

CALIFORNIA
ELECTRONIC
INTERCEPTIONS REPORT



Annual Report
to the
Legislature
2010

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General



Division of Criminal Law

Appeals, Writs & Trials Unit

This annual report is available on the
California Attorney General's website:

<http://ag.ca.gov>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1 Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2010	2
Table 2 General Description of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2010	3
Table 3 Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges and Court Activity During Calendar Year 2010	4
Table 4 Description of Communications Obtained and Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2010	5
Table 5 Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report.....	74
Table 6 Costs of Electronic Interceptions During Calendar Year 2010	104
Table 7 Jurisdictions Reporting No Electronic Interception Activity During Calendar Year 2010	131
Table 8 Summary of Supplemental Reports for Interceptions Conducted in Prior Years	132
Appendix A: Penal Code Section 629.62 Report by Attorney General.....	135

Executive Summary

The Attorney General's Electronic Interceptions Report 2010 is issued in compliance with Penal Code section 629.62 and can be referenced on the Attorney General's website at <http://ag.ca.gov>.

Table 1 reflects that 19 California counties conducted wiretaps in 2010, resulting in a total of 627 electronic interception orders. The electronic interceptions resulted in 696 arrests and 184 convictions thus far, with the majority of the arrests and convictions arising from narcotics offenses.

Table 2 contains a description of the targeted offense, the location of the intercept, and the device intercepted.

Table 3 sets forth the number of electronic interception orders and extensions applied for in 2010, the average length of the interceptions, and the court activity resulting from the electronic interceptions.

Table 4 describes the communications obtained. It also sets forth comments by law enforcement on the usefulness of the electronic interception. The positive remarks regarding the importance of evidence derived from state wiretaps continue to validate electronic interceptions as a critical crime-fighting tool.

Table 5 contains the date of compliance with the inventory order and the number of inventory notices sent. It also lists the name of the applicant and the judge authorizing the interception.

Table 6 compiles the costs of the interception, which are broken down by the nature and quantity of personnel used and resource cost.

Table 7 lists the jurisdictions reporting no electronic interception activity during 2010.

Table 8 provides a supplemental report on arrests, convictions, costs, and trials based on interceptions conducted in prior years that were not previously reported.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please call the Criminal Law Division of the Attorney General's Office at (916) 324-5267.

Table 1
Arrests and Convictions Resulting from Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	No. of Orders	Number of Persons Arrested		Arrest Offenses						Conviction Offenses						Number of Persons Convicted	
		Total	Avg. per Order	Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Total	Avg. per Order
Imperial	17	2	1.0			2									0		
Kern	13	19	>1	1	11	17			1		5	5			5	<1	
Los Angeles	192	155	>1	36		118			1			69			69	3	
Merced	2	7	3			7									0		
Monterey	12	23	>1			23						17			17	>1	
Orange	39	61	>1			41			6			4			4	<1	
Riverside	75	52	1<			52						11			11	<1	
Sacramento	31	44	>1	4		40			4			18		1	19	<1	
San Bernardino	110	12	<1			11		1						1	1	<1	
San Diego	74	204	3			203			155			45			45	<1	
San Joaquin	4	4	1.0	3					1						0		
San Mateo	3	2	<1	2											0		
Santa Barbara	13	84	6			42						15			15	>1	
Santa Clara	4	11	3			11									0		
Sonoma	1	0													0		
Stanislaus	11	2	<1	1		1						1			1	<1	
Sutter	1	0													0		
Tulare	7	0													0		
Ventura	18	16	<1	5	3	8						5			5	<1	
Total:	627	698		52	14	576	0	1	168	0	5	190	0	0	2	192	

Table 2
General Description of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	No. of Orders	Targeted Offenses (Offenses Specified in Order)						Targeted Location					Targeted Device				
		Murder	Gang	Narcotics	Terrorism	Kidnapping	Other	Residence	Business	Public Area	Portable Device	Other	Cell Phone	Land Line	Pager	Computer	Other
Imperial	17			17									17				
Kern	13	1	4	10								12	2				
Los Angeles	192	22	1	172			1	8	1		194		194	7			
Merced	2			2							2		2				
Monterey	12		12	12							11		12				
Orange	39	1		38							39		39				
Riverside	75			75							75		75				
Sacramento	31	12		19			1				31		31	11			
San Bernardino	110	1	4	106		2	2				9		106			2	
San Diego	74	11	6	66		1							74				
San Joaquin	4	4									4		4				
San Mateo	3	1	2								1		3	1			
Santa Barbara	13			13							13		13				
Santa Clara	4			4				4			4		4				
Sonoma	1			1							1		1				
Stanislaus	11	9	7	8							1		11				
Sutter	1	1									1		1				
Tulare	7	7		7							7		7				
Ventura	18	8	2	9				6			6		18	1			

Table 3
Electronic Interception Orders Issued by Judges
and Court Activity During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions						Total Duration of Wiretaps			Motions to Suppress			Number of Trials Resulting from Intercepts
	Applications	Granted	Modified/Amended	Denied	Not Installed/Installed Not Used	Applications	Granted	Modified/Amended	Denied	Not Installed/Installed Not Used	Average Length	Requested Days	Actual Days	Avg. per Order	Granted	Denied	Pending	
Imperial	17	17	2									450	225	13				0
Kern	13	13										390	272	21				0
Los Angeles	192	192			10	61	61			10	30	7710	6443	33				1
Merced	2	2				3	3				18	90	90	45				0
Monterey	12	12	1			5	5				32	520	323	27				0
Orange	39	39			1					1		990	848	26		1		0
Riverside	75	75										2640	2195	29				0
Sacramento	31	31				10	10				24	1124	815	26				20
San Bernardino	110	106			8	56	55			8	30	4918	4000	36				0
San Diego	74	73		1	2	38	36			2	30	3223	2253	30				2
San Joaquin	4	4										120	55	14				0
San Mateo	3	3										90	14	5				0
Santa Barbara	13	13	1									290	269	21				0
Santa Clara	4	4				1	1				30	150	125	31				0
Sonoma	1	1										30	30	30				0
Stanislaus	11	11	1			1	1				30	360	218	20				0
Sutter	1	1										14	14	14				0
Tulare	7	7	1									210						0
Ventura	18	18	1									420	321	18				11

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Imperial	2010-IM-1	9	339	15	85	Target proved to be tangential to the primary drug trafficking organization (DTO), the subject of the investigation, and the intercept was terminated after 15 days.
	2010-IM-2	121	3,271	7	93	Interceptions established that targets were involved in narcotics trafficking but did not provide enough information to advance the investigation. The wiretap was terminated after 30 days.
	2010-IM-3	356	3,336	17	83	Seizures of 2.1 million dollars and one vehicle. One individual was arrested for bulk currency smuggling and prosecution has been deferred until completion of the investigation.
	2010-IM-4	739	12,796	6	94	
	2010-IM-5	673	10,085	9	91	Identification of additional suspects and methods of operation. Seizure of \$106,550 in cash. Seizure of one vehicle. Arrest of one individual, deferred prosecution until completion of the investigation.
	2010-IM-6	305	9,831	3	97	Identification of additional suspects and methods of operations.
	2010-IM-7	87	2,114	27	73	Identification of additional suspects and methods of operation.
	2010-IM-8	284	9,497	1	99	Identification of additional suspects and methods of operation.
Kern	2010-KE-1	60	1,629	3.6	96	2010-KE-1: Based upon wire interception by DEA-Salt Lake City, target was tied to heroin distribution organization there and identified during interceptions at their SOS. Once 2010-KE-1 was signed, interception showed target was out of money and working in the fields. Target arrested by ICE and deported.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-2	57	2,099	38	62	This investigation confirmed that known gang members in the Delano area were committing violent acts against rival gang members and business owners. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to identify numerous members of the criminal street gang that were involved in the violent assaults, arson, and narcotic sales. At the conclusion of the wiretap investigation law enforcement personnel were able to successfully dismantle the criminal street gang organization in our local area. Without the evidence obtained from the intercepted conversations, the local criminal street gang organization would continue to commit violent assaults and arson to businesses throughout the local area. Also, due to this wiretap investigation and the dismantling of this violent gang, the Delano area did not have any homicides occur in over a year's time. Years past averaged over four homicides per year.
	2010-KE-3	4	368	53	47	This investigation targeted a methamphetamine distributor initially identified during a DEA Los Angeles Field Division (LAFD) investigation. It was determined that the user of the phone resided in Bakersfield, CA. During this wire intercept, the target stopped using the phone and the wire intercept was terminated.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-4	81	378	21	79	2010-KE-4 and 2010-KE-6: DEA-Ventura, working in conjunction with DEA's Special Operations Division (SOD) identified Suspect 1 as a member of an international heroin smuggling organization. Suspect 1 was identified as the person providing vehicles and drivers to cross heroin into the US from Mexico. During wire interception in Kern County, Suspect 1 was intercepted contacting the SOS in Mexico, a stash house operator in Los Angeles, and a Money launderer in Mexico. Suspect 1 was arrested in conjunction with, and ahead of, SOD's scheduled national takedown operation and found to be in possession of one-half pound of methamphetamine.
	2010-KE-5	18	410	52	48	See 2010-KE-2.
	2010-KE-6	75	454	2	98	See 2010-KE-4.
	2010-KE-7	39	1,869	15	85	This investigation targeted a methamphetamine distributor initially identified during a DEA Los Angeles Field Division (LAFD) investigation. It was determined that the user of the phone resided in Bakersfield, CA and the DEA Bakersfield Resident Office (BRO) initiated the wire intercept. During this wire intercept, the target's drug trafficking activity substantially diminished. During the time frame of this wire intercept, the target did not transact any methamphetamine. A lead was sent to the DEA Las Vegas, NV office and wire intercepts were initiated on the targets associates.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-8	14	169	54	46	This investigation identified a large scale narcotics organization who was led by a criminal street gang "shot caller" while that individual was in custody. Using the wiretap, law enforcement was able to solve a shooting that had occurred by one of the co-conspirators identified through the intercepted calls. During the wiretap law enforcement was able to identify numerous co-conspirators involved in the sales of methamphetamine. At the end of the wiretap law enforcement was able to successfully dismantle a drug operation and disrupt the organization of a local gang. Without the evidence obtained from intercepted conversations, law enforcement would not have been able to obtain vital evidence to prosecute the "shot caller" during this investigation.
	2010-KE-9	14	208	48	52	See 2010-KE-8.
	2010-KE-10	35	2,487	36	64	This investigation targeted a cocaine HCL and cocaine base distributor operating in Bakersfield, CA. This distributor was being supplied with kilograms of cocaine from a source of supply in Mexico, and from a source of supply in the Maywood, CA area. This cocaine distributor would then supply known gang members or associates. During this wire intercept, two individuals were arrested, one handgun was seized, approximately three ounces of cocaine base was seized, and approximately \$39,220 in US currency was seized. This investigation was continued during a later wiretap.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-11	6	35	46	64	This was a two year old homicide investigation that was mistakenly determined to be an accidental death. After re-opening the case and through the use of a wire tap, officers were able to identify the suspect, obtain a confession of how the suspect committed the crime, and during intercepted conversations, the suspect admitted to killing the victim. Without the use of the wiretap, it is likely the suspect would only have been charged with manslaughter. However, with evidence presented to the District Attorney from the wiretap, the suspect is now charged with first degree murder.
	2010-KE-12	40	2,230	19	81	This investigation targeted a cocaine HCL and cocaine base distributor operating in Bakersfield, CA. This distributor was being supplied with kilograms of cocaine from a source of supply in Mexico, and from a source of supply in the Maywood, CA area. This wiretap was a continuation of a previous wiretap. During this wire intercept, approximately five ounces of cocaine and one pound of methamphetamine was seized, approximately \$49,000 was seized, three guns were seized, and six individuals were arrested including the target of this wire intercept and one of the target's cocaine sources of supply.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-13	82	1,342	31	69	This investigation identified a large scale methamphetamine, heroin and cocaine broker and retail cocaine dealer operating in the Bakersfield, CA, area. During the investigation, the wire target attempted to broker a 7 pound methamphetamine deal with a source in Simi Valley and a second source in Bakersfield. The Wire target also attempted to broker a 5 kilogram heroin deal from a source of supply in Bakersfield. Both transactions fell through. During the investigation, one customer was stopped shortly after meeting with the wire target and cocaine was seized from the customer. During a search warrant executed at the wire targets location, approximately 12 ounces of cocaine was seized with scales and packaging materials. Also seized were an SKS assault rifle and a revolver handgun. The investigation is ongoing and a source of supply obtaining narcotics directly from Mexico is currently being targeted by DEA in Cleveland, Ohio.
Los Angeles	2010-LA-1	6	388	2	98	The target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2010-LA-4	24,838	34,724	9	91	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-8	202	14,411	19	81	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2009-LA-10	30	700	7	93	Investigation is pending.
	2010-LA-11	1,719	3,150	20	80	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-12	6,759	10,559	12	88	Ongoing investigation.
	2009-LA-13	70	1,676	2	98	Ongoing investigation.
	2009-LA-14	72	2,211	1	99	The case is still in its investigation stage.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2009-LA-15	781	1,529	9	91	The interception has provided critical information for obtaining evidence against the user of TT#1 and their co-conspirators. This case is still in its investigation stage and is anticipated, through the use of continued interceptions, to provide critical information to fully expose this DTO.
	2010-LA-17	81	1,080	14	86	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-18	98	16,424	8	92	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2009-LA-19	42	927	9	91	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2009-LA-20	150	11,753	5	95	Suspect(s) involved in this investigation are part of DTO based in Mexico and the United States. The suspect(s) in charge of the organization coordinate the shipments and sales of the narcotics via cellular phones. Pertinent conversations intercepted are crucial in order to show the suspect(s) involvement, since members within the organization are reluctant to testify against other suspect(s) involved.
	2010-LA-21	56	2,826	12	88	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-23	93	5,068	7	93	This phone was also intercepted on another wiretap. This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-24	150	7,419	1	99	Investigation pending.
2009-LA-26	17	172	13	87	The interceptions in this case are important to obtain convictions in that they show the role the targeted individuals played in this organization, the structure and actions of this organization and the elements of narcotics trafficking and conspiracy to traffic in narcotics. None of these things could be proven sufficiently without the intercepted conversation.	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-27	1	363	27	73	Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Contract Language Monitors intercepted calls consisting of target suspect communicating and coordinating other individuals/associates to plan and execute home invasion robberies in the southern California area. The intercepted calls included discussion prior to, during, and after the execution of said home invasion robberies. Said robberies occurred and affiant identified the victims and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Gang Unit is actively investigating said crimes desirous of prosecution. This wire has yet been disclosed for prosecutor use.
	2010-LA-28	150	7,513	10	90	Based on the intercepted calls, targets utilized target telephones to conduct narcotics trafficking and orchestrate related narcotics activities. Arrests and seizures during the course of the intercepted calls, furtherance law enforcement investigation, gaining cooperation and future convictions.
	2010-LA-29	13	330	29	71	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2010-LA-30	84	1,759	12	88	Suspect(s) involved in this investigation are part of a DTO based in Mexico and the United States. The suspect(s) in charge of the organization coordinate the shipments and sales of the narcotics via cellular phones. Pertinent conversations intercepted are crucial in order to show the suspect(s) involvement, since members within the organization are reluctant to testify against other suspect(s) involved.
	2010-LA-31	36	5,567	25	75	This interception has provided critical information for obtaining evidence against the user of the target telephone and their co-conspirators. This case is still in its investigation stage, and is anticipated, through the use of continued Federal wiretap affidavits, to provide critical information to fully expose this DTO.
	2010-LA-32	90	5,127	22	78	This case is still in its investigation stage .

