DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, US ARMY GARRISON, PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY
1768 LENNOX ROAD, SUITE 219
MONTEREY, CA 93940-5056

LAW ENFORCEMENT PROTOCOLS
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
THE PRISIDIO OF MONTEREY
THE MONTEREY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE:
CITY OF MONTEREY, CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
CITY OF SEASIDE, CITY OF MARINA, CITY OF DEL REY OAKS
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MONTEREY BAY
AND
THE MONTEREY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

1. REFERENCES:
   e. MOU between U.S. Army Garrison, Presidio of Monterey and Monterey County Sheriff's Office. Subject: Monterey County Special Weapons and Tactics Team, 14 September 2009.

2. PURPOSE:
   a. The purpose of this MOU is to memorialize an understanding between the Garrison Commander (GC), Presidio of Monterey (POM), the Monterey County Sheriff’s Office, City of Monterey, City of Pacific Grove, City of Seaside, City of Marina, City of Del Rey Oaks, California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) and the Monterey County District Attorney’s Office relating to the investigation and prosecution of offenses over which the above named cities, State and County agencies and the United States Government have concurrent criminal jurisdiction, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code § 13 and the California Government Code §126. For clarification, the area subject to this agreement is a United States Army Military installation commonly referred to as the POM and the Ord Military Community (OMC), located primarily in the City of Seaside. It also includes former Fort Ord property not yet transferred under the base realignment and closure laws until such time as the property is removed from Federal possession.
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b. This MOU addresses the reporting of offenses, the investigation of offenses, the apprehension and/or arrest of civilians and military personnel and the prosecution of offenses in which the GC, POM, Monterey County, CSUMB or a local municipality have an interest. This MOU does not apply to cognizable offenses that fall solely under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ, Title 10, United States Code § 801, et seq.) or other Federal laws. Investigations or matters arising from authorized military training or operations occurring on the POM or on the OMC or to military administrative or security investigations. The parties of this MOU also agree, in the interest of efficient and fair administration of law enforcement investigations and criminal justice matters, to cooperate fully in implementing the provisions of this MOU.

c. All parties of this MOU understand that this MOU is subject to the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Departments of Justice and Defense, dated January 1985, relating to the investigation and prosecution of certain crimes, as implemented in AR 27-10, Military Justice, dated 3 October 2011, chapter 2 (Enclosure 1). The provisions of this MOU are subject to any changes to AR 27-10, or any other Army or Department of Defense (DoD) guidance that may be published after the date of this MOU.

d. All parties agree that nothing in this MOU violates Title 18 United States Code § 1385 (Posse Comitatus Act). No action will be taken under the guise or in reliance on this MOU that is a violation of the Posse Comitatus Act.

3. POLICY:

a. This MOU aids in determining which agency will exercise investigative and have prosecutorial jurisdiction over offenses in which military, State, city or county agencies have an interest as defined in paragraph 2a. The main factors in making this determination of which agency has the greatest interest in the offense are the location of the offense, the status of the suspect(s) and which agency can provide the most effective and swiftest justice. Although various jurisdictional outcomes may result from application of the principles stated in this MOU, these can always be altered by agreement of the agencies concerned.

b. This MOU provides internal guidance to the agencies concerned and it does not create or confer any substantive or procedural rights on individuals. Violation of the provisions of this MOU does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by any person against the United States, city, county or State agencies, or their officers or employees or any other person.

c. No State or local agency has the right or the power to interfere with the Federal government in the proper performance of its authorized functions.
SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

d. AR 190-45, 30 March 2007, establishes Law Enforcement reporting.

4. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT: The following principles shall determine which agency will conduct or participate in traffic enforcement:

   a. The POM Police Department (PD) shall have primary responsibility for traffic control, enforcement or traffic regulations and investigations of motor vehicle accidents on the Federal property described as the OMC. CSUMB and the cities of Marina, Seaside and Del Rey Oaks may also engage in traffic control, enforcement of traffic regulations and the investigations of motor vehicle accidents on the portions of General Jim Moore Boulevard and South Boundary Road that pass through the OMC in their respective jurisdictions.

   b. The County of Monterey and the cities of Seaside, Marina, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey and CSUMB shall jointly engage with the POM PD in traffic control, enforcement of traffic regulations, and investigations of motor vehicle accidents on Federal property located on the portions of former Fort Ord property not yet transferred under the base closure laws within their respective jurisdictions.

5. CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS: The following principles shall determine which agency will conduct or participate in a particular criminal investigation.

   a. Investigative Jurisdiction:

      (1) DoD has broad jurisdiction and authority to investigate criminal activity whenever a military interest exists. Generally, a military interest exists when one or more of the following apply:

         (a) The crime is committed on a Military installation or facility;

         (b) There is a reasonable basis to believe that a suspect may be subject to the UCMJ;

         (c) There is a reasonable basis to believe that a suspect may be a civilian employee of the DoD who has committed an offense in connection with his or her assigned duties with the DoD.

         (d) The military is the victim of the crime; e.g., the offense involves the loss or destruction of government property or allegations of fraud (as defined in AR 195-2, Criminal Investigation Activities concerning the criminal investigation of fraud offenses) relating to Army programs or personnel;
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(c) There is a need to protect personnel, property or activities on military installations from criminal conduct on military installations that has a direct adverse effect on the military’s ability to accomplish its mission;

(f) The activity threatens the good order and discipline of the installation.

(2) Normally, either the POM PD or the U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Division (CID) will conduct Army criminal investigations. The POM PD generally takes jurisdiction over misdemeanors as described in AR 190-30, Military Police Investigations, Appendix B (Enclosure 3). The CID generally takes jurisdiction over all felonies as described in AR 195-2, Appendix B (Enclosure 3). The POM PD will refer all crimes, offenses or incidents falling within CID investigative responsibility to the appropriate CID element for investigation.

(3) The city, county and State signatory agencies to this MOU have broad jurisdiction to investigate criminal conduct where:

(a) The United States Government is not the victim of the offense;

(b) The suspects are civilian personnel who are suspected of offenses other than those described in paragraph 5a(1)(c); or

(c) POM PD or CID, on the advice of the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate (OSJA), waives jurisdiction to the local civilian authorities.

(4) In an investigation involving multiple suspects, only some of whom are subject to the UCMJ, the investigation will be conducted jointly by the POM PD, CID or other appropriate federal agency and the local agency or agencies having concurrent jurisdiction where the crime occurred. The determination of the lead agency will be made on a case-by-case basis.

b. Notification Requirements:

(1) Civilian authorities will notify the POM PD as soon as possible when a report reveals evidence of criminal conduct by a Service Member (SM) involved in a crime committed on or off POM or OMC. In those instances when confidentiality is deemed essential to ensure that the integrity of an ongoing investigation will not be compromised, civilian authorities may use their discretion with regard to when the POM PD shall be so notified. Upon receipt of information of criminal conduct by a SM, the POM PD will notify the appropriate military authorities to include, but not limited, to the OSJA. Investigative jurisdiction will be determined in accordance with the principle discussed above.
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(2) In all felony cases of joint interest, each agency shall provide, if requested, periodic status reports and all reports of their investigation to the other interested agencies.

(c) Evidence Handling Among Agencies:

(1) In those instances where there is only one investigative agency, that agency will maintain control and custody of any evidence;

(2) In those instances where there is a joint investigation, the lead investigative agency will maintain control and custody of any evidence;

(3) Evidence in the control and custody of one agency may be released to another agency for investigative examination, laboratory testing and similar purposes. In such circumstances the borrowing agency will return the evidence, to the extent practicable, upon completion of the examination or testing, and will maintain a proper chain-of-custody while in possession of the evidence.

5. ARRESTS ON THE POM AND OMC:

a. Arrest of SM – This paragraph shall apply to the arrest of SM pursuant to the issuance of a search warrant, indictment or other judicially involved process. The primary objective of this agreement is effective cooperation between civilian authorities to the end that one prosecution does not jeopardize another and that serious offenses are justly and expeditiously prosecuted. In order to facilitate the arrest of SMs, civilian authorities will seek the arrest of a SM on POM property through the POM PD.

(1) Initial Presentation of Arrest Authority – The presentation of a valid warrant of arrest, indictment, or information, together with sufficient information to identify the person sought as the person who allegedly committed the offense(s) charged and a statement of the maximum sentence which may be imposed upon conviction, will be made available to the POM PD.

(2) Arrest Procedures – Upon obtaining a determination of legal sufficiency from the OSJA, the POM PD will assist in the execution of valid arrest warrants, indictments, presentments and information on behalf of civilian authorities as appropriate.

(3) Decision When UCMJ Charges Are Pending.

(a) When civilian authorities wish to arrest a SM against whom disciplinary proceedings under the UCMJ are contemplated or pending, the following procedures and considerations shall apply. The SM will remain in military custody pending coordination between the District
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Attorney and the OSJA. When the arrest involves a SM against whom disciplinary proceedings under the UCMJ are contemplated or pending, the POM PD will be informed and the OSJA will coordinate with the SM’s General Court-Martial Convening Authority (GCMCA) for a determination as to whether the subject should be released to the civilian authorities. The SM will remain in military custody pending agreement between the District Attorney and the SM’s GCMCA.

(b) If the GC of POM and or the SM’s GCMCA determines there is an overriding reason to retain the SM in military custody, the arresting agency shall be promptly notified. The arresting officer or agency designee will be permitted to question the SM and conduct any additional investigation necessary in accordance with the above guidelines concerning investigative jurisdiction. Upon cessation of the reason for retaining the SM in military custody, the POM PD will notify the arresting agency that the SM may be available for jurisdiction by the local authorities.

b. Arrest of Civilians – The following procedures will be used to arrest persons other than SM’s on POM or OMC.

(1) Initial Presentation of Arrest Authority -- The presentation of a valid warrant of arrest, indictment or information, together with sufficient information to identify the person sought as the person who allegedly committed the offense(s) charged and a statement of the maximum sentence which may be imposed upon conviction, will be made to the POM PD.

(2) Arrest Procedures -- Arrest procedures for civilians located on POM or OMC shall be the same as those established in subparagraph 6a(2) above. If exigent circumstances prevent prior notification of POM PD in the arrest of a civilian or SM on the installation, the agency shall contact POM PD immediately after making the arrest to advise the SM’s Chain of Command of the arrest. The OSJA will also be notified immediately by POM PD.

7. PURSUIT OF CRIMINAL SUSPECTS: Authority to Enter Installation Pursuit of Suspects onto the OMC – Local law enforcement officers are authorized to continue the pursuit of criminal suspects onto the OMC. When possible, civilian authorities will inform the POM PD that pursuit of a suspect onto the OMC is likely to occur. The local authorities will ordinarily contact the POM PD dispatcher to notify patrol units of the hot pursuit onto the installation. The POM PD will provide assistance to civilian authorities with the apprehension or pursuit of suspects on the OMC. During any hot pursuit of a suspect onto OMC, civilian law enforcement officers are authorized to enter buildings, structures or facilities on the OMC as otherwise permitted under the laws of the State of California. In such circumstances, the primary pursuing agency will immediately notify or cause to be notified the POM PD.
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circumstances permit, the POM PD may be requested to assume the primary role in the pursuit while on OMC property.

8. CRIMINAL PROSECUTION:

a. In any case in which a person accused of a felony and or misdemeanor offense is subject to the UCMJ and State law, the GC and the Monterey County District Attorney, or their designees, may meet to decide whether the case will be handled through the military justice system or in state court.

b. Once an agreement has been reached with regard to exercising jurisdiction over an accused's case by either military or civilian systems of justice, both sides will cooperate in providing investigative reports concerning the case; in making witnesses available for interviews and testimony; and in making evidence available for examination and use in any legal proceedings in accordance with (FAR) regulatory guidance to include the Freedom of Information Act.

c. Upon request, the District Attorney will inform the OSJA, and GC about charges filed, current status and final disposition in any case the DA is prosecuting in state court, in which the accused is also subject to the UCMJ or that involves a victim who is a SM or who is related to a SM.

d. Upon request, the OSJA, DLIFLC and POM, will inform the DA about charges filed, current status and final disposition in any case subject to the UCMJ.

e. The provisions of the section do not apply to:

   (1) Adverse military administrative actions that may be taken in conjunction with or in lieu of criminal prosecution.

   (2) Nonjudicial punishment administered by military authorities under the Provisions of Article 15, UCMJ (Title 10 United States Code Sec. 815).

   (3) Decisions concerning whether to bring court-martial charges subsequent to a State prosecution.

   (4) Decisions made by representatives of the United States Attorney’s Office concerning prosecution of offenses that have been investigated pursuant to this memorandum of understanding.
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9. SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS (SWAT) TEAM SUPPORT: It is recognized and understood that the GC and the Monterey County Sheriff's Office have entered into a mutual agreement by separate memorandum to provide SWAT support to the POM and OMC in emergency situations (dated 14 September 2009). The Seaside, Marina or Del Rey Oaks Police Departments and CSUMB will be advised of any SWAT development and the circumstances thereof on the OMC within the city limits of their respective cities.

10. SHARING INFORMATION AND REPORTS:

   a. Each party to this agreement agrees, to the best of their ability and IAW State and Federal law, to share information, reports and other documentation concerning the identities of persons involved and the circumstances of incidents covered by this MOU.

   b. The Commander, California Medical Detachment will coordinate with the GC and POM PD prior to releasing information in their custody to the appropriate civilian police department.

11. MEDIA INQUIRIES: Any inquiries by news media concerning any matter covered by this MOU shall be referred to the agency with the lead investigative responsibility.

12. TERMS AND MODIFICATION: This MOU shall remain in force until 1 January 2013, and it shall be renewed thereafter automatically for five-year periods, unless sooner terminated by the parties hereto. This MOU may be modified by mutual consent or terminated unilaterally by any party with thirty days written notice from one of the subscribing officials or his successors to the other subscribing officials or their successors. A review of the provisions of the MOU may be conducted at the request of any party.

Enclosures
1. AR 27–10, Chapter 2
2. AR 190–45, Chapter 4
3. AR 190–2, Appendix B
4. AR 190–30, Appendix B
5. MOU USAG POM and Monterey Sheriff's Office

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have signed below on the dates indicated, this agreement to take effect upon the last date entered.
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Director of Emergency Services
Presidio of Monterey

(Date)

District Attorney
Monterey County

9/20/12

(Date)

Chief of Police
City of Seaside

8-9-12

(Date)

Chief of Police
City of Del Rey Oaks

(Date)

Chief of Police
City of Pacific Grove

8-9-12

(Date)

COL, SF
Commanding

(Date)

Sheriff
Monterey County

(Date)

Chief of Police
City of Monterey

8/9/12

(Date)

Chief of Police
City of Marina

(Date)

Chief of Police
California State University Monterey

(Date)
SOP # 1.05 Authority and Jurisdiction (25 April 2018)

1. REFERENCES.

   a. AR 190-14, Carrying of Firearms and Use of Force for Law Enforcement and Security Duties, 12 March 1993

   b. AR 190-56, The Army Civilian Police and Security Guard Program, 15 March 2013

   c. AR 190-5, Motor Vehicle Traffic Supervision, 22 May 2006


   e. United States Code, 2018

   f. TR-130, Traffic / Non-Traffic Notice to Appear, 26 June 2015

   g. Judicial Council of California Notice to Appear and Related Forms, 26 June 2015

   h. DD Form 1408, Armed Forces Traffic Ticket, 1 December 1987

   i. United States District Court Central Violations Bureau, 2018

2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE. To establish policies, procedures, and responsibilities pertaining to the Ordnance Military Community (OMC), the Presidio of Monterey (POM) and the Defense Language Institute/Foreign Language Center (DLI/FLC), La Mesa Housing and signed MOU areas of responsibility to which the Presidio of Monterey Police Department (POMPD) provides law enforcement.

3. APPLICABILITY. This SOP pertains to all Presidio of Monterey (POM) police officers and Department of the Army Security Guards (DASG) enforcing Federal, State and local laws.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES. It is the responsibility of the Chief of Police and Operations Commander to make sure all police officers and security guards assigned to the POMPD are trained annually on Authority and Jurisdiction. It is the responsibility of the employee to report all actions taken outside the assigned jurisdiction to a Watch Commander who will make notifications.

5. GENERAL.

   a. This SOP outlines the law enforcement authority of the POM police officers and DASG, as well as the geographical location pertaining to law enforcement areas of responsibility.

   b. All lands within the boundaries of POM, OMC, La Mesa Housing and signed MOU areas of responsibility.

   c. The authority of POM police officers performing law enforcement duties derives from the Senior Commander of Presidio of Monterey and from AR 190-56. The POM
police have the authority to apprehend persons subject to the UCMJ and release them to their chain of command, detain civilians and issue them citations; or release them to the appropriate civilian or federal authorities for disposition. POM police officers on duty are considered part of the Army and are therefore subject to the restrictions on aid to civilian law enforcement imposed by Title 18, Section 1385, USC, Posse Comitatus Act (See SOP # 5.18 Posse Comitatus Act).

d. POM police officers and DASG enforce the provisions of the UCMJ, Army Regulations, Federal Law, and State Law under the Assimilative Crimes Act.

e. Enforcement is accomplished through apprehensions of suspected violators and the subsequent rendering of written reports to Commanders, Federal Magistrate and the Superior Court of California, County of Monterey, California.

f. Officers have no authority to punish suspected violators through verbal reprimands unless approved by a Supervisor. Police authority to enforce is exercised through observing; apprehending, if appropriate; processing the suspect courteously and professionally; releasing the suspect to either the military, civilian authority, or on his/her own recognizance after processing; and writing reports, if required.

g. POM police officers and DASG exercise law enforcement authority over Military and Civilian personnel on Presidio of Monterey, OMC, La Mesa Housing, and signed MOU areas of responsibility delegated by the Installation Commander.

6. JURISDICTION. The jurisdiction of the police officers and security guards performing duties extends only to the POM, OMC, La Mesa Housing and signed MOU areas of responsibility. POM police officers and DASG have no law enforcement authority outside of the geographical boundaries of POM, OMC, La Mesa Housing and signed MOU areas of responsibility, as delegated by the Senior Commander, or where lands have not been transferred or sold by the Department of the Army (DA). POM police officers on duty but outside the established POMPD jurisdiction have authority over military members, whether they are in uniform or in civilian clothes, if they are behaving in violation of the UCMJ, Army Regulations, Federal Laws, or State Laws.

7. POWERS OF APPREHENSION. In the performance of duties, POM police officers have the power of apprehension and detention within their jurisdiction. On-duty POM police officers out of their jurisdiction do not have the power of arrest. If a felony is observed to be in progress, POM police officers may take immediate actions to neutralize the situation and detain subjects for the civil authorities. Off-duty POM police officers have the same power of arrest as a private citizen under California law.

8. LIABILITY. POM police officers are agents of the U.S. Government and as such, their actions must be lawful and reasonable to avoid liability.
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PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY POLICE DEPARTMENT
SOP # 2.04 PROCESSING OF OFFENDERS

1. PURPOSE. To establish procedures for processing and releasing alleged offenders, military and civilian, from the Presidio of Monterey Police Department (POMPD) to their respective units, civilian agency, or their own recognizance.

2. APPLICABILITY. This SOP pertains to all Presidio of Monterey Police Officers and Police investigators.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES. The Chief of Police (COP), Deputy Chief of Police (DCOP), Operation Commander (OC), Watch Commanders (WC), Desk Sergeants (DS) and all other personnel responsible for processing and releasing alleged offenders will adhere to this SOP.

4. GENERAL.

   a. This SOP outlines the procedures for the apprehension and release of offenders processed by the POMPD.

   b. The WC, DS or other individual(s) designated by the COP will decide whether or not to place an individual in a Detention Cell (D-Cell).

   c. The DS and WC are responsible for the Detention Cell.

   d. Once it has been decided to place an individual in the D-Cell, the DS will immediately contact the WC, COP, OC, and DCOP.

   e. The DS must exercise considerable care prior to directing the detention of personnel. The DS will refer incapacitated personnel under the influence of alcohol or drugs to medical authorities and will not detain them without a medical examination.

   f. Personnel who can go to the D-Cell are:

      (1) Hostile and belligerent personnel, whether intoxicated or sober who police officer(s) cannot control in any other way.

      (2) AWOL/deserters who have not surrendered themselves.

      (3) Suspected or known felons.

      (4) Individuals who require protective custody.

      (5) Individuals detained for pretrial confinement, accompanied by Memorandum of Authorization from the servicing Staff Judge Advocate (SJA).

   g. Detention Facilities will not be used to maintain custody of apprehended military personnel for periods exceeding 12 hours, except for pretrial confinement; and when there are exceptional circumstances. The Chief of Police must approve detention under exceptional
circumstances. The DS will annotate this in the MP Blotter. Regardless of the circumstances this
detention will not exceed 72 hours. Request for confinement for over 72 hours must be approved,
in writing, by SJA or the Garrison Commander (GC).

h. In the event the Desk Sergeant places a military member in the D-Cell for pretrial
confinement, the units will adhere to SOP # 2.01 Detention Cell/Holding Area Operations. Two
units guards will be stationed outside the D-Cell; and the detainee(s)’s unit(s) will be responsible
for providing rations, linens, and personal hygiene products. The DS will not accept a soldier for
confinement if the unit does not bring the above items at the time they bring the soldier. For
confinement for more than 72 hours the unit must ensure that the soldier receives two hot meals
a day and only one MRE. In addition, the unit is responsible for sanitizing the D-Cell after use.

