrest, conviction, nature of intercept orders, and post-intercept court activity. Table 4 contains a description of and optional commentary for each intercept. Table 5 represents compliance with the inventory notice requirement given to those who were subjected to intercepts.

Table 6 shows the cost of each intercept. Table 7 lists counties with no intercepts to report. Table 8 provides supplemental information for intercepts approved prior to 2016 but completed later. Finally, Table 9 lists electronic intercept orders that were never used.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please contact the Criminal Law Division of the Attorney General's Office at (916) 445-9555.

Table 1
Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016¹

Reporting Jurisdiction	No. of Applications	Number of Persons Arrested		Arrest Offenses						Conviction Offenses						Number of Persons Convicted	
		Total	Avg. per Order	Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Total	Avg. per Order
Alameda	6	0													0		
Contra Costa	11	40	6.7	7	38	24			39		2				2	0.3	
Fresno	34	83	3.5	11		12			61						0		
Imperial	2	0													0		
Los Angeles	221	173	3.1	13		25									0		
Orange	36	1	1.0	1											0		
Riverside	106	54	3.6			54									0		
Sacramento	2	1	1.0			1									0		
San Bernardino	80	127	4.2	33	37	92	4		10		3				3	0.1	
San Diego	17	43	7.2	3	3	37			23			13			13	2.2	
San Joaquin	18	58	58.0	58	58	58									0		
San Luis Obispo	3	12	12.0			12						9			9	9.0	
Santa Barbara	1	17	17.0	17	17										0		
Santa Clara	12	113	12.6	4	100	113			99						0		
Sonoma	1	0													0		
Stanislaus	1	0													0		
Ventura	18	54	6.0	2	45	44			6						0		
Total:	569	776		149	298	472	4	0	238	0	5	22	0	0	2	27	

¹ Any disparity between "Number of Persons Arrested" and "Number of Persons Convicted" may be attributed to the fact that a number of those arrested are pending either changes or trial, processes that could take a period of time, or that the intercept is part of a larger-scale ongoing investigation.

Table 2
General Description of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	No. of Applications	Targeted Offenses (Offenses Specified in Order)						Targeted Location					Targeted Device				
		Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Residence	Business	Public Area	Portable device	Other	Cell Phone	Land Line	Pager	Computer	Other
Alameda	6	6						2	1		4		4	2			
Contra Costa	11	2	8				4						11				
Fresno	34	23	3	8							32	3	34			3	20
Imperial	2			2							2		2				
Los Angeles	221	15		204							203		219			1	7
Orange	36	3		33			2				36		36	2			
Riverside	106	8	4	94			1				106		106				
Sacramento	2	1		1							2		2	1			
San Bernardino	80	11		69							80		80				
San Diego	17	4	1	12			5				17	1	14			1	3
San Joaquin	18	18	18	18							2		18				
San Luis Obispo	3			2			1				3		3				
Santa Barbara	1	1	1										1				
Santa Clara	12	8	10	8			4	12	4		12		12			1	
Sonoma	1	1											1				
Stanislaus	1	1											1				
Ventura	18	2	6	11			3				9		18				

Table 3
Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges
And Court Activity During Calendar Year 2016²

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions						Total Duration of Wiretaps			Motions to Suppress			Number of Trials Resulting from Intercepts
	Applications	Granted	Modified/Amended	Denied	Not Installed/Installed Not Used	Applications	Granted	Modified/Amended	Denied	Not Installed/Installed Not Used	Average Length	Requested Days	Actual Days	Avg. per Order	Granted	Denied	Pending	
Alameda	6	6										180	120	20				0
Contra Costa	11	11	1									330	266	24				0
Fresno	34	33		1	1	11	10			1	30	1320	967	28				0
Imperial	2	2										60	60	30				0
Los Angeles	221	221	1			82	82				30	9089	9466	43			1	0
Orange	36	36				2	2				16	1140	879	24				0
Riverside	106	106				84	84				30	5670	5409	51				0
Sacramento	2	2										37	11	6				0
San Bernardino	80	79	2		4	51	51			4	30	3870	3551	44				13
San Diego	17	17	2			10	10				30	810	730	43				0
San Joaquin	18	18				16	16				30	1020	709	39				0
San Luis Obispo	3	3	1			1	1				30	120	105	35			1	1
Santa Barbara	1	1				2	2				11	52	37	37				0
Santa Clara	12	12	1			3	2				30	440	347	29				0
Sonoma	1	1										30	23	23				0
Stanislaus	1	1	1									20	20	20				0
Ventura	18	18										540	489	27				0

² The purpose of obtaining electronic intercept evidence is not always trial-focused and may relate to further investigation at the state or federal levels for crime prevention.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Alameda	2016-ALA-62	31	91	15	85	This was a wiretap on a cold case murder. Though this wiretap did not lead to any direct arrests at this time, it did provide valuable information on several suspect leads.
	2016-ALA-63	5	14	0	100	See Wiretap No. 2016-ALA-62.
	2016-ALA-64	68	93	5	95	See Wiretap No. 2016-ALA-62.
	2016-ALA-65	16	24	8	92	See Wiretap No. 2016-ALA-62.
	2016-ALA-66	58	145	19	81	See Wiretap No. 2016-ALA-62.
	2016-ALA-67	42	81	2	98	See Wiretap No. 2016-ALA-62.
Contra Costa	2017-CC-1	63	673	3.8	96	The wiretap was part of an investigation into a 2015 murder. Though the information was not sufficient to file homicide charges, it was sufficient to file firearm/gang charges.
	2017-CC-2	937	1,492	10	90	The wire was initiated to investigate a series of murders and attempted murders by a gang. Almost immediately upon interception, law enforcement identified a series of residential burglaries, robberies, and carjackings that this gang was involved in. 6 gang members were apprehended. In addition, firearms were seized and leads were developed to further investigate the shootings that were the original impetus for the wire.
	2017-CC-3	288	4,011	15	85	
	2017-CC-4	325	10,216	2	98	
	2017-CC-5	219	11,207	8	92	
	2017-CC-6	462	16,210	14	86	
	2017-CC-7	81	3,896	9	91	
	2017-CC-8	249	10,164	10	90	
	2017-CC-9	561	8,567	20	80	A multi-agency task force initiated this wiretap investigation and successfully put an end to a tremendous amount of violent gang activity in a specific area of the county for the past 5 years.
	2017-CC-10	82	2,736	11	89	See Wiretap No. 2017-CC-9.
	2017-CC-11	371	5,412	10	90	See Wiretap No. 2017-CC-9.
Fresno	2016-FR-3	383	17,610	31	69	