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-33	23	1,201	27	73	The interceptions in this case are important to obtain convictions in that they show the role the targeted individuals played in this organization, the structure and actions of this organization and the elements of narcotics trafficking and conspiracy to traffic in narcotics. None of these things could be proven sufficiently without the intercepted conversations.
	2010-LA-34	43	1,668	14	86	
	2010-LA-35	13	149	23	77	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2010-LA-37	192	4,332	21	79	ICE is conducting an investigation into the narcotics trafficking of an organization that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of methamphetamine from Mexico into the Los Angeles County area for distribution. Approximately six pounds of methamphetamine and \$60,650 in narcotics proceeds have been seized based on information from this wiretap.
	2010-LA-38	93	3,645	9	91	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-39	51	2,988	19	81	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-40	228	9,228	2	98	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-42	17	1,933	5	95	Based on the intercepted calls, targets utilized target telephones to conduct narcotic trafficking and orchestrate related narcotics activity. Arrests and seizures during the course of the intercepted calls, furtherance law enforcement investigation, gaining cooperation and future convictions.
	2010-LA-43	23	106	54	46	Investigation still pending.
	2010-LA-44	1	3	0	100	
	2010-LA-45	58	8,563	7	93	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-46	0	0			No calls were intercepted. The target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2010-LA-47	37	897	26	74	Interceptions of this target telephone lead to the seizure of 65 Kilograms of cocaine. A case will be filed in the future against four individuals engaged in the conspiracy using the intercepted calls.
	2010-LA-48	614	1,060	28	72	
	2010-LA-49	965	1,881	10	90	N/A
	2010-LA-50	69	2,038	44	56	During the interception, agents arrested 20 suspects and prevented three kidnappings. Agents seized approximately 16 firearms, 25 kilograms of cocaine, 12 pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$75,000 of narcotic proceeds.
	2010-LA-51	48	1,511	26	74	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-52	140	15,901	13	87	By intercepting communications, we were able to gather pertinent information on the target's mode of transportation of narcotics, possible stash locations where narcotics are being stored and the ways in which the targets launder their money from narcotics proceeds.
	2010-LA-53	92	11,266	11	89	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-54		29,953	1	99	Without this wiretap, we would not have received valuable information in the shooting directed towards South Gate Police Department police officers. Specifically we would not have discovered several other shootings involving this gang. With this knowledge, we were able to arrest a subject who in turn will testify against his fellow gang members who were apart of the shooting directed at SGPD police officers.
	2010-LA-55		1,269	14	86	This case is still in its investigation stage.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-56	1,257	2,519	15	85	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-57	46	398	9	91	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-58	2,971	5,373	17	83	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-59	89	9,788	17	83	This wiretap solved a series of approximately three murders, nine attempted murders, and four shootings (eleven separate incidents) involving gang members.
	2010-LA-60	150	8,131	25	75	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-61	55	1,052	27	73	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-62	64	3,154	48	52	There were no arrests.
	2010-LA-63	21	710	17	83	
	2010-LA-64	27	1,181	19	81	Suspect(s) involved in this investigation are part of a DTO based in Mexico and the United States. The suspect(s) in charge of the organization coordinate the shipments and sales of the narcotics via cellular phones. Pertinent conversations intercepted are crucial in order to show the suspect(s) involvement, since members within the organization are reluctant to testify against other suspect(s) involved.
	2010-LA-65	35	1,348	11	89	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2010-LA-66	43	798	9	91	During the interception, agents arrested 20 suspects, prevented three kidnappings, seized approximately 16 firearms, 25 kilograms of cocaine, 12 pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$75,000 of narcotic proceeds.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-67	88	4,216	30	70	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using the target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-68	3,028	4,129	3	97	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-69	929	1,773	24	76	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-70	891	14,698	0	100	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-71	7	42	12	88	The case is currently pending.
	2010-LA-72	94	2,025	19	81	The investigation is still ongoing.
	2010-LA-73	3	167	20	80	Wiretap was discontinued due to lack of evidence.
	2010-LA-74	40	546	29	71	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-75	38	3,349	23	77	This wiretap solved a series of approximately three murders, nine attempted murders, and four shootings (11 separate incidents) involving gang members.
	2010-LA-76	0	0	0	0	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-77	37	326	12	88	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-78	76	901	26	74	In August 2009, LAFD/DEA - HIDTA Group 43 began investigating the narcotic trafficking activities of a methamphetamine cell based in Los Angeles County. A series of intercepted calls indicated that subjects were preparing for the arrival of several loads of narcotics. Through intercepted calls coupled with surveillance, we now know that several loads were received. Based on court authorized interceptions, a Mexico source of supply and several sister cells involved in narcotic trafficking were identified in the states of New Mexico and Missouri.
	2010-LA-79	109	5,373	18	86	This case is still in its investigation stage.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-80	31	3,725	20	80	The target subject is coordinating narcotics shipments from Mexico to Los Angeles with proceeds going back to Mexico.
	2010-LA-81	6	92	36	64	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-82	54	1,986	14	86	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject was arrested on a federal arrest warrant. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-83	43	219	2	98	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-84	71	1,819	11	89	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-85	39	2,014	6	94	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-86	72	1,017	17	83	This is an ongoing case that has identified numerous narcotics traffickers distributing methamphetamine from Mexico to Los Angeles County in California.
	2010-LA-87	47	2,142	1	99	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-88	3	93	1	99	The subject of this intercept is using a cellular telephone to conduct narcotic transactions. All other investigative means did not provide enough information to prosecute. The subject was using a prepaid cellular telephone and exhausted all monies related to the prepaid cellular telephone two days into the intercept. It is believed the subject is using a different cellular phone to conduct his narcotics activities.
	2010-LA-89	52	691	58	42	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-90	25	455	9	91	The interception confirmed that the target subject was a primary member of an interstate DTO.
	2010-LA-91	18	200	16	84	Ongoing investigation.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-92	72	1,571	17	83	Interceptions have led to the positive identification of additional narcotics associates and sources of supply to the main target of the investigation. Additionally, intercepted communications have led to the identification of additional locations possibly used as stash locations for illegal narcotics and narcotics proceeds.
	2010-LA-93	104	6,692	30	70	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. This investigation is continuing.
	2010-LA-95	1,117	1,792	17	83	During the interception , agents seized approximately 900 grams of heroin, 1,450 grams of methamphetamine, 1 firearm, and approximately \$10,000 of narcotics proceeds. Investigators also arrested two subjects. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-96	23	446	8	92	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-97	20	1,077	13	87	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-98	9	532	2	98	The target only used the telephone for 8 days, but in that 8 days he talked about both drug distribution an illegal money proceeds. This wiretap helped identify additional sources of supply, facilitators, and customers and led to additional wiretap.
	2010-LA-99	104	3,698	17	83	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Case is continuing.
	2010-LA-100	34	1,497	17	83	The target subject discontinued using these phones. This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-101	6	42,518	2	98	Interceptions involving numerous target telephone numbers led investigators to the identity of the suspect, and ultimately, a filing of murder charges. Additionally, numerous weapon violations were discovered as a result of the intercepts.
	2010-LA-102	2	4,110	4	96	Interceptions involving numerous target telephone numbers led investigators to the identity of the suspect, and ultimately, a filing of murder charges. Additionally, numerous weapon violations were discovered as a result of the intercepts.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-103	1	7,114	1	99	Interceptions involving numerous target telephone numbers led investigators to the identity of the suspect, and ultimately, a filing of murder charges. Additionally, numerous weapon violations were discovered as a result of the intercepts.
	2010-LA-104	45	938	10	90	This case is still in its investigation stage.
	2010-LA-105	649	1,226	18	82	During the interception, agents seized approximately 14 kilograms of cocaine, one vehicle that was equipped with a hidden compartment and arrested two subjects for drug trafficking charges. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-106	6	211	6	94	The target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2010-LA-107	60	3,689	9	91	Due to intercepted conversations over this target telephone, agents seized eight pounds of methamphetamine in Riverside County and arrested three suspects.
	2010-LA-108	42	431	18	82	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-109	12	193	45	55	The investigation continues.
	2010-LA-110	15	843	40	60	Intercepted calls led to the seizure of \$109,640 in narcotics proceeds and the arrest of one individual.
	2010-LA-111	265	5,994	29	71	This case is being filed by with the District Attorney's Office and is currently pending.
	2010-LA-113	16	1,134	14	86	Coordinating narcotics shipments from Mexico to Los Angeles with proceeds going back down to Mexico.
	2010-LA-114	51	3,818	16	84	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-115	13	526	6	94	During the interception, agents seized approximately 900 grams of heroin, approximately 1,450 grams of methamphetamine, one firearm, and approximately \$10,000 of narcotics proceeds. Investigators also arrested two subjects. This case is ongoing.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-116	1,707	2,784	5	95	Intercepts provided information on the identities and actions as conspirators of the massive medical/bank fraud that was the underlying event leading up to the murder that occurred in Santa Monica. Agents arrested two suspects. A case was filed on suspect and charges will be filed at a later time on the second suspect.
	2010-LA-117	26	1,348	45	55	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-118	3	4,125	75	25	Two hundred twenty-six pounds (226) of methamphetamine seized by law enforcement. Identified and charged co-conspirators in Mexico for offenses committed in United States based on intercepted communications.
	2010-LA-119		15	20	80	The interceptions are vital to determine the entire nature and scope of this organization's activities. Other investigative methods are not enough to properly target and prosecute these violators. The targets of this investigation used their cell phones to communicate with other members of the organization in order to conduct narcotics trafficking.
	2010-LA-120	11	3,019	19	81	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-121	130	1,706	7	93	As a result of the interception and monitoring of this wiretap, two additional telephone numbers for methamphetamine sources of supply were identified. These sources of supply are believed to operate out of the Los Angeles area and additional investigation is ongoing to identify and locate these individuals.
	2010-LA-122	35	1,450	83	17	Interceptions led to three separate seizures which included 23 kilograms of cocaine and approximately \$603,000 on 6/22/10; the seizure of 105 kilograms of cocaine on 7/6/2010; and the seizure of approximately 27 kilograms of cocaine on 7/13/10.
	2010-LA-123	173	1,485	6	94	The cases would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation.
	2010-LA-124	3	26	0	100	Ongoing investigation.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-125	59	2,507	10	90	Based on intercepted conversations on 6/27/2010, agents seized \$40,890 and a 2005 Dodge Ram pick-up truck. The driver has not been arrested but criminal charges will be filed at a later time.
	2010-LA-126	98	860	24	76	The target subject was arrested on 6/19/2010, along with his narcotics source of supply. During the service of a search warrant of his residence, agents located and seized approximately \$91,220 in narcotics proceeds and 78 milligrams of cocaine.
	2010-LA-127	84	18,916	8	92	The case is being filed with the District Attorney's Office and is currently pending.
	2010-LA-128	127	1,820	25	75	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-129	405	512	15	85	
	2010-LA-130	12	155	68	32	The target telephone is a Mexico based Sprint/Nextel cellular telephone number.
	2010-LA-131	622	691	30	70	Investigation pending.
	2010-LA-132	177	301	13	87	The target subject of this wiretap investigation discontinued using his cellular phone.
	2010-LA-133	1,263	8,691	8	92	This case is ongoing and arrests are pending.
	2010-LA-134	39	681	26	74	During the interception , agents arrested 20 suspects, prevented three kidnappings, seized approximately 16 firearms, 25 kilograms of cocaine, 12 pounds of methamphetamine and approximately \$75,000 of narcotic proceeds.
	2010-LA-135	320	9,638	20	80	On 10/16/2010, the interception stage of this wiretap investigation was concluded. Warrants are currently being prepared for the target subjects of this investigation in coordination with the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office.
	2010-LA-136	927	4,102	4	96	During the interception, the target subject spoke a lot about drug trafficking. However, agents were unable to seize any narcotics from the target subject. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-137	66	4,386	9	91	This investigation continues.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept	
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)		
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-138	16	621	2	98	Based on intercepted conversations and GPS data produced by the target telephones, agents seized approximately 179 pounds of methamphetamine, six gallons of liquid methamphetamine, \$9,200 and arrested six subjects who have criminal charges pending	
	2010-LA-139	60	91	12	88	Ongoing investigation.	
	2010-LA-140	6	27	0	100	The target subject discontinued using this phone.	
	2010-LA-141	72	2,585	13	87	As a result of this and other intercepted conversations over Target Telephone #4 (TT#4) and TT#5, agents seized 13 kilograms of cocaine and approximately \$160,000 in U.S. currency, and arrested two suspects. The case has not yet been filed, but charges will be filed at a later time.	
	2010-LA-142	57	4,786	14	86	Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Target subject continues using other target telephones. Case is continuing.	
	2010-LA-143	30	1,081	14	86	The cases would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation.	
	2010-LA-144	24	340	21	79	This case is still in its investigation stage.	
	2010-LA-145	18	179	20	80	This investigation continues.	
	2010-LA-146	27	757	24	76	Ongoing investigation.	
	2010-LA-147	31	562	15	85	Ongoing investigation.	
	2010-LA-148	38	1,840	17	83	The target subject discontinued using these phones. This investigation continues.	
	2010-LA-150	22	1,058	14	86	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.	
	2010-LA-151			140	50	50	The interceptions are vital to determine the entire nature and scope of this organization's activities. Other investigative methods are not enough to properly target and prosecute these violators. The targets of this investigation used their cell phones to communicate with other members of the organization in order to conduct narcotics trafficking.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-152	40	619	21	79	During the wiretap, agents seized approximately 13 kilos of cocaine and \$159,880 in U.S. currency. Agents also arrested two suspects. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-153	86	1,406	17	83	During this wiretap investigation, agents were able to seize approximately 42 pounds of methamphetamine, \$66,300 in narcotics proceeds, one handgun and the arrest of four individuals to include the target subject of this investigation.
	2010-LA-154	8	228	29	71	During the wiretap the target subject spoke a lot about drug trafficking. However, agents were unable to seize any narcotics from the target subject. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-155	23	703	5	95	Investigation is still pending.
	2010-LA-156	2	1	0	100	No interceptions were made.
	2010-LA-157	63	869	1	99	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-159	196	3,512	3	98	Interception of this phone has led to the identification of California and Mexico-based DTOs in addition to narcotics customers in Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties as well as New York. This investigation is currently ongoing with anticipated arrests/seizures to occur during and at the case completion.
	2010-LA-160	10	29	0	100	N/A
	2010-LA-161	51	4,196	4	96	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-163	25	604	13	87	During the wiretap, agents seized approximately eight pounds of crystal methamphetamine and also arrested one suspect for possession of methamphetamine for the purpose of sales. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-164	45	72	0	100	N/A