5. APPREHENSION OF OFFENDER.

a. Detained personnel will be searched by a law enforcement officer of the same sex. If
available, a witness will be present.

b. All persons detained or apprehended by Presidio of Monterey Police personnel will be
treated fairly and equally. Presidio of Monterey Police personnel will be fair and impartial when
processing and releasing personnel.

c. All military members assigned, attached, or TDY to the Presidio of Monterey military
installation who are apprehended by Presidio of Monterey Police Department will be courteously
treated, processed as quickly as possible, and either released to their unit representative or
transported to their unit representative and released on DD FM 2708 - Receipt for Prisoner, or
transported to Monterey County Jail (e.g. Violate Restraining Order signed by a Superior Court
of California Judge).

d. Upon arrival at the Police Station, officers will escort offenders through the northeast door
marked "Police Personnel Only". No subjects will be brought into the station through the lobby
for placement in a detention cell. The booking room door will remain locked when occupied by
offenders; otherwise the doors can be left open.

e. Once inside the station, the officer's weapons, O.C. Spray and baton will be placed in the
blue gun lockers marked "Police Personnel Only". The officer will remove the key from the
locker and secure it on their person.

f. The officer will remove the subject's property, in view of the camera located in the D-Cell
area. The property will be immediately logged on a DA Form 4137. All monies will be counted
in front of the offender and the video camera. The officer and the subject shall sign the DA
Form 4137. The property will be placed in the blue storage bin located inside the D-cell area.
The officer will log the storage bin number on the upper right hand corner of the DA Form 4137.
The completed DA Form 4137 will be placed on the clipboard marked "In Custody". DA Form
4137 will be closely scrutinized by the on duty supervisor for accuracy and correctness.
g. The subject will have Live Scan or two fingerprint cards, one R-84 (Final Disposition Report) and two photos taken by the officer.

h. Officers will fill out the Fingerprint Cards and complete all boxes, ensuring the individual signs the card. If the individual refuses to sign, the officer will write, "Refused to Sign" in the signature block.

i. The Fingerprint Cards and Final Disposition Report will be attached to the DA Form 3975, along with photographs, and submitted to (PAC). Fingerprint Cards, Intoxilyzer cards, will be placed in an envelope, marked with the MPR Number and stapled to the Police Report. All police reports will be stapled prior to forwarding to PAC.

j. Two photographs taken of the subject will be a profile and a frontal view. The back of the photos will contain the MPR number, name of subject, date of birth, hair and eye color, height, weight, social security number and driver's license number. The photographs will be forwarded to Dispatch where they will be logged and filed.

k. Juvenile subjects brought into the police station for processing will be fingerprinted and photographed. Juveniles will be processed per SOP Number 3.11 – Juvenile and Child Neglect Procedures.

l. The subject will be placed in a detention cell as determined by the WC. The housing of an individual in the detention cell will be noted in the Police Report.

m. If a patrol officer is going to conduct an interview, a DA Form 3881 - Rights Warning Procedure/Waiver Certificate will be completed and signed by all active duty military offenders and civilians. If the case is assumed by PI, CID or the FBI no DA Form 3881 is required. If the subject refuses to sign any forms, a second officer will be needed as a witness.

n. In cases where the offender is a civilian being cited for a misdemeanor they will be cited on a Presidio of Monterey Notice to Appear (TR-130) and a court date will be given to the offender and listed on the citation. Any civilian being cited who does not have a valid reason for being on the installation will be escorted to the nearest gate. If the offender is on foot, he/she will be transported to the Broadway Gate. Civilians will not be released while in an intoxicated state, unless released to another adult who is able to care for them.

o. In more serious offenses involving civilians, coordination will be made with the COP for disposition. The WC will determine which offenses require this type of processing. These offenders will not be released without the authority of the WC.

p. Upon arrival of the unit representative, a DD Form 2708 - Receipt for Inmate or Detained Person will be completed. The unit representative will sign the DD Form 2708, acknowledging receipt of the military offender. All personal property will be returned to the offender after he/she signs the DD Form 4137 – Evidence/Property Custody Document. A signed copy should be given to the offender.
q. CLETS, NCIC, and Monterey County Warrant System checks will be conducted on all apprehended offenders. If a warrant appears in the CLETS system, the Warrant Section of the issuing/entering agency will be contacted to verify the warrant is valid. If the warrant is valid, have the agency send an abstract to MNEOMICS ORDO and SNSO (POMPD and MCSO) if out of this county, or just to ORDO if in this county. The charges for the warrant will be reported on page 1 and in the narrative section of DA Form 3975. The WC, OC, or Dispatcher will coordinate with MCSO to have the offender transferred to county jail. The offender will be issued a DD Form 1805 for the offense(s) initially charged prior to release to MCSO. Ensure that all property, except that being held for evidence, is released to the MCSO prior to releasing the detainee to MCSO.

r. Detained civilian(s) will be courteously treated, processed as quickly as possible, and either released or transported to the post boundaries and released, when appropriate, or transported to Monterey County Jail.

s. The Desk Sergeant will ensure that all detainees are under constant observation by law enforcement personnel, or by Dispatcher on the CCTV.

t. Civilian Arrest Warrants - all requests for assistance from civilian law enforcement agencies for arresting anyone or serving any type of legal documentation will be immediately referred to the Civil Liaison Office (CLO) or Staff Judge Advocate (SJA). If it is other than normal duty hours and the civilian agency insists that the matter is urgent, the CLO will be contacted at home. If he/she cannot be contacted, notify COP, DCOP or OC.

6. RELEASE OF OFFENDERS

a. When a military detainee is ready for release, the DS will notify the detainee's unit immediately. The unit representative must come to the Police Station and sign DD FM 2708 to receive custody of detainee.

b. If a unit fails to report to the Police Station within two (2) hours of notification, the next higher level chain of command (Company Commander or First Sergeant) will be notified.

c. If the next higher level chain of command fails to report to the Police Station after an additional two (2) hours of notification, the Officer of the Day (OD) will be notified.

d. Civilians will be released on their own recognizance, escorted to post boundaries and released, or released the appropriate law enforcement agencies. These individuals will not be released into an unsafe environment or where a public phone is not readily accessible.

e. Military personnel not affiliated with the Presidio of Monterey (DLI/FLC) will be released on their own recognizance. The parent unit or installation MP station will be notified of the incident before release of the detainee. If the offense committed by non-affiliated military
personnel is a serious felony (i.e.: Murder, Rape, etc), the detainee will not be released without the DES, COP, DCOP, or OC being notified as to the nature of the incident.

g. Juveniles will be released to their sponsor or legal guardian or transported to the Juvenile Detention Facility depending on the severity of the alleged crime.

h. Individuals involved in minor traffic violations will be cited and released.

i. The DD Form 2708 will be annotated to reflect the appropriate physical condition of the military members at the time of their release.

j. Soldiers can be released to unit personnel who are on orders from the acting Commander, First Sergeant or Detachment Sergeant.

8. REFERENCE.

a. AR 190-45, Law Enforcement Reporting.

b. AR 190-47, The Army Corrections Systems

[Signature]
Chief of Police
## Probable Cause Details

**Officer Name:** [Redacted]  
**Arresting Agency:** Presidio of Monterey Police Department  
**Status:** APPROVED BY JUDGE  
**At:** 01-06-2021 12:42:15

### General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arresee Name</th>
<th>Arresee Date of Birth</th>
<th>County Booking Number</th>
<th>Agency Case Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>01/05/2021 13:32</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/13/1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>User Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2023 7:55:47 PM</td>
<td>CREATED</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2023 7:55:47 PM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SAVED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2023 8:11:41 PM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS SAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2023 8:26:09 PM</td>
<td>SUBMITTED TO JUDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2023 12:42:15 PM</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td>WAS APPROVED THE PCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Booking Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute Code - Description</th>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC23152(g) - Misdemeanor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Probable Cause Narrative

On 05 January 2021, at approximately 1310 hours, I was dispatched to the Presidio of Monterey Entry Control Point located on Private Roads Road for a possible DUI. Upon my arrival, Presidio of Monterey Security Officer [Redacted] and Deputy Chief of Police [Redacted] for the Presidio of Monterey Police Department were standing on the sidewalk adjacent to the Entry Control point with a male later identified as [Redacted] of Pacific Grove. [Redacted] was standing near a 2001 Honda Civic which he stated he was driving at the time. Security Officer [Redacted] stopped him. Deputy Chief [Redacted] conducted the HGN test and the Walk and Turn Test, however, was unable to continue further SFST due to safety concerns. I placed [Redacted] under arrest for suspicion of DUI. [Redacted] consented to both blood and breath testing. The first breath test BAC was 0.16% and the second was 0.17%. [Redacted] stated he had consumed “molly” and marijuana prior to driving the vehicle. He was unable to have a DRE evaluation completed due to safety concerns. [Redacted] was transported to Natividad Hospital and provided with a blood sample for testing. [Redacted] was later transported to Monterey County Jail for lodging.

### DUI Arrest

#### Reason for Contact/Stop

- [ ] Observed Traffic Violation / Erratic Driving
- [ ] Accident Scene
- [ ] Vehicle Blocking Roadway
- [ ] Other  - Presidio of Monterey Security Officer [Redacted] observed vehicle in motion

#### Arrestee Identified as Driver

*Observed by:* [ ] Officer  [ ] Citizen/Witness  [ ] Accident Scene of Vehicle Blocking Roadway & Reasonable Cause

#### Signs of Impaired Driving Ability

- [ ] Odor of Alcohol
- [ ] Blood Shot/Watery/Glassy Eyes
- [ ] Unsteady Gait
- [ ] Slurred Speech
- [ ] Failed FSTs
- [ ] Positive Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus
- [ ] Drug Influence
- [ ] Other

#### Chemical Test Information

- [ ] PAS - Results
- [ ] Breath Test - Results 0.16 0.17
- [ ] Blood or Urine Test Completed
- [ ] Refusal

© 2021, Superior Court of California, Monterey County
Prior DUI Convictions
☒ Arrestee has 1 DUI convictions within the last ten years

Officer Signature
I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that the declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 1/3/2021 7:55:47 PM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking Officer</th>
<th>Agency Liaison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probable Cause Details

Arrestee Name: 
Arrest Date & Time: 12/26/2020 19:39
County Booking Number:

Transaction Log

Log Date Event User Name Description
12/27/2020 4:15:33 AM CREATED PCD CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER
12/27/2020 4:15:33 AM SAVE AS DRAFT PCD SAVED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER
12/27/2020 4:17:06 AM SUBMITTED TO JUDGE PCD SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW
12/27/2020 9:51:21 AM APPROVED HAS APPROVED THE PCD

Booking Charges

Statute Code: PC273.5 Description: Inflict Corporal Injury On Spouse/Cohabitant 
Charge Type: Felony 
Count: 1

Probable Cause Narrative

On 26 December 2020 at approximately 1837 hours, officers responded to 2302 4th Army Road, in reference to a domestic incident in progress. The domestic incident took place between [redacted] and his spouse [redacted]. Investigation revealed the incident began as a verbal dispute but evolved into a physical altercation where [redacted] sustained minor injuries consisting of two bite marks on his left arm, a scratch to his upper right armpit and scratch on the inside of his lower lip. [redacted] was apprehended, processed at the POM Police Station and then later transported and lodged into the Monterey County Jail where he was booked for PC273.5(a) – Corporal Injury to Significant Other.

Officer Signature

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 12/29/2020 4:19:33 AM.

Booking Officer
Name: 
Position: Patrol Sergeant
Phone Number: 
Email: 

Agency Liaison
Name: 
Phone Number: 
Email: 

© 2020, Superior Court of California, Monterey County
On 16 December 2020 at approximately 1806 hours, I responded to the area of 210 Sicily Road in reference to an intoxicated male subject and was argumentative with his roommate. The subject's roommate reported he'd been drinking since 1100 hours today and while she was on the phone calling the police for assistance, the subject was yelling to her "They can shoot me right here in the house." The subject, later identified as John Doe, fled the house and I subsequently located him walking south bound on Hatten Road. I observed him staggering from side to side as he walked, appeared intoxicated and unable to care for his own safety. When I contacted John Doe, I could smell an alcoholic beverage emanating from his breath. While attempting to communicate with him to ascertain his welfare, he was agitated and combative. He was taken into custody for public intoxication, 647(f) PC.

647(f) Arrest
☐ Found in Public Place ☐ Odor of Alcohol ☐ Bloodshot/Glassy Eyes ☐ Staggered Gait ☐ Slurred Speech
☐ Unable to care for his or her own safety or for the safety of others
☐ Other

Officer Signature
I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 12/17/2020 at 01:25 AM.
Probable Cause Details

Officer Name: [Redacted]  
Arresting Agency: Presidio of Monterey Police Department  
Status: APPROVED BY JUDGE

At 12:09/2020 15:45:53

General Information

Arrestee Name: [Redacted]  
Arrest Date & Time: 12/08/2020 20:21  
County Booking Number: [Redacted]  
Arrestee Date of Birth: 11/1/1996  
Expiration Date & Time: 12/10/2020 20:21  
Agency Case Number: [Redacted]

Transaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2020 15:23:33 AM</td>
<td>CREATED</td>
<td>PCO CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2020 15:23:33 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td>PCO SAVED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2020 15:23:33 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td>PCO DRAFT WAS SAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2020 15:23:33 AM</td>
<td>SUBMITTED TO JUDGE</td>
<td>PCO SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/2020 15:23:33 AM</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>PCO APPROVED THE PCO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Booking Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute Code - Description</th>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC273.6 - Child Endangerment</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC275 - False Imprisonment</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC591.5 - Interference with a Wireless - Communication</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC273.5(a) - Inflict Corporal Injury On Spouse/Co-habitant</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable Cause Narrative

Facts establishing elements of offense(s) and identification of arrestee as perpetrator:

On 8 December 2020 at approximately 1927 hours, I responded to 136 Luzon Road, in reference to a domestic dispute between husband and wife. The victim told me that her husband [Redacted] struck her in the face multiple times with his open hands, grabbed her by the hair, and threw her to the ground, during a verbal altercation. When she ran from the room, [Redacted] chased her and slammed a bedroom door into her face causing visible injuries. The victim told me that [Redacted] pinned her arms to her sides to keep her from leaving the residence. [Redacted] also took the victim’s cell phone preventing her from calling for assistance. After the victim fled from the residence, she asked a person passing by to call the police. The victim sustained a bruise under the left eye and scratches on her back. The altercation took place in the same room where their 3-month-old child was in a crib.

Officer Signature

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 12/9/2020 15:23:33 AM.

Booking Officer

Name: [Redacted]  
Position: [Redacted]  
Phone Number: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]

Agency Liaison

Name: [Redacted]  
Phone Number: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]  

© 2020, Superior Court of California, Monterey County
Probable Cause Details

Officer Name: [Redacted]  -  Arresting Agency: Presidio of Monterey Police Department - Status: 48 HOURS RELEASE

General Information

Arrestee Name: [Redacted]
Arrest Date & Time: 11/25/2020 20:30
County Booking Number: [Redacted]
Arrestee Date of Birth: 4/2/1990
Expiration Date & Time: 11/27/2020 20:30
Agency Case Number: [Redacted]

Transaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>User Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 2:50:02 AM</td>
<td>CREATED</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 8:40:19 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SHARED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 3:05:53 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS RESAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2020 3:50:59 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS RESAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 3:25:07 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS RESAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 3:25:33 AM</td>
<td>SUBMITTED TO JUDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 9:33:32 AM</td>
<td>MORE INFO REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORE INFO REQUIRED, REQUESTED BY JUDGE MARK B HODG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2020 9:30:00 AM</td>
<td>48 HOURS RELEASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 HOURS RELEASE STATUS UPDATED BY SYSTEM ADMIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Booking Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute Code - Description</th>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC273.5(a) - Inflict Corporal Injury On Spouse/Cohabitant</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable Cause Narrative

Facts establishing elements of offense(s) and identification of arrestee(s) as perpetrator:

On 25 November 2020 at approximately 1945 hours, I responded to 332 Buna Road in reference to a past-tense physical domestic between a husband and wife. During the course of my investigation the husband, [Redacted] made spontaneous statements to me confessing to strangling his wife, Jane Doe, on the floor of their bedroom during a verbal altercation with Doe on the evening of 24 November 2020.

Officer Signature

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed at Monterey County, California, on 11/26/2020 9:18:05 AM.

Booking Officer

Name: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Agency Liaison

Name: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Agency Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges Request Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2020 9:13:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there visible injuries? What did she report?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Response Log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency has not responded to Judicial Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2020, Superior Court of California, Monterey County
Probable Cause Details


General Information
Arrestee Name: [Redacted]
Arrest Date & Time: 11/18/2020 09:03
County Booking Number: [Redacted]
Arrestee Date of Birth: 6/12/1985
Expiration Date & Time: 11/20/2020 09:03
Agency Case Number: [Redacted]

Transaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>User Name</th>
<th>PCD Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020  3:30:09 PM</td>
<td>CREATED</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020  3:30:09 PM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SAVED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020  3:42:56 PM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS SAVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020  5:04:11 PM</td>
<td>SUBMITTED TO JUDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2020  5:21:47 PM</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td>JUDGE [Redacted] HAS APPROVED THE PCD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Booking Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC21200.5</td>
<td>Bicyclist Riding Under The Influence</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS11377(a)</td>
<td>Possession Of A Controlled Substance</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC273a(b)</td>
<td>Cause Or Permit Cruelty To A Child</td>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC21204(b)</td>
<td>Riding Bicycle On Other Than Permanent Seat</td>
<td>Infraction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC21212(a)</td>
<td>Bicycle Helmet Required/Under 18 Years</td>
<td>Infraction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable Cause Narrative

On 18 November 2020, at 0734 hours, I was in the area of General Jim Moore Boulevard and Ardenes Circle during high peak commuter traffic. I observed a subject riding a bicycle on the bicycle path with a 9 year old autistic child riding on the rear cargo rack of the bicycle without a proper bicycle seat or a helmet. I stopped and contacted the bicyclist whom verbally identified himself to me as [Redacted]. His Identity was confirmed by POM PD Dispatch. The child was determined to be [Redacted]'s step child. During my contact with [Redacted] he appeared to show the signs and symptoms being under the influence of a controlled substance. I had [Redacted] perform several Standardized Field Sobriety Tests which he passed. I could not smell any alcohol emanating from his breath or person. He had rapid speech and a rapid heartbeat. His pupils would not constrict or dilate. I determined, based off of my training and experience [Redacted] appeared to be under the influence of a controlled substance. Cover officers arrived on scene and transported the child to the station for parental pick up. [Redacted] was taken into custody on suspicion of operating a bicycle under the influence of a controlled substance and child endangerment. Search incident to arrest, a small amount of suspected methamphetamine was found on his person. [Redacted] was then transported to the CHP Office in Salinas where a DRE Evaluation was completed. It was determined [Redacted] was under the influence of a Central Nervous System Stimulant. [Redacted] was then transported to Natividad Medical Center for an evidentiary blood draw. He was the booked and lodged into Monterey County Jail for lodging on the above mentioned charges.

Officer Signature

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 11/18/2020 03:30:05 PM.
Probable Cause Details

Officer Name: [Redacted]
Arresting Agency: Presidio of Monterey Police Department
Status: APPROVED BY JUDGE

At 11/2/2020 09:33:50

General Information
Arrestee Name: [Redacted]
Arrest Date & Time: 11/12/2020 03:27
County Booking Number: [Redacted]

Arrestee Date of Birth: 5/28/1987
Expiration Date & Time: 11/14/2020 03:27
Agency Case Number: [Redacted]

Transaction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>User Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020 06:24:15 AM</td>
<td>CRZ-TEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD CREATED BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020 06:24:16 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SAVED AS DRAFT BY SUBMITTING OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020 06:27:18 AM</td>
<td>SAVE AS DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD DRAFT WAS RESAVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020 06:33:37 AM</td>
<td>SUBMITTED TO JUDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCD SUBMITTED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020 06:32:00 AM</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td>JUDGE [Redacted] HAS APPROVED THE PCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Booking Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute Code - Description</th>
<th>Charge Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC273.5(a) - InFLICT Corporal Injury On Spouse/Cohabitant</td>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable Cause Narrative

On 12 November 2020, at approximately 0230 hours, I responded to 400 Kalborn Road in reference to a verbal domestic between same sex partners. Upon subsequent contact with the parties, their statements and subsequent injuries, I determined that a physical altercation occurred in which the suspect, identified as [Redacted] attacked her "live-in" girlfriend, Jane Doe causing facial injuries: a bloody nose and bleeds at the upper gum, scratches to her chin and a bite mark to her right "pinky" finger. I arrested [Redacted] for domestic violence and transported her to the Monterey County Jail, where she was booked on the above charges.

Officer Signature

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this declaration was executed in Monterey County, California, on 11/12/2020 06:24:15 AM.