³ Comments are not mandated and may be edited.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-1	564	19,881	21	79	31 gang members were arrested on state and federal charges including conspiracy to commit murder in aid of racketeering, human trafficking, and fraud in aid of racketeering. Several were also charged with transporting subjects for commercial sex acts. 13 vehicles were seized as well as \$182,000. To date there has been a decrease in shootings and violence perpetrated by this gang.
	2016-FR-2	241	22,847	69	31	
	2016-FR-4	1	69	13	87	
	2016-FR-6	108	4,238	27	73	As a result of this wiretap, agents were able to dismantle a group of individuals who were trafficking in the sales of methamphetamine and cocaine.
	2016-FR-7	34	1,617	10	90	
	2016-FR-8	66	948	19	81	
	2016-FR-9	92	3,087	14	86	
	2016-FR-10	24	404	29	71	
	2016-FR-11	3	135	29	71	
	2016-FR-12	9	95	24	76	
	2016-FR-13	1	69	13	87	
	2016-FR-14	237	9,197	54	46	
	2016-FR-16	55	1,646	46	54	
	2016-FR-21	31	2,182	19	81	
	2016-FR-22	9	342	5	95	
	2016-FR-23	1,743	94,367	8	92	
	2016-FR-24	562	16,863	50	50	
	2016-FR-25	122	1,375	2	98	
	2016-FR-26	331	1,681	53	47	
	2016-FR-27	607	18,395	17	83	
	2016-FR-28	95	3,195	11	89	
	2016-FR-29	53	4,321	22	78	
	2016-FR-30	611	16,781	49	51	
	2016-FR-31	181	3,868	34	66	
	2016-FR-32	348	10,596	26	73	
	2016-FR-33	85	2,359	19	81	
	2016-FR-34	59	1,715	29	71	
	2016-FR-35	161	7,513	18	82	
	2016-FR-36	45	707	24	76	
	2016-FR-37	70	2,534	8	92	
	2016-FR-38	56	5,423	12	88	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-39	36	455	26	74	
	2016-FR-40	55	1,646	49	51	As a result of this wiretap one arrest was made.
Imperial	2016-IM-100	1,072	6,903	19	81	The wire interceptions focused on the narcotics smuggling, transportation, and distribution from a Mexico-based drug trafficking organization (DTO) that was involved in Imperial County and other areas in the United States.
	2016-IM-101	6	736	39	61	See Wiretap No. 2016-IM-100.
Los Angeles	2016-LA-1023	33	7,638	25	75	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1027	2	2,523	48	52	This wiretap was part of a cold case murder investigation and resulted in one arrest. To date, no charges have been filed.
	2016-LA-1054	151	1,900	14	86	This wiretap helped identify members within a DTO, including a supplier.
	2016-LA-1060	592	5,490	2	98	As a result of this wiretap, the following seizures were made: one kilogram of heroin, 45 oxycodone pills, \$55,000 in narcotics proceeds, two vehicles, and useable amounts of methamphetamine and cocaine.
	2016-LA-1061	108	5,651	15	85	As a result of this wiretap, approximately 14 pounds of methamphetamine and \$4,400 in narcotics proceeds were seized.
	2016-LA-1063	29	18,307	31	69	As a result of this wiretap, 77 kilograms of cocaine and approximately \$240,000 in narcotics proceeds were seized. This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1064	5	1,835	26	74	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1068	222	559,003	20	80	As a result of this wiretap, 34 kilograms of cocaine was seized. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1069	46	220,884	4	96	As a result of this wiretap, \$169,048 in narcotics proceeds was seized. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1070	10	14,261	30	70	This wiretap led to identification of additional targets subjects within the DTO.
	2016-LA-1071	95	115,249	28	72	This wiretap led to identification of additional targets subjects transporting narcotics into the United States and overseas. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1073	21	1,107	2	98	No significant activity to report at this time.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1074	31	32,700	38	62	This wiretap led to identification of additional targets transporting narcotics into the United States and overseas. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1075	1	14			The target discontinued use of this phone.
	2016-LA-1076	123	2,814	23	77	As a result of this wiretap, approximately 1 kilogram of heroin, \$51,800, and 2 vehicles were seized.
	2016-LA-1077	147	218,205	16	84	50 pounds of methamphetamine was seized. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1079	10	68	41	59	Approximately 1 pound of methamphetamine was seized.
	2016-LA-1080	42	38,684	31	69	As a result of this wiretap, \$90,000 was seized. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1081	84	5,260	20	80	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1082	67	2,594	3	97	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1084	162	4,782	9	91	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1085	94	3,091	13	87	See Wiretap No. 2016-LA-1076.
	2016-LA-1086	40	1,916	32	68	As a result of this wiretap, 3 arrests were made and 14.2 ounces of heroin was seized.
	2016-LA-1088	19	14,728	4	96	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1089	12	214	3	97	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1090	53	435	5	95	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1091	46	1,784	39	61	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1092	73	12,813	32	68	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1093	32	3,782	12	88	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of \$137,980 in narcotics proceeds and the arrest of 1 person.
	2016-LA-1094	10	394	40	60	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1095	36	3,861	22	78	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of 40 pounds of methamphetamine and the arrest of 1 person.
	2016-LA-1096	1	85	3	97	See Wiretap No. 2016-LA-1093.
2016-LA-1097	77	40,316	89	11	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of \$904,189 in narcotics proceeds, 53 kilograms of cocaine, and the arrest of 4 people.	
2016-LA-1098	71	4,667	32	68	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1099	77	4,793	8	92	As a result of this wiretap, agents identified additional members of the DTO and seized \$144,760.00 in narcotics proceeds. Agents also identified the source of supply, locations, and the method of operations.
	2016-LA-1100	17	7,202	40	60	This intercept led to the identification of a narcotics courier.
	2016-LA-1101	2	225	30	70	Target subject changed phones.
	2016-LA-1102	25	245	46	54	As a result of this wiretap, agents learned the method of operation and identity of other targets. Approximately, one pound of heroin and a quarter-pound of methamphetamine were seized.
	2016-LA-1103	0	0	0	100	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified. One kilogram of cocaine was seized and one person was arrested.
	2016-LA-1104	0	0	0	100	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified. Three pounds of heroin, \$62,000 in narcotics proceeds and one handgun were seized, and two people were arrested.
	2016-LA-1105	0	0	0		As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified.
	2016-LA-1106	94	1,596	40	60	As a result of this wiretap three people were arrested, and three vehicles, \$65,000 in narcotics proceeds, three kilograms of cocaine, and 1.5 pounds of methamphetamine were seized.
	2016-LA-1107	197	60,829	2	98	As a result of this wiretap three arrests were made, 22 kilograms of cocaine, four pounds of methamphetamine and \$48,730 in narcotics proceeds were seized.
	2016-LA-1108	187	7,712	12	88	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1109	73	3,123	22	78	As a result of this wiretap, agents seized \$101,130 in narcotics proceeds and arrested two people.
	2016-LA-1110	15	956	8	92	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1111	0	0	0	0	No significant activity to report as this time.
	2016-LA-1112	134	7,423	27	73	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1114	18	2,318	30	70	14 pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
2016-LA-1115	34	2,941	34	66	Nothing significant to report.	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1116	88	10,276	9	91	
	2016-LA-1117	28	156	40	60	As a result of this wiretap, 1 person was arrested and 10 pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
	2016-LA-1118	2	98	5	95	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1119	11	236	19	81	The target discontinued using this phone.
	2016-LA-1120	20	3,702	28	72	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1121	33	979	8	92	1 person was arrested and 8 pounds of methamphetamine was seized
	2016-LA-1122	24	47	0	100	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1123	46	4,602	29	71	As a result of this wiretap, \$144,000 in narcotics proceeds and 54 kilograms of cocaine were seized.
	2016-LA-1124	52	9,086	18	82	As a result of this wiretap, \$220,000 in narcotics proceeds and 23 kilograms of cocaine were seized and 2 people were arrested.
	2016-LA-1125	81	4,467	30	70	As a result of this wiretap, additional target subjects and information were identified.
	2016-LA-1126	54	5,271	34	66	As a result of this wiretap, \$268,855 in narcotics proceeds was seized and 1 person was arrested.
	2016-LA-1127	15	1,478	17	83	As a result of this wiretap, \$183,000 and 90 kilograms of cocaine were seized and 2 people were arrested.
	2016-LA-1128	72	5,499			See Wiretap No. 2016-LA-1126.
	2016-LA-1129	66	4,783	16	84	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1130	12	712	6	94	The target discontinued use of the phone.
	2016-LA-1131	33	8,409	16	84	During this wiretap investigation approximately \$140,000 in U.S. currency was seized and one arrest was made.
	2016-LA-1132	43	2,479	16	84	The target discontinued use of the phone.
	2016-LA-1135	9	2,137	4	96	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1136	127	24,548	6	94	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1137	945	5,445	12	88	As a result of this wiretap, 70 pounds of marijuana and \$15,398 in narcotics proceeds were seized and a butane honey oil laboratory was discovered.
	2016-LA-1138	202	20,305	22	78	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1139	2	2	100	0	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1140	9	110	41	59	This investigation is ongoing.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1141	6	189	38	62	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1142	581	16,095			As a result of this wiretap, three arrests were made, and 578 grams of methamphetamine, 1199 grams of cocaine, and one handgun were seized.
	2016-LA-1143	40	987	21	79	The target subjects of this wiretap were arrested on methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana charges.
	2016-LA-1144	60	14,000	21	79	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1145	80	12,150	25	75	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1146	24	2,815	2	98	The wiretap resulted in one arrest and the seizure of one ounce of methamphetamine.
	2016-LA-1147	12	588	37	63	The target subject discontinued using the wiretapped phone.
	2016-LA-1148	150	33,534	29	71	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1149	100	15,000	53	47	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1150	25	14,050	50	50	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1151	45	12,000	75	25	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1152	35	14,500	49	51	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1153	12	588	37	63	The target subject discontinued using the wiretapped phone.
	2016-LA-1154	21	125	4	96	The target subjects were involved in a murder and all suspects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1155	254	10,026	8	92	The target subjects were involved in a murder and all suspects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1156	138	21,482		2	The target subjects were involved in a murder and all suspects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1157	796	28,112	7	93	The target subjects were involved in a murder and all suspects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1158	30	11,000	50	50	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1159	127	536	6	94	As a result of intercepted messages, agents seized a total of eight kilograms of cocaine and approximately \$26,000 in narcotic proceeds.
	2016-LA-1160	149	11,823	3	97	The target subject discontinued using the wiretapped phone.
	2016-LA-1161	134	1,403	9	91	The target subject discontinued using the wiretapped phone.
	2016-LA-1162	0	0	0	0	This wire intercept was discontinued after ten days.
	2016-LA-1163	21	20,237	27	73	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets involved in narcotic trafficking.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1164	70	588	35	65	No significant arrests or seizures were made as a result of this interception.
	2016-LA-1165	0	0	0	0	The target discontinued using this phone.
	2016-LA-1166	139	6,480			This interception led to 2 arrests, and the seizure of 16 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pound of heroin, and \$38,020.
	2016-LA-1167	41	2,890	37	63	Approximately \$600,000 in narcotics proceeds was seized during this wire interception.
	2016-LA-1169	58	9,835	19	81	As a result of this wiretap, 43 pounds of methamphetamine and 1 kilogram of cocaine were seized.
	2016-LA-1170		0			As a result of these interceptions 2 arrests were made, and 5.2 kilos of cocaine, 3.2 pounds of methamphetamine, 81 grams of tar heroin, 442 grams of heroin and \$29,338 were seized.
	2016-LA-1171	7	128	22	78	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets involved in narcotic trafficking.
	2016-LA-1174	63	3,245	13	87	Agents seized 3.695 pounds of methamphetamine and 100 grams of cocaine, and arrested 2 suspects.
	2016-LA-1175	178	5,791	29	71	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets.
	2016-LA-1176	44	318	18	82	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets.
	2016-LA-1177	77	2,289	17	83	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1178	0	0	0	0	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets.
	2016-LA-1180	2	14	0	100	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1181	19	1,444			Intercepted conversations led to the seizure of \$144,000 in narcotics proceeds and 54 kilograms of cocaine.
	2016-LA-1182	20	342	58	42	The intercept led to the identification of additional targets involved in narcotic trafficking.
	2016-LA-1183	0	0	0	0	During the course of this wiretap investigation, agents were unable to intercept any pertinent calls from this target telephone, and due to the inactivity of this line, the interception was terminated.
	2016-LA-1184	52	3,653	27	73	\$600,000 in narcotics proceeds seized and 1 suspect was arrested.
	2016-LA-1185	47	1,589	30	70	The target subjects discontinued using their telephones.
	2016-LA-1186	29	1,867	33	67	5 kilograms of cocaine were seized during this wire interception.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1187	9	307	37	63	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1188	73	6,537	22	78	Agents seized approximately 16 pounds of methamphetamine and half a kilogram of cocaine.
	2016-LA-1189	8	270	57	43	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1190	6	90	37	63	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1191	12	3,819	27	73	During this wiretap investigation, 3 arrests were made, and approximately \$1.2 million and 82 kilograms of cocaine were seized.
	2016-LA-1192	9	6,050			This interception led to the seizure of approximately 60 kilograms of cocaine and \$546,285.
	2016-LA-1193	25	10,145			No seizures occurred during this interception.
	2016-LA-1194	4	79	19	81	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1195	3	2,419	98	2	This interception led to 3 arrests, the seizure of approximately 5 kilograms of heroin, and approximately 70 lbs of marijuana.
	2016-LA-1196	783	3,693	17	83	The target subject discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-1197	12	790	36	64	The target subjects discontinued using their telephones.
	2016-LA-1198	0	0			No seizures or arrests were made for this interception.
	2016-LA-1199	10	91	13	87	
	2016-LA-1200	18	107	42	58	As a result of this wiretap, agents made 1 arrest and seized 21 kilograms of cocaine and 1 pound of tar heroin.
	2016-LA-1201	44	5,295	27	73	This wiretap interception resulted in the arrest of 2 subjects and the seizure of 41 pounds of methamphetamine and \$166,542.
	2016-LA-1202	662	1,605	34	66	This intercept led to the identification of multiple couriers and the seizure of approximately 22 lbs of methamphetamine.
	2016-LA-1203	6	73	16	84	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1204	3	34	12	88	
	2016-LA-1205	30	2,635	30	70	
	2016-LA-1206	116	2,840	7	93	
	2016-LA-1207	3	2,288	39	61	Investigators seized a total of 49 kilograms of cocaine and made 1 arrest.
	2016-LA-1208	39	7,536	37	63	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1209	5	1,686	41	59	
	2016-LA-1210	4,600	22,000	11	89	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1211	19	291	64	36	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1212	57	724	11	89	The target was arrested along with others for murder.
	2016-LA-1213	708	27,210	4	96	All targets were involved in the murder.
	2016-LA-1214	61	1,668	8	92	The target was arrested along with others for the murder.
	2016-LA-1215	150	6,288	15	85	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1216	349	2,285	40	60	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1217	183	7,573	6	94	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1218	61	649	7	93	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1219	20	6,047	11	89	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1220	80	4,277	41	59	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1221	100	800	87	13	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1222	68	524	80	20	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1223	84	555	76	24	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1224	115	770	81	19	This wiretap led to more target subjects.
	2016-LA-1225	1	17,950	6	94	This investigation targeted a specific violent criminal street gang and included multiple wiretaps. Numerous assault rifles, handguns, and elicit narcotics were seized. Several people have been charged with assault with a deadly weapon and homicide. 1 person has been charged federally with narcotics and weapons trafficking. The investigation is ongoing. There has been a decrease in violent crimes in the community. Additional arrests are pending.
	2016-LA-1226	1	171	11	89	See Wiretap No. 2016-LA-1225.
	2016-LA-1227	13	804			This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1229	0	0	0	0	The target subject stopped using his phone.
	2016-LA-1230	118	3,302	37	63	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1231	46	1,338	54	46	This investigation is ongoing.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1232	149	4,049	19	81	3 arrests were made, 30 kilos of cocaine, 100 pounds of methamphetamine and \$10,000 were seized. Additional target subjects were identified. This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1233	85	20,379	24	76	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1235	0	0	0	0	Target did not use his phone.
	2016-LA-1236	35	14,500			As a result of this interception the following seizures in CA and other states were made: \$150,000; \$15,000; \$10,000; 5 kilograms of cocaine; 10 kilograms of cocaine; 15 kilograms of cocaine, and 3 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2016-LA-1237	32	14,500	38	62	As a result of this interception the following seizures were made: 13 kilograms of cocaine; 40 kgs of cocaine; and 54 lbs of methamphetamine.
	2016-LA-1238	14	471	87	13	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1239	62	2,891	25	75	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1240	141	7,914	25	75	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1241	27	1,281	31	69	During this interception period, agents identified the members of this DTO and seized 48 kilos of cocaine, 40 pounds of methamphetamine, and \$230,000 in narcotic proceeds. Agents also identified the source of supply, stash locations, the method of operation and other target telephones.
	2016-LA-1242	38	1,192			During this investigation the agents learned the method of operation, others involved, and identified other target telephones used by this DTO.
	2016-LA-1243	32	1,498	31	69	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1244	162	4,782	9	91	Nothing significant to report.
	2016-LA-1245	35	7,183	22	78	During this interception period, agents arrested 2 people and seized approximately 1 pound of heroin.
	2016-LA-1246	31	2,663	16	84	During the course of this investigation, agents learned the method of operation, and identified other subjected.
	2016-LA-1247	0	0	0	0	No seizures made during this interception period.
	2016-LA-1248	34	11,696	53	47	During this interception period, agents identified the members of this DTO and seized approximately 48 kilos of cocaine, 40 pounds of methamphetamine, and \$230,000 in narcotic proceeds.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1249	34	33,572	40	60	No seizures occurred during this interception.
	2016-LA-1250	19	44,814	20	80	Intercepts led to the identification of additional targets involved in the narcotic trafficking. At the conclusion of the investigation, all offenders will be charged and arrested.
	2016-LA-1251	78	9,958	46	54	As a result of this interception agents seized half-a-pound of heroin and arrested 1 subject.
	2016-LA-1252	3	28	14	86	As a result of the interception, agents seized 1 pound of cocaine and arrested 2 subjects.
	2016-LA-1253	130	4,724	41	59	As a result of the interception, agents seized 7 kilograms of cocaine, 1 pound of methamphetamine, and \$10,981, and arrested 2 subjects.
	2016-LA-1254	40	912			As a result of the interception, agents seized 6 kilograms of cocaine, 1 pound of methamphetamine, and \$10,891, and arrested 3 subjects.
	2016-LA-1255	116	6,647	33	67	As a result of this interception agents seized 1,798 pounds of marijuana, approximately \$450,000, 2 pounds of methamphetamine, and 1 firearm, and 5 subjects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1256	34	1,341	30	70	As a result of this interception, agents seized \$100,000 from narcotic proceeds and 21 firearms, and 5 subjects were arrested.
	2016-LA-1257	14	2,384	30	70	As a result of this wiretap, 6 kilograms of cocaine, 1 pound of methamphetamine, and \$10,891 were seized, and 3 arrests were made.
	2016-LA-1258	77	1,680	22	78	No significant arrests or seizures were made.
	2016-LA-1259	6	210	4	96	As a result of this wiretap, 4 pounds of methamphetamine was seized and 2 arrests were made.
	2016-LA-1260	38	39,698	9	91	Although the interceptions did not result in any seizures, it led investigators to additional targets within the organization.
	2016-LA-1261	5	1,835	26	74	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1262	23	3,722	17	83	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1265	1	2	0	0	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1267	1,325	62,074	8	92	The target subjects were involved in a murder. All suspects were arrested as a result of this interception.
	2016-LA-1268	1,373	106,401	3	97	The target subjects were involved in a murder. All suspects were arrested as a result of this interception.
	2016-LA-1269		0			As a result of this interception, \$44,980 was seized.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1270	30	1,505	41	59	The operation targeted DTO members. This is still an ongoing investigation.
	2016-LA-1271	9	73	74	26	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1272	8	71	41	59	No significant arrests or seizures were made as a result of this wire.
	2016-LA-1273	44	2,113	1	99	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1274	0	543			During this wiretap, 1 arrest was made, and 41 pounds of methamphetamine and \$166,542 were seized.
	2016-LA-1275	675	11,473	3	97	The target subjects were involved in a murder. All suspects were arrested as a result of this interception.
	2016-LA-1276	206	15,636	13	87	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-1277	7	678	53	47	The operation targeted DTO members. This is still an ongoing investigation.
	2016-LA-3	77	1,680	22	78	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-LA-4	6	150	35	65	The target subject discontinued using his cell phone.
	2016-LA-5	2	22	0	100	The target discontinued using his telephone.
	2016-LA-6	27	893	64	36	During the course of this investigation, agents learned the target had a few different sources of supply of cocaine and methamphetamine, and other sources were involved and identified.
2016-LA-7	37	4,055	15	85	During the course of this investigation, 2 arrests were made and 1 kilogram of heroin was seized.	
2016-LA-8	28	665	18	82	During the course of this interception, agents learned the target had a few different sources of supply for cocaine and methamphetamine.	
2016-LA-9	16	1,186	37	63	During the course of this investigation, agents learned the target had a few different sources of supply of cocaine and methamphetamine, and other sources were involved and identified.	
2016-LA-10	90	8,605	18	82	During the course of this interception, agents made 3 arrests, and seized 90 pounds of methamphetamine and 1 kilogram of heroin.	
2016-LA-11	85	6,521	6	94	During the course of this interception, agents arrested 3 targets, seized 6 kilos of cocaine, one pound of methamphetamine, and \$10,891.	
2016-LA-12	20	4,932	72	28	During the course of this interception, agents learned about the method of operation and identified other target telephones used by this DTO.	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³	
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)		
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-13	19	240	60	40	During the course of this interception, agents seized a total of 32 kilograms of cocaine, and approximately \$800,000, and arrested 2 subjects.	
	2016-LA-14	41	4,726	29	71	The target discontinued using his telephone.	
	2016-LA-15	68	2,262	31	69	This wiretap resulted in other wiretaps.	
	2016-LA-16	20	952	12	88	This interception led to the identification of additional target subjects.	
	2016-LA-17	12	890	28	72	During the course of this interception, agents learned about the method of operation and identified other target telephones used by this DTO.	
	2016-LA-18	7	128	23	77	During the course of this interception, agents learned about the method of operation and identified other target telephones used by this DTO.	
	2016-LA-19	26	2,873	16	84	During the course of this investigation, additional DTO members have been identified.	
	2016-LA-20	43	4,077	30	70	The interception led to the identification of additional target subjects.	
	2016-LA-21	215	6,162	31	69	The interception led to the identification of additional target subjects.	
	2016-LA-22	85	683	30	70	The interception led to the identification of additional target subjects.	
	Orange	2016-OR-121	108	3,202	20	80	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
		2016-OR-122	8	14	75	25	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
2016-OR-123		2	1,645	33	67	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.	
2016-OR-125		42	1,299	27	73	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.	
2016-OR-126		65	2,967	20	80	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.	
2016-OR-127		28	976	20	80		
2016-OR-128		22	1,026	10	90	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.	
2016-OR-129		23	413	27	73	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.	
2016-OR-130	0	52	0	0	No communications were intercepted.		

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2016-OR-131	17	478	66	34	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-132	94	4,217	25	75	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-133	12	12,280	48	52	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-134	61	2,277	8	92	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-135	79	1,466	10	90	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-136	11	27	49	51	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-137	0	0	0	0	The users of the target telephones discontinued use. There were no interceptions.
	2016-OR-138	27	1,167	5	95	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-139	68	2,900	30	70	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-140	17	451	21	79	This wiretap produced incriminating statements and disproved certain alibi defenses.
	2016-OR-141	49	681	10	90	This wiretap produced previously unknown witnesses to a cold case murder. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-OR-142	16	128	9	91	See Wiretap No. 2016-OR-141.
	2016-OR-143	1	2,643	20	80	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-144	82	2,577	33	67	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-145	18	323	12	88	During the interception law enforcement was able identify narcotics traffickers.
	2016-OR-146	53	2,312	7	93	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-147	57	1,691	25	75	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify other narcotics traffickers.
	2016-OR-148	14	692	26	74	The target subject discontinued use of the phone.
	2016-OR-149	0	4	0	100	The target subject discontinued use of the phone.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2016-OR-150	14	316	20	80	Limited intelligence material was obtained prior to the target subject discontinuing the use of the phone.
	2016-OR-151	2	2,711	20	80	The wiretap intercept allowed law enforcement to identify other narcotics traffickers.
	2016-OR-152	104	7,061	12	88	Limited intelligence material was obtained prior to the target subject discontinuing the use of the phone.
	2016-OR-153	57	3,804	12	88	The wiretap interceptions identified a potential narcotics trafficker.
	2016-OR-154	21	686	12	88	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify potential narcotics traffickers.
	2016-OR-155	61	2,277	13	87	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-156	69	4,304	13	87	The wiretap enabled law enforcement to identify narcotics traffickers and seized controlled substances.
	2016-OR-157	0	0	0	0	The wiretap was installed and monitored briefly before it became apparent there was a numerical error in the phone number listed in the order.
Riverside	2015-RIV-2186	176	10,560	25	75	During this investigation, agents seized a total of 20 pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$110,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2015-RIV-2196	88	3,517	21	79	
	2015-RIV-2197	16	1,652	14	72	
	2015-RIV-2207	216	292,494	11	89	
	2015-RIV-2208	464	10,608	16	84	
	2015-RIV-2223	17	4,328	3	97	
	2015-RIV-2227	164	8,989	20	80	
	2015-RIV-2228	128	100,993	65	35	This wiretap interception order resulted in the arrest of 7 people and the seizure of \$299,965 along with the seizure of 61.59 pounds of amphetamines, 45 kilos of heroin/fentanyl and 10 kilos of cocaine.
	2015-RIV-2231	63	8,304	10	90	
	2015-RIV-2232	340	13,139	2	98	Interceptions assisted investigators in identifying principal parties and ultimately identifying the primary suspects in a case.
	2015-RIV-2234	90	5,434	24	76	
2015-RIV-2235	20	18,000	28	72		
2015-RIV-2236	58	3,630	30	70		
2015-RIV-2237	138	354,287	6	94		