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-165		1,128	54	46	The interceptions are vital to determine the entire nature and scope of this organization's activities. Other investigative methods are not enough to properly target and prosecute these violators. The targets of this investigation used their cell phones to communicate with other members of the organization in order to conduct narcotics trafficking.
	2010-LA-166	52	5,322	8	92	Through the initial interception of TT#1, agents were able to identify four additional narcotic lines related to TT#1, which we are currently monitoring.
	2010-LA-167	39	1,857	27	73	Ongoing investigation
	2010-LA-168	4	91	100	0	Targeted DTO leaders in Mexico. Identified transportation cell in Mexico. Seized 350 lbs. of methamphetamine. Investigation is continuing.
	2010-LA-169	41	4,751	63	37	Targeted DTO leaders in Mexico. Identified distribution centers in California. Seized 41 kilograms of cocaine. Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-170	13	1,988	50	50	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-171	122	11,575	1	99	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-172	101	2,553	22	78	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-173	30	8,146	7	93	During the interception of TT #13, agents seized approximately \$453,000.00 in U.S. currency and approximately 720 pounds of marijuana. Agents arrested three suspects for attempted home invasion robbery. two suspects were arrested for possession of marijuana for the purpose of sales. During the investigation and GPS data obtained from TT#14, agents seized approximately \$100,930.00 in U.S. currency and also arrested a sixth suspect for possession of narcotics proceeds. This case is ongoing.
	2010-LA-175	0	0	0	0	
	2010-LA-176	50	4,931	5	95	Ongoing investigation.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-177	62	1,666	3	97	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-178	36	1,778	14	86	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2010-LA-179	73	6,886	12	88	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-180	3	3,753	100	0	No convictions have been obtained at this point of the investigation.
	2010-LA-181	40	1,891	13	87	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2010-LA-182	88	1,758	5	95	The cases would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial.
	2010-LA-184	496	2,323	3	97	The case has come to a standstill with no workable leads. With the wiretap, the suspects made several incriminating statements via intercepted calls. We were able to identify three additional suspects who had involvement in the case. Case is on-going and a trial date has yet to be set.
	2010-LA-185	32	3,826	12	88	Through the initial interception of TT #5, agents have been able to identify an additional line which agents have a new affidavit pending approval.
	2010-LA-186	49	664	5	95	These cases would not have been filed without the interceptions obtained in this operation. This case has not yet gone to trial.
	2010-LA-187	187	9,133	15	85	Currently the investigation is on-going and there have been no arrests.
	2010-LA-188	1	2,118	43	57	Intercepted communications were necessary for the one arrest made during this intercept. This case is still on-going. No convictions have been obtained at this point.
	2010-LA-189	7	313	22	78	This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-190	9	592	47	53	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-191	3	2	50	50	The intercepts obtained for the wiretaps detail people and information that is invaluable to the prosecution of the target subjects.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-192	21	1,458	17	83	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2010-LA-193		8	0	100	The target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2010-LA-194	12	153	23	77	The investigation is on-going. Currently, we are attempting to obtain a Title III Order for the Primaries new cellular telephone.
	2010-LA-195	40	2,490	11	89	The interceptions directly connect targets to each other and to drug activity which is significant for prosecution.
	2010-LA-196	25	575	23	77	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-198	51	7,553	3	97	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-LA-199	14	179	15	85	The Riverside District Attorney's Office terminated the interception of Target Telephone #14 because the target subject discontinued using this phone.
	2010-LA-200	96	9,211	3	97	At this time, this investigation is in its preliminary stages and this wiretap is important to understand and gather the necessary intelligence required to subsequently convict, in the future, once the investigation has concluded, the members of this organization who have violated drug trafficking laws.
	2010-LA-201	47	2,980	26	74	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-202	42	2,980	26	74	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-203	12	546	73	27	Hundreds of incriminating calls were intercepted. The target of this wiretap dropped his telephone after a load of narcotics was seized at the border.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-204	198	12,888	8	92	During this wiretap, investigating agents were able to seize approximately \$370,000 in narcotic proceeds, one and one-half pounds of cocaine, one-half pound of methamphetamine and 65 pounds of marijuana. In addition, agents will be seizing a 2006 Chevy Equinox with a hidden compartment on the floor board of the vehicle, a 2006 Honda Accord with a hidden compartment behind the dashboard area of the vehicle and a 2008 Toyota Tacoma used by one of the target subjects of this investigation. Agents will be presenting the case in a near future for prosecution.
	2010-LA-205	5	120	1	99	Pending prosecution in Bakersfield.
	2010-LA-206	14	725	28	72	Hundreds of incriminating calls were intercepted. The target of this wiretap dropped his telephone after co-conspirators in Northern California were arrested.
	2010-LA-207	183	4,208	13	87	During this wiretap investigation, agents were able to seize approximately \$370,000 in narcotics proceeds. One and one-half pounds of cocaine, one-half pound of methamphetamine and 65 pounds of marijuana. In addition, agents will be seized a 2006 Chevy Equinox with a hidden compartment on the floor board of the vehicle, a 2006 Honda Accord with a hidden compartment behind the dashboard area of the vehicle and a 2008 Toyota Tacoma used by one of the target subjects of this investigation. Agents will be presenting the case in a near future for prosecution.
	2010-LA-208	62	4,083	8	92	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues. Additional narcotics traffickers identified.
	2010-LA-209	8	9	0	100	Interceptions allow investigating agents/law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization.
	2010-LA-210	16	741	18	82	The target subject discontinued using Target Telephone #2 prior to interception. Results are for Target Telephone #3. This investigation continues.
	2010-LA-211	18	348	16	84	The target subject discontinued using this phone. This investigation continues.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-212	65	3,149	9	91	During this wiretap investigation narcotics related conversations were monitored, and agents identified other narcotics conspirators.
	2010-LA-213	53	2,389	5	95	Pending prosecution.
	2010-LA-214	3	2,051	1	99	Wire interception led to locating, identifying and the arrest of three murder suspects.
Merced	2010-MER-1	30	310	80	20	Ongoing investigation.
	2010-MER-2	88	1,868	25	75	Targets were arrested and are awaiting trial. Targets are members of a major DTO from Mexico. Arrest of targets resulted in over 50 lbs of methamphetamine to be seized.
Monterey	2010-MTY-1	319	4,937	25	75	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-2	84	3,930	45	55	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-3	151	1,858	22	78	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed. This order involved two phones. One of the phones was terminated after 12 days.
	2010-MTY-4	35	390			The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-5	98	1,826	45	55	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-6	74	1,899	20	80	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Monterey (cont'd)	2010-MTY-7	80	2,974	35	65	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-8	218	5,669	13	87	This order involved 7 phones. One phone tap was never installed and several others were terminated before the expiration of the order. The number of intercepted communications indicated is a combination of all the phones that were tapped. The length of use will represent the longest period of interception. The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed.
	2010-MTY-9	40	818	34	66	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed. This order involved two cell phones. One of the intercepts was terminated after six days. The interception numbers reflect the a combination of both phones
	2010-MTY-10	25	369	33	67	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed
	2010-MTY-11	34	1,685	64	36	The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Monterey (cont'd)	2010-MTY-12	181	1,822	30	70	This order involved five cell phones. The interception operations were terminated at various times during the duration of the wiretap. The figures and duration time are for the longest period of interception and are a consolidation for all phones. One wiretap was never installed. The application was a joint federal/state operation. This application resulted in 21 state arrests with 9 convictions. There are still 11 cases pending disposition and one has been dismissed
Orange	2010-OR-1	4	768	0	100	Through the interceptions and information developed from other sources, it was learned that the target subject ceased using the target telephone for narcotics discussions and transactions, and only used the target telephone for personal, non-criminal, conversations.
	2010-OR-2	41	561	24	76	Through the interceptions, investigators learned the target subject delivered 20 pounds of methamphetamine to customers in Oregon. After the target subject learned he was under investigation for this delivery, he stopped answering the target telephone and only monitored incoming calls.
	2010-OR-3	188	1,240	24	76	Through information developed on this wiretap, additional target subjects were identified and narcotics and narcotics proceeds were seized. Further information concerning the effectiveness of this wiretap is contained in 2010-OR-
	2010-OR-4	0	0	0	0	As a result of information developed in this wiretap and another, additional target subjects were identified, narcotics and narcotics proceeds were seized, and arrests were made. No charges have been filed yet because the investigation is continuing. Information developed in these two wiretaps has been provided to other law enforcement agencies that have initiated their own investigations and have obtained their own wiretaps of additional target subjects.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-5	24	440	17	83	Through this wiretap, additional narcotics traffickers were identified. Results of the investigation, including arrests, are detailed in 2010-OR-10.
	2010-OR-7	85	1,387	20	80	Three individuals arrested, one convicted, and seven pounds of methamphetamine seized.
	2010-OR-8	82	1,631	20	80	While there are no defendants as of January 2011, the interceptions of the target telephones may prove crucial in the successful prosecution of future defendants.
	2010-OR-9	21	1,757	26	74	The prosecution of all defendants in this case is still pending. However, the interceptions of the target telephones will be crucial for the successful prosecution of the case. The interceptions led directly to the arrests and a seizure pound quantities of methamphetamine.
	2010-OR-10	14	340	15	85	The target subjects of this wiretap frequently spoke about narcotics trafficking. Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Narcotics proceeds were seized from the target subjects and charges are pending.
	2010-OR-11	5	251	2	98	
	2010-OR-12	3	12	17	83	
	2010-OR-13	40	2,500	18	82	The interceptions led to the identification of several subjects trafficking in narcotics and the seizure of cocaine, methamphetamine, MDMA, marijuana and hashish. The investigation led to additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-14	40	2,580	16	84	Ongoing investigation from previous wiretap. Interceptions led to identity of additional subjects trafficking in narcotics and assisted in obtaining additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-15	35	1,036	41	59	Continuing investigation from previous wiretaps. Additional narcotics traffickers and sources of supply have been identified as a result of the wiretap and led to additional wiretaps.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-16	43	1,481	57	43	Continuing investigation from previous wiretaps. Interception reveals main target subjects discussing narcotics transactions involving cocaine and MDMA. Led to additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-17	0	43	0	100	Continuing investigation from previous wiretaps. Interceptions revealed target subjects discussing narcotics transactions and led to additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-18	32	1,218	36	64	Continuing investigation based on previous wiretaps. Interception revealed target subjects discussing narcotics trafficking and led to additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-19	41	1,529	44	56	Continuing investigation based on previous wiretaps. Interception revealed target subjects discussing narcotics transactions and led to additional wiretaps.
	2010-OR-20	40	1,650	43	57	Continuing investigation based on previous wiretaps. Target subjects heard discussing narcotics transactions and led to additional wiretap.
	2010-OR-21	13	431	40	60	Continuing investigation based on previous wiretaps. Interception revealed target subjects discussing narcotics transactions. Additional wiretaps and search warrants are being considered at this point.
	2010-OR-23	43	5,264	12	88	This wiretap resulted in the arrest of five individuals who are presently being prosecuted. The prosecution is pending in court.
	2010-OR-24	17	91	82	18	The interceptions provided investigators with more detailed knowledge of this DTO, including individuals who are transporting narcotics and narcotics proceeds on behalf of the organization, as well as individuals who are purchasing narcotics from this organization. This information led to the issuance of another wiretap.
	2010-OR-25	65	1,194	36	64	The interceptions led to the issuance of two other wiretaps, which led to the arrests in this investigation.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-26	20	84	15	85	The interceptions provided investigators with more detailed knowledge of this DTO, including individuals who are transporting narcotics and narcotics proceeds for the organization, as well as individuals who are purchasing narcotics from the organization.
	2010-OR-27	57	3,863	3	97	No investigative leads resulted from the wiretap interceptions.
	2010-OR-28	58	1,570	52	48	The interceptions led to the issuance of another wiretap which led to the arrests in this investigation.
	2010-OR-30	32	4,014	5	95	The interceptions assisted in gathering evidence and in making the arrests of four individuals.
	2010-OR-31	22	3,260	5	95	The interceptions assisted in the gathering of evidence and the arrests of four individuals.
	2010-OR-32	14	675	11	89	The interceptions assisted in the gathering of evidence and the arrests of four individuals.
	2010-OR-33	25	4,554	7	93	The interceptions resulted in the seizure of narcotics and the arrests of four individuals.
	2010-OR-34	30	688	20	80	The interceptions in this case led to the seizure of approximately 28 pounds of crystal methamphetamine, 8 kilograms of cocaine, 285 grams of heroin, four handguns, and the arrest of seven suspects. Interception of the target telephones was essential to the investigation and allowed investigators to fully dismantle this DTO operating in Orange County, California.
	2010-OR-35	39	866	15	85	The target subject spoke frequently about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to seize any narcotics or narcotics proceeds. However, other narcotics traffickers were identified and the investigation is continuing.
	2010-OR-36	85	4,500	7	93	The interceptions in this case led to the seizure of approximately 28 pounds of crystal methamphetamine, 8 kilograms of cocaine, 285 grams of heroin, four handguns, and the arrest of seven suspects. The interception of the target telephones was essential to the success of this investigation and allowed investigators to fully dismantle this DTO operating within Orange County, California.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-38	548	700	37	63	As a result of the interceptions in Los Angeles County Wiretaps and Orange County Wiretaps, agents arrested 20 suspects, prevented three kidnappings, and seized 16 firearms, 25 kilograms of cocaine, 12 pounds of methamphetamine, and approximately \$75,000 in narcotics proceeds.
	2010-OR-39	108	1,967	6	94	The target subject of this wiretap frequently spoke about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to seize any narcotics or narcotics proceeds. However, additional narcotics traffickers were identified and the investigation is continuing.
Riverside	2010-RIV-1	70	29,475	5	95	Interceptions resulted in seizures of 5.5 pounds of powered ecstasy, 19 pounds of marijuana and 140 marijuana plants. Interceptions facilitated seizure of 67 kilos of ecstasy and 13 arrests by Bellingham, WA DEA. Interceptions also facilitated seizures of 71 pounds of marijuana, 5 indoor marijuana grows, 54 grams of ecstasy, 23 grams of heroin, 16 grams of cocaine and 13 firearms (including assault rifles) and 26 members of a gang by BNE San Francisco.
	2010-RIV-2	15	683	5	95	
	2010-RIV-3	25	999	18	82	Intercepted conversations between target subjects revealed that 2 kilos of heroin were transported from San Bernardino County, California to the state of Kansas. The heroin was transported via tractor trailer. Kansas DEA intercepted and seized the tractor trailer, operated by two suspects; Kansas DEA has not recovered the heroin as of this date.
	2010-RIV-4	25	1,614	16	84	
	2010-RIV-5	500	1,036	16	84	
	2010-RIV-6	1,015	3,087	12	88	
	2010-RIV-7	197	703	16	84	
	2010-RIV-8	1,342	3,040	16	84	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-9	164	1,220	37	63	Interceptions led to the seizure of approximately 42 pounds of methamphetamine and the arrest of two subjects for violation of Health & Safety Code §11378.
	2010-RIV-10	71	2,109	11	89	Although no arrests were made, interceptions provided the Riverside County Sheriff's Department with information that aided investigators to expand the investigation of the DTO.
	2010-RIV-13	98	470	55	45	Interceptions resulted in the arrest of one subject for violation of Health & Safety Code § 11378 as well as the seizure of approximately two pounds of methamphetamine and \$4,776.00 in U.S. Currency. Although that subject was released from custody, the same charges will be filed against the subject as well as a co-conspirator.
	2010-RIV-14	8	671	11	89	
	2010-RIV-15	8	671	11	89	
	2010-RIV-16	29	3,178	1	99	
	2010-RIV-17	29	582	22	78	
	2010-RIV-18	34	12,577	6	94	
	2010-RIV-19	30	4,363	12	88	
	2010-RIV-20	37	1,347			
	2010-RIV-21	0	0	0	0	As a result of wiretap, the investigation was continued and led to continued interception.
	2010-RIV-22	23	449	40	60	
	2010-RIV-23	17	683	33	66	
	2010-RIV-24	15	431	39	60	
	2010-RIV-25	20	85	15	85	
	2010-RIV-26	5	65			
	2010-RIV-27	23	3,094			