Booking Officer
Name: [Redacted]
Position: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Agency Liaison
Name: [Redacted]
Phone Number: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
At approximately 0649 hours on 11-11-2020 [redacted] battered his wife of 4 years. [redacted] was engaged in a verbal argument with his wife, at their residence located at 409 Kerling Road. The argument became physical when [redacted] attempted to hug his wife and she pulled away again grabbed his wife to hug her, however, she pushed him away from her. The victim sustained a reddening grab mark on her upper left arm, which happened when she hit the wall while pulling away from [redacted].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>How Arrest</th>
<th>Arrest Type</th>
<th>Date Booked</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Date Released</th>
<th>Release Type</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07/14/2004</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/05/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/05/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/13/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/13/2004</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>08/24/2004</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/14/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/14/2004</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09/15/2004</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/02/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/02/2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/07/2004</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/06/2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01/04/2005</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01/13/2005</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/12/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2005</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>02/12/2005</td>
<td>PTA#853.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/18/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/22/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/22/2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/29/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/29/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/25/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/25/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/17/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>05/17/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06/22/2005</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/02/2005</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>08/18/2005</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/21/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/21/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/21/2005</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/10/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/10/2005</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/03/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/03/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/03/2005</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/29/2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/31/2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>01/03/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/06/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/06/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/06/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/12/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/12/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/12/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/18/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/18/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/18/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/27/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/27/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/27/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/29/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/29/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/29/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/03/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/03/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/03/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>04/21/2006</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>04/01/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>03/19/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2006</td>
<td>M H DET ONLY</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>04/10/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/2006</td>
<td>M H DET ONLY</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>04/20/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>05/10/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/2006</td>
<td>F A ARREST</td>
<td>F A</td>
<td>05/17/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>05/17/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>07/27/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>08/02/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>08/02/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/2006</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>08/12/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>08/14/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/2006</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>08/14/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>08/24/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>09/07/2006</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>09/22/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/2006</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td>F W</td>
<td>09/22/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>F W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/2006</td>
<td>M O ARREST</td>
<td>M O</td>
<td>10/03/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2006</td>
<td>M C ARREST</td>
<td>M C</td>
<td>10/04/2006</td>
<td>CASH BAIL</td>
<td>M C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>10/04/2006</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2006</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>10/08/2006</td>
<td>PTA853.6</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>10/16/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>10/19/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>10/22/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2006</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>10/22/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>10/24/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2006</td>
<td>M H DET ONLY</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10/29/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2006</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>F H</td>
<td>10/31/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>F H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2006</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>F H</td>
<td>11/02/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>F H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>11/05/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>11/12/2006</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PTA1853.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PTA1853.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/2009</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/24/2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FUTURE SUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/2010</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/17/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PTA1853.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PTA1853.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FUTURE SUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PTA1853.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/23/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/31/2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/2010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/2012</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2012</td>
<td>M V ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/2012</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/2012</td>
<td>M P DET ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/2012</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/2012</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/2012</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/2012</td>
<td>F C ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2012</td>
<td>M H DET ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2012</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2012</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2012</td>
<td>F C ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
<td>F B ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/2012</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/2013</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/2013</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/2013</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2013</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2013</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/2013</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/28/2013</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2013</td>
<td>M A ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2013</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2013</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>06/22/2013 SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Charge</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>07/10/2013</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10/15/2013</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td>03/31/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04/01/2014</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08/03/2014</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td>06/01/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>06/03/2014</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td>09/22/2014</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11/20/2014</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DET ONLY</td>
<td>02/19/2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>02/24/2015</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>06/05/2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>09/05/2012</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>06/06/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>06/11/2013</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>06/15/2013</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07/02/2013</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>05/24/2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>06/24/2013</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>06/09/2013</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>02/20/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/27/2013</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/21/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/22/2013</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/25/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>09/26/2013</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>H ARREST</td>
<td>09/08/2013</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>03/25/2014</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>11/02/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/05/2013</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>11/11/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/12/2013</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>12/20/2013</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>11/06/2015</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>03/02/2014</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>04/16/2014</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>03/19/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>03/19/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>04/19/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>04/20/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>04/19/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/28/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>04/20/2014</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11/25/2014</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>04/27/2014</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>06/03/2014</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>05/04/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2014</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>05/19/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>05/19/2014</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>05/19/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/17/2014</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>07/12/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/14/2014</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/03/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/03/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/03/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/23/2014</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>01/14/2015</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>08/28/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/14/2015</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>09/14/2014</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>09/14/2014</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>10/19/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/28/2015</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>02/17/2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02/17/2015</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>02/17/2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02/29/2016</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>02/17/2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02/29/2016</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>03/05/2016</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>05/14/2016</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>02/07/2016</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>03/01/2016</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>11/03/2018</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11/19/2018</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>11/25/2018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/02/2018</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>12/16/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/16/2018</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>12/16/2018</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/16/2018</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Case Type</td>
<td>Arrest Type</td>
<td>Charge Date</td>
<td>Arrest Date</td>
<td>Bond Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/01/19</td>
<td>01/01/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/06/19</td>
<td>01/06/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/07/19</td>
<td>01/07/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/08/19</td>
<td>01/08/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/09/19</td>
<td>01/09/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/10/19</td>
<td>01/10/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/11/19</td>
<td>01/11/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/12/19</td>
<td>01/12/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/13/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/13/19</td>
<td>01/13/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/14/19</td>
<td>01/14/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/15/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/15/19</td>
<td>01/15/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/16/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/16/19</td>
<td>01/16/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/18/19</td>
<td>01/18/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/19/19</td>
<td>01/19/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/20/19</td>
<td>01/20/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/21/19</td>
<td>01/21/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/22/19</td>
<td>01/22/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/23/19</td>
<td>01/23/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/24/19</td>
<td>01/24/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/25/19</td>
<td>01/25/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/26/19</td>
<td>01/26/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/27/19</td>
<td>01/27/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/28/19</td>
<td>01/28/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/29/19</td>
<td>01/29/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/30/19</td>
<td>01/30/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/19</td>
<td>FRESH FELON</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>01/31/19</td>
<td>01/31/19</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/28/2014</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>09/28/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/2014</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>09/29/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2014</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2014</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>12/21/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/2017</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>01/28/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2017</td>
<td>F W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>05/12/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/2017</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>07/22/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2017</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/04/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2018</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/2019</td>
<td>F B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>01/29/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>02/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>12/01/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td>F O</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>05/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>05/05/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>05/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2019</td>
<td>F H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>06/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/2019</td>
<td>M O</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>05/02/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2019</td>
<td>M B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>06/02/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2019</td>
<td>M D</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>06/27/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>06/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>06/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>07/07/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/2019</td>
<td>F W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>08/03/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>08/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/2019</td>
<td>M W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>08/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2019</td>
<td>M O</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>09/10/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>09/16/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/2019</td>
<td>M H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>09/16/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>M O</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Time In</td>
<td>Time Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
<td>12/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2019</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/13/2019</td>
<td>10/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2019</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/21/2019</td>
<td>10/22/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2019</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/02/2019</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/2019</td>
<td>F W ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>12/18/2019</td>
<td>12/18/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/2020</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>02/11/2020</td>
<td>02/11/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2014</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>03/21/2014</td>
<td>03/22/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2014</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>06/18/2014</td>
<td>06/25/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/2014</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>07/12/2014</td>
<td>07/12/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>M I ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/2019</td>
<td>M B ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>04/29/2019</td>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2019</td>
<td>F H ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>10/06/2019</td>
<td>10/06/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/2020</td>
<td>M W ARREST</td>
<td>L FEL WAR</td>
<td>02/15/2020</td>
<td>02/15/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/2013</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>L MIS WAR</td>
<td>09/26/2013</td>
<td>09/26/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2015</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>L MIS WAR</td>
<td>02/04/2015</td>
<td>02/04/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/2020</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>L MIS WAR</td>
<td>02/22/2020</td>
<td>02/22/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2020</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>LOCAL BENCH</td>
<td>02/07/2020</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/2019</td>
<td>M H ARREST</td>
<td>OUT WAR FEL</td>
<td>06/13/2019</td>
<td>06/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Days: 7,728  Average Days: 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>How Arrest</th>
<th>Arrest Type</th>
<th>Date Booked</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Date Released</th>
<th>Release Type</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Release To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>10/05/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>10/05/2019</td>
<td>10/05/2019</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>10/08/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>10/08/2019</td>
<td>10/08/2019</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>12/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>12/30/2019</td>
<td>12/30/2019</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/18/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/18/2020</td>
<td>01/18/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td>01/31/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/04/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/04/2020</td>
<td>02/04/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/08/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/08/2020</td>
<td>02/08/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/18/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>02/18/2020</td>
<td>02/18/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>04/08/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>04/08/2020</td>
<td>04/08/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>05/02/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH FELONY</td>
<td>05/02/2020</td>
<td>05/02/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>10/02/2019</td>
<td>CITE REL</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/04/2019</td>
<td>12/11/2019</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>PTA853.6</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>10/13/2019</td>
<td>PTA853.6</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>10/22/2019</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/02/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/02/2019</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/06/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>FRESH MISD</td>
<td>11/06/2019</td>
<td>11/06/2019</td>
<td>PTA853.6</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MIS WAR</td>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>L. MIS WAR</td>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td>02/27/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL BENCH FEL</td>
<td>02/07/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>LOCAL BENCH FEL</td>
<td>02/07/2020</td>
<td>02/07/2020</td>
<td>TIME SERV</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL BENCH MIS</td>
<td>07/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>LOCAL BENCH MIS</td>
<td>07/21/2020</td>
<td>07/21/2020</td>
<td>OWN RECOG</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT WAR MIS</td>
<td>09/18/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>OUT WAR MIS</td>
<td>09/18/2020</td>
<td>09/18/2020</td>
<td>SUR BOND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Days: 200
Average Days: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking Number</th>
<th>Arresting Agency</th>
<th>Arrest Date Code</th>
<th>Violation Description</th>
<th>Fresh Arrest-A</th>
<th>Arrest-A</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POM 10/21/2018</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS21174A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS21174A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14601.1(A)</td>
<td>M DRIVE LIC SUSPENDED/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS21174A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23103.5(A)</td>
<td>M RECKLESS DRIVING</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS21174A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4060</td>
<td>M POS CNTL SUB WO PREVIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 11/02/2018</td>
<td>417(A)(1)</td>
<td>M EXHIBIT DEAD WP/NOT ARM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466</td>
<td>M POSSESS BURGLARY TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456(A)</td>
<td>M REG KNOWN STOLEN PROP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14651.1(A)</td>
<td>M DRIVE LIC SUSPENDED/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10851(A)</td>
<td>M VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>464E(A)</td>
<td>M ACC ACC CARD INT SECLUDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22319</td>
<td>M MAGNETIC LEADED CANE/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11364(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSSSESS CNTL SUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>M POSSESS BURGLARY TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22210</td>
<td>M MAGNETIC LEADED CANE/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 11/10/2018</td>
<td>21310</td>
<td>M CARRY CON/DIRK OR DAGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21310</td>
<td>M CARRY CON/DIRK OR DAGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>F POST RELEASE REVOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>F POST RELEASE REVOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23109</td>
<td>M CARRY CON/DIRK OR DAGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 11/20/2018</td>
<td>365(A)</td>
<td>F THEFT/THIEF ADULT 8450+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450.5</td>
<td>M SHOP LIFTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>487(A)</td>
<td>M GRIOTHT/MONEY LABOR PROP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>459/940C</td>
<td>M BURGLARY FIRST DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 11/28/2018</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>F BURGLARY FIRST DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21200.6</td>
<td>M RIDE BIKE UNDER INFLUENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21200.1(D)</td>
<td>M BIKE HEADLIGHT/ETC VIOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>484(A)</td>
<td>M THEFT OF PERSONAL PROP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 12/01/2018</td>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORD CONDUCT/ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 12/18/2018</td>
<td>626.B(1)</td>
<td>F POSS/ETC FIREARM/UNREG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2755D(A)</td>
<td>M UNREGISTERED FIREARM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 12/16/2018</td>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORD CONDUCT/ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273.5</td>
<td>M INFLECT CRPL INJ SPEC/GENAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 12/20/2018</td>
<td>24(K)(31)</td>
<td>M BATTERY/ESEX SP/DATE/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 01/01/2019</td>
<td>23152(B) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 01/01/2019</td>
<td>23152(A) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(D) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(C) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(D) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(D) W/PR</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23154(A)</td>
<td>M DUI W/PROB:2315223153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>598(A)</td>
<td>F FALSE PERSONATE SPEC CIRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>422(A)</td>
<td>F TRUTH CRIME INT. TERRORIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 01/19/2019</td>
<td>16028(A)</td>
<td>I FAIL PROVE FIN RSP:PO Req</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(E)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(D)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11564(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2322(A)</td>
<td>I POSS OPEN CONTAINER,DRIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14601.2(A)</td>
<td>M DRIVE:65/PETC LIC:DU/WO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14601.3(A)</td>
<td>M DRIVE:65/PETC LIC:DU/WO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40630(A)(1)</td>
<td>I NO REG/VEH/TAILER/ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 01/24/2019</td>
<td>6153</td>
<td>M OFFENSE W/GRS.PUBLIC PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORD CONDUCT/ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking Number</th>
<th>Arresting Agency</th>
<th>Arrest Date</th>
<th>Violation Code</th>
<th>Violation Description</th>
<th>Fresh Arrest</th>
<th>Arrest MA Suppment</th>
<th>Release Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>287(F)</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>410(B)</td>
<td>M OFFENSIVE WORDS-PUBLIC PL</td>
<td>418(F)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>02/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847(F)</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>1032.2(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>484(A)</td>
<td>M THEFT</td>
<td>02/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>243(E)</td>
<td>M BATTERY:SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>484(A)</td>
<td>M THEFT OF PERSONAL PROP</td>
<td>02/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 01/28/2019</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>243(E)</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>484(A)</td>
<td>M THEFT OF PERSONAL PROP</td>
<td>02/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 02/01/2019</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL .08 PERCENT</td>
<td>2/22/2019</td>
<td>23122(A)</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23122(A)</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL</td>
<td>02/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 02/09/2019</td>
<td>M WILLFUL CRUELTY TO CHILD</td>
<td>2/23/2019</td>
<td>273.5(A)</td>
<td>F CRPR INJ SPW/COH/CHILD</td>
<td>423(A)</td>
<td>F THREAT/CRIM INTIMORIZE</td>
<td>02/09/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 02/23/2019</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>2/24/2019</td>
<td>1203.2(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>02/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 03/02/2019</td>
<td>M VIOLATION OF PAROLE-LEE</td>
<td>2/26/2019</td>
<td>4482.5</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL</td>
<td>14900(A)</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>03/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 03/27/2019</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL .08 PERCENT</td>
<td>2/27/2019</td>
<td>23122(A)</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL</td>
<td>24801</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>02/27/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 04/14/2019</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL .08 PERCENT</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>11327(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>423(A)</td>
<td>M THEFT OF PERSONAL PROP</td>
<td>02/28/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 04/26/2019</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>3/24/2019</td>
<td>1203.2(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>647(F)</td>
<td>M DISORDER CONDUCT-ALCOHOL</td>
<td>03/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 05/04/2019</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL .08 PERCENT</td>
<td>3/25/2019</td>
<td>23122(A)</td>
<td>M UVL ALCOHOL</td>
<td>24801</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>03/25/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM 06/11/2019</td>
<td>M DRIVE W/O LICENSE</td>
<td>04/30/2019</td>
<td>2506.1(A)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>M BATTERY/SPOUSE/Etc</td>
<td>04/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arresting Agency</td>
<td>Arrest Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Violation Date</td>
<td>Release Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>05/11/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ANY DRUG</td>
<td>23152(7)</td>
<td>05/13/2019</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22490(A)</td>
<td>M FAIL STOP VEH/WSALK/ETC</td>
<td>12500(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22527(B)</td>
<td>I POSSE MARJUANA WHILE DRIV</td>
<td>12500(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>06/19/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(2)</td>
<td>06/21/2019</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22527(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL/0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td>12500(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/10/2019</td>
<td>M ALTEH ET C, IMITATION FARM</td>
<td>1396.8</td>
<td>07/22/2019</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11378</td>
<td>F POSS NTL SUB FOR SALE</td>
<td>3056(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148(A)(1)</td>
<td>F VIOLATION OF PAROLE/REL</td>
<td>11394(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS NTL SUB</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/20/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(2)</td>
<td>07/22/2019</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL/0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td>26710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23222(A)</td>
<td>I DEFECTIVE WINDSHIELD/ETC</td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/21/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(2)</td>
<td>07/21/2019</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL/0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td>1203(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(D)</td>
<td>M VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td>1203(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/22/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>07/22/2019</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40529(A)</td>
<td>I NO REG VEH/TRAILE/ETC</td>
<td>1203(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/23/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>286(C)(2)(C)</td>
<td>07/24/2019</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291-S(D)</td>
<td>F RAPE BY FORCE/ELEAV/ETC</td>
<td>2400(A)(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11370(A)</td>
<td>F VIOLENT VIOL/PEC</td>
<td>20400(A)(1)</td>
<td>07/24/2019</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11350(A)</td>
<td>F POSS NTL SUB WHILE ARMED</td>
<td>20400(A)(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/26/2019</td>
<td>M DISORD CONDUCT/DRUG</td>
<td>0474(P)</td>
<td>08/27/2019</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/29/2018</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL/0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>08/30/2019</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>07/07/2019</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>07/08/2019</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL/0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td>12500(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14639(A)</td>
<td>M DRIVE WO LICENSE</td>
<td>14810(A)(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12632(A)</td>
<td>F FALSE ID TO SPECIFIC POS</td>
<td>12632(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/03/2019</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>08/04/2019</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS NTL SUB</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23152(C)</td>
<td>M ADDICT DRIVE/VEHICLE</td>
<td>23152(C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>M TRESPASS/OC2 PROP W/O CONSENT</td>
<td>002(M)</td>
<td>08/11/2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS NTL SUB</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>436(A)</td>
<td>M POSS NTL SUB</td>
<td>436(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14CR077C2</td>
<td>Y POSSESS NTL SUB</td>
<td>14CR077C2</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14CR0807C2</td>
<td>18CR0807C2</td>
<td>18CR0807C2</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14CR0807C2</td>
<td>18CR0807C2</td>
<td>18CR0807C2</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17CR063722</td>
<td>Y REPLACE PC STOLEN PROP</td>
<td>17CR063722</td>
<td>10/01/2019</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking Number</td>
<td>Arresting Agency</td>
<td>Arrest Date</td>
<td>Violation Code</td>
<td>Violation Description</td>
<td>Fresh Arrest On</td>
<td>Arrest On</td>
<td>Release Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>647(E)</td>
<td>M DIS CONLOGUE W/O CONSENT</td>
<td>18CR003395</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11364(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
<td>647(E)</td>
<td>M DIS CONLOGUE W/O CONSENT</td>
<td>18CR004395</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11364(A)</td>
<td>M POSS UNLAW PARAPHERNALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/17/2019</td>
<td>16028(A)</td>
<td>I FAIL PROVE HN RSP:PC REQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>F VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23102(A)</td>
<td>F DUI WPRORS,PER 33550 VG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>F DUI ALCOHOL,0.08 . WPRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14501.2(A)</td>
<td>M DRIV:BUS/DVTC LIC/DUI .VOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>F DUI ALCOHOL,0.08 WPRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>F DUI WPRORS,PER 33550 VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23347(E)</td>
<td>M DRIVE W/O INTERLOCK DEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23550.5(A)</td>
<td>F DUI WIN 10YRS,PR FEL DUI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>08/18/2019</td>
<td>23152(F)</td>
<td>M DUARY DRUG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23222(B)</td>
<td>I POSS MARIJUANA WHILE DRIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/12/2019</td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL OR 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/19/2019</td>
<td>23152(B)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL OR 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/20/2019</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M CARRY COM/DIRK OR DAGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M CARRY COM/DIRK OR DAGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>F VIOL OF PROBATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>F BURGLARY,SECOND DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1203.2</td>
<td>F BURGLARY,SECRET DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/21/2019</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL OR 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/22/2019</td>
<td>11377(A)</td>
<td>M POSSESS CNTL SUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11380(A)</td>
<td>M POSSESS CNTL SUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11384(A)</td>
<td>M POSSESS CNTL SUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/29/2019</td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23152(A)</td>
<td>M DUI ALCOHOL OR 0.08 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POM</td>
<td>09/29/2019</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>F FUG JUST WARRANT ARREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, US ARMY GARRISON, PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY
1739 LEWIS ROAD, SUITE 216
MONTEREY, CA 93944-3223

IMPM-ZA

12 October 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR Ms. [Redacted] Directorate of Emergency Services,
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93955-7415

SUBJECT: Reclassification of Installation Management Command (IMCOM) 1811,
Criminal Investigator Positions

1. References:

   a. Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 511, Classification Under the
      General Schedule.

   b. Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), section 752.401(b)(8).

   c. 10 U.S.C § 4027, Civilian special agents of the Criminal Investigation Command:
      authority to execute warrants and make arrests.

   d. U.S. Army Regulation 190-30, Military Police Investigations, Chapter 4,
      Investigations, 1 November 2006.

2. This memorandum is to inform you that the Headquarters Installation Management
Command (IMCOM), at the direction of the Assistant G-1 for Civilian Personnel in
consultation with the Provost Marshal General's Career Program 19 Office, has
performed a classification review of all GS-1811, Criminal Investigator positions
assigned to IMCOM in order to determine the appropriate classification (title, series,
and grade). Based on the review, it was determined IMCOM's current 1811 positions are
actually performing GS-0033, Detective work. This is supported by 10 USC § 4027; the
Office of Personnel Management Classification Standards for the Administrative Work in
the Inspection, Investigation, Enforcement, and Compliance Group, 1800; and Army
Regulation 190-30 Chapter 4, Investigations. As a result, your position will be
reclassified.

3. Please be advised that a personnel action will be processed no later than the
beginning of the fourth pay period from receipt of this memorandum, reclassifying your
position from Supervisory Criminal Investigator, GS-1811-11 to the position of
Supervisory Detective, GS-0083-09, position description number IG160016. Once the
personnel action is processed, you may be entered into the Department of Defense
Priority Placement Program.
4. In accordance with the above references, you are entitled to grade retention and pay retention benefits. You will be eligible to retain your present grade for a period of two years. Grade retention will be terminated earlier if one of the following actions occur:

a. You have a break in service of one workday or more;
b. You are demoted for personal cause or at your request;
c. You are placed in a position the grade of which is equal to or higher than the retained grade;
d. You decline a reasonable offer of a position of which the grade is equal to or higher than the retained grade;
e. You elect in writing to have the benefits terminated; or
f. You move to a position not under a covered pay system.

5. Upon expiration of grade retention, your pay will be adjusted to the lowest step in the grade of the position in which you are being placed which equals or exceeds your rate of basic pay at that time. If your rate of basic pay exceeds the maximum step for the grade of the position in which you are being placed, you will be entitled to pay retention. Under the provisions of pay retention, you will be entitled to the lower of the following rates of pay:

a. Your rate of basic pay at the time grade retention expires; or
b. One hundred and fifty percent (150%) of the maximum step of the grade of the position in which you are being placed.