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2015-RIV-2238	18	2,298	2	98	No subscriber information was obtained.
	2015-RIV-2239	227	23,304	18	82	The identification of a higher level narcotics source of supply was found.
	2016-RIV-2240	702	15,070	19	81	As a result of this wiretap, co conspirators and significant narcotics locations were identified.
	2016-RIV-2241	308	1,012	17	83	
	2016-RIV-2242	55	133,059	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2243	33	2,516	8	92	
	2016-RIV-2244	28	1,243	32	68	
	2016-RIV-2245	593	15,816	19	81	Numerous communications were intercepted which allowed for the identification of higher-level narcotics sources of supply.
	2016-RIV-2246	115	1,798	1	99	The intercepts identified target subjects and co conspirators involved in the coordination and sales of methamphetamine in the county.
	2016-RIV-2247	27	2,028	37	63	
	2016-RIV-2248	101	171,191	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2249	100	2,709	20	80	
	2016-RIV-2250	50	1,679	8	92	
	2016-RIV-2251	458	5,880	24	76	
	2016-RIV-2252	450	450	7	93	
	2016-RIV-2253	56	1,352	32	68	
	2016-RIV-2254	613	96,120	25	75	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of approximately 19.9 kilos of cocaine from a drug courier and an out-of-state seizure of approximately 6 kilograms of heroin.
	2016-RIV-2255	37	861	55	45	
	2016-RIV-2256	47	3,057	1	99	
	2016-RIV-2257	101	168,178	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2258	20	119	1	99	
	2016-RIV-2259	271	4,628	25	75	
	2016-RIV-2260	5,838	5,838	5	95	
	2016-RIV-2261	117	3,507	50	50	
	2016-RIV-2262	55	42,070	26	74	
	2016-RIV-2263	76	3,633	68	32	
	2016-RIV-2264	10	156	50	50	
	2016-RIV-2265	472	472	1	99	
	2016-RIV-2266	432	18,402	18	82	Numerous communications were intercepted which allowed for the identification of higher-level narcotics sources of supply.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2267	53	1,026	13	87	
	2016-RIV-2268	84	202,255	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2269	5	376	11	89	
	2016-RIV-2270	2,007	46,486	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2271	75	3,924	32	68	
	2016-RIV-2272	43	32,971	53	47	
	2016-RIV-2273	20	14,245	33	67	
	2016-RIV-2274	70	112,926	36	64	
	2016-RIV-2275	18	13,026	17	83	
	2016-RIV-2276	706	49,423	7	93	Intercepts were valuable in identifying criminal street gang members involved in multiple conspiracies to distribute narcotics, firearms trafficking, and other crimes for the benefit of and the direction of the criminal street gang. Multiple arrests and narcotics/proceeds were seized.
	2016-RIV-2277	8	205	50	50	Pertinent calls used to identify co conspirators and narcotics related locations investigators were obtained and approximately 10 pounds of methamphetamine and 5 pounds cocaine were seized.
	2016-RIV-2278	22	8,472	35	65	
	2016-RIV-2279	175	18,198	4	96	
	2016-RIV-2280	83	71,061	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2281	14	26,690	18	82	The wiretap order resulted in the seizure of 19.9 kilos of cocaine from a drug courier and an out-of-state seizure of approximately 6 kilos of heroin.
	2016-RIV-2282	28	22,864	22	78	
	2016-RIV-2283	61	2,599	29	71	
	2016-RIV-2284	82	162,035	5	95	
	2016-RIV-2285	189	3,590	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2286	10	63	14	86	
	2016-RIV-2287	69	3,003	8	92	The intercepts were valuable in identifying criminal street gang members involved in multiple conspiracies to distribute narcotics, firearms trafficking, and other crimes for the benefit of and at the direction of the criminal street gang.
	2016-RIV-2288	45	18,195	31	69	
	2016-RIV-2289	91	2,875	91	9	
	2016-RIV-2290	24	1,053	25	75	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2291	52	94,767	11	89	
	2016-RIV-2292	30	22,613	25	75	
	2016-RIV-2293	91,116	91,116	31	69	
	2016-RIV-2294	16	28,664	14	86	
	2016-RIV-2295	54	767	3	97	
	2016-RIV-2296	28	26,855	30	70	
	2016-RIV-2297	67	246,956	18	82	
	2016-RIV-2298	26	35,958	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2299	23	61,338	32	68	
	2016-RIV-2300	2	4,921	1	99	
	2016-RIV-2301	44	1,032	26	74	
	2016-RIV-2302	52	118,645	5	95	
	2016-RIV-2303	16	932	12	88	
	2016-RIV-2304	4,169	64,169	24	76	
	2016-RIV-2305	30	35,245	28	72	
	2016-RIV-2306	4	2,634	2	98	
	2016-RIV-2307	4	3,892	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2308	1	2,094	3	97	
	2016-RIV-2309	13	13,480	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2310	180	12,537	10	90	
	2016-RIV-2311	1	369	5	95	
	2016-RIV-2312	70	16,482	27	73	
	2016-RIV-2314	24	5,219	4	96	
	2016-RIV-2315	53	1,345	20	80	As a result of this wiretap interception order, approximately 48 pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
	2016-RIV-2316	19	10,310	36	64	
	2016-RIV-2317	25	34,135	15	85	
	2016-RIV-2318	19	37	73	27	
	2016-RIV-2319	55	11,571	21	79	
	2016-RIV-2320	27	1,286	44	56	As a result of this wiretap interception order, 56 pounds of methamphetamine, \$97,000, and 2 pounds of cocaine were seized.
	2016-RIV-2321	818	818	73	27	
	2016-RIV-2324	27	17,285	12	88	
	2016-RIV-2325	4	1,288	1	99	
	2016-RIV-2326	14	9,215	41	59	
	2016-RIV-2327	164	12,315	1	99	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2328	33	3,953	11	89	Two targets in this case were stopped by interdiction and 6 pounds of methamphetamine and one weapon were seized.
	2016-RIV-2329	34	4,985	8	92	This wiretap investigation assisted with a triple homicide.
	2016-RIV-2332	34	680	0	100	
	2016-RIV-2333	113	5,779	24	76	
	2016-RIV-2334	44	50,437	12	88	
Sacramento	2016-SAC-63	34	594	40	60	The wiretap was terminated early.
	2016-SAC-65	130	777	12	88	This wiretap was part of a cold case murder investigation.
San Bernardino	2015-SBD-618	748	66,349	11	89	Nothing significant to report.
	2015-SBD-620	119	1,378	40	60	This investigation is ongoing.
	2015-SBD-623	103	37,909	17	83	This wiretap resulted in the 3 separate seizures: (1) 1 kilogram cocaine and \$58,300; (2) \$1,060,800; and (3) 4 grams of cocaine, a handgun and ammunition.
	2015-SBD-627	291	45,599	25	75	This wiretap resulted in the 3 separate seizures: (1) 5 ounces cocaine and \$20,000; (2) 3 kilograms cocaine and \$85,695; and (3) \$101,100.
	2016-SBD-633	81	227,133	17	83	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of 1 pound of heroin, \$254,740, and a handgun.
	2016-SBD-634	143	7,005	12	88	This wire was used to identify and locate the suspects involved in a homicide.
	2016-SBD-635	242	11,679	5	95	Intercepted communications lead to the arrest of 3 subjects, and seizure of 9.3 kilograms of heroin.
	2016-SBD-636	245	18,797	4	96	This wire was used to identify and locate the suspects involved in a homicide.
	2016-SBD-637	508	52,965	15	85	6 pounds of methamphetamine and \$55,590 were seized.
	2016-SBD-638	237	7,403	1	99	Intercepted communications led to the identification of other members of the DTO, and other target telephones.
	2016-SBD-639	29	769	20	80	
	2016-SBD-640	228	13,246	3	97	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-641	46	1,132	53	47	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of 33 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2016-SBD-642	81	6,616	4	96	Intercepted communications led to 1 arrest and the separate seizures of 4 kilograms of heroin and 1 kilogram of heroin.
	2016-SBD-643	48	1,112	3	97	This wire was used to identify and locate the suspects involved in a homicide.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-644	51	1,130	56	44	Other members of the DTO and intelligence on the organization was gained.
	2016-SBD-645	32	2,828	1	99	The wire allowed investigators to rule out target suspects and find additional witnesses. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-646	31	237	11	89	No seizures.
	2016-SBD-647	73	52,601	37	63	Drugs, guns, and money were seized.
	2016-SBD-648	116	2,615	38	62	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-649	78	7,625	9	91	Intercepted communications lead to the identification of several other target subjects and their role in the organization.
	2016-SBD-650	165	2,502	42	58	This interception order focused specifically on one street gang that was involved in the sales of narcotics in the local area. This case produced numerous seizures of narcotics and currency. This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-651	33	554	47	53	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of 130 pounds of methamphetamine, 3 kilograms of heroin, and \$160,000.
	2016-SBD-652	40	4,490	3	97	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-653	5	29	13	87	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of \$137,722 in narcotics-related proceeds, 103 pounds of methamphetamine, and 3 kilograms heroin.
	2016-SBD-654	53	7,499	42	58	
	2016-SBD-655	105	3,760	6	94	Investigators seized 7 pounds of heroin and arrested one subject.
	2016-SBD-656	103	2,224	46	54	Interceptions led to one arrest and the seizure of 2.5 kilograms of heroin. The identification of other members in the DTO were revealed.
	2016-SBD-657	43	1,327	23	77	No arrests.
	2016-SBD-658	36	9,417	48	52	
	2016-SBD-659	0	0	0	0	There were no seizures as a result of interception.
	2016-SBD-660	168	6,596	2	98	Intercepted communications led to the identification of other target subjects and target telephones within the DTO.
	2016-SBD-661	100	14,325	35	65	Several suspects were identified as selling and transporting controlled substances. Approximately 6 lbs of methamphetamine, 11 guns, and \$30,000 were seized.
	2016-SBD-662	13	330	62	38	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of narcotic proceeds and 1 pound of cocaine.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-663	30	500	41	59	This case produced numerous seizures of narcotics and US currency. This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-664	134	3,689	10	90	
	2016-SBD-665	54	13,516	42	58	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of 6 kilograms of cocaine.
	2016-SBD-666	88	1,941	18	82	These interceptions provided the investigators useful intelligence on a DTO. In addition, 1 suspect was arrested another state for possession of 3 kilograms of heroin.
	2016-SBD-667	417	15,695	20	80	Intelligence related to drug and gang information was obtained through the interception of the phone line.
	2016-SBD-669	0	0	0	0	No interceptions were obtained.
	2016-SBD-670	27	640	3	97	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-671	33	20,594	35	65	No identifications were made.
	2016-SBD-672	55	4,347	12	88	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-673	284	11,100	11	89	This investigation allowed investigators to obtain information on narcotic activity and possession of firearms.
	2016-SBD-674	59	6,375	7	93	Investigators seized numerous marijuana plants upon discovering a stash house.
	2016-SBD-675	25	1,182	46	54	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of narcotic proceeds.
	2016-SBD-676	22	61	3	97	Limited calls were intercepted on 2 of the 3 lines.
	2016-SBD-677	19	262	31	69	This case produced numerous seizures of narcotics and currency. The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-678	116	7,903	1	99	
	2016-SBD-679	74	2,692	3	97	This wiretap led to 1 arrest and the seizure of 3 kilograms of heroin. It also assisted in identifying other members of the DTO.
	2016-SBD-680	20	440	34	66	Intelligence related to drugs and gangs was obtained through the interception of the phone line.
	2016-SBD-681	22	6,203	3	97	The intercept assisted investigators with the identification of a gang member dealing narcotics. Approximately \$30,000 was seized.
	2016-SBD-682	249	35,072	3	97	This wiretap led to the seizure of \$18,845, 1 kilograms of brown heroin, 7 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 ounce of cocaine, 2 firearms, and the arrest of 1 subject.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-683	156	7,487	12	88	Intercepted communications led to the arrest of 2 subjects, the seizure of 15 pounds of heroin, and the identification of other target telephones for members of the DTO.
	2016-SBD-684	52	3,742	36	64	The wiretap led to information which assisted in the arrest of 3 suspects.
	2016-SBD-685	0	0	0	100	The target discontinued use of the target phone shortly after initial interception.
	2016-SBD-686	244	7,611	4	96	Intercepted communications led to the identity of other members of the DTO and to several other target telephones.
	2016-SBD-687	142	4,564	9	91	This wiretap led to the seizure of \$137,340, 1 pound of cocaine, and the arrest of 3 subjects.
	2016-SBD-688	225	8,485	12	88	Intelligence related to drugs and gangs was obtained through the interception of the phone line.
	2016-SBD-689	56	3,086	25	75	The wiretap led to information which assisted in the arrest of 3 suspects.
	2016-SBD-690	43	599	14	86	This investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-691	46	1,091	26	74	Intercepted communications led to the arrest of 1 subject, and the seizure of 13 kilograms of cocaine, and helped investigators identify other members of the DTO.
	2016-SBD-692	122	3,556	17	83	Intercepted communications led to the arrest of 2 subjects and the seizure of 25 pounds of methamphetamine and 435 pounds of heroin.
	2016-SBD-693	33	1,389	10	90	Intercepted communications led to the arrest of 2 subjects and the seizure of a kilogram of heroin.
	2016-SBD-694		0			No calls were intercepted on this wire.
	2016-SBD-695	94	4,030	13	87	
	2016-SBD-696	104	14,397	1	99	Intercepted communications led to the arrest of 1 subject and the seizure of 35 kilograms of cocaine. Investigators were also able to identify target telephones of narcotic couriers/source of supply of narcotics.
	2016-SBD-697	6	2,386	5	95	This wiretap resulted in the seizure of \$14,858, 1 kilo of cocaine, 2 kilos of heroin, 35 pounds methamphetamine, one pistol, and the arrest/detention of 3 subjects.
	2016-SBD-698	208	11,965	16	84	As a result of intercepted communications, investigators were able to identify other members of the organization and other target telephones. Investigators seized 5 kilograms of heroin.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-699	201	11,299	6	94	This investigation allowed investigators to obtain information regarding ongoing gang activity including murder, conspiracy to commit murder, and possession of firearms.
	2016-SBD-700	21	456	21	79	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SBD-701	24	92	12	88	These interceptions provided the investigators useful intelligence on a DTO.
	2016-SBD-702	38	2,011	3	97	
	2016-SBD-703	50	218	32	68	Intercepted communications led to identifying locations associated with the DTO as well as its members.
	2016-SBD-705	592	24,291	3	97	This investigation allowed investigators to obtain information regarding ongoing gang activity including murder, conspiracy to commit murder, and possession of firearms.
	2016-SBD-706	0	11	0	100	The phone appeared to have been discarded by the target subject prior to interceptions.
	2016-SBD-707	177	3,469	3	97	This investigation allowed investigators to obtain information regarding ongoing gang activity including murder, conspiracy to commit murder, and possession of firearms.
	2016-SBD-709	64	29,158	3	97	The interception of targets in this case was invaluable and led to the seizure of 15 firearms and the following narcotics: cocaine, methamphetamines, heroin, and marijuana. Without the interceptions, the above firearms would still be on the streets and cause a constant danger of crime and violence.
	2016-SBD-710		0			
	2017-SBD-1	189	15,594			This investigation allowed investigators to obtain information regarding narcotic activity and possession of firearms.
San Diego	2016-SD-217	45	3,644	9	91	
	2016-SD-218	248	1,530	52	48	This wiretap assisted in identifying higher level narcotic traffickers within San Diego County. This investigation has also provided information relating to multiple individuals in Mexico who are transporting narcotics into the state.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2016-SD-219	55	321	36	64	Through this wiretap, agents seized approximately 23.1 kilograms of methamphetamine and one handgun. This wiretap also led to the arrest of 3 individuals. The drug transportation cell which this investigation targeted has been effectively dismantled.
	2016-SD-220	25	3,111	0.5	99	No arrests or seizures were directly tied to this wiretap.
	2016-SD-221	46	2,670	15	85	No arrests or seizures were directly tied to this wiretap.
	2016-SD-222	26	665	25	75	The purpose of seeking this wire was to identify any additional co-conspirators to the murder and/or locate the murder weapon, both of which would not be possible without wire interceptions.
	2016-SD-223	37	66,794	36	64	This investigation targeted subjects operating in parts of San Diego, Mexico, Central America and South America.
	2016-SD-224	27	84,850	27	73	This investigation targeted subjects operating in parts of San Diego, Mexico, Central America and South America.
	2016-SD-225	24	1,368	19	81	Wire intercepts identified an active methamphetamine distribution network.
	2016-SD-226	106	2,898	9	91	Intercepted conversations allowed law enforcement to conduct surveillance during key points in this murder investigation and document communication between targets and witnesses.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2016-SD-227	312	16,059	20	80	Human traffickers are known for controlling their victims through force and emotional manipulation, to the point victims do not see themselves as victims and do not cooperate with law enforcement. Victims often hide or destroy evidence law enforcement needs to prove the crime. The main target in this case was known to have a violent history with women. Although the main target was known to be trafficking women, due to the victims' lack of cooperation with law enforcement, a prosecutable case was not possible. The interception of wire and electronic communications in this case allowed law enforcement access to evidence of the force and emotional manipulation between targets and victims. Evidence was obtained of the targets providing illegal substances to their victims as well as the methods of their operation. The evidence obtained during the interception allowed the prosecution to move forward without a cooperative victim to testify and provide evidence or testimony against their trafficker.
	2016-SD-228	59	3,108	41	59	15 individuals who were street level heroin users and dealers were intercepted.
	2016-SD-229	43	2,047	9	91	This wire was initiated as part of a cold case homicide investigation.
	2016-SD-230	1,252	17,068	37	63	
	2016-SD-231	174	2,615	20	80	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2016-SD-232	45	212	6	94	This wire investigation targeted a sophisticated Money Laundering Organization (MLO) utilizing shell companies to conceal the true nature of their criminal purpose. At the conclusion of the investigation agents successfully obtained arrest warrants for 26 individuals, of which 17 have been arrested. In addition, agents seized approximately 2 million dollars cash of illicit proceeds, a residential property valued at approximately 2 million dollars, and a vehicle worth approximately \$100,000. Further, as a result of the interceptions, agents have identified several of the MLO's shell company bank accounts held in the U.S and Mexico, as well as an employee at a U.S. bank who was using their position to assist the MLO with illicit transactions. It is believed this MLO laundered over 9 million dollars.
	2016-SD-233	119	4,483	21	79	The need for this intercept was to thwart a conspiracy to murder a peace officer(s). In such a circumstances, the success of this wiretap and related law enforcement actions is measured by the fact that the crime was prevented.
San Joaquin	2016-SJ-83	553	30,025			This investigation targeted some of the most violent gangs in San Joaquin County. The investigation thwarted five armed robberies, prevented multiple shootings, brought to light human trafficking, and solved a homicide. To say the wire was successful would be an understatement. There has been no significant crime in the targeted areas since the investigation ended.
	2016-SJ-84	155	2,887			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-85	18	452			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-86	115	4,665			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83..
	2016-SJ-87	394	10,554			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-88	165	6,882			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-89	184	1,780			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-90	75	2,054			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-91	165	4,923			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-92	130	7,192			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-93	322	9,196			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-94	96	3,592			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-95	212	5,120			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Joaquin (cont'd)	2016-SJ-96	75	363			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-97	125	3,980			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-98	124	1,171			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-99	94	1,625			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
	2016-SJ-100	46	282			See Wiretap No. 2016-SJ-83.
San Luis Obispo	2017-SLO-1	167	2,707	9	91	The wiretap intercept was part of an investigation by law enforcement regarding a suspected conspiracy to commit murder. As a result of the wiretap, there were no criminal charges filed against any suspects.
	2017-SLO-2	22	56	1	100	Through initial investigation, law enforcement learned of the intended target(s) sophistication at evading law enforcement detection. Consequently, law enforcement utilized the wiretap to evaluate the workings of the target(s) and the suspected drug trafficking of the target(s) in San Luis Obispo County.
	2017-SLO-3	90	4,007	33	67	This wiretap intercept was part of an investigation by law enforcement regarding suspected trafficking of narcotics. As a result of this wiretap, 13 defendants were indicted for conspiring to distribute methamphetamine and several of were also charged with distributing.
Santa Barbara	2016-SBA-53	285	5,437	15	85	This wiretap intercept had the most significant impact of any operation in the history of Santa Barbara County. The wiretap enabled law enforcement to arrest 17 gang members or associates who had been terrorizing the City of Santa Maria. The suspects were charged with the murder of 10 people and the conspiracy to commit the murder of 14 more people.
Santa Clara	2016-SCL-1	39	390	10	90	This wiretap intercept culminated with state search warrants and arrest warrants which resulted in the arrest of 11 individuals, and the seizure of \$2,295.85 in narcotics proceeds, approximately 3 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pound of cocaine, 4 pounds of marijuana, 392 marijuana plants, 42 grams of hashish, and 33 grams of psilocybin mushrooms.
	2016-SCL-2	109	6,352	40	60	See Wiretap No. 2016-SC-1.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Santa Clara (cont'd)	2016-SCL-3	121	3,603	4	96	During the wiretap intercept, additional suspects were identified and a suspect was confirmed to be involved in the homicide under investigation. Additionally, information concerning drug sales, drug trafficking, and street gang membership was gathered and found to assist in the homicide investigation. The street gang was also identified to be involved in two robberies.
	2016-SCL-4	52	2,879	2	98	The investigation is ongoing.
	2016-SCL-5	358	120,093	6	94	This wire intercept was a multi-agency investigation. The primary target was a transnational organized criminal enterprise who were using violence to extort café owners to continue the illegal gambling in the cafés. At least four homicides have been attributed to this organization. Additionally, an officer was identified as a participant in the criminal activity, 24 people were arrested and charged and the following items were seized: five firearms, 69 illegal gambling machines, more than one million dollars, assorted jewelry, 14,000 Ecstasy pills, more than 300 Xanax pills, four vials of a steroid substance, five vehicles, one alligator, and, over 900 pounds of green marijuana and hashish oil. The wiretap also identified multiple instances of extortion with a gang enhancement, attempts to bribe law enforcement, witness intimidation and aggravated assaults.
	2016-SCL-6	57	1,514	17	83	See 2016-SCL-5.
	2016-SCL-7	9	59	50	50	See 2016-SCL-5.
	2016-SCL-8	251	30,356	9	91	See 2016-SCL-5.
	2016-SCL-9	45	3,011	6	94	This investigation is pending.
	2016-SCL-10	30	1,383	19	81	This case is currently pending.
	2016-SCL-11	23	1,242	25	75	As a result of the wiretap intercept, law enforcement became aware of one target subject attempting to acquire firearms for the purpose of assisting another target subject in the murder of San Jose Police Department officers. Target Subject #1 provided law enforcement with 2.5 ounces of methamphetamine and \$787 to the undercover agent with the intent to purchase weapons and was arrested.
	2016-SCL-12	39	598	42	58	See Wiretap No. 2016-SCL-11.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Sonoma	2015-SON-8	43	1,748	1	99	This pending wiretap intercept investigation will likely identify a homicide suspect a cold case murder.
Stanislaus	2016-STA-1	83	1,459	1	99	This wiretap intercept assisted in a cold case murder investigation. Although significant information was discussed that has led to new investigative avenues, no arrests have been made at this time.
Ventura	2016-VE-176	689	24,543			The wiretap intercept led to the seizure of multiple firearms and some controlled substances. One of the firearms seized may have prevented a shooting from occurring.
	2016-VE-177	622	20,854	15	85	See Wiretap No. 2016-VE-176.
	2016-VE-178	178	1,528	13	87	This wiretap intercept led to the arrest of a person responsible for trafficking narcotics into Ventura County.
	2016-VE-179	1,329	27,351	4	96	This wiretap intercept allowed law enforcement to expand the scope of the investigation up the chain of command within the criminal street gang and to reach sources of supply for the controlled substances.
	2016-VE-180	1,551	32,844	45	55	This wiretap intercept turned into a very large investigation into a sophisticated human trafficking and prostitution ring. It led the arrest of the top-level leaders of the organization.
	2016-VE-181	2,069	48,453	11	89	See Wiretap No. 2016-VE-179.
	2016-VE-182	1,754	42,972	48	52	This was a human trafficking investigation.
	2016-VE-183	1,079	28,145	5	95	This wiretap intercept investigation resulted in the seizure of 22 pounds of methamphetamine, five pounds of heroin, four pounds of cocaine, six handguns, two assault weapons, and over \$100,000 in assets. It also resulted in the dismantling of a large scale DTO.
	2016-VE-184	234	8,593	2	98	
	2016-VE-185	1,307	32,223	48	52	This wiretap intercept allowed investigators to gather evidence against those running an organization involved in human trafficking, and allowed for the seizure of the proceeds from the criminal conspiracy.
	2016-VE-186	477	10,422	11	89	This is still an ongoing investigation into a DTO.
	2016-VE-187	119	12,367	2	98	The wiretap intercept led to the arrest of people importing drugs from Mexico, the seizure of an assault weapon, other handguns, three pounds of methamphetamine, and more than one pound of cocaine.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ³
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Ventura (cont'd)	2016-VE-188	75	1,038	23	77	This is an ongoing investigation into the smuggling of heroin all over the country.
	2016-VE-189	463	3,231	23	77	This was an investigation into the killing of a child, and the detectives arrested the suspected killer during the wiretap.
	2016-VE-190	82	811	23	77	This is an ongoing investigation into heroin trafficking around the country.
	2016-VE-191	399	6,364	13	87	This is an ongoing investigation into a DTO bringing large amounts of narcotics into southern California.
	2016-VE-192	47	792	42	58	This was an investigation into heroin being shipped all over southern California and the United States.
	2016-VE-193	35	500	15	85	This is an ongoing narcotics trafficking investigation.