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-28	114	2,287			Interception of the target telephones assisted agents in identifying additional narcotic traffickers
	2010-RIV-29	3	131			
	2010-RIV-30	114	2,221			Interception of the target telephones assisted agents with the seizure of one pound of methamphetamine and arrest of one suspect.
	2010-RIV-31	0	0			Agents did not intercept any telephone calls
	2010-RIV-32	20	1,077	29	71	Wiretaps were crucial in convictions and drug seizures. 20 kilos of cocaine, 6 pounds of heroin, 8 pounds of methamphetamine.
	2010-RIV-33	10	1,519	9	91	Interception of conversations about cocaine, methamphetamine sales and deliveries.
	2010-RIV-35	18	1,288	30	70	Interception of conversations about multi kilo cocaine and methamphetamine sales.
	2010-RIV-36	32	3,254	45	55	Interception of conversations about multi methamphetamine sales.
	2010-RIV-37	26	917	27	73	Interception of communications about heroin and methamphetamine drug sales.
	2010-RIV-38	74	1,457	37	63	Interception of communications about multi ounce drug deals regarding heroin/methamphetamine drug sales occurred daily.
	2010-RIV-39	45	1,124	37	63	Interception of communications about multi pound methamphetamine and heroin drug sales.
	2010-RIV-40	22	775	10	90	
	2010-RIV-41	4	775	1	99	
	2010-RIV-42	0	57	0	100	
	2010-RIV-43	89	1,327	2	98	
	2010-RIV-44	64	1,901	5	95	
	2010-RIV-45	3	312			Interceptions led to ability to determine full scope of the DTO, as well as determine other value information, i.e., phone numbers of source of supply.
	2010-RIV-46	28	790			Interceptions led to ability to seize one ounce of methamphetamine and place two subjects in custody.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-47	61	1,066			Interceptions led to ability to make arrests for Health & Safety Code §§ 11378 and 11379, and Penal Code § 182.
	2010-RIV-48	28	1,225			Interceptions led to arrest made for Penal Code § 182 and Health & Safety Code § 11378.
	2010-RIV-49	13	339			Interceptions allow investigating agents/ law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization
	2010-RIV-50	8	216			Interceptions allow investigating agents/ law enforcement officers the needed information to dismantle the entire organization
	2010-RIV-51	138	768	21	79	
	2010-RIV-52	372	3,998			
	2010-RIV-53	351	7,197	21	79	
	2010-RIV-54	26	1,075	10	90	Interception of this target telephone was essential for the purpose of identifying co-conspirators involved in this LA based DTO.
	2010-RIV-55	31	1,154	4	96	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified.
	2010-RIV-56	44	5,531	21	79	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified.
	2010-RIV-57	53	1,022	6	94	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified.
	2010-RIV-58	26	360	15	85	The target subject of this wiretap discontinued using the target telephone. Other narcotics traffickers were identified. Approximately 200 pounds of marijuana was seized.
	2010-RIV-59	61	1,833	2	98	The target subject of this wiretap discontinued using the target telephone. other narcotics traffickers were identified.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-60	83	4,859	6	94	The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, but investigators were not able to intercept any narcotics and/or narcotics proceeds from the target subject. Other narcotics traffickers were identified.
	2010-RIV-61	19	1,163	9	91	The target subject of this wiretap discontinued using the target telephone. other narcotics traffickers were identified.
	2010-RIV-62	21	646			ICE is conducting an investigation into the narcotics trafficking of DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of methamphetamine from Mexico into the Los Angeles County area for distribution. Approximately \$151,000 in narcotics proceeds and four firearms have been seized from a vehicle belonging to the user of the target telephone.
	2010-RIV-63	42	4,162			ICE is conducting an investigation into the narcotics trafficking of DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of methamphetamine from Mexico into the LA County area for distribution. Approximately 18 pounds of methamphetamine, 221 pounds of marijuana and 4 firearms have been seized based on information from wiretap.
	2010-RIV-64	40	1,813			ICE is conducting an investigation into the narcotics trafficking of DTO that is responsible for coordinating the smuggling of methamphetamine from Mexico into the LA County area for distribution. Approximately 90 pounds of methamphetamine and 2 firearms have been seized based on information from this wiretap.
	2010-RIV-65	71	1,592			The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, other narcotics traffickers were identified. Case is continuing.
	2010-RIV-66	0	60			The day this wiretap was signed agents seized approximately 39.5 pounds of methamphetamine from the target subject's narcotic's associate. As a result, use of this phone was discontinued by the target subject, however incoming calls were received which went to voicemail, however no messages were left.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-67	60	6,924			The target subject of this wiretap spoke a lot about narcotics trafficking, other narcotics traffickers were identified. Case is continuing.
	2010-RIV-68	153	6,030			Intercepted calls lead to five arrests for methamphetamine sales and distribution as well as conspiracy to commit mayhem (Health & Saf. Code §§ 11378, 11379). Intercepted communications led to a seizure of approximately three pounds of methamphetamine and \$15,000 U.S. currency.
	2010-RIV-69	17	955			Interceptions lead to a 25 pound seizure of methamphetamine.
	2010-RIV-70	4	69	10	50	Phone interception was terminated after 14 days. Zero arrests, zero drugs seized, zero assets seized, zero indictments, case has been closed.
	2010-RIV-71	1	1	0	100	Only one interception, voice mail reached non port call.
	2010-RIV-72	55	609	40	60	Intercepted communications involved conversations between co-conspirators discussing and coordinating their criminal activities. This led to search warrants and seizure of drug evidence and the arrest of one subject.
	2010-RIV-73	25	88	7	93	No convictions obtained to date. Interceptions used to establish targets mode of operating. Interceptions also used to establish hierarchy of organization.
	2010-RIV-74	30	716	30	70	No convictions obtained to date. Interceptions used to establish targets mode of operandi. Interceptions also used to establish hierarchy of organization.
	2010-RIV-75	122	837	40	60	As a result of this wiretap, investigators discovered several other members of the organization who were later arrested for a violation of Health & Safety Code § 11378 (42 pounds).
Sacramento	2010-SAC-1	21	64	47	53	The interceptions obtained in this wiretap were crucial in locating and arresting the suspect for violation of Penal Code §§ 664/187 and Penal Code § 186.22.
	2010-SAC-2	200	8,485	2.4	98	Excellent investigative tool.
	2010-SAC-3		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Sacramento (cont'd)	2010-SAC-4		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-5		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-6		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-7		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-8		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-9		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-10		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-11		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-12		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-2.
	2010-SAC-13	40	4,196	3	97	Interceptions were integral in obtaining incriminating statements of co-conspirators in order to disrupt, dismantle and disorganize this criminal group.
	2010-SAC-14	90	9,629	9	91	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-15	70	7,231	9	91	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-16	30	678	5	95	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-17	50	5,099	4	96	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-18	0	103	0	100	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-19	60	5,992	12	88	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-20	20	1,717	1	99	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-21	5	244	11	89	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-22	5	278	14	86	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-23	10	1,823	11	89	Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-13.
	2010-SAC-24	173	6,256	17	83	It should be noted that statistics for EICOS 2010-SAC-24 through 31 are included in this report.
	2010-SAC-25		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Sacramento (cont'd)	2010-SAC-26		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
	2010-SAC-27		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
	2010-SAC-28		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
	2010-SAC-29		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
	2010-SAC-30		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
	2010-SAC-31		0			Please see EICOS No. 2010-SAC-24.
San Bernardino	2010-SBD-6	21	397	12	88	Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-7	42	1,818	16	84	Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-8	26	475	3	97	
	2010-SBD-9	50	1,884	7	93	
	2010-SBD-10	611	2,626	7	93	12/13/2009: seizure of \$699,209.00; 12/21/2009: seizure of \$3,033.00.
	2010-SBD-11	44	1,681	7	93	
	2010-SBD-12	32	1,411	16	84	
	2010-SBD-13	79	2,752	15	85	
	2010-SBD-15	63	584	10	90	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-16	1,875	5,789	12	88	\$94,961.00 U.S. Currency was seized as a result of this intercept order. Criminal charges are pending.
	2010-SBD-17	66	2,643	20	80	
	2010-SBD-18	28	887	0	100	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-19	164	7,120	28	72	Investigation ongoing. 1.5 pounds of methamphetamine seized from target subject.
	2010-SBD-20	22	1,908	27	73	The case was referred to Washington State, where narcotics were being delivered. They made one arrest and seized five pounds of methamphetamine and several guns. Criminal charges have been filed on seven subjects in San Bernardino County.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-21	21	1,446	3	97	As a result of this investigation, five subjects were arrested, approximately \$126,000.00 was seized, approximately 94.7 pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
	2010-SBD-22	39	1,060	5	95	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-23	10	242	24	76	2/04/2010: Arrest of three target subjects in Riverside County. Search warrant of target subject's residence, and seizure of 12 kilograms of cocaine, approximately 5 pounds of methamphetamine, a handgun, and two rifles. 2/04/2010: Arrest of target subject and search warrant of his residence. Seizure of \$15,000 dollars in narcotics proceeds. Criminal charges filed against three target subjects in San Bernardino County.
	2010-SBD-24	65	4,754	6	94	Criminal Charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-25	54	1,623	42	58	4/23/2010: Search warrant, seizure of one pound of methamphetamine and \$50,000.00. Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-26	191	2,177	5	95	
	2010-SBD-27	86	5,409	2	98	Five were arrested, approximately. \$126,000.00 was seized and approximately 94.7 pounds of methamphetamine was seized.
	2010-SBD-28	124	774	17	83	A total of 16 suspects were identified as a result of this and other intercept orders related to this investigation; 10 were arrested and criminal charges were filed on all 16. Sixty-five kilograms of cocaine were seized during a search warrant.
	2010-SBD-29	122	1,624	2	98	Investigation is ongoing.
	2010-SBD-30	73	173	7	93	There were no criminal charges filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-31	85	4,980	12	88	3/17/2010: seizure of \$70,020; 3/24/2010: seizure of \$84,610 and one arrest.
	2010-SBD-32	25	1,287	3	97	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-33	58	503	1	99	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-34	92	1,798	24	76	4/19/2010: seizure of \$11,226.00.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-35	304	3,348	8	92	6/05/2010: \$102,005.00 and one vehicle seized.
	2010-SBD-37	4	28	0	100	Criminal charges were filed as a result of the investigation, but not of this particular intercept order.
	2010-SBD-38	4	7	0	100	This intercept order led to the arrest and conviction of the target subject, as well as the recovery of two abducted children.
	2010-SBD-39	25	924	41	59	Seizure of three pounds of methamphetamine and two firearms. Three arrests, one conviction, two pending criminal prosecution.
	2010-SBD-40	809	2,654	10	90	4/23/2010: seizure of \$998,270.00.
	2010-SBD-41	33	1,934	3	97	No criminal prosecution.
	2010-SBD-42	33	492	37	63	Criminal charges were not filed as a direct result of this intercept order; however, the investigation including several other intercept orders led to multiple criminal filings in multiple counties.
	2010-SBD-43	18	485	21	79	Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-44	4	34	3	97	
	2010-SBD-45	114	8,381	9	91	3/17/2010: seizure of \$70,020; 3/24/2010: seizure of \$84,610 and arrest of one subject.
	2010-SBD-46	92	1,030	1	99	This intercept order led to eight arrests and criminal filings. Five suspects have been convicted of conspiracy to commit a crime, while one suspect awaits trial.
	2010-SBD-50	178	1,734	18	82	November 2010: 549.6 grams of marijuana seized. Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-51	27	398	30	70	4/23/2010: search warrant; seizure of one pound of methamphetamine and \$50,000.00.
	2010-SBD-52	225	4,498	11	89	See EICOS Nos. 2010-SBN-027, and 2010-SBD-039.
	2010-SBD-53	49	3,147	29	71	
	2010-SBD-54	7	70	21	79	Investigation ongoing
	2010-SBD-55	241	6,680	1	99	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-56	120	352	9	91	6/05/2010: \$102,000.00 seized.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-57	992	4,313	3	97	6/23/2010: arrest of target subject. Seizures: 1,250 kilograms of cocaine, 67 pounds of methamphetamine, and 38,000 pounds of marijuana.
	2010-SBD-58	291	2,003	23	77	Investigation ongoing
	2010-SBD-60	18	2,348	30	70	
	2010-SBD-61	83	2,540	17	83	As a result of this investigation, criminal charges have been filed against six subjects in San Bernardino County. 6/03/10: traffic stop and seizure of approximately \$10,000.00. Search warrant in Perris, CA- seizure of 5 kilograms of cocaine.
	2010-SBD-62	0	0	0	0	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-63	42	1,199	5	95	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-64	32	5,659	11	89	
	2010-SBD-65	34	407	39	61	6/05/2010: \$102,005.00 and one vehicle seized.
	2010-SBD-66	57	1,663	6	94	
	2010-SBD-67	25	2,514	29	71	
	2010-SBD-68	19	363	10	90	
	2010-SBD-70	65	4,701	3	97	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-71	18	179	21	78	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-72	53	1,655	17	83	As a result of this intercept order, five subjects were arrested and 19 pounds of methamphetamine were seized.
	2010-SBD-73	0	13	0	100	7/7/10: arrest of subjects and seizure of 1.26 pounds of methamphetamine
	2010-SBD-74	282	5,530	1	99	Criminal charges pending.
2010-SBD-75	37	2,167	5	95	6/19/2010: arrest and release of two target subjects. Seizure of \$49,510.00, 12 kilograms of cocaine, and 10 pounds of methamphetamine.	
2010-SBD-76	3	17	0	100	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-77	240	18,346	2	98	Criminal charges were filed against three target subjects in San Bernardino County. The case is pending.
	2010-SBD-78	21	424	14	86	7/20/2010: Arrest of target subject in Chino, CA. Seizure of 32 kilograms of cocaine, \$102,000.00 and a car.
	2010-SBD-79	84	11,803	4	96	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-80	128	21,187	7	93	
	2010-SBD-81	20	1,260	30	70	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-82	25	662	31	69	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-83	25	883	18	82	Three pounds of methamphetamine and 2 firearms were seized as a result of this intercept order. Also, criminal charges were filed against 12 subjects, four of whom have been convicted.
	2010-SBD-85	28	2,019	7	93	7/26/2010: arrest of target subject. Search warrant of stash house and seizure of 65 kilograms of cocaine.
	2010-SBD-86	11	615	12	88	
	2010-SBD-87	94	8,759	7	93	Two subjects were arrested. One pound of cocaine, one pound of methamphetamine, and one firearm were seized.
	2010-SBD-88	21	135	28	72	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-89	10	201	25	75	This intercept order led to the following seizures: four AK-47 assault rifles, six handguns, and 124 rifle and handgun magazines.
	2010-SBD-90	18	563	44	56	8/09/2010: arrest of target subject. Seizure of 13 pounds of methamphetamine from targets car, and 20 pounds of methamphetamine from stash house. Federal indictment pending.
	2010-SBD-92	107	1,207	6	94	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-94	10	14	0	100	No criminal charges. Kidnapped victim was located.
	2010-SBD-95	62	6,414	12	88	
	2010-SBD-96	354	7,097	10	90	Investigation is ongoing.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-97	120	2,039	8	92	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-98	152	3,458	2	98	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-99	1	1	0	100	
	2010-SBD-100	116	3,654	6	94	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-102	31	943	94	6	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-103	20	482	12	88	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-104	27	239	4	96	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-105	47	2,160	18	82	1 arrested and approximately one pound of methamphetamine seized.
	2010-SBD-107	97	1,515	30	70	11/01/2010: two subjects arrested and 15 kilograms of cocaine seized.
	2010-SBD-109	16	179	5	95	Criminal charges were not filed as a result of this intercept order.
	2010-SBD-110	18	287	39	61	11/03/2010: arrest of two subjects and seizure of one pound of methamphetamine
	2010-SBD-111	55	1,850	24	76	11/24/2010: arrest of two suspects, and seizure of one pound of methamphetamine.
	2010-SBD-112	8	106	10	90	No criminal charges; however, intercepted communications assisted with identification of additional target subjects and target telephones.
	2010-SBD-113	52	416	7	93	Investigation ongoing.
	2010-SBD-114	102	3,847	17	83	12/01/2010: seizure of two pounds of methamphetamine.
	2010-SBD-115	242	12,507			Criminal charges were filed against one suspect.
	2010-SBD-119	115	18,846	2	98	One kilogram of cocaine seized.
	2010-SBD-123	40	1,437	11	89	Investigation ongoing
	2010-SBD-124	78	5,539	1	99	Investigation ongoing
	2010-SBD-125	4	45	0	100	No criminal charges
	2010-SBD-126	99	2,175	9	91	Two arrests, \$50,000.00 seized, 12 kilograms of cocaine seized, and one- pound of methamphetamine seized.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-127	139	2,287	44	56	Three arrests, and five firearms seized.
	2010-SBD-128	23	1,303	26	74	1/22/2010: five arrests. Seizure of 19 kilograms of cocaine and \$452,000.00.
	2010-SBD-129	19	1,728	21	79	1/22/2010: five arrests. Seizure of 19 kilograms of cocaine and \$452,000.
	2010-SBD-130	876	2,613	7	93	No criminal charges
San Diego	2010-SD-1	55	4,743	20.6	79.4	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 561 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles and resulted in 36 arrests
	2010-SD-2	40	6,006	10.3	89.7	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests
	2010-SD-3	45	7,846	11.59	88.41	The wiretap interceptions on this case, collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles and resulted in 36 arrests.
	2010-SD-4	75	2,277	29.95	70.05	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests.
	2010-SD-5	95	8,410	25.49	74.51	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-6	35	2,361	14	86	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests.
	2010-SD-7	25	1,232	34	66	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests.
	2010-SD-8	55	1,192	8	92	The wiretap interceptions on this case collectively led to the seizure of approximately 581 pounds of methamphetamine, 63 pounds of cocaine, 34 pounds of heroin, 2448 pounds of marijuana, \$369,700 cash, 9 firearms, 20 vehicles, and resulted in 36 arrests.
	2010-SD-9	30	2,000	90	10	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, one pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-10		464	31	69	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 2021.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-11	15	1,488	13	87	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 2021.
	2010-SD-12		2,495	23	77	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 2021.
	2010-SD-13		4,506	9	92	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 2021.
	2010-SD-14		336	39	61	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, and 11370.9; Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 2021.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-15		3,417	9	91	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378, 11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-16	82	4,113	10	90	Although numerous criminal conversations were intercepted during this wiretap, no significant seizures of drugs or money were made. the interceptions were important to learn the patterns and daily activities of the main target, who was arrested and convicted after the wiretap.
	2010-SD-17	45	2,747	7	93	This wiretap was necessary to fully identify and dismantle a DTO operating in the northern San Diego county CA. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization have been fully identified as being part and partial of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests, drug and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2010-SD-18	12	293	19	81	This wiretap was necessary to fully identify and dismantle a DTO operating in northern San Diego county. As a result, members of this organization have been fully identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrests, drug and money seizures related to this investigation.
	2010-SD-19	30	2,132	6	94	This wiretap was necessary in order to identify and dismantle a DTO operating in northern San Diego county. As a result of this wiretap, members of this organization have been identified as being part of a conspiracy to traffic and distribute narcotics. Agents were able to make multiple arrest, drug and money seizures related to this investigation.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-20	123	1,811	9	91	The intercept allowed agents to significantly impact the supply of PCP being distributed in the San Diego County. Agents were able to arrest the primary distributor in San Diego along with two individual sources of supply operating in the Los Angeles area. The narcotics trafficking organization was closely associated with gangs operating in San Diego and Los Angeles areas. The arrests will subsequently cut-off supply of PCP to many gang members in those areas. The primary SOS in Los Angeles has a multitude of violent criminal behavior and is looking at a life sentence as a result of this wiretap investigation. Agents were able to seize approximately 8 ounces of PCP and 3 firearms. The firearms were in the possession of previously convicted felons with violent criminal an gang backgrounds.