6. Upon expiration of the two-year period of grade retention, you will be eligible for pay retention indefinitely or until any of the following conditions occur:

a. You have a break in service of one workday or more;
b. You are entitled to a rate of basic pay which is equal to or higher than, or decline a reasonable offer of a position the rate of basic pay for which is equal to or higher than, the rate to which you are entitled under pay retention;
c. You are demoted for personal cause or at your request; or

d. You move to a position not under a covered pay system.
IMPM-ZA
SUBJECT: Reclassification of Installation Management Command (IMCOM) 1811, Criminal Investigator Positions

7. You may file a classification appeal with the Department of Army, Department of Defense, or your regional Office of Personnel Management. For more information regarding grade and pay retention and/or filing instructions, please contact your servicing Civilian Personnel Advisory Center. An OPM Employee Fact Sheet which provides an overview of the appeal process is attached.

8. Please acknowledge receipt of this memorandum at the block provided below.

3 Encls
1. Position Description
2. Appeals: Employee Fact Sheet
   (Appeal Process)
3. SRC Questions & Answers Sheet

Acknowledgement of receipt:

[Signature] 19 Oct 2017

Colonel, MI
Commander
INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTION REQUEST

For use of this form, see AR 21-1; the proponent agency is the Office of The Inspector General.

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974


PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: To secure sufficient information to inquire into the matters presented and to provide a response to the requestor(s) and / or take action to correct deficiencies.

ROUTINE USES: Information is used for official purposes within the Department of Defense; to answer complaints or respond to requests for assistance, advice, or information; by Members of Congress and other Government agencies when determined by The Inspector General to be in the best interest of the Army; and, in certain cases, in trial by courts-martial and other Military matters as authorized by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Department of Defense Blanket Routine Uses also apply.

DISCLOSURE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER AND OTHER PERSONAL INFORMATION IS VOLUNTARY. HOWEVER, FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLETE INFORMATION MAY HINDER PROPER IDENTIFICATION OF THE REQUESTOR, ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE REQUESTED ACTION(S), AND RESPONSE TO THE REQUESTOR.

LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL

UNIT AND COMPLETE MILITARY ADDRESS
Presidio of Monterey Police Department Investigations 4468 Giguine Road, Monterey, CA 93944

GRADE / RANK
GS11 / 1811

SSN
274-54-4177

PREFERRED CONTACT TELEPHONE
wk 831-242-6926
cell 831-901-5457

COMPONENT / STATUS
Army DACP

E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional)

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED (What do you want the IG to do for you?)

Before a reclassification is made effective, I am requesting your assistance to have the The Army Provost Marshal General’s Career Program 19 Office to come to the Presidio of Monterey to make an accurate assessment of the duties of all 1811 and 0083 police work.

INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THIS REQUEST (Background. Use additional sheets if necessary; list enclosures if applicable.) IMCOM Assistant G1 in consultation with The Army Provost Marshal General Career Program 19 Office has determined I am not doing the work of a GS 11 Supervisory Criminal Investigator. I have been in my position for over 17 years and have never had anyone from The Army Provost Marshal General Career Program 19 Office to come to the Presidio to do an assessment of my duties. My duties have been consistent since November 22, 2004 and a desk audit conducted in 2013 indicating I am doing 1811 work.

I assert the Army Provost Marshal General Career Program 19 Office has not effectively assessed the working conditions and functions of myself and other fellow 1811/0083 investigators, detectives and 0083 police officers. The Presidio Police Department is operating under unique circumstances since the closure of Fort Ord in 1994. The old Fort Ord is now named the Old Mission Community (OMC). OMC is not a garrison housing community and is surrounded by at least 7 jurisdictions. OMC military housing community houses Army and sister military services families in addition to support services for the Garrison such as the MWR programs, PX, G-1, and the financial services. The Army rents privatized housing on OMC to civilians. Our police department crime rate is a majority of crime committed by civilians and in order to address the crime of the civilians our police officers, detectives, and criminal investigators work criminal cases and conduct criminal investigations outside of what the standardized job descriptons outline. The typical Army Military Police Model is not effective here when it comes to both misdemeanor and felony civilian investigations when the case does not fall within Army CID purview. Often felony domestic violence and child abuse cases not within Army CID purview are not investigated by Army CID.

I do consent to release my personal information outside of IG channels (but within DoD official channels) in order to resolve the matters listed above. I understand that if I do not agree to release my personal information, my request for assistance may go unresolved.

This information is submitted for the basic purpose of requesting assistance, correcting injustices affecting the individual, or eliminating conditions considered detrimental to the efficiency or reputation of the Army. Those who knowingly and intentionally provide false statements on this form are subject to potential punitive and administrative action (UCMJ Art 107, 18 USC 1001).

SIGNATURE

DATE (YYYYMMDD)
2017031
Office of the Inspector General

November 8, 2017

Dear Ms. [Name Redacted],

This letter is in response to your Inspector General Action Request, dated October 31, 2017, regarding an assessment of your civilian job classification series, and an assessment of Presidio of Monterey Police Department Operations to determine operating instructions after 1811 series Detectives have been reclassified.

The Inspector General conducted a thorough preliminary analysis and determined that civilian complaints pertaining to the terms and condition of their employment are not appropriate for Inspector General action. In accordance with Army Regulation 20-1, Inspector General Activities and Procedures, Federal law and regulations, DoD guidance, Army regulations, and local collective bargaining agreements include procedures for processing grievances and appeals. Procedures are also provided for processing equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaints made by employees pertaining to the terms and conditions of their employment.

Your Reclassification Notice provided several options for Position Classification Appeals. Since you have already spoken with your supervisory chain of command, your next avenue of redress is to file a grievance with the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Please visit the OPM website listed in the Employee Fact Sheet.

Your request for an assessment of Presidio of Monterey Police Department Operations was referred to the Installation Management Command (IMCOM) Inspector General, 2405 Gun Shed Road, Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234 for review and direct reply to you.

We trust this information responds to your complaint. The Defense Language Institute Inspector General will take no further action regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature Redacted]

Deputy Inspector General
November 29, 2017

Office of the Inspector General

Sent via email to mary.a.hostetler.civ@mail.mil

Dear [Redacted]

This letter is in response to your October 31, 2017, IG request for assistance.

We conducted an exhaustive inquiry into your request for assistance. You had asked that The Army Provost Marshall General's (APMG) Career Program 19 Office come to the Presidio of Monterey to make an accurate assessment of the duties of all 1811 and 0083 police work. As we discussed on multiple occasions, Installation Management Command (IMCOM) and the IMCOM Inspector General do not have the ability to compel any action by the APMG Career Program 19 Office.

You also asked that IMCOM provide you with any advisements the IMCOM Provost Marshall/Protection Division (PM/P) provided to the APMG Career Program 19 Office. We determined that requesting pre-decisional policy memoranda not intended for release would not be appropriate. However, our inquiry revealed that IMCOM PM/P concurs with the Army’s efforts to reclassify garrison police personnel, including within the Presidio of Monterey (POM) police department.

Moreover, IMCOM PM/P recently conducted a staff assistance visit (SAV) with the POM police department in June 2016, and in response to a specific question asked by the Garrison Commander, concluded that POM was taking on investigations that should have been left to other agencies. During the SAV, IMCOM PM/P met with the Monterey Criminal Investigation Command (CID) Office, the installation Staff Judge Advocate, and POM police, and extracted a commitment from CID to handle all investigations within its purview, provided that POM police referred the cases to them.

In sum, IMCOM IG found no violation of law, regulation or policy in IMCOM's concurrence with the decision to reclassify POM's 1811s as 0083s. We hope this responds to your request for assistance. This letter constitutes our final response, and we consider this matter closed.

Inspector General
Department of Defense
Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service
Classification Appeal Decision

Appellant: [Redacted]

Organization: Investigations Branch
Police/Provost Marshall Division
Directorate of Emergency Services
Installation Management Command
Department of the Army
Presidio of Monterey, CA

Current Classification: Supervisory Detective
GS-0083-09

Decision: GS-1802-10
(Title at agency discretion with “Supervisory” prefix)

Chief, Classification Appeals
Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service

July 24, 2020
Date
This decision constitutes a Department of Defense (DoD) classification certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting offices within DoD. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision.

Since this decision changes the classification of the appealed position, it is to be effective not earlier than the date of the decision and not later than the beginning of the fourth pay period after the date of this decision (5 CFR 511.702). The servicing human resources office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description (PD) and a Standard Form (SF) 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action to the Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service (DCPAS), Classification Appeals Adjudication Section, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, VA, 22350-1100.

This certificate is not subject to further appeal within DoD. As provided in Part 511 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, the employee may submit an appeal to the Office of Personnel Management at the following address:

Classification Appeals and FLSA Claims
Program Manager
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Merit System Accountability and Compliance
1900 E Street, NW
Room 6484
Washington, DC 20415
Introduction

This position is located in the Investigations Branch, Police/Provost Marshall Division, Directorate of Emergency Services, Installation Management Command (IMCOM), Department of the Army, at Presidio of Monterey, California. The position is currently classified as Supervisory Detective, GS-0083-09. The appellant believes that her position is more properly classified as Supervisory Criminal Investigator, GS-1811-11. The appellant is assigned to position description (PD) number EYIG160016. This is a standardized position description (PD) used throughout the Installation Management Command.

Sources of Information

1. Appeal documentation received from the appellant’s Human Resources Office.
2. Telephone audit with the appellant on January 17, 2019, and several follow-up telephone calls.
3. Telephone interview with the appellant’s supervisor on February 12, 2019.

Standards Referenced

b. Job Family Position Classification Standard for Administrative Work in the Inspection, Investigation, Enforcement, and Compliance Group, 1800, April 2011
c. Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, TS-107, August 2009

General Issues

The appellant’s representative presents their argument for reclassification of the appellant’s position by comparing her duties to criteria for Special Retirement Coverage (SRC) for certain law enforcement personnel (including those classified to the GS-1811 series) contained in 5 U.S.C. 8401 (17) and codified at 5 CFR 842.802, then asserting that since these criteria are met, the position must therefore be properly classified to the GS-1811 series. However, positions are classified by direct comparison to the relevant OPM position classification standards, not by comparison to criteria used to make other determinations, such as retirement system coverage. Therefore, as a classification appeal decision, this evaluation compares the appellant’s position to the applicable OPM position classification standards. The following guidance provided in reference b. is relevant:

Position classification and law enforcement officer (LEO) retirement coverage decisions are entirely separate from one another. While LEO retirement coverage eligibility determinations may involve some of the same factual matters considered in position classification determinations, the two matters have entirely separate criteria under which a determination is made. LEO retirement coverage determinations are made under
regulations found at 5 CFR Part 831, Subpart I, and Part 842, Subpart H. LEO retirement coverage eligibility allowances generally may be made only by the agency head, and staff actually involved in the decision making process who are aware of the eligibility criteria.

Therefore, the appellant’s eligibility for SRC or, by extension, her staff’s eligibility for SRC, is beyond the purview of the classification appeals process and will not be addressed in this decision.

Background Information

In 2015 the Department of the Army Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA) performed a review of IMCOM’s Criminal Investigator, GS-1811, positions and found they did not meet the series definition for the GS-1811 Criminal Investigation series but rather were performing GS-0083 Detective work. As a result, effective October 29, 2017, the appellant’s position was reclassified from Supervisory Criminal Investigator, GS-1811-11, to Supervisory Detective, GS-0083-09.

During our appellate review process, our office was informed the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) had accepted an appeal from an IMCOM employee performing the same type of nonsupervisory functions as identified in the subject appellant’s PD. Since an OPM appeal decision is binding on the agency (5 CFR 511.612), the present appeal was suspended pending issuance of the OPM decision. OPM rendered a decision for case number C-1802-08-03 on October 8, 2019. The position was reclassified as GS-1802-08, with the title at agency discretion. Our review of the OPM appeal decision confirms that the nonsupervisory work performed in that case is essentially similar to the nonsupervisory work performed by the subject appellant and her subordinates. Therefore, the OPM appeal decision is controlling and we must apply it to this decision.

Position Information

The mission of the Presidio of Monterey Police Department is to enforce Federal and State laws in order to protect the lives and property of the Presidio of Monterey Base Complex. The appellant is responsible for conducting investigations of alleged criminal offenses perpetrated by offenders for violations of Federal, State, and county laws/statutes/rules. The offenses can range from theft/damage to property, assault, shoplifting, unlawful entry, domestic violence, narcotics, and other violations. The investigations include taking statements; apprehending/detaining persons; performing surveillance of suspects; collecting evidence; analyzing facts to develop case information; preparing oral/written reports, etc. The appellant also serves as the supervisor and unit chief performing the full range of personnel management and supervisory duties over three subordinates by planning and assigning work, monitoring and evaluating completed work, interviewing candidates, identifying training needs, establishing performance goals, and hearing/resolving employee complaints.
Consistent with OPM case number C-1802-08-03, the position is classified to the GS-1802 series with the title at the discretion of the agency and with the prefix "Supervisory."

OPM found that the appealed position was not classifiable to the GS-1811 series because the scope of the investigatory tasks occurring within a prescribed local jurisdiction and being of relatively short duration, similar to the appellant's work situation, were not consistent with criminal investigative work, where the cases "involve investigating alleged or suspected major offenses or violations of specialized laws of the United States where the investigative assignment requires an extended period of time," such as periods of weeks, months, or even years, and where the scope of the violations are not limited to those committed on Federal property. OPM also found that the appealed position was not classifiable to the GS-0083 series, which includes positions the duties of which are the performance or supervision of law enforcement work to include "the arrest or apprehension of violators." The OPM decision noted that occupational information in the GS-0083/0085 Guide provides that "[a]rrest and apprehension authority includes the power to formally detain and incarcerate individuals pending the completion of formal charges (booking); requesting and serving warrants for search, seizure, and arrest; testifying at hearings to establish and collect collateral (bond); and/or participating in trials to determine innocence or guilt." The Guide further states that "[p]olice officers are commissioned, deputized, appointed, or otherwise designated as agency and/or local law enforcement officers by statute, delegation, or deputization by local governments, or other official act." Thus, formal arrest authority is a prerequisite for classification to the GS-0083 series.

Department of the Army "civilian police" positions, including the appellant's position, do not have arrest authority delegated to them by statute. This is addressed in AR 190-56, The Army Civilian Police and Security Guard Program, dated March 15, 2013. Chapter 5, paragraphs 5-1 General and 5-2 Authority, discuss the authority of DA Civilian Police (DACP) and Security Guards (SG) and Contract Security Guards. Paragraph 5-2.a. provides the following:

The DACP/SG performing law enforcement and security duties authorized by the installation or activity commander are limited in the execution of this authority to the installation boundaries. They can apprehend any persons found on the installation or activity for offenses committed on post that are felonies, misdemeanors, breaches of the peace, a threat to property or welfare, or detrimental to good order and discipline. Such apprehension authority is limited to issuing citations and turning the subject over to the appropriate civilian or military authorities.

The appellant does not have statutory arrest authority deriving through delegation or deputization. Therefore, her position cannot be classified to the GS-0083 series. The agency is responsible for ensuring that its employees do not assume or exercise authorities that are not specifically permitted by relevant statute and DoD policy as described in AR 190-56.
Grade Determination

The appellant’s supervisory duties constitute a major duty occupying at least 25 percent of the position’s time and workload. Thus, the position meets the criteria for application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG). The GSSG uses a point-factor evaluation approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions. Under each factor there are several factor level definitions which are assigned specific point values. The points for all levels are fixed and no interpolation or extrapolation is permitted. Work of positions at different organizational levels often will be properly credited at the same level of a factor.

Supervisory duties are evaluated by comparing them with each factor. Designated points are credited for the highest factor level which is met according to the instructions specific to each factor and level. If two or more levels of a factor are met, the points for the highest level met are credited. However, if one level of a factor is exceeded, but the next higher level is not met, the lower level involved is credited.

Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect

This factor assesses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including its organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To assign a factor level, the criteria dealing with both scope and effect must be met.

The agency assigned Level 1-2.

Scope

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The functions, activities, or services provided have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities comprising a typical agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments.

At Level 1-3, the program segment directed performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States; or, when most of an area’s taxpayers or businesses are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative or technical or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation also falls at this level.

Effect

At Level 1-2, the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or
provide services to a moderate, local or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.

At Level 1-3, activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multi-mission organizations and/or very large serviced populations) the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

Level 1-2 is credited, 350 points.

The appellant directs the work of persons engaged in specific law enforcement operations in support of the Presidio of Monterey. Consistent with Level 1-2 scope and effect, these services involving maintaining law and order and protecting life, property, and civil rights of individuals have the limited geographic coverage of a mid-sized military installation and support installation level operations.

Level 1-3 is not credited as the scope of the appellant’s program falls short of that which provides administrative, protective, or investigative work for a metropolis, State, or a small region of several States, or complex administrative or technical work directly affecting a large or complex multi-mission military installation. Further, the work provided does not substantially impact essential support operations of numerous, varied, and complex technical/professional/administrative functions. Presidio of Monterey is not considered to be a large (exceeding 4000 personnel) or complex, multi-mission installation but rather a mid-sized installation that serves as home to the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center whose sole mission is to provide linguistic and cultural instruction to DoD (and other Federal agency) students. Although the installation leases on-base property to the general public, the serviced population is not equivalent to a major metropolitan area.

Factor 2, Organizational Setting

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management.

The agency assigned Level 2-1.

At Level 2-1, the position is accountable to a position that is two or more levels below the first (i.e., lowest in the chain of command) SES, flag or general officer, equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain.

At Level 2-2, the position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first SES, flag or general officer, or equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain.

Level 2-1 is credited, 100 points.
The appellant reports to the Chief of Police (GS-12), who in turn reports to the Director of Emergency Services (GS-13). Therefore, the appellant’s supervisor is at least two levels below the first SES or General Officer equivalent within the chain of command.

Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities which are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. Levels under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities. Where authority is duplicated or not significantly differentiated among several organizational levels, a factor level may apply to positions at more than one organizational level.

The agency assigned Level 3-2c.

In order to meet Level 3-2, a position must meet the conditions described in paragraphs a, b, or c under this factor level. Paragraph a relates to planning and scheduling production-oriented work. Paragraph b relates to supervising work that is contracted out. The appellant’s position does not meet paragraphs a or b. In order to meet paragraph c, a supervisor must carry out at least three of the first four authorities and responsibilities, and a total of six or more of the ten authorities and responsibilities described.

To meet Level 3-3, positions must (a) exercise delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar types of long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assure implementation of the goals and objectives for the program segment(s) or function(s) they oversee; determine goals and objectives that need additional emphasis; determine the best approach or solution for resolving budget shortages; and plan for long range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work. These positions are closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives for assigned staff function(s), program(s), or program segment(s). For example, they direct development of data; provision of expertise and insights; securing of legal opinions; preparation of position papers or legislative proposals; etc.; or (b) exercise all or nearly all of the delegated supervisory authorities and responsibilities described at Level 3-2c of this factor and, in addition, at least eight of the fifteen listed authorities and responsibilities.

Level 3-2c is credited, 450 points.

The appellant performs as a first-level supervisor, i.e., plans work to be accomplished by subordinates; evaluates work performance of subordinates; interviews candidates for positions in the unit; hears and resolves complaints from employees, etc., meeting the conditions described at Level 3-2c.
Level 3-3a is not met. The appellant does not exercise, nor does her organizational level permit, the degree of delegated managerial authority envisioned at this level, such as the development of long-range program plans or the preparation of legislative proposals as depicted at Level 3-3a. Level 3-3b is not met either, as this level pertains to second-level supervisors who direct, coordinate, or oversee work through the use of supervisors, leaders, team chiefs, etc.; approve serious disciplinary actions; make decisions on costly training needs and approve expenses comparable to within-grade increases, extensive overtime, and employee travel; and direct a program or major program segment with significant resources (e.g., multimillion dollars of annual resources).

Factor 4, Personal Contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under Subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under Subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

The agency assigned Levels 4A-1 and 4B-1.

At Level 4A-1, contacts are with subordinates within the organizational unit(s) supervised, with peers who supervise comparable units within the larger organization, with union shop stewards, and/or with the staff of administrative and other support activities when the persons contacted are within the same organization as the supervisor. Contacts are typically informal and occur in person at the work place of those contacted, in routine meetings, or by telephone.

At Level 4A-2, contacts are with, for example, members of the business community or the general public; higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff throughout the field activity; representatives of local public interest groups; technical or operating level employees of State and local governments; etc. Contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through telephone, and sometimes may require special preparation.

At Level 4B-1, the purpose of contacts is to discuss work efforts for providing or receiving services; to exchange factual information about work operations and personnel management matters; and to provide training, advice, and guidance to subordinates.

At Level 4B-2, the purpose of contacts is to ensure that information provided to outside parties is accurate and consistent; to plan and coordinate the work directed with that of others outside the subordinate organization; and/or to resolve differences of opinion among managers, supervisors, employees, contractors or others.

Level 4A-2 (50 points) and Level 4B-2 (75 points) are credited.

The appellant has contacts with subordinates within the organizational unit supervised; with peers who supervise comparable units within the organization, e.g., other unit commanders; and
with higher level managers and staff at the installation, such as the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) and the U.S. Army Criminal Investigative Command (CID). Given that the majority of violations are committed by non-DoD affiliated civilians leasing property on the Presidio grounds, she has regular contact with members of the general public. She serves as the point-of-contact with other external law enforcement agencies such as local civilian police authorities, the FBI, DEA, and BATF; has regular contacts with the local court systems including judges and the district attorney; and testifies at administrative or judicial proceedings (although this occurs rarely as most cases end in plea bargains).

This exceeds the exclusively internal contacts described at Level 4A-1 and meets the external contacts described at Level 4A-2, where contacts include members of the general public, higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff throughout the field activity, and operating level employees of State or local governments.