Table 4A
Previously Unreported Description of Communications
Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept ⁴
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Imperial	2015-IM-84	411	11,728	9	91	
	2015-IM-85	173	6,850	8	92	
	2015-IM-86	33	772	2	98	
	2015-IM-87	75	12,293	15	85	
	2015-IM-88	135	3,149	31	69	
	2015-IM-90	43	2,284	47	53	
	2015-IM-92	68	1,560	8	92	
	2015-IM-93	56	579	2	98	
	2015-IM-94	19	3,276	7	93	
	2015-IM-96	118	8,314	2	98	
	2015-IM-97	225	11,419	3	97	
	2015-IM-98	2,801	102,123	7	93	
	2015-IM-99	8	549	1	99	
	San Mateo	2016-SM-10	185	40	9	91

⁴ Comments are not mandated and may be edited.

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Alameda	2016-ALA-62	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016		5/13/2016	67
	2016-ALA-63	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016			67
	2016-ALA-64	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016		5/13/2016	67
	2016-ALA-65	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016		5/13/2016	67
	2016-ALA-66	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016		5/13/2016	67
	2016-ALA-67	Ahern, Sheriff	Hon. Rolefson	(Inventory due) 7/8/2016		5/13/2016	67
Contra Costa	2017-CC-1	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/4/2017	1/4/2017		
	2017-CC-2	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/4/2017	1/4/2017		
	2017-CC-3	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2017-CC-4	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2017-CC-5	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2017-CC-6	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2017		
	2017-CC-7	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2017-CC-8	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2017-CC-9	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	4/18/2017	1/19/2017		
	2017-CC-10	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	4/20/2017	1/20/2017		
	2017-CC-11	Peterson, District Attorney	Hon. Laettner	4/18/2017	1/19/2017		
Fresno	2016-FR-3	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/20/2016			383
	2016-FR-1	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/20/2016			564
	2016-FR-2	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/25/2016			241
	2016-FR-4	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 6/15/2016			1
	2016-FR-6	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	8/26/2016		8/11/2016	47
	2016-FR-7	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	9/21/2016		8/11/2016	9

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-8	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	9/25/2016		8/11/2016	19
	2016-FR-9	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	10/8/2016		8/11/2016	8
	2016-FR-10	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	10/8/2016		8/11/2016	3
	2016-FR-11	Smittcamp, district attorney	Hon. Harrell	10/22/2016		8/11/2016	3
	2016-FR-12	Smittcamp, district attorney	Hon. Harrell	10/26/2016		8/11/2016	3
	2016-FR-13	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 6/15/2016			1
	2016-FR-14	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/20/2016			237
	2016-FR-16	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/11/2016			
	2016-FR-21	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/20/2016			31
	2016-FR-22	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/20/2016			9
	2016-FR-23	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/1/2017			1743
	2016-FR-24	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/20/2017			562
	2016-FR-25	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 12/25/2016			122
	2016-FR-26	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 12/14/2016			331
	2016-FR-27	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/28/2017			607
	2016-FR-28	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/9/2017			95
	2016-FR-29	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/18/2017			53
	2016-FR-30	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			611
	2016-FR-31	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/20/2017			181
	2016-FR-32	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			348
	2016-FR-33	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 1/28/2017			85
	2016-FR-34	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			59
	2016-FR-35	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			161