	2010-SD-21	210	8,019	5	95	The intercept allowed agents to significantly impact the supply of PCP being distributed in the San Diego area. Agents were able to arrest the primary distributor in San Diego as well as identify two additional source of supply's operating in the Los Angeles area. The narcotics trafficking organization was closely associated with gangs operating in the San Diego and Los Angeles areas. The arrests subsequently cut-off supply of PCP to many gang members in the San Diego and Los Angeles areas. In addition, agents applied for and were granted another wiretap and began intercepting calls from the PCP source in Los Angeles area. The wiretap led to the arrest of individuals in the Los Angeles area and the seizure of three weapons.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-23	4	41	36	64	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-24	14	389	32	68	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-25	4	241	13	87	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-26	10	1,614	28	72	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378,11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-27	4	73	28	72	Evidence obtained during this investigation using multiple wiretaps resulted in 9 individuals being arrested, 20.5 pounds of methamphetamine, 1 pounds of cocaine, \$167,100 in narcotics proceeds, 9 guns which included several stolen guns, being seized. Target subjects are being prosecuted for crimes including Health & Safety Code §§ 11378, 11379, 11370.1, 11370.9' Penal Code §§ 496, 273a(a), and 12021.
	2010-SD-28	71	2,220	35	65	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.
	2010-SD-29	52	3,184	20	80	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-30	194	17,704	18	82	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.
	2010-SD-31	194	13,358	4	96	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.
	2010-SD-32	14	659	26	74	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-34	131	15,432	11	89	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.
	2010-SD-35	3	44	43	57	Wiretaps initiated resulted in the seizure of approximately \$1.3 million in drug proceeds, approximately 79 kilograms cocaine, approximately 25 pounds methamphetamine, seven vehicles, one loaded AK-47 assault rifle and resulted in the arrest of eleven individuals in California. Information obtain in these wiretaps also resulted in the seizure of \$1.2 million in drug proceeds in Illinois. These seizures and arrests have significantly affected the operations of the DTO. There is a lack of trust between remaining DTO members and the DTO is struggling financially.
	2010-SD-36	7	436	91	9	Identified "ring leaders" in Mexico, and targeted co-conspirators transporting narcotics and proceeds across US-Mexico border. Seized 10 pounds of meth and \$200,000.00 U.S. currency based on intercepts.
	2010-SD-37	17	1,241	78	22	Intercepted communications provided valuable evidence leading to conviction of DEA suspect prosecuted by Fargo N. Dakota U.S. Attorney's Office. Intercepted communications also provided direct intelligence on suspect's whereabouts in Mexico resulting in suspect's arrest by Mexico military and DEA agents in Mexico.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-38		0			Target subject resided in Mexico and did not enter U.S. during the above period. Agents never installed intercepts. Agents only monitored PEN. Intercept order one of several orders.
	2010-SD-39	49	2,913	26	74	Intercept order supported Los Angeles based investigation resulting in total seizures of 322 pounds of meth, 40 kilos of cocaine, and 201,000.00 in US Currency. Targeted cartel cell.
	2010-SD-40		0			Never used. Target subject resided in Tijuana, Mexico.
	2010-SD-41		22	40	60	Target subject resided in Mexico. subject remained in Mexico during the above period. Target was a cartel cell boss.
	2010-SD-42	39	1,391	24	76	During the course of this investigation approximately one half pound of methamphetamine was seized. This investigation is ongoing.
	2010-SD-43	55	1,640	36	64	During the course of this investigation approximately one half pound of methamphetamine was seized. This investigation is ongoing.
	2010-SD-44	148	5,275	17	83	During the course of this investigation approximately one half pound of methamphetamine was seized. This investigation is ongoing.
	2010-SD-45	84	1,369	23	77	The investigation as of 1/4/2010 has yielded approximately 9 arrests, 9.5 kilograms of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 40 pounds of marijuana, one Range Rover Sport SUV and \$285,366.00 U.S. currency. Due to the sophistication of the organization, ordinary investigative tactics involving surveillance and buy/walk operations would not be sufficient to capitalize on the organizations multiple load couriers and the involvement of narcotics suppliers in Mexico. Intercepted conversations has allowed agents to identify organization members, associates and their position within the organization meeting locations, stash locations and residences.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-46	20	2,248			The investigation as 1/4/11 has yielded approximately 9 arrests, 9.5 kilograms of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 40 pounds of marijuana, one Range Rover Sport SUV and \$285,336.00 U.S. currency. Due to the sophistication of this organization, ordinary investigative tactics involving surveillance and buy/walk operations would not be sufficient to capitalize on the organizations multiple load couriers and the involvement of narcotics suppliers in Mexico. Intercepted conversations has allowed agents to identify organization members, associates and their positions within the organization, meeting locations, stash locations and residences. Further wire intercepts will allow agents to fully penetrate and dismantle the DTO's organizational structure.
	2010-SD-47	57	2,037	62	38	The investigation as of 1/3/2011 has yielded approximately 9 arrests, 9.5 kilograms of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 40 pounds of marijuana, one Range Rover Sport SUV and \$285,336.00 in U.S. currency. Due to the sophistication of this organization, ordinary investigative tactics involving surveillance and buy/walk operations would not be sufficient to capitalize on the organizations multiple load couriers and the involvement of narcotics suppliers in Mexico. Intercepted conversation has allowed agents to identify organization members, associates and their position with the organization, meeting locations, stash locations and residences. Further wire intercepts will allow agents to fully penetrate and dismantle the DTO's organizational structure.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-48	18	83	56	44	The investigation has yielded approximately 9 arrests, 9.5 kilograms of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 40 pounds of marijuana, one Range Rover Sport SUV and \$285,336 in US currency. Due to the sophistication of this organization, ordinary investigative tactics involving surveillance and buy/walk operations would not be sufficient to capitalize on the organizations multiple load couriers and the involvement of narcotics suppliers in Mexico. Intercepted conversation has allowed agents to identify organization members, associates and their position within the organization, meeting locations, stash locations and residences. Further wire intercepts will allow agents to fully penetrate and dismantle the DTO's organizational structure.
	2010-SD-49	15	101	61	39	The investigation has yielded approximately 9 arrests, 9.5 kilograms of cocaine, 5 pounds of methamphetamine, 40 pounds of marijuana, one Range Rover Sport SUV and \$285,336 in U.S. currency. Due to the sophistication of this organization, ordinary investigative tactics involving surveillance and buy/walk operations would not be sufficient to capitalize on the organizations multiple load couriers and the involvement of narcotics suppliers in Mexico. Intercepted conversation has allowed agents to identify organization members, associates and their position within the organization, meeting locations, stash locations and residences. Further wire intercepts will allow agents to fully penetrate and dismantle the DTO's organizational structure.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-50	10	313	52	48	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-51	10	1,176	13	87	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-52	50	11,314	9	91	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-53	20	2,660	60	40	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-54	0	0			DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-55	10	2,329	22	78	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-56	10	1,500	53	47	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-57	20	2,708	15	85	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-58	40	7,664	11	89	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-59	5	137	16	84	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-60	75	4,524	44	56	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.
	2010-SD-61	75	12,164	15	85	DEA Carlsbad RO is currently investigating a large Mexican based DTO. Operating in Mexico, and throughout California, with distribution cells operating in multiple states including California, Arizona, Texas, Georgia, Michigan, Illinois, Colorado, Utah, and Kansas. Mexican based sources of supply have been connected to a DTO (one of the largest and most violent cartels in Mexico). Interceptions and the drug seizures (200 pounds marijuana, 5 pounds heroin, 1 pound cocaine, 106 pounds methamphetamine) are being utilized to further identify DTO members and ultimately work towards prosecution of DTO members operating throughout the U.S.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-62	51	1,813	5	95	This wiretap was initiated to investigate gang related activity including a conspiracy to commit murder, witness intimidation, and narcotics sales. As a result of this wiretap, we relocated a primary murder witness, were able to proceed with a murder prosecution and obtained a guilty verdict. We also gained valuable gang evidence related to this criminal street gang. During the interception, law enforcement discovered that gang members were assisting one another with narcotics sales and learned they had ties to narcotics cartels. We issued several narcotics cases that resulted in conviction. This wiretap was a piece of a larger project aimed at dismantling this particular criminal street gang. Since the conclusion of the project the arrests resulting from this wiretap, this gang's activities have been significantly curtailed and they have not committed any new, known violent or narcotic related crime.
	2010-SD-63	279	2,374	16	84	This wiretap was initiated to investigate gang related activity including a conspiracy to commit murder, witness intimidation, and narcotics sales. As a result of this wiretap, we relocated a primary murder witness, were able to proceed with a murder prosecution and obtained a guilty verdict. We also gained valuable gang evidence related to this criminal street gang. During the interception, law enforcement discovered that gang members were assisting one another with narcotics sales and learned they had ties to narcotics cartels. We issued several narcotics cases that resulted in conviction. This wiretap was a piece of a larger project aimed at dismantling this particular criminal street gang. Since the conclusion of the project the arrests resulting from this wiretap, this gang's activities have been significantly curtailed and they have not committed any new, known violent or narcotic related crime.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-64	374	6,463	5	95	This wiretap was initiated to investigate gang related activity including a conspiracy to commit murder, witness intimidation, and narcotics sales. As a result of this wiretap, we relocated a primary murder witness, were able to proceed with a murder prosecution and obtained a guilty verdict. We also gained valuable gang evidence related to this criminal street gang. During the interception, law enforcement discovered that gang members were assisting one another with narcotics sales and learned they had ties to narcotics cartels. We issued several narcotics cases that resulted in conviction. This wiretap was a piece of a larger project aimed at dismantling this particular criminal street gang. Since the conclusion of the project the arrests resulting from this wiretap, this gang's activities have been significantly curtailed and they have not committed any new, known violent or narcotic related crime.
	2010-SD-65	229	1,534	30	70	This was an emergency wiretap pursuant to Penal Code § 629.56. This wiretap was initiated to prevent an impending plot to kidnap and murder two unknown victims who owed the target subjects money. During the interception period, law enforcement developed information related to that plot. In addition, a substantial amount of calls confirmed the target subjects narcotics and weapons trafficking. Evidence related to narcotics and weapons were forwarded to federal authorities who plan to conduct further investigation and projects related to the target subjects and their cartel. Investigation is ongoing.
	2010-SD-66	20	1,194	3	97	The interceptions on this wire helped us confirm and prove the gang affiliation of our target and in conjunction with other evidence, was vital to our ability to arrest our target and charge him with the murder of an innocent 21-year-old woman who was shot and killed while celebrating her 21st birthday.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-67	100	931	7	93	The interceptions on this wire helped us confirm and prove the gang affiliation of our target and in conjunction with other evidence, was vital to our ability to arrest our target and charge him with the murder of an innocent 21-year-old woman who was shot and killed while celebrating her 21st birthday.
	2010-SD-68	66	5,980	14	86	The interceptions in this wiretap revealed ongoing conspiracies to commit murder and other crimes of violence as well as narcotics trafficking both in the U.S. and Mexico. The investigation expanded to include the use of federal wiretaps targeting many more conspirators for similar crimes and resulted in the indictment of 43 individuals in federal court, 38 of whom have been arrested. Those proceedings are pending.
	2010-SD-69		0			Intercepts were used to confirm the existence of a conspiracy to commit murder on behalf of a criminal street gang. During this investigation we also discovered the trafficking of firearms, methamphetamine, and heroin in Escondido.
	2010-SD-70		0			
	2010-SD-71		0			
	2010-SD-72		0			
	2010-SD-74		0			
	2010-SD-75		10,943	1	99	intercepts were used to trace and locate a homicide suspect and to obtain additional evidence linking the suspect to the homicide.
	2010-SD-76		1,307	56	44	Intercepts were used to trace and locate a homicide suspect and to obtain additional evidence linking the suspect to the homicide.
	2010-SD-77		0			
	2010-SD-78		0			
	2010-SD-79	0	0			
San Joaquin	2010-SJ-1	194	3,524	6	94	Interceptions were used to obtain evidence identifying the killer in two homicides.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Joaquin (cont'd)	2010-SJ-2	120	723	1	99	Interception was used to identify the participants in a walk-up shooting/murder.
	2010-SJ-3	77	1,428	5.6	94	Interceptions were utilized to attempt to arrest the shooter and get-away driver in a felony-murder conspiracy.
	2010-SJ-4	36	982	3	97	Interceptions were utilized to attempt to corroborate a reluctant witness in a murder.
San Mateo	2010-SM-2	10	446	14	86	This case was crucial in obtaining evidence for a potential murder prosecution. This wire created a "domino" effect which led to statements and admissions of suspects and the procurement of cooperators who will testify against the targets. On a larger scale, this wiretap assisted in the complete dismantling of a local gang, which in turn results in a safer community.
	2010-SM-3		2,590	14	86	One of the main goals of the San Mateo Police Department (SMPD) is to keep the community safe from criminal street gangs. The target subjects of this investigation are part of a violent street gang that plagues the overall safety of the citizens of San Mateo. By intercepting the target subject's phone calls, the goal was to establish their participation in a violent act that could have cost the lives of numerous innocent members of the community. By taking a strong stance on criminal streets gangs and implicating six members of this violent gang in a violent criminal act, it would show the community that the SMPD is taking a strong stance on gang members.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
San Mateo (cont'd)	2010-SM-4		331	21	79	One of the main goals of the SMPD is to keep the community safe from criminal street gangs. The target subjects of this investigation are part of a violent street gang that plagues the overall safety of the citizens of San Mateo. By intercepting the target subject's phone calls, the goal was to establish their participation in a violent act that could have cost the lives of numerous innocent members of the community. By taking a strong stance on criminal streets gangs and implicating six members of this violent gang in a violent criminal act, it would show the community that the SMPD is taking a strong stance on gang members.
Santa Barbara	2010-SBA-1	42	2,044			
	2010-SBA-2	31	3,174			Interceptions were part of a nine-month drug/gang investigation which included multiple telephones. As a result, approximately 14 pounds of methamphetamine was seized as well as cocaine and marijuana. Firearms were seized as well and approximately \$784,609 of illicit proceeds.
	2010-SBA-3	2	47			Interceptions were part of a nine-month drug investigation. See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-4	89	4,465			Nine-month investigation. See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-5	54	1,318			Nine-month investigation. See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-6	91	7,704			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-8	1	152			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-9	114	6,612			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-10	2	305			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-11	43	2,434			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-12	3	26			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-13	3	91			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Santa Barbara (cont'd)	2010-SBA-14	0	6			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-15	104	13,351			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-16	44	1,660			See comments in 2010-SBA-02.
	2010-SBA-17	17	819			Interceptions were instrumental in identifying and dismantling a major DTO. In excess of \$280,000, 8 pounds of heroin, 11 pounds of methamphetamine, and one-half pound of cocaine seized.
	2010-SBA-18	3	451			Interceptions were invaluable to the dismantling of a DTO.
	2010-SBA-19	24	1,454			Instrumental in dismantling a major DTO.
Santa Clara	2010-SCL-1	73	5,047	3.5	96	See 2010-SCL-5.
	2010-SCL-2	61	7,187	2	98	See 2010-SCL-5.
	2010-SCL-3	123	11,550	5	95	See 2010-SCL-5.
	2010-SCL-4	22	604	3	97	See 2010-SCL-5..
	2010-SCL-5	22	1,737	24	76	The interception allowed agents to investigate a sophisticated Mexican DTO that had been operating more or less undetected for several years. Eleven suspects were arrested, another identified fled to Mexico, eight firearms, approximately 15 pounds of methamphetamine, 4.5 pounds of cocaine, and \$40,200 was seized. With the aid of the wiretap interceptions agents were able to make a significant impact on several communities spanning four counties.
Sonoma	2010-SON-1	125	2,581	10.1	90	The interceptions are invaluable to combat major drug trafficking groups that utilize cell phone communications to negotiate, monitor and distribute methamphetamine in our community.
Stanislaus	2010-STA-1	34	757	3.3	88.8	This wiretap was used to locate the person responsible for a homicide, leading to his arrest.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Stanislaus (cont'd)	2010-STA-2	22	2,277	2.8	80	No incriminating evidence related to the homicide was interrupted. The target observed the presence of surveillance officers and stopped utilizing the cell phone to talk about anything related to the homicide.
	2010-STA-3	10	1,063	14.4	61.2	This wiretap helped dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
	2010-STA-4	24	1,920	23.5	57.3	This wiretap help dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
	2010-STA-5	42	1,030	18.3	63.9	This wiretap helped dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
	2010-STA-6	63	1,708	10	84	This wiretap helped to dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
	2010-STA-7	226	6,248	19.2	33.4	The wiretap helped dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County. The target also pled guilty in San Joaquin County to charges stemming from the interception of this phone.
	2010-STA-8	35	874	8.6	45.3	This wiretap helped dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
	2010-STA-10	128	1,961	16.5	24.6	Intercepts used to aid in the investigation of a DTO.
	2010-STA-11	27	213	20	25	Intercepts were used to aid in the investigation of a DTO.
	2010-STA-12	58	789	14.5	31.4	Intercepts were used to aid in the investigation of a DTO.
	2010-STA-13	269	4,252	14.5	29.4	Investigation of a DTO within a gang.
	2010-STA-14	20	834	8.5	42.5	Target subject was taken into custody just prior to the beginning of the intercept. Target's family member attempted to maintain the business but was not trusted. Intercept terminated by agents.
	2010-STA-15	217	4,827	13.8	38	This wiretap helped dismantle a gang's leadership in Stanislaus County.
Sutter	2010-SUT-1	55	7,866	2	98	The communications intercepted provided intelligence and information on ongoing homicide investigations. This evidence will assist investigators and prosecutors in the investigation and prosecution of pending murder cases.
Ventura	2010-VE-1	49	4,795	4	96	