This also exceeds the limited purpose of contacts described at Level 4B-1, where contacts are mostly for basic information exchange. Consistent with Level 4B-2, the purpose of the appellant’s contacts is to ensure the accuracy and integrity of case information provided to outside parties and to coordinate with other law enforcement entities. By law, the appellant must review each investigative case file prepared by her subordinates every ten days, and she reviews their final reports prior to their presentation to the DA for prosecution. Because Presidio has concurrent jurisdiction with several local law enforcement agencies, including Seaside PD, Monterey PD, Marina PD, and the Monterey County Sheriff’s Office, the appellant has constant contact with these agencies to discuss which will assume jurisdiction for individual cases. When requesting search warrants, she accompanies her subordinates on meetings with the DA to review the request and subsequently with the presiding judge who will sign the request as appropriate to the subordinate’s experience level. She attends monthly detective meetings of the twelve regional municipal police agencies to discuss cases and similarities, and quarterly meetings of the FBI joint terrorism task force for information sharing.

It was noted that on the PD to which the appellant’s subordinates are assigned, Factors 6 and 7 are evaluated at Levels 6-3 and 7-3. These factor level assignments are reinforced in OPM case number C-1802-08-03. Crediting of Level 6-3 is based on contacts with the general public, military personnel of all ranks, the SJA and CID, and other agencies such as the FBI, DEA, BATF, etc. Crediting of Level 7-3 is based on their contacts with other agencies to exchange information and to plan and conduct operations. Although these measure nonsupervisory rather than supervisory contacts, it would be reasonable to conclude that the appellant has a comparable level of contacts as her subordinates, in a supervisory capacity and operating within the context of her role as the unit chief, particularly for the purposes of planning and conducting operations and otherwise coordinating with external parties. It was also noted that on the appellant’s previous GS-1811-11 PD, which was reclassified as GS-0083-09 without any apparent change in duties, Factor 4 was evaluated at Levels 4A-2 and 4B-2.

Factor 3, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor
has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others. It requires determining the highest grade which best characterizes the nature of the basic nonsupervisory work performed or overseen; and constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload.

The agency assigned Level 5-4.

At Level 5-4, the highest level of base work is GS-7 or GS-8, or equivalent.

At Level 5-5, the highest level of base work is GS-9 or GS-10, or equivalent.

Level 5-4 is credited, 505 points.

The appellant supervises a total of three employees performing base level GS-8 work.

Factor 6, Other Conditions

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. Conditions affecting work for which the supervisor is responsible (whether performed by Federal employees, assigned military, contractors, volunteers, or others) may be considered if they increase the difficulty of carrying out assigned supervisory or managerial duties and authorities.

To evaluate Factor 6, two steps are used. First, the highest level that a position meets fully is initially credited. Then, if the level selected is Level 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the Special Situations listed after the factor level definitions are considered. If a position meets three or more of the situations, then a single additional level is added to the level selected in the first step. If the level selected in the first step is Level 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, the Special Situations may not be considered in determining whether a higher factor level is creditable.

The agency assigned Level 6-2a.

At Level 6-2a (covering first-level supervisors), the work supervised or overseen involves technician and/or support work comparable in difficulty to GS-7 or GS-8, or work at the GS-4, 5, or 6 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority over the work, which requires coordination and integration of work efforts, either within the unit or with other units, in order to produce a completed work product or service.

The required coordination at this level ensures: consistency of product, service, interpretation, or advice; conformance with the output of other units, with formal standards or agency policy. Supervisors typically coordinate with supervisors of other units to deal with requirements and problems affecting others outside the organization.
At Level 6-3a (covering first-level supervisors), supervision and oversight requires coordination, integration, or consolidation of administrative, technical, or complex technician or other support work comparable to GS-9 or 10, or work at the GS-7 or 8 level where the supervisor has full and final technical authority over the work. (Full and final technical authority means that the supervisor is responsible for all technical determinations arising from the work, without technical advice or assistance on even the more difficult and unusual problems, and without further review except from an administrative or program evaluation standpoint. Credit for this should be limited to situations involving an extraordinary degree of finality in technical decision making.) This level may also be met when the work directed is analytical, interpretive, judgmental, evaluative, or creative. Such work places significant demands on the supervisor to resolve conflicts and maintain compatibility of interpretation, judgment, logic, and policy application.

Level 6-2a is credited, 575 points.

The appellant supervises subordinates at the GS-08 grade level. The work requires coordination and integration of services to assure quality, accuracy, and application of formal standards/regulations/laws.

Level 6-3a is not met. The appellant’s work does not involve coordination of work assignments comparable in difficulty to the GS-09 level, nor does the appellant exercise full and final technical authority in conjunction with her supervision over GS-8 level work. The appellant operates with a high degree of autonomy in the conduct of her operational assignments with minimal technical direction. However, this is not synonymous with “full and final technical authority” with the attendant “extraordinary degree of finality in technical decision making.” This would be creditable in a situation where, for example, the employee has delegated signature authority to commit the agency from a monetary or legal standpoint without any technical advice or review. Therefore, this degree of authority would generally not be creditable where the immediate supervisor is technically qualified in the employee’s functional area or has broader programmatic responsibility over the employee’s work. In this case, the appellant’s first-line supervisor, the Chief of Police, periodically reviews her cases and discusses them with her. Although he defers to her judgment, he is both qualified to technically review her work and has responsibility for the overall law enforcement program at the installation. Therefore, the appellant may not be credited with exercising “full and final technical authority.” Further, the work supervised is not primarily analytical, interpretive, judgmental, evaluative, or creative such that it imposes significant demands in resolving conflicts and maintaining compatibility in interpretation, judgment, logic, and policy interpretation. In this case, the appellant’s subordinates are engaged primarily in such work as apprehending and detaining suspects, coordinating with other law enforcement agencies to exchange information and discuss jurisdictional authority, conducting investigations to develop case information, and preparing reports. Therefore, the work supervised is oriented primarily toward gathering and reporting information rather than analyzing or interpreting that information and making subsequent judgments, which is the purview of other parties to the legal process such as judges and district attorneys.
The appellant's position does not meet at least three of the Special Situations described under this factor (i.e., variety of work, meaning supervising more than one kind of work as represented by different occupational series; shift operations, meaning supervising an operation of such size as to require at least two fully staffed shifts; fluctuating workforce such as seasonal variations in staff; or constantly changing deadlines requiring frequent operational adjustments; physical dispersion, meaning work that is carried out at different locations under conditions which make supervision difficult, e.g., due to inaccessibility or difficulty in monitoring work performance; special staffing situations, meaning special employment programs requiring regular counseling and motivational activities; and impact of specialized programs, meaning when a significant portion of the workload is at grade levels above the level credited under factor 5.)

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Scope and Effect</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Setting</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory/Managerial Authority Exercised</td>
<td>3-2c</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Contacts</td>
<td>4A-2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Contacts</td>
<td>4B-2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of Typical Work Directed</td>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Conditions</td>
<td>6-2a</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2105</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of 2105 points falls within the GS-10 point range (2105-2350) on the grade conversion table in the GSSG.

**Decision**

The position is properly classified as GS-1802-10, with the title to be determined by the agency and with the "Supervisory" prefix.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The United States Department of the Army, Criminal Investigation Division Command (USACIDC), 22nd Military Police (MP) Battalion (CID), Joint Base Lewis-McChord (JBLM), Washington, was tasked with identifying potential investigative and prosecutorial gaps experienced in partnership with respective law enforcement and prosecution agencies throughout the 22nd MP Battalion, encompassing: Fort Riley, Kansas; Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Fort Carson, Colorado; Fort Irwin¹, California; Presidio of Monterey, California; and Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington. The Battalion requested information pertinent to this inquiry across respective Detachments and received responses based upon their individual relationships with local law enforcement and prosecution partners.

Ultimately, partner law enforcement and prosecution relationships spanning cross-jurisdictional and authority matters with CID appear strong, generally built upon establishing proactive and positive relationships, but lacking formalized process or procedural frameworks. Many jurisdictions have well-established relationships with local police and sheriff departments, specifically in significant drug cases occurring at installation gates, where lower level drug involvement are handled by DES. Other installations have managed the growing visibility of juvenile investigations through local police department engagement, with prosecution being managed by local District Attorney’s offices. Relationships with the FBI for civilian based crimes appear to be appropriately referred and coordinated, with the FBI deferring investigation in many matters outside of high profile or media driven investigations on installations.

However, gaps have been identified, particularly at the Presidio of Monterey, whereby varied and nuanced jurisdictional complexities with numerous law enforcement stakeholders overlap with a unique mix of military and non-military residents and visitors. Jurisdictional challenges are further compounded by a culture established between locally established military police force (POMPD). Efforts are ongoing to de-conflict and identify areas of opportunity, including the possibility of a jurisdictional shift from concurrent jurisdiction to proprietary jurisdiction.

Finally, those areas where formalized process and procedural gaps appear with respective stakeholders appear to have been an effort undertaken with the JBLM, who provided examples of various MOUs and MOAs with various local and Federal investigative and prosecutorial stakeholders as detailed herein.

Ultimately, gaps will continue to exist in CID investigations whereby jurisdiction and authority matters require referral to outside agencies for investigation due to the overarching concern about military Special Agents conducting what would normally be investigations with a Federal nexus, due to fear of posse comitatus. A shift to empowering civilian Special Agents the opportunity to investigate such matters outside these constraints would bridge this gap in congruence with partner law enforcement across the Federal Executive.

Individual Detachment details are provided below with greater granularity.

¹ Fort Irwin was not able to provide a response respective to their individual relationships or gaps experienced in time for this report.
22\textsuperscript{nd} MP Detachment Feedback:

\textbf{Fort Leavenworth, Kansas:}
FLKS operates with Exclusive Jurisdiction and experiences no issues when a crime is committed on the installation itself with local partners.

When a crime occurring on the installation concerns a civilian on civilian, current relationships with the FBI seamlessly allow for their investigation to run jointly with CID, although it is rare as such investigations are routinely worked by CID without the FBI accepting jurisdiction and authority of the matter. While CID notifies the FBI in all such matters where their authority and jurisdiction requires, generally they will only become involved when the matter is a serious crime or those with significant media attention; otherwise they normally decline investigative responsibility.

Cases involving local PD's where the crime occurred off the installation and the subject is a service member are handled differently. Relationships with the local PD's off the installation are well established, however, when working joint investigations with the local PD as the lead, significant investigative delays are the result, generally related to the local PD’s ability to conduct timely investigative leads off the installation and then present the case to the District Attorney’s Office. Even in circumstances where we are aware the crime will not necessarily meet the DA’s established threshold for prosecution, CID’s investigation is held in abeyance until the local PD completes their leads before releasing jurisdiction to CID. Following the PD’s release of jurisdiction to CID, the office then is responsible for conducting additional leads before presenting the matter to the SJA for an official opinion. Many of these delays ultimately are the result of process of procedural delays.

\textbf{Fort Carson, Colorado:}
FCCO is Exclusive Jurisdiction, and while local law enforcement does not enter the installation to investigate crimes, local juvenile prosecutors will accept investigations for prosecution.
FCCO reported experiencing no investigative or prosecutorial gaps.

\textbf{Dugway Proving Grounds:}
DPG is concurrent with Toole County Sheriff's Department (TCSD), who will accept investigative authority and jurisdiction over major drug cases at FCCO gates and other serious crimes on base (they will not respond to low level drug crimes). Due to the remote location of DPG, installation DES will accept drug investigations at the gate falling below the TCSD threshold. During the past three years, FCCO has not initiated any drug cases at DPG outside the gate area.

TCSD will also conduct joint investigations where a Soldier is not the subject. For example, CID currently is working a joint investigation with the TCSD for a child sexual assault, with a civilian offender where CID conducted the majority of the investigative leads as both the victim and subject were located in Texas. While the subject is identified as a transient, TCSD is
presenting the investigation to the local District Attorney to obtain an arrest warrant.

Presidio of Monterey, California:
Concurrent jurisdiction within the AOR with several local law enforcement partners, including: Seaside PD, Monterey PD, Marina PD, and the Monterey County Sheriff's Office. There are numerous issues within these cross-jurisdictional agencies resulting in gaps with CID investigations, including the following:

Housing for service members in the area is called the Ord Military Community (OMC), formerly known as Fort Ord. OMC contains service members from all branches of DoD attending training at DLI and the Naval Post Graduate School in Monterey, California. OMC has no gates controlling access and is located directly between Marina, and Seaside, California. This area is also adjacent to California State University - Monterey Bay.

Due to the amount of housing and lack of military personnel in the region, remaining available privatized housing on OMC is leased to civilians having no-DoD affiliation. These quarters are then sub-leased to unknown civilians (i.e., friends, family) who are unable to lease these properties because of wide ranging criminal records.

Due to the high volume of civilian residents utilizing these military housing area(s), the result is numerous calls for service involving criminal activity with no federal nexus. In most concurrent jurisdictions, local police will assume all cases and investigations with no federal nexus; however, at the Presidio of Monterey will not assume these investigations outright.

Presidio of Monterey Police Department (POMPD), which is 100% Department of the Army Civilian Police, has adopted policies to arrest civilians for crimes committed in the housing areas and transport them directly to Monterey County Jail. POMP then refers these investigations to the Monterey County DA's office for prosecution. This function is routinely managed by local law enforcement agencies in other Department of the Army locations, however, the POMP has assumed this function at the Presidio of Monterey.

Due to the above identified issues, the Presidio of Monterey experiences investigative and prosecution gaps whereby local law enforcement will decline to assume investigations initiated by CID that have non-DoD affiliation. For example, POMP responds to a sexual assault in the housing area involving non-DoD civilians. POMP notifies CID due to Army Regulation and CID will initiate a case number. Once CID identifies no federal nexus exists, other than the crime occurring within a housing unit rented to civilian through the privatized housing company, CID refers the matter to the local PD, who subsequently declines the referral and the matter is referred back to the POMP. Since POMP is comprised of DACP's, the matter falls outside their investigative purview. In these circumstances, CID has identified a gap in that there now exists a crime, and an investigation involving individuals with no DoD affiliation, in which local PDs won't work, and the AUSA won't prosecute as it is concurrent jurisdiction with no federal nexus. CID is then required to coordinate with Army Chief of Justice to request the DA's office seek prosecution in the matter. Procedurally, the gap exists due to 15 years of
precedent set by POMPD, with local PD passive avoidance.

In conjunction with the SJA, DES, and Deputy Garrison Commander, efforts are ongoing in exploring the possibility of seeking a change from Concurrent jurisdiction to Proprietary jurisdiction on OMC in order to relinquish all law enforcement jurisdiction to the local PDs or Sheriff's Office. Considering approximately 90% of all cases generated by POMPD involve civilians, the Army assumes great risk in day-to-day law enforcement operations on OMC whereby no DoD nexus exists in furtherance of our law enforcement mission.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington:
JBLM has Exclusive Jurisdiction within main cantonment and Concurrent Jurisdiction in some of the training area with Pierce County Sheriff's Department and Thurston County Sheriff's Department. At this time, JBLM has the following MOUs/MOAs in place with investigative and prosecutorial partners

Firstly, the Pierce County Juvenile prosecutor provides legal guidance and opines respective to child vs child cases, and JBLM has a firmly established relationship with a local AUSA who previously served as an Army SJA, and has provided gracious assistance in support of CID efforts, as well as acting as a conduit between CID and the FBI.

MOA between the Provost Marshall and the SAC—This MOA is designed to assist both the PMO and the CID Office Administrative Section when processing District Court Violation Notices (DCVN). The MOA delineates responsibilities when handling mutual interest investigations. This MOA was established because the SAUSA was unable to prosecute cases when the PMO and CID office would conduct simultaneous cases within their own purview. This MOA notes both administrative sections will coordinate with cases simultaneously having DCVN's to ensure they can be sent in unison, which streamlines their assignment within the same court docket. It has been identified, when such matters are not within the same docket, the DCVNs result in case dismissals.

MOA between the JBLM CID Office and the Provost Marshall's Office—The purpose of this agreement was to establish the responsibilities for the storage of weapons between the PMO and the CID Office. DST investigators are 31Bs who do not possess their duty weapon at all times, thus when conducting investigations outside duty hours, they must respond to the PMO in order to draw their weapon. This MOA alleviates an agent having to respond or the unit's armorer to come and issue their weapon.

MOA between the JBLM CID Office and the 42nd MP BDE (JBLM)—The purpose of this agreement was to establish the responsibilities for investigative support (borrowed military manpower) for the JBLM CID Office from personnel assigned to the 42nd MP BDE. Although regulations provide a guideline of how the MP units will provide MPs to aid in drug suppression efforts, this MOA breaks it down to issues that may relate with OPCON/ADCON. Further, it helps for Commanders and 1SGs of respective units to quickly see what they will handle and what the CID Office will handle in respects to issues of equipment and Soldier readiness.

MOA between DES and the JBLM CID Office—This agreement relates to offenses involving
the simple possession of Marijuana by civilians while on JBLM. The agreement was coordinated with the SAUSA and states DES assumes responsibility for all simple passion cases of Marijuana. Simple possession was defined as any amount equal or less than 250 grams, unless packaged in a manner to show intent to distribute at which time the JBLM CID office assumes responsibility.

Fort Riley, Kansas:
FRKS is an Exclusive jurisdiction and experiences a good relationship with local jurisdiction via the Special Assistant United States Attorney (SAUSA). Challenges FRKS encounters are generally within the realm of juvenile cases, oftentimes resulting from miscommunication between stakeholders in various jurisdictions, requiring consistent outreach efforts. The installation has a MOU in place with local prosecutors for all juvenile cases originating from FRKS, which has historically been successful in developing this long-term relationship.
Input to the Management Assistance Report (MAR) dated 21 August 2018, 22nd MP Battalion

Page 1: date of document 21 August 2018

Executive Summary:

Page 2: Monterey CID "does not" have any agreements with local non-military police or POMPD. As stated in the Army Regulation AR 190-30, Par. 4-4(g), procedures will be developed to ensure mutual cooperation between MPI and USACIDC.

I reached out to 5th MP to discuss options in late December 2017 after the reclassifications. We discussed several options trying to tackle the volume of types of work in which MPI could assist CID as supported by regulations that resulted in two draft MOU involving POMPD getting trained and certified by CID in drugs and process for sexual assaults. Currently 3 of us 4 MPI investigators are Special Victims Unit (SVU) schooled trained at USAMPS. The MOU's were to work drug cases and sexual assaults. There has been no movement since mid-March on this working relationship. CID pulled of working with POMPD and has not been transparent as to the status. It may have to do with wanting to interview one of their employees who wrongly accessed a POMPD State Court Justice Partners account and ran employees for the POMPD.

Page 2, para 3: "Gaps" were filled by Presidio MPI investigators since my tenure NOV 2004 up to late 2017 when the 1811 reclassifications occurred.

Jurisdictional challenges exist based on a "lack" of strategic planning when Fort Ord closed in 1994, the war efforts after 911, IMCOM's lack of assistance, and CID's lack of interest in civilian on civilian cases. Is jurisdictional shift CID's role or Garrison's role?

Page 2, para 5: Bridge the "gap" is addressing civilian Special Agents. POMPD had civilian GS 11 1811's handling these gaps since 2004. (Point: The grade of a CID civilian 1811, Special Agent is a GS13, varies on MPI 1811, GS 12/11).

Presidio of Monterey:

Since the closing of Fort Ord in 1994, the POMPD jurisdiction included both exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction. The land changed over to nine (9) other jurisdictions which included municipalities, county, state, and other federal entities.

The Army jurisdiction under authority of the Garrison Commander (POMPD) was referred to as a checker board with changes of property happening on going. Around mid-2005, the privatized housing began to tear down old military housing. During this time the military housing for service members "was" the area presently rented to civilians. The current military housing west of General Jim Moore was called the "Kneedy" and a major project occurred in flattening the old housing to build the new. This major modernization of the housing area was never addressed after completion as to police jurisdiction. In other words, what was military housing during the modernization phase is now the civilian housing and it remained part of POMPD's jurisdiction with full service police and fire. There has not been any relinquishment of POMPD police jurisdiction for any of this area.

One of the first MOU's with the County District Attorney was signed by the Garrison Commander COL in June 2003. Memorandums dated back to March 1998 signed by the Garrison Commander COL described properties as "Property transfers within the installation boundary of the former..."
input to the Management Assistance Report (MAR) dated 21 August 2018, 22nd MP Battalion

Fort Ord have created islands of local jurisdiction within an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction, that have become a source of confusion for law enforcement and other public safety agencies. Future transfers of land to four different municipalities, two state universities, and state and county parks departments will exacerbate this problem.

Page 4, parag 4: states calls for service involving criminal activity with no federal nexus. The statement "no federal nexus" does not consider the property belongs to the Army and the Army has not relinquished it. If there was no federal nexus then why do the 911 calls come into our police agency? Additionally, as stated, in most concurrent jurisdictions local police assume. My question is this housing area was never determined "not to be POMPD's responsibility after the military residents moved into the newly Stillwell/Doe Park area west of General Jim More. It was business as usual here at POMPD.

SIA has advised as recent as April 2018 that it is our dirt and we have authority to investigate anything on our dirt.

Page 4, parag 5: POMPD "has adopted policies to arrest after conferring with SIA. SIA opine to take military subject cases to the County District Attorney for domestic violence in the past. Civilian cases are referred to state court based on SIA opinions. IMCOM LE PM Office is well aware of the civilian prosecutions since 2005 as staff assistance visits (SAV) occurred bi-annually. The SAV always addressed the majority of evidence handled at POMPD due to the retention longer for state court that military cases. IMCOM has offered no a solutions.

This executive summary shows "gaps" in which MPI has handled for years, up until the reclassifications in late 2017, and it appears the intention now is that CID will fill the gaps with civilian Special Agent who are not subject to PCA. PCA is, I thought, subject to all military police uniform services and civilians? This was filled by POMPD 1811's. The reality is POMPD patrol handles all these jurisdictional issues everyday.

Page 4, parag 6: Relating to the example of a sexual assault: CID does not always initiate a case number. If a sexual assault occurs on the Army's dirt, it is my understanding CID has the obligation to assume the case. Assuming the case requires a response. If CID decides that the only nexus is the dirt, with no military subject, and offer the case to the municipal agency having concurrent jurisdiction, then it follows on CID to handle such not POMPD.