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-36	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			45
	2016-FR-37	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			70
	2016-FR-38	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			56
	2016-FR-39	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 2/2/2017			36
	2016-FR-40	Smittcamp, District Attorney	Hon. Harrell	(Inventory due) 7/11/2016			55
Imperial	2016-IM-100	Domezain, DDA IV	Hon. Plourd	7/1/2016		6/22/2016	0
	2016-IM-101	Domezain, DDA IV	Hon. Plourd	7/1/2016		6/22/2016	0
Los Angeles	2016-LA-1023	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1027	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/2/2016		3/22/2016	369
	2016-LA-1054	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1060	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/30/2016		4/15/2016	11
	2016-LA-1061	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/18/2016		6/16/2016	13
	2016-LA-1063	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1064	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/2/2016	5/2/2016		
	2016-LA-1068	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1069	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/12/2016			
	2016-LA-1070	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/9/2016			
	2016-LA-1071	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1073	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/4/2016		7/12/2016	3
	2016-LA-1074	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/15/2016			
	2016-LA-1075	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1076	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/13/2016		7/13/2016	6
	2016-LA-1077	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/6/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1079	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/4/2016			
	2016-LA-1080	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/15/2016			
	2016-LA-1081	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/25/2016		4/15/2016	7
	2016-LA-1082	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/9/2016			
	2016-LA-1084	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1085	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/20/2016			
	2016-LA-1086	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/3/2016		10/5/2016	4
	2016-LA-1088	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1089	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/1/2016			
	2016-LA-1090	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/1/2016			
	2016-LA-1091	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1092	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/17/2016			
	2016-LA-1093	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1094	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1095	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1096	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/4/2016			
	2016-LA-1097	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1098	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1099	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/25/2016		8/26/2016	5
	2016-LA-1100	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1101	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/19/2016			
	2016-LA-1102	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/9/2016			
	2016-LA-1103	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/19/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1104	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1105	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/15/2016			
	2016-LA-1106	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1107	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/30/2016			
	2016-LA-1108	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/26/2016			
	2016-LA-1109	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1110	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1111	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/30/2016			
	2016-LA-1112	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/6/2016		9/30/2016	6
	2016-LA-1114	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/12/2016		9/20/2016	2
	2016-LA-1115	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/19/2016			0
	2016-LA-1116	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/2/2016		10/14/2016	4
	2016-LA-1117	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/13/2016		10/21/2016	3
	2016-LA-1118	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2016			
	2016-LA-1119	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/13/2016			
	2016-LA-1120	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1121	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/16/2016		10/4/2016	2
	2016-LA-1122	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/22/2016			
	2016-LA-1123	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1124	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/9/2016			
	2016-LA-1125	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/29/2017			
	2016-LA-1126	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/26/2016			
	2016-LA-1127	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1128	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2016			
	2016-LA-1129	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1130	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1131	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/11/2017			
	2016-LA-1132	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/21/2017			
	2016-LA-1135	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1136	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/26/2016			
	2016-LA-1137	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/2/2016			
	2016-LA-1138	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1139	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/29/2016			
	2016-LA-1140	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1141	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1142	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/8/2016			
	2016-LA-1143	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/28/2016			
	2016-LA-1144	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/17/2016			
	2016-LA-1145	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/17/2016			
	2016-LA-1146	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1147	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			
	2016-LA-1148	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1149	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/20/2016			
	2016-LA-1150	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/2/2016			
	2016-LA-1151	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1152	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/24/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1153	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			0
	2016-LA-1154	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1155	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1156	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/16/2016			
	2016-LA-1157	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2016			
	2016-LA-1158	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			
	2016-LA-1159	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1160	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1161	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1162	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/17/2016			
	2016-LA-1163	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1164	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1165	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/1/2016			
	2016-LA-1166	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/26/2016		10/4/2016	4
	2016-LA-1167	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1169	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/8/2017			
	2016-LA-1170	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/21/2016			
	2016-LA-1171	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2017			
	2016-LA-1174	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1175	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/22/2016			
	2016-LA-1176	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/22/2016		1/31/2017	4
	2016-LA-1177	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1178	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/28/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1180	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/26/2016		12/29/2016	1
	2016-LA-1181	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/12/2016			
	2016-LA-1182	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1183	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			0
	2016-LA-1184	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/13/2016		11/4/2016	1
	2016-LA-1185	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/3/2016			0
	2016-LA-1186	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/11/2016			
	2016-LA-1187	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Bailey	5/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1188	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1189	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2016			0
	2016-LA-1190	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1191	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/13/2016			
	2016-LA-1192	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1193	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1194	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/2/2016			0
	2016-LA-1195	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/15/2017			
	2016-LA-1196	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/8/2017			0
	2016-LA-1197	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/26/2017			0
	2016-LA-1198	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/9/2016		11/3/2016	3
	2016-LA-1199	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/11/2016		11/16/2016	4
	2016-LA-1200	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/1/2016		12/5/2016	3
	2016-LA-1201	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/9/2016			
	2016-LA-1202	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1203	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1204	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1205	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1206	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1207	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/10/2016			
	2016-LA-1208	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/23/2016			
	2016-LA-1209	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2017			
	2016-LA-1210	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/15/2016			
	2016-LA-1211	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1212	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1213	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/13/2017			
	2016-LA-1214	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/20/2016			
	2016-LA-1215	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/29/2016			
	2016-LA-1216	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1217	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/29/2016			
	2016-LA-1218	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/20/2016			
	2016-LA-1219	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 2/25/2017			
	2016-LA-1220	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/30/2016			
	2016-LA-1221	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/4/2016			
	2016-LA-1222	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/24/2016			
	2016-LA-1223	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/29/2016			
	2016-LA-1224	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/11/2016			
	2016-LA-1225	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/28/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1226	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/31/2016			
	2016-LA-1227	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/22/2016			
	2016-LA-1229	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1230	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1231	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/10/2016		12/15/2016	1
	2016-LA-1232	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1233	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1235	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/30/2016			
	2016-LA-1236	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	4/14/2016			
	2016-LA-1237	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/18/2017			
	2016-LA-1238	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/19/2016			
	2016-LA-1239	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1240	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/5/2017			
	2016-LA-1241	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/15/2016			
	2016-LA-1242	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/21/2017			
	2016-LA-1243	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/14/2017			
	2016-LA-1244	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1245	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/25/2016			
	2016-LA-1246	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/6/2016			
	2016-LA-1247	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/24/2016			
	2016-LA-1248	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2017			
	2016-LA-1249	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1250	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/29/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1251	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	10/17/2016			
	2016-LA-1252	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/24/2016			
	2016-LA-1253	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/28/2016			
	2016-LA-1254	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	11/11/2016			
	2016-LA-1255	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/8/2016			
	2016-LA-1256	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/27/2016			
	2016-LA-1257	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2017			
	2016-LA-1258	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/26/2017			
	2016-LA-1259	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/5/2017			
	2016-LA-1260	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	6/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1261	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/2/2016			
	2016-LA-1262	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	7/3/2016			
	2016-LA-1265	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	9/16/2016			
	2016-LA-1267	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1268	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/18/2016			
	2016-LA-1269	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/10/2017			
	2016-LA-1270	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/10/2017			
	2016-LA-1271	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/6/2017			
	2016-LA-1272	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2017			
	2016-LA-1273	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/23/2017			
	2016-LA-1274	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	8/5/2016			
	2016-LA-1275	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	5/7/2016			
	2016-LA-1276	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/21/2017			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1277	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/23/2017			
	2016-LA-3	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/26/2016			
	2016-LA-4	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/16/2017			
	2016-LA-5	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/21/2017			
	2016-LA-6	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/22/2017			
	2016-LA-7	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/30/2017			
	2016-LA-8	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/2/2016			
	2016-LA-9	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2017			
	2016-LA-10	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2017			
	2016-LA-11	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	1/6/2017			
	2016-LA-12	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/7/2017			
	2016-LA-13	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2017			
	2016-LA-14	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 3/14/2017			
	2016-LA-15	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/15/2017			
	2016-LA-16	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/15/2017			
	2016-LA-17	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/10/2017			
	2016-LA-18	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/13/2017			
	2016-LA-19	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/22/2017			
	2016-LA-20	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/10/2017			
	2016-LA-21	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/17/2017			
	2016-LA-22	Lacey, District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	3/17/2017			
Orange	2016-OR-121	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	4/20/2016		4/20/2016	2
	2016-OR-122	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	1/20/2017	4/19/2016		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Orange (cont'd)	2016-OR-123	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Jensen	10/25/2016		10/26/2016	2
	2016-OR-125	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	5/19/2016		5/20/2016	3
	2016-OR-126	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/13/2017	5/13/2016		
	2016-OR-127	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	4/20/2016		4/21/2016	3
	2016-OR-128	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	5/19/2016		5/20/2016	3
	2016-OR-129	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	6/2/2016		6/8/2016	2
	2016-OR-130	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	11/4/2016		11/7/2016	2
	2016-OR-131	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	6/20/2016		6/14/2016	2
	2016-OR-132	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	12/18/2016	6/17/2016	1/6/2017	6
	2016-OR-133	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	6/23/2016		6/21/2016	3
	2016-OR-134	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	1/27/2017	7/27/2016		
	2016-OR-135	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/14/2017	8/11/2016		
	2016-OR-136	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/19/2017	8/9/2016		
	2016-OR-137	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	(Inventory due) 9/1/2016			
	2016-OR-138	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	1/13/2017	10/11/2016		
	2016-OR-139	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/12/2017	11/10/2016		
	2016-OR-140	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	11/1/2016		11/3/2016	17
	2016-OR-141	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	12/8/2016		12/9/2016	12
	2016-OR-142	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	12/8/2016		12/9/2016	12
	2016-OR-143	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	3/3/2017			
	2016-OR-144	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	1/6/2017	10/7/2016		
	2016-OR-145	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/8/2017	11/8/2016		
	2016-OR-146	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	7/1/1916		7/21/2016	1

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Orange (cont'd)	2016-OR-147	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/24/2017	8/24/2016		
	2016-OR-148	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	8/30/2016		8/30/2016	0
	2016-OR-149	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	12/22/2016	9/22/2016	1/6/2017	1
	2016-OR-150	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	3/19/2017	12/19/2016		
	2016-OR-151	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/25/2017	8/26/2016		
	2016-OR-152	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	7/19/2016		7/21/2016	1
	2016-OR-153	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Jensen	1/27/2017	7/22/2016		
	2016-OR-154	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Jensen	1/27/2017	7/27/2016		
	2016-OR-155	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Jensen	1/27/2017	7/27/2016		
	2016-OR-156	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	2/4/2017	8/16/2016		
	2016-OR-157	Rackauckas, District Attorney	Hon. Menninger	(Inventory due) 7/12/2016			
Riverside	2015-RIV-2186	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/20/2016		4/11/2016	1
	2015-RIV-2196	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/9/2016		4/9/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2197	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/9/2016		4/9/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2207	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/27/2016		4/27/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2208	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/27/2016		4/27/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2223	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/2/2016		5/25/2016	2
	2015-RIV-2227	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/10/2016		5/25/2016	23
	2015-RIV-2228	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/10/2016	4/3/2017		
	2015-RIV-2231	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/24/2016		4/24/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2232	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/26/2016	1/14/2017	1/10/2017	61
	2015-RIV-2234	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/6/2016		5/25/2016	5
	2015-RIV-2235	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/7/2016		4/15/2016	1

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2015-RIV-2236	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/4/2016		4/11/2016	7
	2015-RIV-2237	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/5/2016		6/5/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2238	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/11/2016		4/11/2016	0
	2015-RIV-2239	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/29/2016		5/25/2016	53
	2016-RIV-2240	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/10/2016		6/24/2016	13
	2016-RIV-2241	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/10/2016		6/29/2016	6
	2016-RIV-2242	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/19/2016		2/19/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2243	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/16/2016		6/24/2016	5
	2016-RIV-2244	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/17/2016		4/11/2016	6
	2016-RIV-2245	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/29/2016		5/25/2016	54
	2016-RIV-2246	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/10/2016		6/29/2016	24
	2016-RIV-2247	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/11/2016		5/25/2016	6
	2016-RIV-2248	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	4/29/2016		4/29/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2249	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/11/2016		6/24/2016	5
	2016-RIV-2250	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/9/2016		6/24/2016	17
	2016-RIV-2251	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/16/2016		5/25/2016	19
	2016-RIV-2252	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/25/2016		5/25/2016	9
	2016-RIV-2253	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/11/2016		6/11/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2254	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/12/2016	6/6/2017		
	2016-RIV-2255	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/25/2016	5/20/2017		
	2016-RIV-2256	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/23/2016		5/25/2016	15
	2016-RIV-2257	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/22/2016		6/22/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2258	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	6/21/2016		6/24/2016	17

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2259	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/3/2016		7/14/2016	25
	2016-RIV-2260	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/2/2016		5/25/2016	9
	2016-RIV-2261	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/1/2016	6/25/2017		
	2016-RIV-2262	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/1/2016		6/1/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2263	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/10/2016	4/19/2017		
	2016-RIV-2264	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/11/2016		7/14/2016	6
	2016-RIV-2265	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/9/2016		6/8/2016	9
	2016-RIV-2266	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/19/2016		6/24/2016	29
	2016-RIV-2267	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/16/2016		6/24/2016	17
	2016-RIV-2268	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/11/2017		10/11/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2269	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/2/2016		7/14/2016	2
	2016-RIV-2270	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/31/2016		8/5/2016	175
	2016-RIV-2271	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/4/2016		8/16/2016	4
	2016-RIV-2272	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	7/29/2016		4/29/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2273	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/8/2016		6/8/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2274	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/31/2016		5/31/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2275	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	5/14/2016		5/14/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2276	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/10/2016		8/5/2016	63
	2016-RIV-2277	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/17/2016		10/14/2016	11
	2016-RIV-2278	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/21/2015		5/21/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2279	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/2/2016		8/5/2016	8
	2016-RIV-2280	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/27/2016		5/27/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2281	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/26/2016	7/6/2017		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2282	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	10/18/2016		7/18/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2283	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/7/2016	6/4/2017		
	2016-RIV-2284	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	10/18/2016		7/18/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2285	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/10/2016		6/10/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2286	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/14/2016		10/14/2016	3
	2016-RIV-2287	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	9/18/2016		9/18/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2288	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	11/2/2016		8/2/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2289	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/1/2016	5/30/2017		
	2016-RIV-2290	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	10/9/2016		7/9/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2291	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/10/2016		8/10/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2292	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/10/2016		8/10/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2293	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	2/19/2017	8/8/2017		
	2016-RIV-2294	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	11/2/2016		8/2/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2295	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	10/19/2016		10/14/2016	5
	2016-RIV-2296	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	8/10/2016		8/10/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2297	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/11/2017		10/11/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2298	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	11/26/2016		8/26/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2299	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/19/2017		12/19/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2300	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/16/2016		11/16/2016	30
	2016-RIV-2301	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/4/2016		10/14/2016	5
	2016-RIV-2302	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/14/2016		9/14/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2303	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/15/2016		11/16/2016	2
	2016-RIV-2304	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/19/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2305	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/19/2017		12/19/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2306	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	11/21/2016	8/18/2017		
	2016-RIV-2307	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	2/12/2017	5/29/2017		
	2016-RIV-2308	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/16/2016		11/16/2016	16
	2016-RIV-2309	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/11/2017		10/11/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2310	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	2/6/2017	2/4/2017		
	2016-RIV-2311	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	12/16/2016		11/16/2016	5
	2016-RIV-2312	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/6/2017		12/6/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2314	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/22/2017	4/20/2017		
	2016-RIV-2315	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/21/2016		11/16/2016	8
	2016-RIV-2316	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/22/2017			
	2016-RIV-2317	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/19/2017		10/19/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2318	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/2/2017	5/6/2017		
	2016-RIV-2319	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/28/2017		1/10/2017	6
	2016-RIV-2320	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/26/2017		12/20/2016	6
	2016-RIV-2321	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	2/5/2016			
	2016-RIV-2324	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Donner	2/11/2017			
	2016-RIV-2325	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	2/23/2017			
	2016-RIV-2326	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/15/2017		12/15/2016	0
	2016-RIV-2327	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	1/23/2017	1/21/2017		
	2016-RIV-2328	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/6/2017			
	2016-RIV-2329	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/1/2017		1/10/2017	34
	2016-RIV-2332	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/9/2017		1/10/2017	34

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2333	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/15/2017			
	2016-RIV-2334	Hestrin, District Attorney	Hon. Dugan	3/16/2017		12/16/2016	0
Sacramento	2016-SAC-63	Schubert, District Attorney	Hon. White	11/15/2016		11/9/2016	12
	2016-SAC-65	Schubert, District Attorney	Hon. White	2/22/2017	11/22/2016		
San Bernardino	2015-SBD-618	Fermin, Assistant District Attorney	Hon. Powell	(Inventory due) 4/21/2016			0
	2015-SBD-620	Villanueva, Detective	Hon. Powell	6/3/2016	9/2/2016		
	2015-SBD-623	Ramos, District Attorney	Hon. Powell	2/22/2016			0
	2015-SBD-627	Ramos, District Attorney	Hon. Powell	4/11/2016			0
	2016-SBD-633	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	5/12/2016			0
	2016-SBD-634	Rizzardi, Deputy	Hon. Powell	5/6/2016	2/23/2016		
	2016-SBD-635	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	5/30/2016		6/1/2016	1
	2016-SBD-636	Rizzardi, Deputy	Hon. Powell	5/6/2016	2/23/2016		
	2016-SBD-637	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Nakata	(Inventory due) 4/9/2016			0
	2016-SBD-638	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Nakata	4/8/2016	4/13/2016	2/7/2017	1
	2016-SBD-639	Abdelmuti, Investigator	Hon. Nakata	4/8/2016		11/30/2016	7
	2016-SBD-640	Salsberry, Detective	Hon. Powell	4/8/2016		1/28/2016	93
	2016-SBD-641	Abdelmuti, Investigator	Hon. Nakata	6/22/2016		6/20/2016	10
	2016-SBD-642	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	5/20/2016		5/16/2016	1
	2016-SBD-643	Rizzardi, Deputy	Hon. Powell	5/2/2016	2/23/2016		
	2016-SBD-644	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	5/6/2016		5/16/2016	1
	2016-SBD-645	Kirby, Detective	Hon. Powell	5/16/2016		5/17/2016	3
	2016-SBD-646	Odum, Agent	Hon. Powell	5/16/2016	3/30/2016	5/10/2016	5
	2016-SBD-647	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	6/17/2016			0

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-648	Stanley, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/21/2016	8/3/2016		
	2016-SBD-649	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	5/20/2016		5/16/2016	1
	2016-SBD-650	Lozano, Detective	Hon. Powell	5/25/2016	6/8/2016		
	2016-SBD-651	Layaye, Officer	Hon. Powell	6/22/2016		6/21/2016	3
	2016-SBD-652	Phillips, Detective	Hon. Powell	5/27/2016	4/6/2016		
	2016-SBD-653	Layaye, Officer	Hon. Powell	5/27/2016		5/27/2016	3
	2016-SBD-654	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	6/3/2016			0
	2016-SBD-655	Vicondoa, Officer	Hon. Powell	6/2/2016		5/27/2016	1
	2016-SBD-656	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	6/6/2016		6/1/2016	1
	2016-SBD-657	Tscharanyan, Officer	Hon. Powell	6/13/2016		6/6/2016	2
	2016-SBD-658	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	7/14/2016			0
	2016-SBD-659	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	(Inventory due) 6/10/2016			
	2016-SBD-660	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/15/2016		7/8/2016	1
	2016-SBD-661	Clough, Detective	Hon. Powell	6/24/2016	8/9/2016	2/9/2017	33
	2016-SBD-662	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/21/2016	8/12/2016		
	2016-SBD-663	Godoy, Deputy	Hon. Powell	6/30/2016		6/28/2016	20
	2016-SBD-664	Layaye, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/1/2016		6/28/2016	4
	2016-SBD-665	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	7/28/2016			0
	2016-SBD-666	Vicondoa, Officer	Hon. Powell	8/4/2016		8/19/2016	3
	2016-SBD-667	Hughes, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/5/2016	10/20/2016		
	2016-SBD-669	Vicondoa, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/12/2016			
	2016-SBD-670	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	7/13/2016		7/12/2016	1
	2016-SBD-671	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Powell	7/21/2016			0