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Ventura (cont'd)	2010-VE-2	102	6,057	30	70	This investigation is in its initial stages. It is anticipated that there will be 10-20 subjects arrested at the conclusion of the investigation.
	2010-VE-3	47	2,176	21	79	This investigation is ongoing. Currently, there are approximately 8 to 10 subjects that have been identified and will be arrested at the conclusion of the investigation.
	2010-VE-4	21	270	27	73	Eight to ten subjects have been identified and will be arrested at the conclusion of the investigation.
	2010-VE-5	54	1,194			Monitoring was helpful in gathering additional evidence of the crime and establishing relationships between witnesses, possible accomplices, and/or accessories to the crime.
	2010-VE-6	67	3,807	34	66	Eight to ten subjects have been identified and will be arrested at the conclusion of the investigation.
	2010-VE-7	74	2,068	37	63	This investigation is ongoing. Thus far, five of the eight subjects arrested in the current investigation have pled. There are additional persons to be arrested.
	2010-VE-8	7	0			Used to identify suspects in an ongoing gang homicide investigation.
	2010-VE-9	1	0			Used to identify suspects in an ongoing gang homicide investigation.
	2010-VE-10	30	262			Currently the investigation is ongoing and there have been no arrests. Agents seized 3 kilograms of cocaine that were destined for London, England. Ventura Resident Agents contacted DEA London and arranged an International Controlled Delivery. Once all co-conspirators have been identified, arrests will be forthcoming.
	2010-VE-11		0			Wire used to identify suspects in an ongoing gang homicide investigation.
	2010-VE-12		0			Used to identify suspects in an ongoing gang homicide investigation.
	2010-VE-13	47	896	25	75	Ongoing investigation after a 3 kilogram cocaine seizure that was destined for London, England. Ventura Resident Office Agents contacted DEA London to arrange an International Controlled Delivery. Once all co-conspirators have been identified, arrest will be forthcoming.