In reality, past practice has been CID cannot be reached or when contacted by telephone by POMPD will decline when they learn it is a civilian on civilian case and will advise POMPD to hand over to civilian police. This is a problem. CID does not always pull a case number either. The problems in the past is that new CID Agent in Charge comes on board and operates like at their previous assignment location without establishing a foundation of the area relationships and MPI's in place. Another area in which this is true is Child Protective Services (CPS) because California law only law enforcement has certain authorities different from many other states. MPI has filled this gap as the solid Army POC's in partnerships with the local agencies. POMPD has invited CID to many local meetings (local police investigators meetings, CPS, Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Crisis Negotiations, Gang Task force, Active Shooter, District Attorney, etc.) because the partnerships exist with POMPD. POMPD has years of working relationships with the local LE population.
Input to the Management Assistance Report (MAR) dated 21 August 2018, 22nd MP Battalion

The "Gap" exists because of 24 years of precedent set by the Garrison with the MOU's and the SJA offering different opinions with lack of historical turn over to the next SJA. The passive avoidance is questionable when the Garrison asked to maintain jurisdiction due to the military population within the concurrent jurisdiction.

There clearly is DOD nexus on DMC and it is hard to understand why CID indicates there is no DOD nexus. We bar people committing crime in the civilian housing area. How can we bar people/civilian that reside in the housing area if there is not federal nexus?
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2020 2:07 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: MOU - Prosecution Agreement - DLIFLC-POM-MCDA 20201016.docx

Hi [Redacted],

Here are my thoughts:

1. Yes, it strictly relates to prosecution, not arrest.
2. It does not address authority to make arrests. Although the MOU mentions “the arrest or apprehension of civilian and military personnel,” in the Purpose section, arrest is not addressed anywhere else in the MOU.
3. Again, yes, it strictly relates to prosecution, not arrest.

[Redacted]
Assistant District Attorney
Monterey County District Attorney’s Office

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2020 1:12 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: MOU - Prosecution Agreement - DLIFLC-POM-MCDA 20201016.docx

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Hi [Redacted],

Attached is a draft MOU our agency will ask [Redacted] to agree to sign. Again, it is just a draft. I was asked by Chief [Redacted] to offer feedback. I plan to do so after I review all the authorities listed.

My question to you is relating to this type of MOU as far as the DA is concerned is strictly relating to prosecution versus arrest. Is that your understanding of it? Does it address authority to make arrests as the DA would not be who gives Presidio Police Authority, correct? I believe I know the answer but I have concerns like in the past decades that it is clear that this is about prosecution and not the arrest side. Would you advise me of your understanding as currently written in this draft please?

Presidio has made 36 arrests in FY2020, FYI.
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Ma'am,

I am not in charge over here. I suggest you handle this with the leadership. I have tried and nobody seems to believe me. Again, LTC does not appear to know what we do over here which "blows my mind." I am uncertain where he is getting his information from. In his email dated 1 SEP 2020, he is telling me to address this with you as Col.

V/R

[Redacted]

President of Monterey Police Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone:
(831) 242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831) 242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.
It sounds like their needs to be an adjustment to the system. POMPD officers do not have the ability to make arrests. Thus, they should not be doing so. The arresting office, a local law enforcement agency, should be entering such data into database and assuming responsibility for any/all necessary arrests if the decision is made to arrest an individual, not a POMPD officer. POMPD officers merely have the ability to apprehend individuals and transfer them to an agency with the ability to make an arrest.

I agree with your analysis—"If it were as [redacted] explains in his example, the sheriff’s office would take the Pompd officers statement, and the sheriff deputy would make an arrest, write the report, and do the “pc” statement as the arresting officer." I believe this correctly states what they forward should be.

Very respectfully,

CPT, JA
Chief of Justice & Special Assistant United States Attorney
USAO-NDCA DLIFLC & Presidio of Monterey
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944

Government Cell Phone: 831-250-3240
Personal Cell Phone: 703-314-3918

Ma’am,

I am still awaiting on a response to my email dated 3 SEP 2020 over the miss information on what we do here at POMPD at the SAJA’s approval. Looking for a response.

V/R
Good Morning Ma'am,

This is follow up from LTC ____’s email to me on the arrest apprehension reasoning and his examples as he indicated he is referring to me, as well as he has asked you to handle future correspondence on such.

The way local jurisdiction operates is police arrest, if the offense requires bail or is a mandated arrest such as domestic violence, the arresting officer logs into Justice Partners, the State system, completes the probable cause statement as the arresting officer, then transports the arrested to county jail.

POMPDL "does not" just drop off a detainee. The arrestee is held up to 48 hours. Within the 48 hours, a judge reviews the "pc" and either approves it or indicates there is not enough "pc" at which time the arrestee would be released by the sheriff’s department correction section if no pc and telephone the arresting agency to advise them of such.

If POMPDL Officer was only apprehending as LTC ____ says, the detained would never be taken to jail the sheriffs detention center.
Are you aware of this? One issue to address here is does the sheriff’s office accept detained subjects on federal property and prosecute them? There is no agreement for that. The practice for over 20 years plus has been POMPD arrests them. No other police agency does that.

POMPD does that based on the CA PC 830.8(b). Every POMPD officers attends the CA PC832 training for arrest and control. It’s budgeted in our PD budget. That’s why we arrest. I know I am repeating myself, but no other police agency is arresting these detained people. POMPD Officer does the arrest. That is the current practice.

If it were as LTC [REDACTED] explains in his example, the the sheriffs office would take the Pompd officers statement, and the sheriff deputy would make an arrest, write the report, and do the “pc” statement as the arresting officer.

I would add that if it was another civilian agency making the arrest, POMPD would detain them on site, call for the civilian agency to respond like any other reported crime from a private citizen. The civilian agency would determine the pc, make the arrest, write the report. POMPD Officer would be a witness.

I argue we are not following the military process which is why what we are doing requires approval from SECDEF now. If we were doing as LTC [REDACTED] says, I would not be arguing it.

POMPD writes the police report as the arresting officer on a fresh arrest. No other person or any other civilian police agency is doing such but the POMPD Officer.

I can understand this may be what the Army locally wants and may be working towards but it is not what we do.

In my opinion, there is a lot of work to do before we get what LTC [REDACTED] is saying, which in the meantime to get POMPD in compliance with Army and DODD requires approval to deputize. The approval does not necessarily require we be deputized because CA recognizes federal police. But it requires approval. China Lake, Ca has approval to deputize for SECMNAVY but they did not have to deputize due to CA pc 830.8(b) and agreements with local chiefs and sheriffs.

The approval would make us in compliance.

As in my appeal decision, if we had been approved for deputization before the decision, the decision would have been different.

Also, it’s important to understand we are making arrests under CA pc and I do not understand how anyone can say differently. Our officers get subpoenaed to court to testify as the arresting officer.

I believe you can work to change the future of what we do after considerable work in setting up agreements with many civilians agencies and a infrastructure, but you can never change what is occurring presently or in the past. I have testified in court as a POMPD criminal investigator as an arresting officer. How can anyone dispute this or any of the other arrests POMPD Officers, detectives, or criminal investigators are making or have made?

This matter has been brought to the attention of the leadership for years now. It’s not new. The legal advice to our leadership locally, I would argue is incorrect. It would be correct if it “is” what we’re doing but it “is not” what we are doing.
I want to assist in these decisions to be the "devils advocate" in challenging the complicated works ahead for our agency. I believe I have a very good understanding of both sides of the issues because I have worked both sides here locally and want to be part of the solutions to make it right.

I will look forward to your response and working with you.

V/R

Sent from my iPhone
Please excuse any shorting coming in my writing as I am sending from my iPhone.
Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted]
Date: September 1, 2020 at 10:04:56 AM PDT
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

I apologize but I have little bandwidth to fully contribute to this issue due to my normal duties as SJA. As a result, I will do my best to respond to your inquiry below and then hand the matter off to CPT [Redacted] as CoJ.

When it comes to differentiating between arrest and apprehension, we have several authorities to which we may refer. We must constrain ourselves to federal and DOD/DA authorities, because that is the system in which we operate.

So, 10 USC 807 (Article 7, UCMJ) provides that "[a]pprehension is the taking of a person into custody." This happens when an appropriate authority has a "reasonable belief that an offense has been committed and that the person apprehended committed it."

Under 10 USC 809 (Article 9, UCMJ) "[a]rest is the restraining of a person by an order, not imposed as a punishment for an offense, directing him to remain within certain specified limits. Confinement is the physical restraint of a person." That code provision goes on to discuss who may arrest someone - and that is only commissioned / commanding officers.

Section 809 makes clear though, that "Nothing in this article limits the authority of persons authorized to apprehend offenders to secure the custody of an alleged offender until proper authority may be notified."

Consistent with those authorities above, we have AR 190-56, para 5-2, which provides, DACPs may "apprehend any persons found on the installation or activity for offenses committed on post that are felonies, misdemeanors, breaches
of the peace ... [etc.]." However, "Such apprehension authority is limited to issuing citations and turning the subject over to the appropriate civilian or military authorities." This is the same as what is provided in 10 USC 807 and 809.

Play this out with a DUI stop.

A DACP, based on observations, has a reasonable belief that a crime has been committed. DACP stops the vehicle, detects alcohol on the driver's breath, observes blood shot eyes and slurred speech, and conducts an FST. The subject fails the FST. The DACP then apprehends that person, briefly taking them into custody, for the purposes of issuing a citation, and transferring them into the custody of a proper arrest authority (military or civilian).

To illustrate the limits of a DACPs apprehension authority, vice arrest authority, consider the following. If the DACP transports the subject to Monterey County Detention Center, fills out the PC statement or whatever paperwork is required, and the personnel there decline to accept the subject, what happens to that individual? The DACP can no longer detain the subject, so the subject must be released. The DACP has no ability or authority to further detain / arrest that subject. The continued detention of the subject can only be effected if a law enforcement officer (or military officer / commander), with the authority to arrest, accepts the subject from the DACP and effects the arrest.

I hope that helps.

Very Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Staff Judge Advocate
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6403
Cell: (831) 917-1444

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 6:50 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Fwd: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

Morning Sir,

I really do want to work with you on this legal and regulation matter. And I am constantly striving to understand what you are saying. Can you help me a bit more in telling me what it means to turn over to civilian authorities? What does that look like? What is involved with that? I think may be the difference in opinion.
V/R

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "__________"  
Date: August 31, 2020 at 2:23:17 PM PDT  
To: "__________"  
Subject: Re: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

Sir,

We do more than handover to civilians authorities. CID does that. We do it all. I have the proof.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 31, 2020, at 1:12 PM, _________ wrote:

Please take care of your home, belongings, and health.

When you have time next week we can discuss if you so desire.
But, the gist of the consensus of opinions is that under AR 190-56, DACPs performing law enforcement may "apprehend any persons found on the installation or activity for offenses committed on post that are felonies, misdemeanors, breaches of the peace, a threat to property or welfare, or detrimental to good order and discipline." Furthermore, "Such apprehension authority is limited to issuing citations and turning the subject over to the appropriate civilian or military authorities."

This is also consistent with the federal definitions of apprehension and arrest (10 U.S.C. 807 and 809).

And, essentially, that is what we do on the Presidio. Cite and release or transfer.

If the subject is transferred to military authorities, and requires further detention, the military command structure will effect that. If the subject is transferred to civilian authorities, and requires further detention, those authorities will effect that.

The DoD is generally loath to approve deputization because of the risk of PCA violations. This is made clear by AR 190-56, para 5-4, and that's why the exception approval authority is so high (See Army) ("[I]t is Army policy that DACP/SGs will not be deputized or exercise any additional authority or jurisdiction granted by local, state, or Federal Governments to perform law enforcement duties on or off a military installation ... .").

We have no legitimate basis to request such an exception, in direct
contravention of Army policy.

I hope that helps.

Very Respectfully,

[Redacted]
Staff Judge Advocate

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey

1336 Plummer Street, Building 275

Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6403

Cell: (831) 917-1444

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]

Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 12:54 PM

To: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

I appreciate that Sir. I am interested in your guidance to the Garrison Commander on getting approval for deputization per AR 190-56. My PD revision is the result of not having it or statutory arrest authority. I had an extensive conversation with DES [Redacted] Friday regarding this. He said you and IMCOM SJA indicate we do not need it- approval. I ask why? My issues brought up to the DES is the army regulations and DOD policy say we do. He indicates you and IMCOM SJA said we are in compliance and I would appreciate understanding such by knowing what your opinion is based on.

If you have references to regulations or policy I would like to know what it is. China Lake, CA does what we do. They arrest civilians per 830.8. They got SECNAVY approval per the DODDrequisites. Do we have that approval?

I am out this week getting my house cleaned due to the ash and smoke damage from the River Fire. I would welcome to meet to discuss this next week. In the meantime, if you can send your reasoning on why we are not getting approval from SECARMY and now SECDEF, to arrest civilians per 830.8(b) would help me understand this issue.

My understanding is approval for deputization has been brought up by many at police department before me. I have been asking since the Army put me in a 0083 position without choice which since OCT2017 I began asking and had the
right to appeal. I do not understand how we do what we do without "approval" which as of 27 July requires SECDEF approval.

I understand the state allows us. From my understanding we are arresting based off of CAP verses following our own Army policy and DOD guidance. Why is that?

Next week I’ll be back to work on Tuesday afternoon. I would appreciate being a part of this understand because it effects me and apparently only me.

Thank You, Sir.

I hope to hear from you for a meeting.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 31, 2020, at 11:18 AM, [Redacted] wrote:
I am more than willing to discuss arrest versus apprehension with you. In fact, I just had a conversation with the MCDA's office as well, and we seem to all be on the same page. We all agree that apprehension authority as authorized under AR 190-56 is appropriate and sufficient.

I know that is not helpful when it comes to the PD revision / classification issue. However, I have no vote or influence on the PD revision / classification issue.

Very Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Staff Judge Advocate

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey

1336 Plummer Street, Building 275

Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6403
-----Original Message-----

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2020 10:39 AM

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

We spoke yesterday Sir on this matter. I was able to get her cell through Fort Hood.

On another not, I spoke to my DES [Redacted] yesterday evening requesting to speak with you on your analysis of POMPD making the arrests and he is going to ask you to allow m input. I have serious concerns approval from DA/SECDEF is needed. I hope you are open to help me understand recommendation to the Garrison Commander. It appears I am the only person effected by the appeal decision therefore do request to be part of or have some transparency in how the decisions are being made. I look forward to such.
V/R

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 29, 2020, at 7:24 AM...

Please reach out to CPT M on her cell:...
Very Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Staff Judge Advocate
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center & Presidio of Monterey
1336 Plummer Street Bldg 275
Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6403
Cell: (831) 917-1444

From: [Redacted]

Date: Friday, August 28, 2020 at 12:15:54 PM

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: After Hours SJA - crim law (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Sir,

I have tried reaching CPT [REDACTED] to discuss an opine on a borderline touching case. Are you available?

[REDACTED]

Presidio of Monterey Police

Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone:

(831) 242-6926

Police Dispatch:

16
(831)242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:

4468 Gigling Road

Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.
August 28, 2020

Dear [Name]

I am writing regarding my concern that my personnel action related to my pending appeal was shared with a subordinate employee, Mr. [Name], by DES [Name] and that I am continuing to be retaliated against. I also remain deeply concerned that the Department is not following DOD policy and law by continuing to proceed to arrest civilians, while DOD has indicated that we have no arrest authority. This places our officers and department at needless physical and legal risk, while also raising concerns about the legality of prior and future arrests. If there is no arrest authority, how are we continuing to be directed to perform arrests?

While the appeals decision stated that there is no statutory arrest authority for my position and others at the Presidio Police Department and required action to be taken for the entire class of employees of similar or identical positions, which is all 0083's, due to no statutory arrest authority, DES [Name] informed Mr. [Name] that he should not worry, no action will be taken related to the appeals decision except as it relates to my pay and classification.

DES [Name] also indicated that the Department will wait until the Attorney General signs the arrest authority and the issue would be resolved. He also told Mr. [Name] that he will have to sit down with me to go over my new job description and pay. There was no reason to discuss my pay and position description with Mr. [Name].

I am deeply concerned about my personnel matters are being disclosed with persons with no need to know. I am sure this also made Mr. [Name] uncomfortable and placed him in a bad position, as I am in a supervisory role over him.

Further, it appears that I am again being singled out and treated differently and worse for raising violations of law and policy and asking that we follow DOD policy. I believe in the mission of this department and the Army and I am concerned that continuing in this manner places the department, its officers, and the public at needless risk.

V/R [Signiture]
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Director,

I have examined the information paper MAJ [REDACTED] SJA, provided dated 20 APR 2020 (attached).

My response to the information paper:

The SJA relies on Army Regulation 190-56 to state that federal authority limits POM DACP’s to apprehension only; they do not have authority conduct arrests. However, the Department of Defense Instruction Number 5525.13 issued September 28, 2007, and incorporating a change effective 29 June 2018, and the change allows the commander of the installation request and arrange for state and local deputization, which would be an appropriate resolution in this case for the Presidio of Monterey Police Department.

The POM installation already has an agreement and practice in place with the Monterey County District Attorney’s office, under which for over two decades the POM PD has regularly conducted arrests followed by the necessary investigation and documentation concluding with referrals to the District Attorney’s office for prosecution in which the POMPD officers are recognized as “peace officers” in California and invited to testify in state trials. POMPD DACP’s arrest civilians and at times uniform military persons under the authority and requirements as an essential command Law Enforcement function. This practice on the ground cannot be overlooked.

Under the California law section of the information paper, I believe it fails to address CPC section 830.8 (b). This section states “Duly authorized federal employees who comply with the training requirements set forth in Section 832 are peace officers when they are engaged in enforcing applicable state or local laws on property owned and possessed by the United States government, or on any street, sidewalk, or property adjacent thereto, and with the written consent of the sheriff or chief of police, respectively, in whose jurisdiction the property is situated. This 832 requirement is a must for all POMPD officers to do their essential functions.

The conclusion of the information paper I believe lacks to address we are “not” just turning over to the proper authorities. POMPD officers make the arrest. POMPD officers write the PC declaration a State judge signs and approves to hold the arrestee. POMPD officers write the investigative police report and POMPD officers will testify in court if required. What POMPD officers are doing is not new and this practice has been an essential command Law Enforcement function backed by the Garrison Commander which dates back to the early 2000’s which is more than just handing over the detained to proper authority.

I know I mentioned my appeal for my reclassification from 1811 to 0083 is going forward. As I voiced to you and Ms. [REDACTED] I had concerns that if I went forward there could be an negative effect on POMPD. I believe you reassured me there was no concern of any effect on the department and offered your support for me to continue to go forward. That
being said, I have, and what I am being told by DCPAS is this remains a pending issue sitting on the AG Barr’s desk because no 0083’s in DOD has such authority. If that is true, every arrest we make locally as in our practice would be a false arrest if we at POMPD our officers/detectives have no statutory arrest authority. I have submitted prove of this practice for my appeal for your information.

Please correct me if I am wrong on this. I look forward to your response.

V/R

[Redacted]

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone:
(831) 242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831) 242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 7:43 AM
To: [Redacted]
CC: [Redacted]
ID-Tag: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: IP on Arrest v Apprehension (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Thanks [Redacted] After I examine this information paper, I will, if its ok with you, submit my follow up questions and concerns, directly related to our practice here at Presidio Police on a day to day basis.
V/R

Presidio of Monterey Police Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone: (831) 242-6926

Police Dispatch: (831) 242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 12:13 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
ID: [Redacted]

Subject: FW: IP on Arrest v Apprehension

Attached is the Information Paper done by SJA on Arrest and Apprehension. I think it is well written and clearly articulates that POM police officers are operating within their authorities (federal and state).

Hope that this is useful concerning your questions about the topic.

[Redacted]
Director of Emergency Services
US Army Garrison Presidio of Monterey
O: 831-242-7773
C: 831-760-6651
-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 11:34 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: IP on Arrest v Apprehension

Please see attached.

BLUFF: PoM PD may only apprehend. However, the difference between the terms (arrest v apprehension) is merely a civilian military distinction. PoM PD’s authority to apprehend and transfer does not adversely affect the officer’s ability to later participate in any follow on federal, state, or military judicial proceeding.

Very Respectfully,

[redacted]
Staff Judge Advocate
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Presidio of Monterey
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6403
Cell: (831) 917-1444

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED
This is certainly a confusing topic and the differences between arrest and apprehension are apparently very subtle. I attached one of the Delegations of Law Enforcement Arming. It only lists apprehension authority, not arrest. This discussion between OPM and OPMG on arrest versus apprehension authority for DACPs does not change anything relative to local operations. POM officers can still apprehend, process, title, fingerprint, take DNA, and take persons to the MOCO Jail that are apprehended on federal property - all of the things we are currently doing.

CID has arrest authority per their regulation and can execute all of the above both on and off federal property. It appears that the distinction between arrest and apprehension has to do with the area of authority and where the authority is derived.

I spoke to [ ] about this topic on a number of occasions to ensure that POM PD is not operating outside of their authorities given the recent OPM discussion concerning the topic. As long as we are not apprehending suspect off of federal property, we are operating within our authorities.

Hope this explanation helps.

[Redacted]

Director of Emergency Services
US Army Garrison Presidio of Monterey
O: 831-242-7773
C: 831-760-6651

----Original Message----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 3:15:52 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Appeal Reclassification - Hostetler (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Ma'am,

I am clearly addressing Presidio and our arrests of civilians. The AR 190-56 policy says we get our authority from the Garrison Commander which is COL [Redacted] and agreements have been made with county and state that we arrest civilians. It would be nice if you acknowledged you are aware of this.

V/R
-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 1:47 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Appeal Reclassification - Hosteler (UNCLASSIFIED)

Yes [Redacted] I saw your email. Please read my answer and you will see that you are asking the same questions but in different ways. I clearly explained what the current policy is and isn't.