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-672	Alvarado, Officer	Hon. Nakata	8/19/2016	8/12/2016		
	2016-SBD-673	Browne, Deputy	Hon. Powell	7/21/2016	8/3/2016		
	2016-SBD-674	Tscharanyan, Officer	Hon. Nakata	7/21/2016		7/18/2016	2
	2016-SBD-675	Carroll, Investigator	Hon. Nakata	7/26/2016			0
	2016-SBD-676	Hughes, Officer	Hon. Powell	8/8/2016	10/20/2016		
	2016-SBD-677	Godoy, Deputy	Hon. Powell	8/8/2016		7/13/2016	18
	2016-SBD-678	Spurlock, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/5/2016		6/16/2016	29
	2016-SBD-679	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/9/2016		9/6/2016	3
	2016-SBD-680	Hughes, Officer	Hon. Powell	8/11/2016	10/20/2016		
	2016-SBD-681	Clough, Detective	Hon. Powell	8/15/2016		2/9/2017	14
	2016-SBD-682	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/15/2016		9/9/2016	2
	2016-SBD-683	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	11/17/2016		11/15/2016	1
	2016-SBD-684	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/29/2016		9/26/2016	1
	2016-SBD-685	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	8/2/2016			0
	2016-SBD-686	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	10/17/2016		10/7/2016	1
	2016-SBD-687	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	11/17/2016		11/17/2016	2
	2016-SBD-688	Hughes, Officer	Hon. Nakata	9/29/2016	10/20/2016		
	2016-SBD-689	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	9/29/2016		9/26/2016	2
	2016-SBD-690	Boylan, Agent	Hon. Harrison	11/14/2016	10/20/2016		
	2016-SBD-691	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Harrison	10/17/2016		10/7/2016	2
	2016-SBD-692	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	10/19/2016		10/12/2016	2
	2016-SBD-693	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	10/20/2016		11/2/2016	1
	2016-SBD-694	Hughes, Officer	Hon. Powell	(Inventory due) 11/7/2016			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-695	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	11/18/2016		11/17/2016	3
	2016-SBD-696	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	11/23/2016		11/28/2016	2
	2016-SBD-697	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	11/28/2016		1/5/2017	2
	2016-SBD-698	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	1/27/2017			
	2016-SBD-699	Rizzardi, Detective	Hon. Powell	2/3/2017		11/16/2016	100
	2016-SBD-700	Boylan, Agent	Hon. Powell	12/12/2016	12/9/2016		
	2016-SBD-701	Vicondoa, Officer	Hon. Powell	12/22/2016		12/15/2016	2
	2016-SBD-702	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Powell	12/23/2016		1/5/2017	2
	2016-SBD-703	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	12/26/2016		12/20/2016	2
	2016-SBD-705	Rizzardi, Detective	Hon. Powell	2/3/2017		11/18/2016	287
	2016-SBD-706	Kissell, Officer	Hon. Powell	1/23/2017			0
	2016-SBD-707	Rizzardi, Detective	Hon. Powell	2/3/2017		11/16/2016	93
	2016-SBD-709	Rojas, Agent	Hon. Powell	3/7/2017			
	2016-SBD-710	Camacho, Officer	Hon. Nakata	3/23/2017			
	2017-SBD-1	Brosowske, Deputy	Hon. Powell	4/10/2017			
San Diego	2016-SD-217	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 4/11/2016	8/25/2016		
	2016-SD-218	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 5/15/2016	8/25/2016		
	2016-SD-219	Sherman, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	2/11/2016			45
	2016-SD-220	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Fraser	6/14/2016			15
	2016-SD-221	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Fraser	6/14/2016			15
	2016-SD-222	Zimmerman, Chief of Police	Hon. Smyth	1/27/2017			
	2016-SD-223	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Rogers	6/2/2016			0
	2016-SD-224	Torres, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	6/2/2016			0

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Diego (cont'd)	2016-SD-225	Perez, Agent	Hon. Smyth	3/3/2017			
	2016-SD-226	Vasquez, Chief of Police	Hon. Rogers	12/19/2016	9/23/2016	12/20/2016	25
	2016-SD-227	Gore, Sheriff	Hon. Fraser	8/1/2016			70
	2016-SD-228	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Smyth	2/15/2017			
	2016-SD-229	Turner, Captain	Hon. Smyth	2/14/2017			
	2016-SD-230	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 11/16/2016	10/7/2016		
	2016-SD-231	Sherman, Agent	Hon. Fraser	(Inventory due) 10/11/2016	10/7/2016		
	2016-SD-232	Perez, Agent	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 10/16/2016	10/7/2016		
	2016-SD-233	Gore, Sheriff	Hon. Smyth	1/30/2017			
San Joaquin	2016-SJ-83	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-84	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-85	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-86	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-87	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-88	Freitas, ADA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-89	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-90	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-91	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-92	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-93	Salazar, DA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-94	Fichtner, ADA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-95	Fichtner, ADA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-96	Salazar, DA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Joaquin (cont'd)	2016-SJ-97	Salazar, DA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-98	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-99	Salazar, DA	Hon. Johnson	9/16/2016		8/10/2016	391
	2016-SJ-100	Salazar, DA	Hon. Hoyt	9/10/2016		8/10/2016	391
San Luis Obispo	2017-SLO-1	Rooyen, DDA	Hon. Duffy	6/30/2016	9/7/2016	12/1/2016	133
	2017-SLO-2	Gran, CDDA	Hon. Trice	9/14/2016		8/30/2016	10
	2017-SLO-3	Gran, CDDA	Hon. Trice	10/24/2016		10/24/2016	52
Santa Barbara	2016-SBA-53	Dudley, DA	Hon. Kelly	6/1/2016		5/25/2016	342
Santa Clara	2016-SCL-1	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	6/9/2016	5/6/2016	6/9/2016	7
	2016-SCL-2	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	7/27/2016		6/9/2016	7
	2016-SCL-3	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	8/17/2016	8/5/2016	11/8/2016	95
	2016-SCL-4	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	8/16/2016	8/5/2016	11/8/2016	30
	2016-SCL-5	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	2/21/2017	11/21/2016		
	2016-SCL-6	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Nishigaya	2/21/2017	11/21/2016	9/30/2016	57
	2016-SCL-7	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	2/21/2017	11/21/2016		
	2016-SCL-8	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	2/21/2017	11/21/2016		
	2016-SCL-9	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	2/28/2017			
	2016-SCL-10	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	3/10/2017			
	2016-SCL-11	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Nishigaya	3/22/2016	12/22/2016		
	2016-SCL-12	Rosen, District Attorney	Hon. Ryan	3/22/2016	12/22/2016		
Sonoma	2015-SON-8	Ravitch, DA		4/13/2016		4/13/2016	37
Stanislaus	2016-STA-1	Arguellas, Officer	Hon. Ashley	8/6/2016		8/6/2016	83
Ventura	2016-VE-176	Velazquez, Officer	Hon. Wright	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/ Authorizing Official	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Ventura (cont'd)	2016-VE-177	Velazquez, Officer	Hon. Coleman	3/19/2017	12/20/2016		
	2016-VE-178	Wilkinson, Deputy	Hon. Coleman	(Inventory due) 5/5/2016		3/11/2016	178
	2016-VE-179	Bramlette, Deputy	Hon. Murphy	2/20/2017	11/22/2016		
	2016-VE-180	Porter, Deputy	Hon. Coleman	(Inventory due) 9/1/2016		10/27/2016	4026
	2016-VE-181	Bramlette, Deputy	Hon. Bennett	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2016-VE-182	Porter, Deputy	Hon. Bennett	(Inventory due) 10/1/2016		10/27/2016	4026
	2016-VE-183	Bramlette, Deputy	Hon. Coleman	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2016-VE-184	Ramirez, Officer	Hon. Coleman	3/31/2017	12/31/2016		
	2016-VE-185	Porter, Deputy	Hon. Coleman	(Inventory due) 11/2/2016		10/27/2016	4026
	2016-VE-186	Malagon, Deputy	Hon. Bennett	3/19/2017	12/20/2016		
	2016-VE-187	Bramlette, Deputy	Hon. Bennett	4/5/2017	1/5/2017		
	2016-VE-188	LaRock, Special Agent	Hon. Bennett	3/18/2017	1/5/2017		
	2016-VE-189	Skaggs, Deputy	Hon. Guasco	(Inventory due) 1/15/2017		12/28/2016	499
	2016-VE-190	LaRock, Special Agent	Hon. Bennett	3/18/2017	1/5/2017		
	2016-VE-191	Langford, Officer	Hon. Bennett	3/20/2017	12/20/2016		
	2016-VE-192	LaRock, Special Agent	Hon. Bennett	2/20/2017			
	2016-VE-193	Burkdol, Special Agent	Hon. Bennett	2/28/2017			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Alameda	2016-ALA-62	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
	2016-ALA-63	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
	2016-ALA-64	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
	2016-ALA-65	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
	2016-ALA-66	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
	2016-ALA-67	1 manager, 1 technician, 1 monitor	17,700	1,950	19,650
Alameda Total			106,200	11,700	117,900
Contra Costa	2017-CC-1	6 monitors, 1 agent	18,720	3,800	22,520
	2017-CC-2	11 monitors/agents	14,200	3,200	17,400
	2017-CC-3	2 monitors, 1 agent, 6 surveillance	111,000	2,000	113,000
	2017-CC-4	3 monitors, 1 agent, 5 surveillance	49,000	1,000	50,000
	2017-CC-5	3 monitors, 1 agent	100,000	2,000	102,000
	2017-CC-6	3 monitors, 1 agent	40,000	2,000	42,000
	2017-CC-7	Cost not available			
	2017-CC-8	3 monitors, 1 agent, 6 surveillance	50,000	2,000	52,000
	2017-CC-9	4 monitors, 1 agent	57,600	13,000	70,600
	2017-CC-10	1 monitor, 1 agent	14,400	3,800	18,200
	2017-CC-11	3 monitors, 1 agent	43,200	9,000	52,200
Contra Costa Total			498,120	41,800	539,920
Fresno	2016-FR-3	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	104,760	8,908	113,668
	2016-FR-1	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	212,347	10,318	222,665
	2016-FR-2	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	78,570	6,682	85,252
	2016-FR-4	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	18,333	1,559	19,892

⁵ Total costs per electronic interception and per county do not delineate between sources of funds (county, state, federal).

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-6	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	15,840	1,000	16,840
	2016-FR-7	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	21,120	1,334	22,454
	2016-FR-8	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	32,208	2,032	34,240
	2016-FR-9	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	20,592	1,300	21,892
	2016-FR-10	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	7,920	500	8,420
	2016-FR-11	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	4,224	267	4,491
	2016-FR-12	2 interpreters, 4 monitors, 2 patrol, 7 surveillance	2,112	133	2,245
	2016-FR-13	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	18,333	1,559	19,892
	2016-FR-14		75,951	6,459	82,410
	2016-FR-21	1 monitor, 1 team, 67 surveillance, 2 patrol	21,825	3,710	25,535
	2016-FR-22	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	4,365	742	5,107
	2016-FR-23		346,799	21,750	368,549
	2016-FR-24		61,872	24,750	86,622
	2016-FR-25		5,053	21,750	26,803
	2016-FR-26		6,177	24,750	30,927
	2016-FR-27		67,602	27,750	95,352
	2016-FR-28		11,742	21,750	33,492
	2016-FR-29	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	29,610	2,599	32,209
	2016-FR-30		61,670	30,750	92,420
	2016-FR-31		50,914	4,373	55,287
	2016-FR-32		38,940	24,750	63,690
	2016-FR-33	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	32,994	2,886	35,880

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Fresno (cont'd)	2016-FR-34	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	25,380	2,220	27,600
	2016-FR-35	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	19,458	1,702	21,160
	2016-FR-36	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	14,382	1,258	15,640
	2016-FR-37	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	37,224	3,256	40,480
	2016-FR-38	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	12,690	1,110	13,800
	2016-FR-39	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	6,768	592	7,360
	2016-FR-40	1 monitor, 1 team, 6 surveillance, 2 patrol	26,190	2,227	28,417
Fresno Total			1,493,965	266,726	1,760,691
Imperial	2016-IM-100	T Mobile/Wire Monitors	25,822	2,500	28,322
	2016-IM-101	T Mobile and Wire Monitors	25,822	2,500	28,322
Imperial Total			51,644	5,000	56,644
Los Angeles	2016-LA-1023	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1027	Costs related to 15-141			
	2016-LA-1054	1 installer; 2 monitors	27,600	1,100	28,700
	2016-LA-1060	1 tech; 3 linguists	26,820	1,400	28,220
	2016-LA-1061	1 tech; 3 linguists	40,125	1,400	41,525
	2016-LA-1063	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1064	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1068	Install, monitor	90,000	4,000	94,000
	2016-LA-1069	Install, monitor	24,000	1,000	25,000
	2016-LA-1070	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1071	Install, monitor	48,000	3,000	51,000
	2016-LA-1073	1 technician, 3 linguists	26,820	700	27,520
	2016-LA-1074	Install, monitor	24,000	1,000	25,000
	2016-LA-1075	Install, monitor	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1076	1 technician, 3 civilian linguists	26,820	1,400	28,220
	2016-LA-1077	Install, monitor	48,000	2,000	50,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1079	2 day overlapping with other wire	15,197	1,700	16,897
	2016-LA-1080	Install, monitor	24,000	4,000	28,000
	2016-LA-1081	1 technician; 3 linguists	26,820	700	27,520
	2016-LA-1082	1 technician, 3 civilian linguists	26,820	700	27,520
	2016-LA-1084	1 technician; 3 linguists	26,820	1,200	28,020
	2016-LA-1085	1 technician; 10 civilian linguists	26,820	700	27,520
	2016-LA-1086	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1088	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1089	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1090	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1091	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1092	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1093	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1094	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1095	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1096	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1097	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1098	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1099	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1100	Install, monitor	13,000	1,013	14,013
	2016-LA-1101	Install monitor	13,000	1,013	14,013
	2016-LA-1102	Install, monitor, and prepare transcripts	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1103	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1104	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1105	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1106	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1107	6	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1108	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1109	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1110	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1111	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1112	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1114	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1115	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1116	2	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1117	1	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1118	Cost not available			
	2016-LA-1119	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1120	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1121	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1122	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1123	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1124	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1125	Cost not available			
	2016-LA-1126	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1127	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1128	2 monitors per day- state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1129	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1130	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1131	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1132	4	36,000	4	36,004
	2016-LA-1135	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1136	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1137	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1138	6	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1139	Metropolitan	25,000	2,500	27,500

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1140	2 monitors per day	20,000	6,000	26,000
	2016-LA-1141	2 monitors per day	20,000	6,000	26,000
	2016-LA-1142	2 monitors/day shared on two lines	52,000	3,000	55,000
	2016-LA-1143	2 monitors/day shared on two lines	39,000	1,500	40,500
	2016-LA-1144	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1145	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1146	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1147	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1148	Translators	26,500	5,000	31,500
	2016-LA-1149	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1150	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1151	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1152	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1153	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1154	Approximately 17	119,000	3,500	122,500
	2016-LA-1155	Approximately 17	119,000	3,500	122,500
	2016-LA-1156	Approximately 17	119,000	3,500	122,500
	2016-LA-1157	Approximately 17	230,000	7,500	237,500
	2016-LA-1158	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1159	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1160	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1161	17	119,000	0	119,000
	2016-LA-1162	Cost not available			
	2016-LA-1163	Cost not available			
	2016-LA-1164	8	27,357	3,000	30,357
	2016-LA-1165	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1166	2	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1167	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1169	6	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1170	6	54,000	6,000	60,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1171	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1174	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1175	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1176	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1177	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1178	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1180	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1181	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1182	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1183	2	26,846	1,600	28,446
	2016-LA-1184	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1185	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1186	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1187	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1188	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1189	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1190	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1191	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1192	Install, monitor	13,000	1,013	14,013
	2016-LA-1193	Install, monitor	13,000	1,013	14,013
	2016-LA-1194	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1195	Install, monitor	26,000	2,026	28,026
	2016-LA-1196	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1197	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1198	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1199	1 monitor	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1200	1 monitor	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1201	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1202	2 monitors/transcribers per day	13,423	3,500	16,923
	2016-LA-1203	2 monitors/transcribers per day	26,846	2,500	29,346