Table 4
Description of Communications Obtained and
Usefulness of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Approximate No. of Persons Whose Communications Were Intercepted	Total No. of Communications Intercepted	Nature & Frequency (Penal Code § 629.62(9))		Comments on Usefulness of Intercept
				Incriminating Communications (%)	Other Communications (%)	
Ventura (cont'd)	2010-VE-14	120	2,501			
	2010-VE-15	46	1,583	45	55	Investigation is ongoing. There are three subjects identified for future arrests. This wire has led to a 2.2 pound heroin seizure.
	2010-VE-16	66	146	9	91	Wire was used to locate and arrest a fleeing suspect.
	2010-VE-17	478	18,057	3	97	Three people have been arrested and more are anticipated.
	2010-VE-18	39	1,638	0	100	

N/A - Not applicable

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Imperial	2010-IM-1	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	8/18/2010		8/18/2010	
	2010-IM-2	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	6/15/2010		6/15/2010	
	2010-IM-3	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 11/11/2010			
	2010-IM-4	Otero, DA	Hon. Lehman	(Inventory due) 12/11/2010			
	2010-IM-5	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 1/14/2011			
	2010-IM-6	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 2/18/2011			
	2010-IM-7	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 3/6/2011			
	2010-IM-8	Otero, DA	Hon. Yeager	(Inventory due) 3/19/2011			
Kern	2010-KE-1	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 5/25/2010		2/25/2010	60
	2010-KE-2	Saleen, ADA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 8/6/2010		8/4/2010	57
	2010-KE-3	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 8/10/2010	8/6/2010	11/3/2010	4
	2010-KE-4	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 9/3/2010		7/11/2010	20
	2010-KE-5	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 9/1/2010			
	2010-KE-6	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 9/3/2010		7/11/2010	15
	2010-KE-7	Jagels, DA	Hon. Bush	(Inventory due) 10/1/2010		11/3/2010	39
	2010-KE-8	Saleen, ADA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 11/24/2010		12/9/2010	14
	2010-KE-9	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	(Inventory due) 12/19/2010		12/10/2010	14
	2010-KE-10	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	2/1/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Kern (cont'd)	2010-KE-11	Jagels, DA	Hon. Humphrey	1/28/2011			
	2010-KE-12	Jagels, DA	Hon. Lewis	3/7/2011			
	2010-KE-13	Saleen, ADA	Hon. Lewis	3/16/2011			
Los Angeles	2010-LA-1	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/22/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-4	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/3/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-8	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/21/2010	12/10/2010		
	2009-LA-10	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/19/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-11	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/15/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-12	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/12/2010	10/1/2010		
	2009-LA-13	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/1/2010			
	2009-LA-14	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/5/2010			
	2009-LA-15	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/28/2010	9/29/2010		
	2010-LA-17	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/28/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-18	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2011	10/14/2010		
	2009-LA-19	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/12/2011	10/14/2010		
	2009-LA-20	Grobeson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/8/2010	11/22/2010		
2010-LA-21	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/7/2010	12/10/2010			
2010-LA-23	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/5/2010	12/10/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-24	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/3/2010	1/5/2011		
	2009-LA-26	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 4/17/2010		7/21/2010	166
	2010-LA-27	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/3/2011	11/4/2010		
	2010-LA-28	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/9/2010		6/9/2010	28
	2010-LA-29	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-LA-30	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/10/2010	10/5/2010		
	2010-LA-31	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/28/2010	9/29/2010		
	2010-LA-32	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-33	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 5/25/2010		7/21/2010	166
	2010-LA-34	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2001	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-35	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-LA-37	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/19/2010		7/12/2010	32
	2010-LA-38	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/30/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-39	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/2/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-40	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/3/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-42	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/10/2010		6/9/2010	28
	2010-LA-43	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-44	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-45	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-46	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/28/2010	9/29/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-47	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/16/2010		1/6/2011	14
	2010-LA-48	Grobesson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/19/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-49	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/17/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-50	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2010			
	2010-LA-51	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/17/2010	10/22/2010		
	2010-LA-52	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2011	10/13/2011		
	2010-LA-53	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-54	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/16/2010		10/18/2010	30
	2010-LA-55	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/15/2010		12/21/2010	1
	2010-LA-56	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/30/2010		8/10/2010	2
	2010-LA-57	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/30/2010		
	2010-LA-58	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/4/2010	10/5/2010		
	2010-LA-59	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/31/2010		6/21/2010	426
	2010-LA-60	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/26/2010	9/27/2010		
	2010-LA-61	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-62	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/5/2010			
	2010-LA-63	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/10/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-64	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 6/27/2010	12/17/2010		
	2010-LA-65	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-66	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-67	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/15/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-68	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/23/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-69	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/20/2010	10/1/2010		
	2010-LA-70	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/27/2010		7/27/2010	524
	2010-LA-71	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/17/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-LA-72	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/17/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-73	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	10/13/2010			
	2010-LA-74	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/16/2010		8/3/2010	86
	2010-LA-75	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/31/2010		6/21/2010	426
	2010-LA-76	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2010			
	2010-LA-77	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-78	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2010			
	2010-LA-79	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-80	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/31/2010			
	2010-LA-81	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-82	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/28/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-83	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/30/2010		
	2010-LA-84	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/12/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-85	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/21/2010	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-86	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/21/2010		8/16/2010	7

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-87	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/30/2010		
	2010-LA-88	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/17/2011	11/18/2010		
	2010-LA-89	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/12/2010		12/21/2010	3
	2010-LA-90	Burnley, Deputy District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	2/7/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-91	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-LA-92	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/8/2010			
	2010-LA-93	Plascencia, Deputy District Attorney	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-95	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2011	10/13/2010		
	2010-LA-96	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	10/23/2010			
	2010-LA-97	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/1/2010			
	2010-LA-98	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/10/2011	10/12/2010		
	2010-LA-99	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/5/2010	10/22/2010		
	2010-LA-100	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/7/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-101	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/7/2010		8/27/2010	830
	2010-LA-102	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/25/2010		8/27/2010	830
	2010-LA-103	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 7/6/2010		9/24/2010	830
	2010-LA-104	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/9/2010			
	2010-LA-105	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	10/15/2010		
	2010-LA-106	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-107	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/9/2010			
	2010-LA-108	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-109	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/14/2010	10/22/2010		
	2010-LA-110	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/30/2010			
	2010-LA-111	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/30/2010			
	2010-LA-113	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/21/2010	11/22/2010		
	2010-LA-114	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/17/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-115	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2011	10/13/2010		
	2010-LA-116	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/16/2010		9/27/2010	196
	2010-LA-117	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-118	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-119	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/28/2011	12/28/2010		
	2010-LA-120	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/30/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-121	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/26/2010		11/9/2010	30
	2010-LA-122	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/16/2010			
	2010-LA-123	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/19/2010		9/28/2010	87
	2010-LA-124	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/11/2011	10/12/2010		
	2010-LA-125	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/9/2010	10/15/2010		
	2010-LA-126	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-127	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/22/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-128	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/9/2010	10/22/2010		
	2010-LA-129	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/11/2011	10/12/2010		
	2010-LA-130	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/11/2011	10/13/2010		
	2010-LA-131	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/21/2010			
	2010-LA-132	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-133	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2010			
	2010-LA-134	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	9/10/2010			
	2010-LA-135	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2010			
	2010-LA-136	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/13/2011	10/13/2010		
	2010-LA-137	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/2/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-138	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/9/2010			
	2010-LA-139	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/20/2010			
	2010-LA-140	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-141	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	10/15/2010		
	2010-LA-142	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/27/2010	10/22/2010		
	2010-LA-143	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/13/2010		9/28/2010	87
	2010-LA-144	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/19/2011	10/21/2010		
	2010-LA-145	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/2/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-146	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2011	11/15/2010		
	2010-LA-147	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/6/2011	12/6/2010		
	2010-LA-148	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/2/2010	10/22/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-150	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/2/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-151	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/28/2011	12/28/2010		
	2010-LA-152	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/17/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-LA-153	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/30/2010		
	2010-LA-154	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-LA-155	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-LA-156	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-157	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 12/2/2010	12/29/2010		
	2010-LA-159	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/28/2011	12/28/2010		
	2010-LA-160	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/30/2010	11/22/2010		
	2010-LA-161	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/8/2011	12/8/2010		
	2010-LA-163	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-LA-164	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 11/30/2010	12/6/2010		
	2010-LA-165	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/28/2011	12/28/2010		
	2010-LA-166	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-167	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/15/2011	12/15/2010		
	2010-LA-168	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 8/6/2010	11/9/2010		
	2010-LA-169	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 9/12/2010	12/23/2010		
	2010-LA-170	Niedermann, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 10/7/2010	10/12/2010		
	2010-LA-171	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/10/2011	12/10/2010		
	2010-LA-172	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/15/2011	12/15/2010		
	2010-LA-173	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011	11/29/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-175	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/14/2011			
	2010-LA-176	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	12/22/2010			
	2010-LA-177	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/4/2011			
	2010-LA-178	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2011			
	2010-LA-179	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011			
	2010-LA-180	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/15/2011			
	2010-LA-181	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/31/2011			
	2010-LA-182	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/6/2011		12/9/2010	51
	2010-LA-184	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/31/2011			
	2010-LA-185	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/27/2011			
	2010-LA-186	Burnley, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/6/2011		12/9/2010	51
	2010-LA-187	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/13/2011			
	2010-LA-188	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/11/2010			
	2010-LA-189	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/28/2011			
	2010-LA-190	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 1/29/2011			
	2010-LA-191	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/23/2011			
	2010-LA-192	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/26/2011			
	2010-LA-193	Belis, DDA	Hon. Fidler	(Inventory due) 2/13/2011			
	2010-LA-194	Sims, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/22/2011			
	2010-LA-195	Nishita, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/27/2010			
	2010-LA-196	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/7/2011			
	2010-LA-198	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/16/2011			
	2010-LA-199	Johnson, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/29/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-200	II, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/22/2011			
	2010-LA-201	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/4/2011			
	2010-LA-202	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/16/2011			
	2010-LA-203	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	2/12/2011			
	2010-LA-204	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/27/2011			
	2010-LA-205	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/16/2011			
	2010-LA-206	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/6/2011			
	2010-LA-207	Barkhurst, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/27/2011			
	2010-LA-208	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/24/2011			
	2010-LA-209	Helmolt, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/15/2011			
	2010-LA-210	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2011			
	2010-LA-211	Daniel, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/14/2011			
	2010-LA-212	Marshall, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/23/2011			
	2010-LA-213	Plascencia, DDA	Hon. Fidler	1/14/2011			
	2010-LA-214	Pincus, DDA	Hon. Fidler	3/16/2011			
Merced	2010-MER-1	Bacciarini, CDDA	Hon. Kiriara	(Inventory due) 6/16/2010			
	2010-MER-2	Min, DDA	Hon. Kiriara	9/23/2010		9/23/2010	88
Monterey	2010-MTY-1	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-2	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-3	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-4	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-5	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-6	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-7	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/21/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-8	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-9	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Monterey (cont'd)	2010-MTY-10	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-11	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
	2010-MTY-12	Olvis, Managing DDA	Hon. Burlison	8/31/2010		11/17/2010	380
Orange	2010-OR-1	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	5/13/2010			
	2010-OR-2	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	5/4/2010			
	2010-OR-3	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Donahue	5/22/2010	8/6/2010		
	2010-OR-4	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	6/13/2010	7/21/2010		
	2010-OR-5	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	7/20/2010			
	2010-OR-7	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	8/24/2010			
	2010-OR-8	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	8/26/2010			
	2010-OR-9	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	9/1/2010			
	2010-OR-10	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	8/18/2010			
	2010-OR-11	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	8/20/2010			
	2010-OR-12	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Donahue	9/3/2010			
	2010-OR-13	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	8/7/2010	11/30/2010		
	2010-OR-14	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	9/7/2010			
	2010-OR-15	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	10/13/2010	2/8/2011		
	2010-OR-16	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/10/2010	2/8/2011		
	2010-OR-17	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/8/2010	12/7/2010		
	2010-OR-18	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/11/2010	12/7/2010		
	2010-OR-19	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	1/27/2011			
	2010-OR-20	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	2/26/2011			
	2010-OR-21	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	3/3/2011			
	2010-OR-23	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	11/25/2010			
	2010-OR-24	Rackaucaks, DA	Hon. Prickett	1/1/2011			
	2010-OR-25	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	12/31/2010	1/3/2011		
	2010-OR-26	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	2/15/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-27	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	1/28/2011			
	2010-OR-28	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Prickett	2/10/2011	2/8/2011		
	2010-OR-30	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	6/24/2010			
	2010-OR-31	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	7/31/2010			
	2010-OR-32	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. King	7/31/2010			
	2010-OR-33	Rackauckas, DA	Hon. Donahue	9/21/2010			
Riverside	2010-RIV-1	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/26/2010	3/1/2011		
	2010-RIV-2	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/23/2010	3/1/2010		
	2010-RIV-3	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	4/18/2011	7/18/2011		
	2010-RIV-4	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2011			
	2010-RIV-5	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	1/26/2011			
	2010-RIV-6	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	12/9/2010		6/11/2011	
	2010-RIV-7	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/10/2010		2/7/2011	
	2010-RIV-8	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/21/2010		3/20/2011	
	2010-RIV-9	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/1/2011			
	2010-RIV-10	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/29/2010	9/27/2010		
	2010-RIV-13	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/8/2011			
	2010-RIV-14	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2011			
	2010-RIV-15	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/12/2011			
	2010-RIV-16	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Cahraman	9/11/2010		3/1/2011	
	2010-RIV-17	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/20/2010		3/1/2011	
	2010-RIV-18	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	8/18/2010		3/1/2011	
	2010-RIV-19	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	9/11/2010		3/1/2011	
	2010-RIV-20	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/10/2011			
	2010-RIV-21	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/8/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-22	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/3/2010			
	2010-RIV-23	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Cahraman	(Inventory due) 7/23/2010			
	2010-RIV-24	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/21/2010			
	2010-RIV-25	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/9/2010			
	2010-RIV-26	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/21/2010			
	2010-RIV-27	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 10/7/2010			
	2010-RIV-28	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 5/27/2010			
	2010-RIV-29	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/16/2010			
	2010-RIV-30	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/9/2010			
	2010-RIV-31	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 10/11/2010			
	2010-RIV-32	Pacheco, Da	Hon. Cahraman	(Inventory due) 7/25/2010			
	2010-RIV-33	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/29/2010			
	2010-RIV-35	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/18/2010			
	2010-RIV-36	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/26/2010			
	2010-RIV-37	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/22/2010			
	2010-RIV-38	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/7/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-39	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/16/2010			
	2010-RIV-40	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Cahraman	(Inventory due) 10/27/2010			
	2010-RIV-41	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/17/2010			
	2010-RIV-42	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 8/28/2010			
	2010-RIV-43	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/30/2010			
	2010-RIV-44	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 7/10/2010			
	2010-RIV-45	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/30/2010			
	2010-RIV-46	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/5/2011			
	2010-RIV-47	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/5/2011			
	2010-RIV-48	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/10/2011			
	2010-RIV-49	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/27/2011			
	2010-RIV-50	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/25/2011			
	2010-RIV-51	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	4/1/2011	10/5/2010		
	2010-RIV-52	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 11/27/2010			
	2010-RIV-53	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	4/1/2011			
	2010-RIV-54	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	2/28/2011			
	2010-RIV-55	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/30/2010			
	2010-RIV-56	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/10/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-57	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/30/2010			
	2010-RIV-58	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/10/2011			
	2010-RIV-59	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 2/10/2011			
	2010-RIV-60	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 3/18/2011			
	2010-RIV-61	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 3/18/2011			
	2010-RIV-62	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-RIV-63	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-RIV-64	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 9/6/2010			
	2010-RIV-65	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 10/13/2010			
	2010-RIV-66	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Cahraman	(Inventory due) 10/25/2010			
	2010-RIV-67	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 11/10/2010			
	2010-RIV-68	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/12/2011			
	2010-RIV-69	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 5/27/2010			
	2010-RIV-70	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/25/2010			
	2010-RIV-71	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 6/12/2010			
	2010-RIV-72	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 5/7/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-73	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 12/10/2010			
	2010-RIV-74	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/6/2011			
	2010-RIV-75	Pacheco, DA	Hon. Luebs	(Inventory due) 1/12/2011			
Sacramento	2010-SAC-1	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	12/15/2010		12/1/2010	12
	2010-SAC-2	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/12/2011		12/8/2010	200
	2010-SAC-3	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/2/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-4	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/1/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-5	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/2/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-6	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/2/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-7	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	1/16/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-8	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/8/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-9	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/8/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-10	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/8/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-11	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	1/16/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-12	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/8/2011		12/8/2010	
	2010-SAC-13	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	6/24/2010		6/21/2010	171