V/H

Chief, Law Enforcement Branch
IMCOM Provost Marshal/Protection Division Bldg 2261 (2-1), 2405 Gun Shed Rd Joint Base San Antonio Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-1223

Office: 210-466-0499
Cell: 210-846-7709

We are the Army's Home
Serving the Rugged Professional!

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2020 3:24 PM
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Appeal Reclassification - Hostetter (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

I sent a follow up to your answer which is this:

I understand the AR 190-56 which clearly indicates the activity Commander after consultation with SJA and the PM (Chief: [Redacted]) / DES (Mr. [Redacted]) will provide to all personnel who perform law enforcement on his activity guidance on authority
(1) their authority and jurisdiction
(2) procedures for suspending and withdrawing their LE authority

At Presidio Police our SJA, DES, COP, and Garrison Commander (Activity Commander) authorize arrests, which is our practice.

Is this your understanding of POMPD arrest authority? Isn’t this as required under AR 190-56? If so, would you agree that POMPD 0083’s do have arrest authority?

V/R

Presidio of Monterey Police
Investigations Supervisor
Office Phone:
(831) 242-6926
Police Dispatch:
(831) 242-7851
FAX: (831) 242-7869
Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain “For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive” information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.
I am sorry but I thought I clearly gave you my answer on 11 Mar and 12 Mar in the email below. Your email on 12 Mar asked the same question in a different way.

Q: Do you have an interim policy that I may see that allows 0083 arrest authority?
A: There is currently no interim policy in effect allowing 0083’s arrest authority.
Q: So does 0083’s currently have arrest authority?
A: No. 190-56 only gives the authority to detain and apprehend.

Best of luck and have a wonderful weekend.

v/r

Chief, Law Enforcement Branch
IMCOM Provost Marshal/Protection Division Bldg 2261 (2-1), 2405 Gun Shed Rd Joint Base San Antonio Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-1223

Office: 210-466-0499
Cell: 210-846-7709

We are the Army’s Home
Serving the Rugged Professional!

I know there are other priorities with the covid19 issues afloat. I was wondering if you had a chance to read my email below sent on March 12th, 2020 and could offer me a response. This is critical to my appeal process pending with DAPAS relating to my 1811 / 0083 status.
I hope to receive your response soon.

Sincerely,

Presidio of Monterey Police Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone:
(831) 242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

---Original Message---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2020 3:44 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]

Subject: Re: Appeal Reclassification - Hosteler

I understand the AR 190-56 which clearly indicates the activity Commander after consultation with SIA and the PM (Chief [Redacted] / DES (Mr. [Redacted])) will provide to all personnel who perform law enforcement on his activity guidance on authority:
(1) their authority and jurisdiction
(2) procedures for suspending and withdrawing their LE authority

At Presidio Police our SIA, DES, COP, and Garrison Commander (Activity Commander) authorize arrests, which is our practice.

Is this your understanding of POMPD arrest authority? Isn’t this as required under AR 190-56? If so, would you agree that POMPD 0083’s do have arrest authority?

Respectfully,
Chief-Presidio Police Investigations
Desk phone: (831) 242-6926

> On Mar 12, 2020, at 6:00 AM, wrote:
> 
> No. 190-56 only gives the authority to detain and apprehend.
> v/r
>
> Chief, Law Enforcement Branch
> IMCOM Provost Marshal/Protection Division Bldg 2261 (2-1), 2405 Gun
> Shed Rd Joint Base San Antonio Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-1223
>
> Office: 210-466-0499
> Cell: 210-846-7709
>
> We are the Army's Home
> Serving the Rugged Professional!
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: 
> Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 7:27 PM
> To: 
> Cc: 
> Subject: Re: Appeal Reclassification - Hostetler
>
> So do we 0083's currently have arrest authority?
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Chief-Presidio Police Investigations
> Desk phone: (831) 242-6926
>
> > On Mar 11, 2020, at 4:22 PM, wrote:
> >>
> >> Thank you!
> >>
> >> Respectfully,
On Mar 11, 2020, at 3:48 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

There is currently no interim policy in effect allowing 0083's arrest authority.

v/r,

Chief, Law Enforcement Branch
IMCOM Provost Marshal/Protection Division Bldg 2261 (2-1), 2405 Gun
Shed Rd Joint Base San Antonio Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-1223

Office: 210-466-0499
Cell: 210-846-7709

We are the Army's Home
Serving the Rugged Professional!

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2020 5:11 PM
To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Appeal Reclassification - Hostetler

Dear [REDACTED],

I received information from DAPAS Monday on my option to request my appeal to go forward. I understand that if I do have it go forward the implications of results of my appeal could affect the entire POMP, relating 0083 series. I understand currently the only entities that have arrest authority in DOD is the Pentagon Police Force and NAS. I understand a request to delegate this such authority to the SECDEF is currently on Attorney General Barr's desk.

Based on this information, is there currently an interim policy in effect allowing 0083's arrest authority? I understand the implications of this effects all sister services 0083's and military uniformed felony investigators.

Do you have an interim policy that may see that allows 0083 arrest authority or is it status quo? I ask because it will help me in deciding if I process in my appeal action. My need to make a decision is soon.

I appreciate any help with this request of obtaining the interim policy.
Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Chief Presidio Police Investigations Desk phone: (831) 242-6926
I understand that but we arrest here. We have been doing it for years. It is why we have asked to be deputized under the DODI. I have arrest records back to 2004 for Presidio Police Department making arrests of civilians not turned over to local LE. If you recall, we discussed this in the past where it was my suggestion as a temporary solution the SECARMY authorize deputation per the DODI was a fix. I thought you thought it was a permanent fix.

I am being told in my appeal that I will be converted to a different series other than 0083 because DOD 0083 across the board have no arrest authority. I am trying to address our local situation and it seems to be disregarded because our SJA says we can do what we are doing and I think maybe they are not correct or do not understand what we are doing. I feel obligated to address this because we do arrest civilians. I can show proof of this. It happens every day. This is not anything new. I feel like nobody wants to know. If we as a police agency allow our police officers or detectives to arrest a civilian, book them in County jail, provide a probable clause statement on this arrest to the state court and a state judge signs off on it, then we write the report and testify in court that we are arresting. That's what we are doing and have been doing since I have worked here back to 2004 and it was going on before I became employed here. IMCOM LE knows about it. It's very frustrating in my appeal to be told we are not doing this when we are. It's like a pink elephant in the room. I even sent MG an email on this two years ago.

I will continue to try and get my DES and SJA to understand what we are doing. If it's true there is no statutory arrest authority for 0083's then Presidio Police is making unlawful arrest. I feel as if this appeal process is causing some problems also because it is difficult for me who only wants my due process to address what I have been doing as other police offers here have being doing for years to be addressed appropriately.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2020 9:36 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: SECDEF to AG (UNCLASSIFIED)

You have apprehension authority over the military members, via Army Regulations and UCMJ, and you can of course detain civilians for referral/hand off to local law enforcement. The statutory arrest authority they are talking about gives you an actual Federal statute versus Army Regulations and UCMJ.
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Thank You. I appreciate your response. It seems strange to me that if this is true there is no current statutory authority that a directive of some sort has not been issued to us working bees (police officers/0083's) to prevent violating people's rights and making false arrests. I am very confused over this and I cannot grasp it in my head that we are operating under the "status quo" if higher Army LE leadership is aware without some directive. Any suggestions in who I can address this issue with in OPMG?

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2020 9:09 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: SECDEF to AG (UNCLASSIFIED)

Yes, it is my understanding that under some Title 10 that Congress put in an NDAA about two years ago, that the SECDEF could make the request to the Attorney General. As I understand, it has gone thru a number of starts and re-starts because of course the various change overs of SECDEF and AG, and Actings in between.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2020 12:03 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: SECDEF to AG (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Hello [Redacted]

I hope all is well with you during these interesting times. Of recent, I have been told by the decision maker for my appeal of my reclassification from 1811 to 0083 that is currently at the Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service that no 0083's in the DOD have statutory arrest authority because it can only come from the Attorney General and the DOD has not ever received it. That being said, I am concerns of this if true considering we are arresting people locally and have been for many, many years. I am being told the SECDEF has submitted a letter to Attorney General Barr asking to delegate arrest authority to him. I am trying to verify this information as being true or not. Do you have any idea or knowledge of this?

I would appreciate any information you may have on this.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

Presidio of Monterey Police Investigations Supervisor

Office Phone:
(831) 242-6926
Police Dispatch:
(831) 242-7851

FAX: (831) 242-7869

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING: This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED
To: [Redacted]

Subject: [Redacted]

FYSA!

--------Original Message--------
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 2, 2018 9:51 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: [Redacted]

Copy Ma'am. Here is my position.

I had already discussed the jurisdiction issue with you and been blessed to take it to state court. I talk the state court language as procedural because I need to use and put together a prosecutable case based on the state rules if already decided to go that direction. No different from UCMJ - if it's military, I talk UCMJ. I've never had a federal case prosecuted since I began working here in NOV 2004. The non-military cases have been state prosecutions. Therefore, I work the case based off of the rules for state clearly recognizing my authority is federal to assimilate the state code. To do the work of a police investigator, I start with the elements of the statutes to prove the case and outside of active duty subjects, the code has always been state Ca PC.

What I think would be useful to POMPD Police Officers is your assistance in framing what cases are handled a certain way up front (which code - UCMJ, Federal, State) because for a uniformed police officer and sometimes for a police detective we need to act on the spot and the statutes are necessary to apprehend and/or effect the necessary probable cause. What I am trying to bring to your attention is police need to know their authority up front to efficiently and effectively build a case. That is what POMPD needs from SJA. Often POMPD cannot wait to take action. With the complex work environment, it is imperative to have guidance how to treat various crimes. The is a bit different because it is past tense and no apprehensions made, yet having to fight to preserve evidence with the officials handling an administrative investigation was not necessary considering the criminal case was discussed up front with the SJA.

I get your prospective, Ma'am. What I do not get is if you understand how hard it is to do police work here at POMPD. POMPD officers are always second guessing as to what code will be the actual code. It is important to do this from the start and we get little guidance. If I understand the Army Regulations, within concurrent jurisdiction, all the civilian cases should be turned over to the civilian jurisdiction but that does not occur here. The Army has not worked out a viable option to handle this. The Army Garrison wants concurrent jurisdiction in order to have command and control over the military members that reside in housing yet there is not a clear way or guidance to effect police the civilian jurisdiction. We need a strong infrastructure, training, then action to follow through. This was discussed with you in one of our first meetings with DES, COP, CID.

I have no hard feelings. I honestly wonder when someone is going to stand up for the POMPD and acknowledge the work environment is complex and that the training the Army provides at Fort Leonardwood in 9 weeks does not even cover a tiny bit of what our work conditions/environment is here. I do not know of any other police jurisdictions in the Army or outside of the Army that deal with all three codes (UCMJ, USC, CA PC) and all sister services SJA's other than POMPD. It's complex and it does not appear anyone other than us that have to work with it gets the difficulty and thought behind analyzing on the spot how to proceed.

I appreciate your understanding Ma'am and I understand your position.
Let me know when you wish to meet and discuss further.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office:
(831)242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 1:39 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: [Redacted] Case

I sincerely apologize if anything in my emails came off as any type of personal affront to your knowledge and experience. Trust me, that was not—and is never—my intent. I appreciate greatly what you do every day and the fact that you've been doing this for a long time. My comments were not intended to suggest you don't know we're federal (of course you know this), but to explain the basis for why we need to view our cases through a federal lens and how to do so. Also, when I hear a case investigated by us, yet being called "state" vs. "federal", it's legally imprecise and lends to all sorts of potentially problematic practices and interpretations of the law, as we've already seen in the past.
My job is to ensure our cases are investigated and prosecuted properly, in accordance with law and regulation, and in the interest of justice. Part of that is understanding legally why we do what we do, and how we're permitted to do it. That has been the impetus for the changes we've been making to our practices, which I've been trying to carefully move us toward in consideration of the history and unique challenges faced by POMPD. I understand the frustrations with the seeming lack of clarity for your office, and this is something we will definitely address.

In regards to the search warrant, if, in your joint investigative efforts with PGPD, you want to take the step of getting a state search auth for the government computer, that's fine. It seems like (potentially unnecessary) extra work on your end, when a DoD/commander's authorization would be sufficient for us, but doesn't hurt the case.

I am in federal magistrate court Monday morning (hearings in Salinas), and then heading up to the US Attorney's office in San Jose for a meeting, case filings, and a search warrant filing. I will have time that afternoon to speak over the phone, or we can meet Tuesday mid-morning (either your office or mine). I apologize it's been a tough time getting aholt of me the last few weeks, but this coming month should be better.

Best,

---

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 12:56 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Re: [Redacted] Case

I get that. Then is Monday morning good for us to discuss the case further? We would request the forensic computer search through Usacil - ma'am please understand that I get who I work for and I understand your position and I been doing Army LE since 1975. I get it and don't need to be reminders I am DOD federal. You seem to taken for granted POMPD has been left to handle many civilian cases within a federal attorney or SJA to assist. As stated in the beginning I'd love testify in a federal case before retire it has been the practice and even your go getting effect we still do not a a clear way for our officers to enforce law day to day - in my opinions the army need to face this fact and offer solutions verses the status quo because when they step out the back foot of the PD they need to know how to handle all these civilian cases. I know for a fact the cases CID hands over to civilian police fall through the cracks and the subject to reappear in crimes in our jurisdictions-

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 30, 2018, at 12:38 PM, [Redacted] wrote:
> 
> Great, that's her, thanks for the correct spelling.
> 
> She told me yesterday they're only doing a warrant for his home computer, which is in PG. The DoD government computer and network we can search without a warrant because the federal government owns it and there's no expectation of privacy under the Fourth Amendment. I obtain these records from our network all the time with a simple intra-agency request. The state/DA's office obviously has no control over a federal government network, so it makes sense they think they might need to get a warrant (if the request came from them acting in a state capacity, and not us), but again, you are part of DoD/federal gov, not the state.
>

> -----Original Message-----
> From: [Redacted]
> Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 11:30 AM
> To: [Redacted]
> Subject: Re: [Redacted] Case

3
Last week TK and I discussed the search issue with DDA [redacted] (I think correct name and spelling).

We discussed the issue for state electronic data and agreed a state search was best way if we prosecute the joint agencies cases at DA.

I will call. Although I don't have the case with me since I am in training. My frustration is fighting all the entities which delays efficient investigation. I look forward to discussing the case Ma'am.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 30, 2018, at 11:22 AM, [redacted] wrote:

She's the deputy DA on the case whose name I'm not sure how to spell, but she pronounced it "nana-nye." Is this who you talked to?

And you're welcome to get a warrant from any competent authority, either state or federal. If you need a warrant from a federal judge, please let me know immediately so I can get you the proper forms to fill out.

If the only thing you are searching is on a federal government network (i.e. NEC records), there is no need to get a warrant. The request can be made via my office for any federal criminal investigation (which this qualifies). I discussed this with TK two weeks ago.

Please feel free to call me at your earliest convenience so we can make sure we're on the same page. Thanks!

Original Message-----

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 10:53 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: [redacted] Case

Ma'am, I understand the "talk" the past year yet how we move to acquire evidence and search technical data from a computer which is what is pending to "prove" this case must be determined which court up front. Getting a search authorization by federal/army standards appear to be different for state. I understand the assimilated crimes are assimilating state code. I think for an active investigation requiring action the investigator to know up front and your voice message on the 20th gave the ok for state since it is a joint.

I am curious who in the DA's Office you are speaking to. I am also interested should we get a state search warrant or federal? For the computer.

Are you back in the area able to assist on this case now?

On Mar 30, 2018, at 10:44 AM, [redacted] wrote:

This has always potentially been a federal case as far as your investigation is concerned. This is the same for every other case investigated by your office (which is technically a federal/Army law enforcement office, and NOT state agency) as I've explained over the last year. Just because you guys might be citing state charges for now (as assimilated under the Assimilative Crimes Act, which is the only legal authority that lets us use state law) does NOT make it a state case. In fact, under the statute, the state crimes "become" federal crimes as a matter of law when assimilated.

------Original Message-----

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 10:44 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: [redacted] Case

Ma'am, I understand the "talk" the past year yet how we move to acquire evidence and search technical data from a computer which is what is pending to "prove" this case must be determined which court up front. Getting a search authorization by federal/army standards appear to be different for state. I understand the assimilated crimes act assimilating state code. I think for an active investigation requiring action the investigator to know up front and your voice message on the 20th gave the ok for state since it is a joint.

I am curious who in the DA's Office you are speaking to. I am also interested should we get a state search warrant or federal? For the computer.

Are you back in the area able to assist on this case now?

On Mar 30, 2018, at 10:44 AM, [redacted] wrote:

This has always potentially been a federal case as far as your investigation is concerned. This is the same for every other case investigated by your office (which is technically a federal/Army law enforcement office, and NOT state agency) as I've explained over the last year. Just because you guys might be citing state charges for now (as assimilated under the Assimilative Crimes Act, which is the only legal authority that lets us use state law) does NOT make it a state case. In fact, under the statute, the state crimes "become" federal crimes as a matter of law when assimilated.
Essentially, either the state (DA) or the feds (my office) can prosecute this, and we will decide who does that once we review the case and coordinate on our end (we meaning my office and the DA’s office) as we do with every other case over which we have concurrent interest and jurisdiction.

I don’t know yet until I review the evidence what charges are proven by the evidence. If we proceed federally, I can charge crimes under the US Code (i.e. the federal stalking or federal harassment statutes under Title 18), or I might assimilate relevant provisions of California Penal Code under 18 USC 13. If the state prosecutes it, obviously they would proceed with CPC provisions. At this point, that is still to be determined.

v/r,

-----Original Message-----
From:  
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 10:37 AM
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] Case

When did it turn federal? We discussed this when you were in federal court- I discussed the technical issues for investigative purposes. Your voice mail said ok with state - because Ma'am it's extremely important to know our authorities before we investigate as the rules can be different. Help me with this one, please.

Sent from my IPhone

On Mar 30, 2018, at 10:32 AM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for the update. This is a federal case on our end, and the correct liaison for us would come from the US Attorney's office. I've already alerted the victim-witness liaison about this case, and just need to provide her the contact info for the victim. Or if you prefer, you can give the victim the following information:

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From:  
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2018 10:28 AM
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] Case

Ma'am,
I provided the victim the DA's Office victim/ witness right contact phone numbers on Tuesday.

As we discussed previously while you were in federal court in San Francisco, we are planning to use the CA penal code sections. I have also spoke with the DA office on the legal/joint CA agencies that have reports. They are CSUMB, Salinas (they have a report at DA pending our report) MCSO, CHP, and PGPD.

I am overseeing DET [redacted] writing of a search warrant on the govt computer. He needs to interview the NEC tech for the warrant can be submitted. We are back on this Monday. Can we discuss on Monday? Or I can go in PD on Sunday and get info from case file and call you. We are on days off, I am in training today San Jose.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 30, 2018, at 10:14 AM, [redacted] wrote:

INV [redacted]

Can you call me with an update on this case? The DA's office called me yesterday about this case and I think we're generally on the same page as far as our concurrent investigations still pending (between POMP and PGPD).

And can you also send me the victim contact information? I want to forward this to the victim/witness liaison office at the US Attorney's office so she can be notified of her victim rights and available programs under federal law.

Thanks!

[redacted]

Chief, Military Justice

Special Assistant United States Attorney DLIFLC & Presidio of Monterey

Office: (831) 242-6416
Blackberry: (831) 402-0008
Fax: 6392 DSN Prefix: 768
The DOJ attorney had a telephonic conference with the Defendant's attorney, Mr. [redacted] and they agreed to explore an amicable resolution which would not require the state judge to order us to produce anything, and which would not require DOJ to remove the matter to federal court. DOJ will speak to Mr. [redacted] next week after MAJ [redacted] reviews the responsive records.

To that end, Mr. [redacted] submitted a slightly revised request, and is seeking:

* Any and all police reports generated by the incident on February 4, 2017 that resulted in Monterey County Criminal Case # [redacted];
  * This specifically includes, but is not limited to, any supplemental report involving Officer [redacted]'s use of a firearm during the incident in question (Mr. [redacted] does not appear to have the supplemental reports that you provided yesterday);
  * Any prior complaints, accusations, or sanctions regarding the use of excessive force against officer [redacted];
  * Any official sanctions or reprimands stemming from Officer [redacted]'s use of his firearm in this case;
  * The results of any investigations into Officer [redacted]'s use of his firearm in this case;
  * Any prior complaints, accusations, or sanctions regarding dishonesty or moral turpitude for officers [redacted]
* This specifically includes, but is not limited to, any incidents regarding the omission of material fact or falsification of police reports.

We will need to search all places that are reasonably likely to contain responsive records. This would include the four officers' disciplinary files, if any, going back five years, and not just their personnel files. Discoverable documents will include those showing perjurious conduct, dishonesty, or any other exculpatory or impeachment information.

Thanks for the help, let me know if there are any questions. I'll keep you both updated if I hear anything more on this end.

v/r

[redacted]
Subject: Suspend 21 AUG 2017: Pitchess Motion for Discovery

Good afternoon! I know that Chief [redacted] already spoke with you about this issue, but we received a discovery motion from the public defender’s office concerning a criminal case that is currently pending in the CA courts. POM PD responded to the incident since it occurred on OMC, and filed the police report that is forming the basis for the current case.