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1204	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1205	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1206	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1207	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1208	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1209	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1210	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1211	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1212	17	220,000	7,500	227,500
	2016-LA-1213	17	220,000	7,500	227,500
	2016-LA-1214	17	220,000	7,500	227,500
	2016-LA-1215	19	225,000	7,500	232,500
	2016-LA-1216	19	225,000	7,500	232,500
	2016-LA-1217	19	225,000	7,500	232,500
	2016-LA-1218	19	225,000	7,500	232,500
	2016-LA-1219	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1220	2 monitors per day-state	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1221	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1222	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1223	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1224	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1225	8 monitors, 2 technicians, 4 detectives	1,000,000	30,000	1,030,000
	2016-LA-1226	Costs related to WT 16-25			
	2016-LA-1227	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1229	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1230	8	72,000	18,000	90,000
	2016-LA-1231	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1232	8	72,000	8,000	80,000
	2016-LA-1233	12	108,000	12,000	120,000
	2016-LA-1235	2 monitors per day	8,400	1,500	9,900
	2016-LA-1236	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1237	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1238	2 monitors per day	27,357	2,500	29,857
	2016-LA-1239	2 metropolitan Spanish monitors	27,374	1,600	28,974
	2016-LA-1240	2 metropolitan Spanish monitors	29,717	3,160	32,877
	2016-LA-1241	5	25,000	12,500	37,500
	2016-LA-1242	1	13,000	2,500	15,500
	2016-LA-1243	Cost not available			
	2016-LA-1244	1 technician, 3 linguists	26,820	1,200	28,020
	2016-LA-1245	6	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1246	2	48,000	3,000	51,000
	2016-LA-1247	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1248	18	162,000	18,000	180,000
	2016-LA-1249	Install, monitor	26,000	2,013	28,013
	2016-LA-1250	Install, monitor	52,000	4,019	56,019
	2016-LA-1251	1/2/2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1252	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1253	1/2/2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1254	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1255	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1256	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1257	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1258	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1259	2,2,1	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1260	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1261	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1262	Install, monitor	12,000	1,000	13,000
	2016-LA-1265	1/2/2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1267	17 monitors, 4 investigators	625,000	32,600	657,600
	2016-LA-1268	17 monitors, 4 investigators	625,000	33,600	658,600

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016-LA-1269	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-1270	2 monitors per day	30,130	2,500	32,630
	2016-LA-1271	4	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2016-LA-1272	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1273	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1274	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-1275	17 monitors, 4 investigators	250,000	8,400	258,400
	2016-LA-1276	2 translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
	2016-LA-1277	2 monitors per day	28,802	15,000	43,802
	2016-LA-3	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-4	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-5	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-6	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-7	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-8	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-9	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-10	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-11	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-12	4	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-LA-13	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-14	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-LA-15	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000
2016-LA-16	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000	
2016-LA-17	6	54,000	6,000	60,000	
2016-LA-18	2	18,000	2,000	20,000	
2016-LA-19	2	18,000	2,000	20,000	
2016-LA-20	2 monitors per day - state	18,000	2,000	20,000	
2016-LA-21	Translators	26,000	5,000	31,000	
2016-LA-22	2 translators	26,000	5,000	31,000	
Los Angeles Total			9,726,234	752,274	10,478,508

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Orange	2016-OR-121	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-122	2 monitors, 2 sworn	6,000	1,200	7,200
	2016-OR-123	3 monitors, 2 agents, 4 detectives	43,000	1,700	44,700
	2016-OR-125	2 monitors	1,800	2,000	3,800
	2016-OR-126	2 monitors, 2 sworn	6,000	1,200	7,200
	2016-OR-127	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-128	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-129	2 monitors	18,000	20,000	38,000
	2016-OR-130	3 monitors, 2 agents, 4 detectives	43,000	17,000	60,000
	2016-OR-131	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-132	2 monitors, 2 sworn	6,000	2,400	8,400
	2016-OR-133	2 monitors	8,000	2,000	10,000
	2016-OR-134	Costs related to 1-14			
	2016-OR-135	2 monitors, 2 sworn	6,000	1,200	7,200
	2016-OR-136	2 monitors, 2 sworn	2,000	1,200	3,200
	2016-OR-137	0	0	1,200	1,200
	2016-OR-138	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	1,400	22,400
	2016-OR-139	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	14,000	35,000
	2016-OR-140	12 monitors, 2 technicians	133,680	978	134,658
	2016-OR-141	9 monitors, 1 agent, 2 technicians	17,129	0	17,129
	2016-OR-142	3 monitors, 1 agent, 2 technicians	7,670	0	7,670
	2016-OR-143	2 FBI monitors, 2 detectives	10,000	1,000	11,000
	2016-OR-144	2 monitors, 2 sworn	2,000	2,400	4,400
	2016-OR-145	2 sworn, 2 monitors	2,000	1,200	3,200
	2016-OR-146	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-147	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	14,000	35,000
	2016-OR-148	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-149	2 monitors, 2 sworn	2,000	1,200	3,200
	2016-OR-150	2 monitors, 1 technician	26,000	1,400	27,400

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Orange (cont'd)	2016-OR-151	2 monitors, 2 agents, 4 detectives	20,000	700	20,700
	2016-OR-152	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-OR-153	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	1,400	22,400
	2016-OR-154	2 monitors, 1 technician	26,000	1,400	27,400
	2016-OR-155	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	1,500	22,500
	2016-OR-156	2 Spanish monitors	21,000	1,400	22,400
	2016-OR-157	2 monitors, 2 agents, 4 detectives	3,000	700	3,700
Orange Total			641,279	109,778	751,057
Riverside	2015-RIV-2186	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2015-RIV-2196	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2015-RIV-2197	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2015-RIV-2207	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	132,000	12,000	144,000
	2015-RIV-2208	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2015-RIV-2223	1 install, 2 monitors	54,000	4,000	58,000
	2015-RIV-2227	2 monitors	91,861	3,500	95,361
	2015-RIV-2228	2 monitors	61,260	191,700	252,960
	2015-RIV-2231	2 monitors	52,378	5,200	57,578
	2015-RIV-2232	4 monitors	94,800	3,000	97,800
	2015-RIV-2234	6 monitors	56,125	6,800	62,925
	2015-RIV-2235	2 monitors	65,470	12,500	77,970
	2015-RIV-2236	2 monitors	46,008	3,000	49,008
	2015-RIV-2237	1 officer; 6 civilian monitors; 1 technician	158,400	13,000	171,400
	2015-RIV-2238	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	22,880	1,000	23,880
	2015-RIV-2239	27 linguists	82,238	13,900	96,138
	2016-RIV-2240	5 DEA SA, 2 TFOs, 2 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2241	2 monitors, 10 investigators, 1 install	86,000	15,000	101,000
	2016-RIV-2242	1 officer, 6 civilian monitors, 1 technician	79,200	7,000	86,200
	2016-RIV-2243	2 linguists monitors	19,205	1,200	20,405

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2244	2 monitors	19,205	1,600	20,805
	2016-RIV-2245	6 monitors	128,913	25,000	153,913
	2016-RIV-2246	2 monitors; 1 technician	28,934	2,000	30,934
	2016-RIV-2247	2 monitors	26,188	800	26,988
	2016-RIV-2248	1 officer, 6 civilian monitors, 1 technician	108,791	8,000	116,791
	2016-RIV-2249	2 monitors	26,189	1,500	27,689
	2016-RIV-2250	2 monitors	2,200	1,400	3,600
	2016-RIV-2251	4 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2252	1 DEA; 2 monitors	17,548	2,600	20,148
	2016-RIV-2253	2 monitors	15,600	2,000	17,600
	2016-RIV-2254	2 monitors	63,000	193,000	256,000
	2016-RIV-2255	1 technician; 10 officers	18,900	2,500	21,400
	2016-RIV-2256	2 monitors	11,633	2,000	13,633
	2016-RIV-2257	1 officer, 6 civilian monitors, 1 technician	133,850	11,000	144,850
	2016-RIV-2258	2 monitors	2,200	1,400	3,600
	2016-RIV-2259	5 DEA SA, 2 TFOs, 2 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2260	1 DEA; 2 monitors	28,624	2,600	31,224
	2016-RIV-2261	1 technician; 10 officers	37,800	5,000	42,800
	2016-RIV-2262	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	60,160	5,000	65,160
	2016-RIV-2263	2 monitors	15,000	27,000	42,000
	2016-RIV-2264	5 DEA SA, 2 TFOs, 2 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2265	1 DEA personnel; 2 monitors	28,624	2,600	31,224
	2016-RIV-2266	23 linguists	91,299	13,825	105,124
	2016-RIV-2267	2 monitors	2,200	1,400	3,600
	2016-RIV-2268	1 Officer, 3 civilian monitors, 1 technician	131,547	16,000	147,547
	2016-RIV-2269	5 DEA SA, 2 TFOs, 2 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2270	1 install; 2 monitors	187,200	39,000	226,200

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2271	2 monitors	25,357	2,000	27,357
	2016-RIV-2272	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,400	2,000	28,400
	2016-RIV-2273	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	37,600	3,000	40,600
	2016-RIV-2274	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	44,000	4,000	48,000
	2016-RIV-2275	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,400	1,000	27,400
	2016-RIV-2276	5 persons used re installation and monitoring	41,340	27,000	68,340
	2016-RIV-2277	5 DEA SAs, 2 TFOs, 2 monitors	52,380	2,400	54,780
	2016-RIV-2278	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	52,800	4,000	56,800
	2016-RIV-2279	1 install; 2 monitors	46,800	6,000	52,800
	2016-RIV-2280	1 officer, 3 civilian monitors, 1 technician	52,800	5,000	57,800
	2016-RIV-2281	2 monitors	31,500	92,000	123,500
	2016-RIV-2282	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	67,680	6,000	73,680
	2016-RIV-2283	1 tech 10 officers	75,600	10,000	85,600
	2016-RIV-2284	1 officer, 6 civilian monitors, 1 technician	67,372	9,000	76,372
	2016-RIV-2285	1 install; 2 monitors	17,160	4,000	21,160
	2016-RIV-2286	2 linguists monitors	17,459	1,300	18,759
	2016-RIV-2287	1 installer/monitor	11,700	3,000	14,700
	2016-RIV-2288	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	64,800	7,000	71,800
	2016-RIV-2289	1 technician, 10 officers	56,700	7,500	64,200
	2016-RIV-2290	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	22,560	2,000	24,560
	2016-RIV-2291	1 officer, 6 civilian monitors, 1 technician	95,303	7,000	102,303
	2016-RIV-2292	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	67,680	6,000	73,680
	2016-RIV-2293	2 monitors, 1 technician, 2 translators	260,000	6,000	266,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2294	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	40,972	3,000	43,972
	2016-RIV-2295	2 monitors	10,746	1,300	12,046
	2016-RIV-2296	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	45,120	4,000	49,120
	2016-RIV-2297	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	52,800	4,000	56,800
	2016-RIV-2298	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	52,800	5,000	57,800
	2016-RIV-2299	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	144,000	10,000	154,000
	2016-RIV-2300	4 monitors	181,094	5,115	186,209
	2016-RIV-2301	2 monitors	20,078	1,000	21,078
	2016-RIV-2302	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	52,800	5,000	57,800
	2016-RIV-2303	1 DEA Personnel; 2 monitors	28,624	2,600	31,224
	2016-RIV-2304	2 monitors, 1 installer, 1 interpreter	27,000	6,101	33,101
	2016-RIV-2305	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	144,000	10,000	154,000
	2016-RIV-2306	2 monitors	44,000	3,600	47,600
	2016-RIV-2307	2 monitors	13,200	12,000	25,200
	2016-RIV-2308	4 monitors	181,094	5,115	186,209
	2016-RIV-2309	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,400	3,000	29,400
	2016-RIV-2310	4 monitors	83,960	5,200	89,160
	2016-RIV-2311	4 monitors	181,094	5,115	186,209
	2016-RIV-2312	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	72,000	4,000	76,000
	2016-RIV-2314	4 monitors	44,000	7,200	51,200
	2016-RIV-2315	2 monitors	26,188	800	26,988
	2016-RIV-2316	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	45,120	4,000	49,120
	2016-RIV-2317	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,400	3,000	29,400
	2016-RIV-2318	6 monitors	44,000	3,600	47,600
	2016-RIV-2319	2 monitors	29,618	2,000	31,618
	2016-RIV-2320	2 monitors	4,343	800	5,143

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Riverside (cont'd)	2016-RIV-2321	2 monitors, 1 technician, 1 translator	68,784	1,500	70,284
	2016-RIV-2324	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	43,200	5,000	48,200
	2016-RIV-2325	2 monitors	44,000	3,600	47,600
	2016-RIV-2326	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	72,000	4,000	76,000
	2016-RIV-2327	4 monitors	83,960	7,200	91,160
	2016-RIV-2328	2 monitors	27,485	1,950	29,435
	2016-RIV-2329	2 monitors	56,732	1,500	58,232
	2016-RIV-2332	2 monitors	57,604	3,000	60,604
	2016-RIV-2333	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-RIV-2334	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	24,000	6,000	30,000
Riverside Total			5,999,937	1,049,521	7,049,458
Sacramento	2016-SAC-63	2 monitors	6,662	15,000	21,662
	2016-SAC-65	18 monitors, 1 technician	37,786	0	37,786
Sacramento Total			44,448	15,000	59,448
San Bernardino	2015-SBD-618	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	151,893	11,000	162,893
	2015-SBD-620	2 detectives, 3 monitors, 1 technician	75,600	10,000	85,600
	2015-SBD-623	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	84,480	10,000	94,480
	2015-SBD-627	1 officer, 2 monitors, 1 technician	51,634	5,000	56,634
	2016-SBD-633	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	105,600	8,000	113,600
	2016-SBD-634	1 technician, 10 monitors, 2 transcriptionists, 10 officers	107,000	8,000	115,000
	2016-SBD-635	1 technician, 2 monitors, 15 officers	75,000	6,000	81,000
	2016-SBD-636	1 technician, 10 monitors, 2 transcriptionists, 10 officers	107,000	8,000	115,000
	2016-SBD-637	1 officer, 4 monitors, 1 technician	52,800	6,000	58,800

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-638	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	26,000	2,000	28,000
	2016-SBD-639	1 technician, 1 monitor	23,000	2,400	25,400
	2016-SBD-640	2 technicians, 8 monitors, 4 transcriptionists	2,580	3,400	5,980
	2016-SBD-641	1 technician, 2 monitors	34,000	1,200	35,200
	2016-SBD-642	1 technician, 4 monitors, 15 officers	75,000	6,000	81,000
	2016-SBD-643	1 technician, 10 monitors, 2 transcriptionists, 10 officers	107,000	8,000	115,000
	2016-SBD-644	1 technician, 2 monitors, 15 officers	28,000	2,000	30,000
	2016-SBD-645	1 technician, 9 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	34,275	1,036	35,311
	2016-SBD-646	3 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,820	1,400	28,220
	2016-SBD-647	1 officer, 3 civilian monitors, 1 technician	163,378	10,000	173,378
	2016-SBD-648	3 monitors, 1 technician, 1 investigator	78,348	625	78,973
	2016-SBD-649	1 technician, 4 monitors, 15 officers	50,000	4,000	54,000
	2016-SBD-650	10 investigators, 4 monitors	67,159	3,500	70,659
	2016-SBD-651	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-SBD-652	1 technician, 2 monitors	12,000	2,000	14,000
	2016-SBD-653	2 monitors, 1 transcriptionist, 3 officers	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-654	2 civilian monitors, 1 officer, 1 technician	18,408	5,000	23,408
	2016-SBD-655	6 monitors, 12 officers	81,000	6,000	87,000
	2016-SBD-656	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	26,000	2,000	28,000
	2016-SBD-657	10 monitors, 3 officers, 3 technicians	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-658	1 technician, 4 civilian monitors, 1 officer	54,714	6,000	60,714

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-659	1 technician, 1 monitor	13,000	2,000	15,000
	2016-SBD-660	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	56,000	2,000	58,000
	2016-SBD-661	1 technician, 19 monitored and transcribed	100,000	20,000	120,000
	2016-SBD-662	2 technicians, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-663	10 investigators, 4 civilian monitors	107,000	8,000	115,000
	2016-SBD-664	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionist	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2016-SBD-665	1 technician, 4 civilian monitors, 1 officer	54,714	7,000	61,714
	2016-SBD-666	2 technicians, 6 monitors, 2 transcriptionist	156,000	4,000	160,000
	2016-SBD-667	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	90,000	1,200	91,200
	2016-SBD-669	1 technician	0	2,000	2,000
	2016-SBD-670	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionist	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-671	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	35,200	4,000	39,200
	2016-SBD-672	1 technician, 8 monitors	55,778	625	56,403
	2016-SBD-673	12 investigators/monitors	32,400	3,650	36,050
	2016-SBD-674	2	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-675	1 officer, 4 civilian monitors, 1 technician	24,640	4,000	28,640
	2016-SBD-676	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	27,000	1,900	28,900
	2016-SBD-677	1 technician, 10 investigators, 4 civilian monitors	107,000	8,000	115,000
	2016-SBD-678	9 officers, 1 technician	20,000	7,000	27,000
	2016-SBD-679	1 technician, 3 monitors, 12 officers	4,000	36,000	40,000
	2016-SBD-680	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	27,000	1,200	28,200