I’ve spoken with the folks at US Army Litigation Division and the Department of Justice, who would handle any litigation on the Army’s behalf. They would prefer to resolve this request ahead of the scheduled motion deadline and avoid the need for a hearing altogether. To that end, can you please assist with conducting a thorough search for any responsive records, and provide those records (or a response in the negative if no such records exist) no later than 21 August 2017 so I may forward them to LITDIV (MAJ [redacted] on the cc line) and DOJ? Upon review of the records, DOJ will likely craft a response contesting the court’s jurisdiction, but consenting to disclosure of the appropriate records. As part of that disclosure, you would need to sign a declaration affirming that as the custodian of the records, you conducted a diligent search. DOJ may need your assistance crafting the details of the declaration (i.e. what database did you search, what were the key terms that you used, etc), so you may want to keep some notes relating to the process that you use to search the records.
The motion requests that we search our records for Officers [REDACTED] over the past five years for the following documents:

(1) All complaints from any and all sources relating to false arrest, perjury, dishonesty, writing of false police reports, omitting material information in police reports, and any other evidence of misconduct amounting to moral turpitude, including the names, addresses, dates of birth, and telephone numbers of all person who filed complaints, who may be witnesses, and/or who were interviewed by investigators or other personnel from the Seaside [I assume that the meant Presidio of Monterey] Police Department, the dates and locations of the incident complained of, as well as the date of the filing of such complaints, including any documentation relating to the writing of false police reports omitting material information in police reports.

(2) Any discipline imposed upon the named officers as a result of the investigation of any citizen complaint described in item (1).

(3) Any other material which is exculpatory or impeaching.

(4) The statements of all police officers who are listed as either complainants or witnesses within the meaning of items (1) and (3).

(5) All files and complaints or other documents, no matter how catalogued or described no matter where kept, whether sustained, not sustained or classified frivolous, which contain information relevant to excessive and/or unreasonable use of force, false arrest, perjury dishonesty, writing of false police reports, omitting material information in police reports, and any other evidence of misconduct amounting to moral turpitude or other acts relevant to the credibility of the described officer are to be produced.

From my conversation with [REDACTED], it sounds like he is not aware of any responsive records, but there is an internal affairs inquiry concerning Officer [REDACTED]'s statement being left out of the original report, then recorded as a reporting party supplemental report, rather than a witness statement. Records relating to this IA and the complaint that triggered it would likely fall under category (1) and (4) above, so please include that.

[REDACTED] - if this IA is not complete yet, can you provide me with what you have? Records involved in an open inquiry may be protected from ultimate disclosure, but MAJ [REDACTED] and the DOJ attorneys can help determine if the records are in fact responsive before anything is released. It would be better to send too much than not enough at this point.

Let me know what, if anything, I can do to help. Thanks in advance for the assistance!

v/r

CPT, JA
Administrative Law Attorney
DLIFLC & Presidio of Monterey
1336 Plummer Street, Bldg 275
Monterey, CA 93944

COMM: (831) 242-7345
FAX: 6392
DSN Prefix: 768

ATTORNEY CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
The information contained in this e-mail and any accompanying attachments may constitute attorney work product and/or client advice, which are legally privileged. This information is for official use only. It should not be released to unauthorized persons and should be maintained in a separate file.

If you are not the intended recipient of this information, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail or by calling (831) 242-7345.
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2005 12:12 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Follow-up to Off-Post Transportation Question

FYI
-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2005 4:36 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Follow-up to Off-Post Transportation Question

Officer [Redacted]

Recently, you asked whether it is lawful for POMPD to transport civilians off the installation to the Monterey County Sheriff's Office. I offered the following response. "POMPD transportation of civilian personnel from the installation directly to civilian law enforcement agencies located off the installation does not violate the PCA, so long as the civilian personnel were lawfully detained by POMPD on the installation pursuant to the Installation Commander's inherent authority to protect the safety, security and well-being of the installation and its inhabitants or to ensure the good order and discipline of the installation was not compromised. If the primary purpose of such transportation is to further this inherent authority of the Installation Commander, then such transportation fits squarely within the Military Purpose Doctrine, which is an exception to the PCA."

Today, you asked for further clarification regarding detention of civilians on the installation and transportation of detained civilians off the installation to the Monterey County Sheriff's office.

The key is to ensure that your law enforcement activity (detention and transportation) has a legitimate Primary Military Purpose. Some factors to consider are the location of the crime, the recency of the crime, and severity of the crime. With a straight face, you can say there is a legitimate primary military purpose to detaining a civilian that a POMPD officer witnesses commit a misdemeanor on the installation. On the other hand, I do not believe you can say with a straight face that there is a primary military purpose for POMPD to execute a warrant on a civilian residing on the installation for a DUI committed last month off the installation. In this second example, the nexus between the law enforcement activity and the Installation Commander's inherent authority to ensure good order and discipline on the installation is far too attenuated to say detention has a primary military purpose.

Violation of the PCA can lead to PERSONAL liability of your police officers. For example, POMPD is transporting a civilian off the installation to the Monterey County Sheriff's office. During the transportation the civilian is injured. The civilian might sue the police officer personally, and argue the police officer was not acting with a Primary Military Purpose. If the Judge determines the police officer was not acting with a primary military purpose, the judge might find a PCA violation. The Judge might further find that the PCA violation causes the police officer to lose the scope of employment protection from financial liability.

VR,

[Redacted]

CPT, JA
Special Assistant United States Attorney
(831) 242-7321

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Sunday, February 06, 2005 1:57 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Off-Post Transportation Question

Officer [Redacted]

I missed your call Friday, so we were not able to discuss the specific facts of your transportation request. However, if your transportation request fits within one of the following paragraphs, then the off-post transportation is not a problem. Hopefully this

[Redacted]
Email sent Sunday 2 August 2020, to [redacted], District Director, Office of Congressman [redacted] CA-20
142 W Alisal St Room E-116
Salinas, CA 93901

Subject: Documents relating to [redacted] reclassification and her attempts to get attention to the policing matters at Presidio Police Department

1. 12 October 2017 Letter Reclassification 1811 Criminal Investigator, pages 1-3
2. DA Form 7433, Privacy Act Information Inspector General requesting relief dated, 20171031
3. DA Form 1559, Inspector General Action Request
5. Letter dated 29 November 2017, from IMCOM Inspector General
6. Email to MG [redacted] from [redacted] regarding “Policing Concerns Presidio of Monterey Police, dated 11 May 2018
7. My letter written to MG [redacted] pages 1 through 3, dated 11 May 2018
8. Email to DES [redacted] from [redacted], subject Appeal Packet, dated August 2, 2018, pages 1 and 2.
10. [redacted] input to MAR relating to the Presidio of Monterey jurisdiction pages 1-3.
11. Email from [redacted] to COL [redacted], GC, subject Authority to deputize dated 13 SEP 2018, pages 1-6.
12. Email from [redacted] to COL [redacted], GC, Jurisdiction-Presidio, dated 30 October 2018.

NOTE: Although these all relate to getting higher command attention on the policing and jurisdictional issues at the Presidio of Monterey, they do not include all documents, emails, arrest records, and attempts in getting assistance on the work the Presidio Police Department has been doing.
### PRIVACY ACT INFORMATION RELEASE STATEMENT

For use of this form, see AR 20-1; the proponent agency is the Office of The Inspector General.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. GS 11 Supervisory 1811</th>
<th>authorize access or release of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any inspector general information or records pertaining to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspector general information or records pertaining to my request specifically for relief from reclassification as 1811 until a thorough assessment of duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the following individual(s):
- General release

(Rank/Title, First M/Last Name)

SIGNATURE: __________________________

DATE (YYYYMMDD): 20170331

DA FORM 7433, APR 2009
Dear [Name] [Redacted],

I hope this email finds you well. Sarah, at your Office, provided me your email. The attached letter is in regards to the DACP's policing concerns locally here at the Presidio of Monterey. I am uncertain what you know personally about the area as I imagine you have direct contact with the local Monterey CID Office. This is not in regards to them specifically as I believe my section in MPI has been working well together. This is about the LE policing overall locally.

Respectfully,

[Name] [Redacted]

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office:
(831)242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.
May 11, 2018

Dear MG [Name]

My name is [Name]. I am currently employed as a Supervisory Detective, MPI, for the Presidio of Monterey Police Department (POMPD). I have been employed at the POMPD since November 22, 2004. I am one of the MPI 1811’s that was recently reclassified as a 0083 in October 2017.

Prior to my employment at POMPD I retired from municipal policing from the City of Seaside, Police Department. My civilian police career however began three years after joining the Army as a MP in 1976 in the State of Ohio in which I have worked LE at the State and County level. I have served honorably in the Army as a military police officer and retired from the Army Reserve on November 1, 2016, after 40 years of continuous service.

Of my 40 years of service, the last 29 years was as an Army Reserve CID Agent. Since 911, I mobilized 5 times with USACIDC. In 2003 to Iraq, and between 2009 and 2013 I served on 3 different assignments within my 4 years of mobilization as an IMA, assigned at CID HQ.

My last 4 years of my service before retirement, I served as the Command Chief Warrant Officer, CW5, for the 200th Military Police Command. I have had the privilege to work with 3 Commanding Generals at the 200th, attend senior leader conferences for CCAR, USACIDC, and USAMPS from 2013 until I retired November 2016, and I am aware of the direction the Army and the Army Military Police Corps is headed to face the challenges of the future.

I write to you out of respect of you as the Commanding General of the Army’s Military Police Corps, with concerns I have regarding the policing environment at the Presidio of Monterey. I offer you my overall law enforcement background as a reference that I care about LE and the direction and focus of the policing requirements at the Presidio Police Department.

Policing at the Presidio is strictly done by DACP’s with the exception of our Army CID. The jurisdiction for the Presidio comprises three different sites located within the cities of Monterey and Seaside. We have no exclusive jurisdiction. We have no local memorandums of agreement with the City of Seaside and Monterey Police Departments.

The Presidio Garrison requests through the State of California to maintain military jurisdiction for the Ord Military Community (OMC) because it is the military housing area for the Defense Language Institute, in order to maintain command and control, otherwise the entire jurisdiction would be the city of Seaside police.

[Signature]
POMPD patrols all three locations. The majority of crime that occurs in our OMC jurisdiction is committed by "civilians," generally civilian on civilian, who either reside in our jurisdiction with no military connection, travel through our jurisdiction as it is not gated, or visit residents residing in our jurisdiction.

Our area of responsibility for LE can be complex. Besides enforcing the UCMJ for the Army and all the sister services, Coast Guard, and National Guard, we refer criminal cases to the State Court through the assimilated crimes act. Yet, we are not protected by the State Peace Officers Bill of Rights like other State of California Peace officers. Our SJA locally does not protect our rights when cases are prosecuted and motions filed to have access to our personnel files.

The work handled by the Presidio DACP’s can be complex work. Yet, often when the patrol officer exits the police station he or she is uncertain from one day to another what codes to enforce - the state penal code or federal code. The UCMJ is the easiest and it is the only code taught to DACP’s at USAMPS DACP Academy.

Any mandated "will arrest" offenses under the state code are taken to the local Sheriff's Office for detention and the DACP writes the police report and if required testifies in court because there is no federal infrastructure. These cases are not handed over to the civilian police to investigate. The only federal remedy is issuing a cvb and allow the assailant to return home or remain in our jurisdiction/military housing area.

I have asked our Garrison Commander COL. [redacted] to reach out to Career Program 19 under OPMG's office to request an assessment of work done locally. He has not done so. I have gone through the local IG and IMCOM IG asking the same. No resolutions. IMCOM PMO is aware of our working conditions since I have been employed here. It appears to me nobody wants to address the facts of the work situation of policing here to offer viable working solutions.

I wrote Mr. [redacted] at CP19 office asking to speak to him as I felt it was important that you are properly apprised of the situation. He has not offered me the ability to speak to him. I believe it is related to his prospective that I am appealing the reclassification act of my 1811 position. Although I am appealing that action, I advised I had other concerns on the policing responsibilities locally and I sent him a copy of the newspaper article regarding congressional efforts to address child-on-child sexual assaults and pointing out to him that the Presidio had no such issues because our GS 11, MPI, 1811's handled those cases, at least since my tenure since 2004.

It seems the OSJA responsibility is to prosecute cases after the police department enforces the law. I believe however, since Fort Ord's closure in 1994, the federal system locally does not have an infrastructure to prosecute the volume of cases. The police dynamics here are confusing in respect to an officer enforcing federal law. I believe the Army has a responsibility to assist the Presidio Police Department with viable solutions. I believe we need assistance from the top to address the policing issues locally. This includes the policy makers who hold the DACP's to standards with
regulations that do not address our challenging environment locally. I request your serious consideration to assess our policing environment.

I'd like to add that the dynamics working police matters at a Garrison as a DACP involves layers of politics I am not accustom to as a CID agent and believe serious thought should be taken into separating the command for the military police/DACP's to remove undue command influence.

I would like to make myself available to speak with you regarding my concerns on the policing matters locally and direction on how to address them.

Thank You for your time, Sir. I hope to hear from you.

Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Employed:

Presidio of Monterey Police
MPI Supervisory Detective
4468 Giggling Road
Monterey, Ca 93944

(831) 242-6926

[Redacted]

CW5(R) / MP

[Redacted]
Thank You for asking. For me, specifically because my employment was prior to 2005 the date the AR 190-30 that listed 1811's as DAC's and codified in law, as well as the fact that Fort Ord Police had 1811's of which I have 4 names of 1811's that retired as 1811 from Fort Ord, and that my position did not have special retirement (a specific listed cause for the audit) as well as my secondary position is an indication of such, the fact a had a desk audit completed I feel strongly needs to be addressed in the appeal (it resulted in clearly indicating Lerma and Balala's were doing 1811 work) should be included in my appeal to support my specific appeal.

I see information pertaining specific to and 's loss of retirement, but nothing on the fact why am I targeted if I do not get the special retirement. In addition, my job hiring required two specific skills to get employed. 60% is criminal intelligence. I had to have those skills. I did with my DOJ certification received by CA DOJ as a crime analyst May 2004. I had these skills to be eligible to apply for the job posted on USA Jobs. Without such I would not have been eligible and would not have applied.

Because IMCOM G1 and PMG Career Program 19 were unwilling to examine the specific work as compared to my job specifics, I assert I am being targeted outside the scope of audit.

I hope you will consider adding such to my specific position appeal. I am also interested in knowing who is actually filling the TDA positions at the police departments and if any of the police department/DES positions are the bill payers for other Garrison Directorates. Word here over the years is my old GS 12 Supervisory Criminal Investigator position 1811 position was the bill payor for Resource Management. I have every intent to request this information as I believe it is relevant specially to the past treatment of my 1811 position. If you can assist me with this I would greatly appreciate it.

I suggest speak on their specific appeals.

Thank You again for asking.

R/

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office:
(831)242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 2, 2018 8:33 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Appeal Packets

[Redacted]

Wanted to check with you on where you stand with the appeal packets. [Redacted] spoke to me about signing my memo and I will gladly do so. Wanted to know if you think anything else should be added into my memo relative to the complexity of work that you are performing.

I can tailor my Memo to support what it is that you are looking for. If you will be asking for your special retirement back, then I can write my Memo to support that. If you are asking to be returned to 1811 status, then I think the current memo was written to show the complexity of work is greater than the 0083 classification guide accounts for.

Please let me know which way each of you would like for me to proceed. Thanks.

[Redacted]

Director of Emergency Services
US Army Garrison Presidio of Monterey
831-242-7773 /DSN: 768-7773
Fax: 831-242-7730
From: [blacked out]  
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 10:47 AM  
To: [blacked out]  
Subject: RE: Authority to Deputize 

COL [blacked out]

I appreciate your acknowledgement to my questions as well as you taking the lead to address the matter. I ask to be kept in the loop as the process continues and I offer you my expertise in Law Enforcement matters. The jurisdictional concerns have been addressed repeatedly over the years. My assertion is the Presidio Police Department is the "fall guy" entity that is blamed for the lack of a Federal enforcement versus the Army taking responsibility. I say this because the jurisdictional and crime committed on OMC was dealt with through MOU with the local LE and District Attorney without strategic planning and follow through. The neglect of such resulted in the Presidio Police Department not having the proper legal advice or tools to address the complexity of it. Police Officers are blamed for doing what is "told" versus "clear authorities" and guidance because it changes based upon the circumstances of the day, the SJA, and/or the Garrison Leadership.

I also emphasize until the situation is fixed with a permanent solution that implementing an "approved" DOD/Army instrument as outlined in the DODI 5525.13 (Limitation of Authority to Deputize DOD Uniformed Law Enforcement Personnel by State and Local Governments) as policy stops the nonsense that Presidio Police Department is acting rogue "Wild-Wild-West" doing whatever they want to enforcement state laws that violates Army policies as well as the constant "being told" versus memorialized guidance protecting each police personnel from always taking the fall for the lack of proper direction. Somebody must get down into the "weeds or go down the rabbit hole" to fully understand the complexity that exits. I am talking about a Army foundation that supports the LE here at Presidio. This LE support includes paying for services a sexual assault exam the county provides, paying for urinalysis DOJ Lab provides for prosecution of a subject arrested for under the influence of drugs in State Court, victim protective orders in Federal court, disposition of evidence, defense, advocate support, etc.

The status quo as of last Friday when CPT [blacked out] met with police supervisors including me was "we should not be doing felonies" and we should not work cases such as the statutory rape that occurred on 12 August on lower POM even if the civilian police refused or CID refused. This is unbelievable to me. This is not protecting the Federal Government from liability or as a victim or supports what Congress is addressing about sexual assault is not being handles on military bases.

I feel very passionate there is a need to establish an "approved DOD/Army temporary fix" until a "permanent DOD/Army fix" is in place here at the Presidio to protect us "police" from the constant inconsistencies of process resulting in blame and disciplinary considerations when a police officer should have confidence in their authority to do their job, as well as the ability to properly advise and assist and support the civilian public they are servicing, which currently is the majority of what we do, with the professional LE product and the backing of our leadership. Handling a civilian victim case with no Army nexus other than the jurisdiction location is presently being question by our DES as to why we do what we do as if the DES is not aware of the historical practice or has offered a solution.

Currently, I am unsure if I should be handling a civilian case of Ms. [blacked out] because I have yet received an answer from the DES who asks the Chief of Police why the case is not given to Seaside PD. This puts me in the middle and at odds with both Ms. [blacked out] and my civilian DES leadership. I should not be put in odds or in the middle of any case with victims or subjects because the DES does not know how to advise me. This, Sir, is what I am talking about when saying we need an "approved temporary fix" in "real time" that is supported by DES, Garrison Leadership, and the DOD/Army policy. If I have conflicts in understanding my place, my authorities, with my longevity of 42 years Army LE and Civilian
LE experience, what kind of conflicts would you imagine a new Presidio Army Police Officer barely get off of probation is having to tackle with here at the Presidio in "present time" is facing.

I assert it is not right and I am surprised that nobody is addressing this fact.

Respectfully,

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office:
(831)242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 8:53 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Authority to Deputize

This is something that I am discussing the FORA Director and then with the municipalities. I meet with the FORA Director next week and this is one of my biggest concerns.
I don't have an answer for you other than it will take time to do it right and ensure that all citizens are protected appropriately. So I owe you more, but this is something I am closely following because I need to get out of this business, but can't until someone else assumes it.

V/R

[Redacted]

COL, MI
Commanding
USAG Presidio of Monterey
Bldg. 614, Lewis Rd, Ste 212
Monterey, CA 93944

Office: (831) 242-6604
Cell: (831) 402-5085

We are the Army's Home - Serving the Rugged Professional Learn more at http://www.imcom.army.mil/

-----Original Message-----
From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 5:07 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Authority to Deputize

COL [Redacted]

I agree with you Sir. My concern is how long until we get it set up? Until we have that foundation in place to get the municipalities to handle the state law and the Federal system in place to handle the crime as Federal this is the "approved" way for the Army to address "real time-current" policing as a "temporary fix" until a "permanent fix" (infrastructure or foundation) is in place. How long is expected to have this Federal process in place and the municipalities on board? It has been neglected since the closure in 1994. There are many layers to set up an effective LE infrastructure in order to properly address corrections and detention issues, victim witness issues, court, training, etc.

From your perspective do you see a problem with a correct approved "temporary fix" until this is in place? Or do you see a quick transition period or end date?

Establishing a change in policing will require changes in relationships and, potentially, changes in procedures with the courts, prosecutor's office, jail, community corrections (probation, parole), and defense attorneys (e.g., public defenders). Such change in work to Federal may significantly affect the workloads of these other agencies as well.

Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Presidio Police
Thanks! I am not looking to enforce state law. I want to get us back to enforcing Federal law and get the municipalities to step up and do their job.

The DA guidance is to divest ourselves of missions that don't support readiness and enforcing state laws, that should be enforced by state entities, doesn't support our readiness.

Having said that, I know why we have been doing what we have, but we need to get out of it. And that is where I need the municipalities to be.

Thanks again!

V/R

COL, MI
Commanding
USAG Presidio of Monterey
-----Original Message-----
From: [Name Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 1:38 PM
To: [Name Redacted]
Subject: Authority to Deputize

COL [Name Redacted]

The attached DODI 5525.13 dated 28 SEP 2017, is the way to deal with the local policing in concurrent jurisdiction until a better policing policy is in place.

This DODI has been brought to the attention of previous Garrison leadership, including SJA and DES. The end result is nobody will push it forward.

Paragraph 4. Speak to the exceptions when essential command LE functions within jurisdictions hinders lack authority to enforce State and local enforcement, need for effectively LE cannot be effectively by assistance from LE agencies, and adequate internal safeguards and management controls exit to ensure proper exercise of authority.

Historically, POMP has tried to get the DES and Garrison Leadership support of this avenue as an approved LE authority locally.

Respectfully,

[Name Redacted]

Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor

Office:
(831)242-6926

Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851

Mailing address:
4468 Gigling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it
in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.
I was told you would like to see the information being discussed within the CID Groups regarding Army Police jurisdiction which includes the Presidio's police jurisdiction. I would be glad to share it with you. I am good to hand it to you directly. Would you like me to drop it off to you?

Respectfully,

[Name]
Presidio Police
Investigations Supervisor
Office:
(831)242-6926
Police Dispatch:
(831)242-7851
Mailing address:
4468 Gigiling Road
Monterey, CA 93944

WARNING:

This message may contain "For Official Use Only / Law Enforcement Sensitive" information. Do not disseminate includes forwarding the contents of this message, without the approval of the sender. If you are not the intended addressee, or the person responsible for delivering it to the intended addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorized manner; to do so is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail by mistake, advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software.