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-681	1 technician, 19 monitored and transcribed	100,000	20,000	120,000
	2016-SBD-682	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-683	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	112,000	8,000	120,000
	2016-SBD-684	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-685	1 technician, 2 monitors	28,000	2,000	30,000
	2016-SBD-686	1 technician, 4 monitors, 12 officers	36,000	6,000	42,000
	2016-SBD-687	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-688	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	54,000	3,800	57,800
	2016-SBD-689	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionist	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-690	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	53,035	925	53,960
	2016-SBD-691	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	28,000	4,000	32,000
	2016-SBD-692	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	56,000	4,000	60,000
	2016-SBD-693	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	28,000	2,000	30,000
	2016-SBD-694	1 technician, 2 monitors, 1 officer	11,000	1,200	12,200
	2016-SBD-695	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-696	1 technician, 2 monitors, 12 officers	56,000	4,000	60,000
	2016-SBD-697	1 technician, 2 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2016-SBD-698	2 technicians, 2 monitors, 12 officers	60,000	6,000	66,000
	2016-SBD-699	21 investigators	70,110	1,929	72,039
	2016-SBD-700	1 officer, 2 civilian monitors, 1 technician	26,846	650	27,496
	2016-SBD-701	2 technicians, 3 monitors	75,000	4,000	79,000
2016-SBD-702	1 technician, 2 monitors, 1 transcriptionist	18,000	2,000	20,000	

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2016-SBD-703	1 technician, 2 monitors, 10 officers	46,000	6,000	52,000
	2016-SBD-705	21 investigators	140,220	11,622	151,842
	2016-SBD-706	1 technician, 1 monitor	28,000	2,000	30,000
	2016-SBD-707	21 investigators	23,370	1,825	25,195
	2016-SBD-709	25 officers	100,000	7,000	107,000
	2017-SBD-1	Investigators/monitors	28,000	4,300	32,300
San Bernardino Total			4,076,002	384,387	4,460,389
San Diego	2016-SD-217	2 monitor, 2 agents, 1 technician	23,940	700	24,640
	2016-SD-218	4 monitors, 4 agents, 2 technician	43,102	1,400	44,502
	2016-SD-219	2 monitors per day	26,189	1,600	27,789
	2016-SD-220	1 monitor	13,423	2,250	15,673
	2016-SD-221	1 monitor per shift	26,846	1,600	28,446
	2016-SD-222	12 monitors total	15,000	750	15,750
	2016-SD-223	3 monitors per shift	180,000	10,000	190,000
	2016-SD-224	3 monitors per shift	0	5,000	5,000
	2016-SD-225	1 monitor per shift	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2016-SD-226	35 LE Agents, 1730 monitor hours	99,845	2,950	102,795
	2016-SD-227	4 monitors per shift	238,500	16,000	254,500
	2016-SD-228	Monitors	42,059	1,400	43,459
	2016-SD-229	Linguists, agents and officers	22,131	4,215	26,346
	2016-SD-230	Costs related to Wire 16-10 (EICOS No. 2016-SD-232)			
	2016-SD-231	Costs related to Wire 16-10 (EICOS No. 2016-SD-232)			
	2016-SD-232	Monitors, installation costs, transcript preparation	367,612	50,599	418,211
	2016-SD-233	4 peace officers per day	38,586	600	39,186
San Diego Total			1,157,233	101,064	1,258,297
San Joaquin	2016-SJ-83	10 DOJ Agents/officers, 2 DOJ Agent, 1 Pilots DOJ Analyst	635,000	92,000	727,000
	2016-SJ-84	Costs related to 2016-SJ-83			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
San Joaquin (cont'd)	2016-SJ-85		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-86		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-87		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-88		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-89		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-90		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-91		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-92		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-93		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-94		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-95		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-96		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-97		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-98		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-99		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
	2016-SJ-100		Costs related to 2016-SJ-83		
San Joaquin Total			635,000	92,000	727,000
San Luis Obispo	2017-SLO-1	18 monitors, 3 agents, 2 clerks, 1 technician, 1 supervisor	47,500	7,545	55,045
	2017-SLO-2	2 monitors/interpreters, 2 agents, 1 technician	0	920	920
	2017-SLO-3	12 monitors/interpreters, 2 agents, 1 technician	37,731	852	38,583
San Luis Obispo Total			85,231	9,317	94,548
Santa Barbara	2016-SBA-53	7 monitors, 15 detectives, 4 technicians, 15 transcriptionists	180,496	102,739	283,235
Santa Barbara Total			180,496	102,739	283,235
Santa Clara	2016-SCL-1	2 monitors per 8 hour shift	22,852	1,700	24,552
	2016-SCL-2	3 monitors, 2 agents	14,000	1,300	15,300
	2016-SCL-3	105 law enforcement personnel	118,782	5,000	123,782

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Santa Clara (cont'd)	2016-SCL-4	39 sworn peace officers	45,662	2,000	47,662
	2016-SCL-5	Costs related to WT 16-08			
	2016-SCL-6	Costs related to WT 16-08			
	2016-SCL-7	2 monitors, 6 law enforcement officers	340,730	24,635	365,365
	2016-SCL-8	Costs related to WT 16-08			
	2016-SCL-9	4 civilian monitors	83,385	4,075	87,460
	2016-SCL-10	3 civilian monitors	45,231	3,450	48,681
	2016-SCL-11	Costs related to WT 16-10			
	2016-SCL-12	3 law enforcement officers	17,440	6,300	23,740
Santa Clara Total			688,082	48,460	736,542
Sonoma	2015-SON-8	HIDA personnel installed wire 1, approximately 3 monitors	6,000	3,000	9,000
Sonoma Total			6,000	3,000	9,000
Stanislaus	2016-STA-1	7 monitors	55,628	2,522	58,150
Stanislaus Total			55,628	2,522	58,150
Ventura	2016-VE-176	3 monitors, 1 technician	35,142	13,146	48,288
	2016-VE-177	3 monitors, 1 technician	35,142	13,416	48,558
	2016-VE-178	2 monitors, 1 technician	26,666	1,325	27,991
	2016-VE-179	15 detectives, 5 monitors, 3 technicians, 4 transcriptionists	100,000	7,589	107,589
	2016-VE-180	1 technician, 4 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	123,445	35,747	159,192
	2016-VE-181	3 technicians, 15 detectives, 21 monitors, 4 transcriptionists	300,000	2,547	302,547
	2016-VE-182	1 technician, 4 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	123,445	35,747	159,192
	2016-VE-183	3 technicians, 15 detectives, 10 monitors, 4 transcriptionists	100,000	0	100,000
	2016-VE-184	1 monitor, 1 technician	22,446	5,200	27,646

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2016

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁵
Ventura (cont'd)	2016-VE-185	1 technician, 4 monitors, 2 transcriptionists	123,445	35,747	159,192
	2016-VE-186	6 monitors, 1 technician	34,504	3,284	37,788
	2016-VE-187	3 technicians, 5 detectives, 6 monitors, 4 transcriptionists	35,000	0	35,000
	2016-VE-188	2 monitors, 1 technician	25,520	625	26,145
	2016-VE-189	16 monitors, 2 technicians, 2 transcriptionists	39,088	3,000	42,088
	2016-VE-190	2 monitors, 1 technician	25,695	875	26,570
	2016-VE-191	6 monitors, 1 technician	34,504	3,284	37,788
	2016-VE-192	2 monitors, 1 technician	27,169	1,000	28,169
	2016-VE-193	2 monitors, 1 technician	26,666	1,700	28,366
Ventura Total			1,237,877	164,232	1,402,109
Grand Total			26,683,376	3,159,520	29,842,896

Table 6A
Previously Unreported Costs
of Electronic Interceptions

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Cost (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Fees, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource) ⁶
Imperial	2015-IM-84	Monitors, agents, interpreters	132,445	5,100	137,545
	2015-IM-85	Monitors, agents, interpreters	79,202	2,570	81,772
	2015-IM-86	Monitors, agents, interpreters	79,202	0	79,202
	2015-IM-87	Monitors, agents, interpreters, technicians	26,318	3,000	29,318
	2015-IM-88	Monitors, agents, interpreters, technicians	6,816	3,000	9,816
	2015-IM-90	Interpreters	26,189	3,400	29,589
	2015-IM-92	Monitors	26,189	1,700	27,889
	2015-IM-93	Monitors	26,189	1,700	27,889
	2015-IM-94	Interpreters	25,822	2,500	28,322
	2015-IM-96	Monitors	25,822	2,500	28,322
	2015-IM-97	Monitors	26,318	2,500	28,818
	2015-IM-98	Monitors	13,159	2,500	15,659
	2015-IM-99	Monitors	13,159	2,500	15,659
Imperial Total			506,830	32,970	539,800
San Mateo	2016-SM-10	3 install, 41 monitors	76,955	15,654	92,609
San Mateo Total			76,955	15,654	92,609

⁶ Total costs per electronic interception and per county do not delineate between sources of funds (county, state, federal).

Table 7
Jurisdiction Reporting No
Electronic Interception Activity During
Calendar Year 2016

Alpine	Madera	San Mateo
Amador	Marin	Santa Cruz
Butte	Mariposa	Shasta
Calaveras	Mendocino	Sierra
Colusa	Merced	Siskiyou
Del Norte	Modoc	Solano
El Dorado	Mono	Sutter
Glenn	Monterey	Tehama
Humboldt	Napa	Trinity
Inyo	Nevada	Tulare
Kern	Placer	Tuolumne
Kings	Plumas	Yolo
Lake	San Benito	Yuba
Lassen	San Francisco	

Table 8
Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions
Conducted in Prior Years

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Alameda	2013		13-16	13-16								1	murder
	2014		14-08 to 14-09	2014-ALA-19				1				1	murder
Contra Costa	2015		15-21 to 15-27	2015-ALA-42								7	firearm violations, robbery, accessory, grand theft from the person
	2015		15-001					1	0	0	0	3	firearms, gang
Imperial	2015	8/19/2015		2015-IM-93	\$0.00	4	narcotics weight enhancements of over 90 kilograms total	0	0	0	0	4	narcotics offenses sentences ranging from 7-30 years.
	2016	9/23/2015				1	narcotics, weight enhancement	0	0	0	0	1	narcotics, weight enhancement
Los Angeles	2013		13-86			2	conspiracy narcotics sale						
	2014		14-149	2016-LA-939		1	narcotics proceeds over \$25k, conspiracy						
	2014		14-113			2	conspiracy and possession for sale, possession narcotics proceeds, resist; false compartment						
	2015		15-45; 15-59	2016-LA-1000		2	possession, conspiracy						
	2015		(15-430;15-405)			1	possession narcotics sale, proceeds						
	2015		15-37	2016-LA-999		1	possession narcotics and firearms for sale						
	2015		15-56; 15-56x1-3;15-87; 15-103			2	murder; torture						
	2016		16-15x 1	2016-LA-1061		2	transportation for sale; possession for sale; obstruction/resist						

Table 8
Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions
Conducted in Prior Years

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016		16-151x1	2016-LA-1061		2	conspiracy and possession for sale, possession narcotics proceeds, resist						
	2016		16-151x1	2016-LA-1061		2	conspiracy, possession, transport for sale, possession ammunition						
	2016		16-01; 16-20			4	conspiracy and possession for sale, possession narcotics proceeds, resist						
	2016		16-62	2016-LA-1246		2	transportation of heroin; possession; conspiracy of sale						
	2016		16-33; 16-62	2016-LA-1246		2	transportation of meth; possession for sale						
	2016		16-167	2016-LA-1169		1	possession narcotics and firearms for sale						
	2016		16-140	2016-LA-1159		1	possession narcotics sale, proceeds						
	2016		16-09			2	transportation for sale; possession for sale; conspiracy						
	2016		16-09			4	transportation for sale; possession for sale; conspiracy						
	2016		16-05; 15-169			4	possession narcotics and firearms for sale						
	2016		16-123; 16-123x1	2016-LA-1174		2	possession narcotics sale						
	2016		16-05			1	possession narcotics and firearms for sale						

Table 8
Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions
Conducted in Prior Years

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2016		16-33; 16-32			2	possession narcotics sale, transportation; conspiracy						
	2016		16-33; 16-62			2	possession narcotics sale, transportation; conspiracy						
	2016		16-108	2016-LA-1121		1	possession narcotics						
San Bernardino	2010	2/19/2010	2010 SBN 016	2010-SBD-28				1	0	0	0	1	conspiracy to commit crime, narcotics
	2011		2011 SBN 042	2011-SBD-291				1	0	0	0	1	murder, carjacking, street terrorism, assault with a firearm
	2011		2011 SBN 064	2011-SBD-363				0	0	0	0	3	conspiracy to commit crime; firearm; street gang terrorism
	2012	1/23/2012	2012 SBN 012	2012-SBD-437			murder, arson causing great bodily injury, aggravated mayhem, torture	1	0	0	0	1	murder, arson causing great bodily injury, aggravated mayhem, torture, murder by lying in wait, murder, was accomplice, murder with torture
	2015	7/16/2015	CH15-8177	2015-SBD-604		9	narcotics, gang	2		2		2	narcotics, street terrorism
San Diego	2014		14-14	2014-SD-180								1	narcotics
	2015		15-01, 15-02, 15-09	2015-SD-201								2	narcotics
	2015		15-04	2015-SD-210								1	murder
	2015		15-08	2015-SD-198								1	narcotics
	2015		15-05, 15-06, 15-11, 15-13, 15-15	2015-SD-208								3	narcotics

Table 9
List of Electronic Interception Orders
Approved But Never Installed or Not Used
Calendar Year 2016

Approved But Never Installed	Installed But Never Used
2016-FR-16	2016-SAC-64
2016-FR-17	2016-SBD-659
2015-IM-91 (previously unreported)	2016-SBD-668
2016-LA-1172	2016-SBD-669
2016-LA-1234	2016-SBD-694
2016-OR-124	2016-SBD-704
2016-SBD-710	2016-SBD-708
2016-SOL-1	
2016-VE195	

Appendix A: Penal Code section 629.62 “Report by Attorney General”

(a) The Attorney General shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Legislature, the Judicial Council, and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on interceptions conducted under the authority of this chapter during the preceding year. Information for this report shall be provided to the Attorney General by any prosecutorial agency seeking an order pursuant to this chapter.

(b) The report shall include all of the following data:

- (1) The number of orders or extensions applied for.
- (2) The kinds of orders or extensions applied for.
- (3) The fact that the order or extension was granted as applied for, was modified, or was denied.
- (4) The number of wire or electronic communication devices that are the subject of each order granted.
- (5) The period of interceptions authorized by the order, and the number and duration of any extensions of the order.
- (6) The offense specified in the order or application, or extension of an order.
- (7) The identity of the applying law enforcement officer and agency making the application and the person authorizing the application.
- (8) The nature of the facilities from which or the place where communications were to be intercepted.
- (9) A general description of the interceptions made under the order or extension, including (A) the number of persons whose communications were intercepted, (B) the number of communications intercepted, (C) the percentage of incriminating communications intercepted and the percentage of other communications intercepted, and (D) the approximate nature, amount, and cost of the manpower and other resources used in the interceptions.
- (10) The number of arrests resulting from interceptions made under the order or extension, and the offenses for which arrests were made.
- (11) The number of trials resulting from the interceptions.
- (12) The number of motions to suppress made with respect to the interceptions, and the number granted or denied.
- (13) The number of convictions resulting from the interceptions and the offenses for which the convictions were obtained and a general assessment of the importance of the interceptions.
- (14) Except with regard to the initial report required by this section, the information required by paragraphs (9) to (13), inclusive, with respect to orders or extensions obtained in a preceding calendar year.
- (15) The date of the order for service of inventory made pursuant to Section 629.68, confirmation of compliance with the order, and the number of notices sent.
- (16) Other data that the Legislature, the Judicial Council, or the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall require.

(c) The annual report shall be filed no later than April of each year, and shall also include a summary analysis of the data reported pursuant to subdivision (b). The Attorney General may issue regulations prescribing the content and form of the reports required to be filed pursuant to this section by any prosecutorial agency seeking an order to intercept wire or electronic communications.

(d) The Attorney General shall, upon the request of an individual making an application, provide any information known to him or her as a result of these reporting requirements that would enable the individual making an application to comply with paragraph (6) of subdivision (a) of Section 629.50.