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Sacramento (cont'd)	2010-SAC-14	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	7/23/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-15	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	9/2/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-16	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	8/2/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-17	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	8/19/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-18	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	8/2/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-19	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	9/2/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-20	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	9/2/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-21	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	8/9/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-22	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	9/1/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-23	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	9/1/2010		7/21/2010	
	2010-SAC-24	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	1/5/2010			
	2010-SAC-25	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	(Inventory due) 1/3/2011			
	2010-SAC-26	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	3/2/2011			
	2010-SAC-27	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/28/2011			
	2010-SAC-28	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	2/8/2011			
	2010-SAC-29	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	3/1/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Sacramento (cont'd)	2010-SAC-30	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	3/3/2011			
	2010-SAC-31	O'Mara, Asst. Chief DDA	Hon. White	3/3/2011			
San Bernardino	2010-SBD-6	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/13/2010			
	2010-SBD-7	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/6/2010			
	2010-SBD-8	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/6/2010			
	2010-SBD-9	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/3/2010			
	2010-SBD-10	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/3/2010			
	2010-SBD-11	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-12	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	7/9/2010			
	2010-SBD-13	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-15	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010			
	2010-SBD-16	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/28/2010			
	2010-SBD-17	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-18	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010			
	2010-SBD-19	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/2/2010			
	2010-SBD-20	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/23/2010			
	2010-SBD-21	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010		3/23/2011	12
	2010-SBD-22	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010			
	2010-SBD-23	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010			
	2010-SBD-24	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	6/26/2010			
	2010-SBD-25	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/14/2010			
	2010-SBD-26	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	6/10/2010			
	2010-SBD-27	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/9/2010		3/23/2011	16
	2010-SBD-28	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-29	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	6/19/2010			
	2010-SBD-30	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	6/26/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-31	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/30/2010			
	2010-SBD-32	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/31/2010			
	2010-SBD-33	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/31/2010			
	2010-SBD-34	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/7/2010			
	2010-SBD-35	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/14/2010			
	2010-SBD-37	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/9/2010			
	2010-SBD-38	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/13/2010			
	2010-SBD-39	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-40	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/28/2010			
	2010-SBD-41	Christy, ADA		7/28/2010			
	2010-SBD-42	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-43	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/28/2010			
	2010-SBD-44	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/28/2010			
	2010-SBD-45	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	7/31/2010			
	2010-SBD-46	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/3/2010			
	2010-SBD-50	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/10/2010			
	2010-SBD-51	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/11/2010			
	2010-SBD-52	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/11/2010			
	2010-SBD-53	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/18/2010			
	2010-SBD-54	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	8/21/2010			
	2010-SBD-55	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-56	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/10/2010			
	2010-SBD-57	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-58	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/7/2010			
	2010-SBD-60	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/9/2010			
	2010-SBD-61	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/16/2010		2/8/2011	55
	2010-SBD-62	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/17/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-63	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-64	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/16/2010			
	2010-SBD-65	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-66	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/14/2010			
	2010-SBD-67	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	9/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-68	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/1/2010			
	2010-SBD-70	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/8/2010			
	2010-SBD-71	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/8/2010			
	2010-SBD-72	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/9/2010			
	2010-SBD-73	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/8/2010			
	2010-SBD-74	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	11/6/2010			
	2010-SBD-75	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/13/2010			
	2010-SBD-76	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/22/2010			
	2010-SBD-77	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/13/2010			
	2010-SBD-78	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/13/2010			
	2010-SBD-79	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-80	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/18/2010			
	2010-SBD-81	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/30/2010			
	2010-SBD-82	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/30/2010		2/8/2011	17
	2010-SBD-83	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/26/2010			
	2010-SBD-85	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	12/18/2010			
	2010-SBD-86	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/17/2010			
	2010-SBD-87	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	1/22/2010			
	2010-SBD-88	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/18/2010			
	2010-SBD-89	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/27/2010			
	2010-SBD-90	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/27/2010			
	2010-SBD-92	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/27/2010		1/27/2011	20

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-94	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	11/27/2010			
	2010-SBD-95	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	1/7/2011			
	2010-SBD-96	Christy, ADA	Hon. Harrison	12/21/2010			
	2010-SBD-97	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/10/2010		1/27/2011	34
	2010-SBD-98	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/18/2010			
	2010-SBD-99	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/15/2010			
	2010-SBD-100	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/30/2010			
	2010-SBD-102	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	1/25/2011			
	2010-SBD-103	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	1/30/2011			
	2010-SBD-104	Hackleman, ADA	Hon. Pace	2/5/2011		1/27/2011	6
	2010-SBD-105	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	2/26/2011			
	2010-SBD-107	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/27/2011			
	2010-SBD-109	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	2/26/2011			
	2010-SBD-110	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/1/2011			
	2010-SBD-111	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/24/2011			
	2010-SBD-112	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/24/2011	3/22/2011		
	2010-SBD-113	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/24/2011			
	2010-SBD-114	Christy, ADA	Hon. Pace	3/24/2011			
	2010-SBD-115	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/27/2010			
	2010-SBD-119	Christy, ADA	Hon. Barr	4/18/2010		2/8/2011	39
	2010-SBD-123	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	4/22/2010			
	2010-SBD-124	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	4/22/2010			
	2010-SBD-125	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	10/11/2010			
	2010-SBD-126	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/29/2010			
	2010-SBD-127	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	2/20/2011			
	2010-SBD-128	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/24/2010			
	2010-SBD-129	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	5/29/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-130	Christy, ADA	Hon. Cortez	12/22/2010			
San Diego	2010-SD-1	Rodriguez, ADA	Hon. Trentacosta	(Inventory due) 6/3/2010			
	2010-SD-2	Rodriguez, ADA	Hon. Trentacosta	(Inventory due) 6/24/2010			
	2010-SD-3	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/24/2010			
	2010-SD-4	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/8/2010			
	2010-SD-5	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 7/28/2010			
	2010-SD-6	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 7/16/2010			
	2010-SD-7	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 7/13/2010			
	2010-SD-8	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 8/8/2010			
	2010-SD-9	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	4/5/2011	10/8/2010		
	2010-SD-10	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	1/6/2011			
	2010-SD-11	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/20/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-SD-12	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/10/2011			
	2010-SD-13	Jennings, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	4/13/2011	10/8/2010		
	2010-SD-14	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	3/21/2011	9/21/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-15	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	1/20/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-SD-16	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/11/2010			
	2010-SD-17	Unzueta, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 12/15/2010			
	2010-SD-18	Unzueta, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 12/23/2010			
	2010-SD-19	Unzueta, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	(Inventory due) 1/31/2011			
	2010-SD-20	Torres, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 10/6/2010			
	2010-SD-21	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 9/30/2010			
	2010-SD-23	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/13/2010			
	2010-SD-24	Tomaski, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/20/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-SD-25	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 6/28/2010			
	2010-SD-26	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/19/2011	8/19/2010		
	2010-SD-27	Lepkofher, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/26/2011	8/2/2010		
	2010-SD-28	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/30/2010	7/1/2010		
	2010-SD-29	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/26/2011	8/2/2010		
	2010-SD-30	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	3/14/2011	9/21/2010		
	2010-SD-31	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	3/14/2011	9/21/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-32	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/10/2011	8/19/2010		
	2010-SD-34	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/20/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-SD-35	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	1/20/2011	11/19/2010		
	2010-SD-36	Hunter, Asst. Chief Calif DOJ/BNE	Hon. Danielsen	1/21/2011			
	2010-SD-37	Hunter, Asst. Chief Calif DOJ/BNE	Hon. Danielsen	4/13/2011	12/13/2011		
	2010-SD-38	Simpson, Acting Asst. Chief	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due)			
	2010-SD-39	Simpson, Acting Asst. Chief	Hon. Danielsen	4/13/2011	12/10/2010		
	2010-SD-40	Simpson, Acting Asst. Chief	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due)			
	2010-SD-41	Hunter, Acting Asst. Chief	Hon. Danielsen	4/12/2011	10/8/2010		
	2010-SD-42	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	6/28/2011			
	2010-SD-43	Sherman, Acting Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	3/1/2011			
	2010-SD-44	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/8/2011			
	2010-SD-45	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	2/27/2011			
	2010-SD-46	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/27/2011			
	2010-SD-47	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/11/2011			
	2010-SD-48	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/22/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-49	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Rogers	3/7/2011			
	2010-SD-50	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	6/15/2011	12/17/2010		
	2010-SD-51	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	6/15/2011	12/17/2010		
	2010-SD-52	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	6/15/2011	12/17/2010		
	2010-SD-53	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	6/15/2011	12/17/2010		
	2010-SD-54	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	6/15/2011	12/17/2010		
	2010-SD-55	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	3/28/2011	9/29/2010		
	2010-SD-56	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	3/28/2011	9/29/2010		
	2010-SD-57	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	5/9/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-SD-58	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	5/9/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-SD-59	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	5/9/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-SD-60	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	2/11/2011			
	2010-SD-61	Partridge, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Danielsen	3/11/2010			
	2010-SD-62	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	12/29/2010	9/28/2010		
	2010-SD-63	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	12/26/2010	9/28/2010		
	2010-SD-64	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 7/20/2010	10/18/2010		

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-65	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	6/16/2011			
	2010-SD-66	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Rogers	11/18/2010			
	2010-SD-67	Landsowne, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	2/24/2011			
	2010-SD-68		Hon. Danielsen	12/9/2010	6/29/2010		
	2010-SD-69		Hon. Danielsen	2/10/2011	11/9/2010		
	2010-SD-70		Hon. Danielsen	5/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-SD-71		Hon. Danielsen	5/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-SD-72		Hon. Danielsen	5/27/2011	11/29/2010		
	2010-SD-74		Hon. Danielsen	2/10/2011			
	2010-SD-75	Maher, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	6/3/2011	12/3/2010		
	2010-SD-76	Maher, Chief of Police	Hon. Danielsen	6/3/2011	12/3/2010		
	2010-SD-77		Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 8/18/2010			
	2010-SD-78		Hon. Rogers	4/13/2011	12/13/2010		
	2010-SD-79	Hunter, Asst. Chief Calif DOJ/BNE	Hon. Danielsen	(Inventory due) 8/17/2010			
San Joaquin	2010-SJ-1	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	(Inventory due) 6/8/2010	5/7/2011		0
	2010-SJ-2	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	(Inventory due) 6/8/2010	5/7/2011		
	2010-SJ-3	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Vlavianos	(Inventory due) 12/10/2010	3/9/2011		
	2010-SJ-4	Busuttil, ADA	Hon. Guiliani	1/19/2010		1/18/2010	7
San Mateo	2010-SM-2	Fox, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	12/9/2010		12/6/2010	10
	2010-SM-3	Fox, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	3/10/2011			
	2010-SM-4	Fox, DA	Hon. Grandsaert	3/10/2011			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Santa Barbara	2010-SBA-1	Brown, Sheriff	Hon. Hill	(Inventory due) 6/17/2010			
	2010-SBA-2	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 6/4/2010			
	2010-SBA-3	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 6/11/2010			
	2010-SBA-4	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 7/2/2010			
	2010-SBA-5	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 7/2/2010			
	2010-SBA-6	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 7/9/2010			
	2010-SBA-8	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	(Inventory due) 7/16/2010			
	2010-SBA-9	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Hill	(Inventory due) 8/6/2010			
	2010-SBA-10	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Hill	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/17/2010	
	2010-SBA-11	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/13/2010	
	2010-SBA-12	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/17/2010	
	2010-SBA-13	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/13/2010	
	2010-SBA-14	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/13/2010	
	2010-SBA-15	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	7/16/2010	7/16/2010	10/13/2010	
	2010-SBA-16	Landrum, Special Agent in Charge	Hon. Garcia	10/17/2010		10/17/2010	
	2010-SBA-17	Macagni, Chief	Hon. Garcia	9/15/2010		9/16/2010	
	2010-SBA-18	Macagni, Chief	Hon. Garcia	9/15/2010		9/16/2010	
	2010-SBA-19	Macagni, Chief	Hon. Garcia	9/15/2010		9/16/2010	

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Santa Clara	2010-SCL-1	Carr, District Attorney	Hon. Pennypacker	7/15/2010	1/14/2011		
	2010-SCL-2	Carr, District Attorney	Hon. Pennypacker	8/10/2010	4/14/2010		
	2010-SCL-3	Carr, District Attorney	Hon. Pennypacker	9/3/2010	3/1/2011		
	2010-SCL-4	Carr, District Attorney	Hon. Pennypacker	8/25/2010	3/1/2011		
	2010-SCL-5	Carr, District Attorney	Hon. Pennypacker	11/15/2010	11/15/2010	2/15/2010	70
Sonoma	2010-SON-1	Passalaqua, DA	Hon. Nadler	3/8/2011			
Stanislaus	2010-STA-1	Yandell, Detective	Hon. Whiteside	1/20/2010		1/17/2011	0
	2010-STA-2	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	5/27/2010		1/17/2010	12
	2010-STA-3	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	7/6/2010		1/17/2011	1
	2010-STA-4	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	7/8/2010		1/17/2011	0
	2010-STA-5	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	7/14/2010		1/17/2011	27
	2010-STA-6	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	9/1/1910		1/17/2011	4
	2010-STA-7	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	9/11/2010		1/17/2011	14
	2010-STA-8	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	8/17/2010		1/17/2011	10
	2010-STA-10	Soriano, DEA	Hon. Ashley	4/2/2010			
	2010-STA-11	Soriano, DEA	Hon. Ashley	4/30/2010			
	2010-STA-12	Soriano, DEA	Hon. Ashley	(Inventory due)5/14/2010			
	2010-STA-13	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	9/26/2010		1/17/2011	1
	2010-STA-14	Hoek, Agent	Hon. Ashley	11/22/2010		9/8/2010	20
	2010-STA-15	Brown, Detective	Hon. Ashley	9/16/2010		1/17/2011	21
Sutter	2010-SUT-1	McClung, ADA	Hon. Chandler	8/7/2010		7/15/2010	55
Ventura	2010-VE-1	Weiss, DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 4/25/2010			

Table 5
Penal Code Section 629.62 Inventory Report

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Name of Applicant/Agency	Judge Authorizing Application	Date of Order for Service of Inventory	Date Granted for Postponement of Service of Inventory	Date of Compliance With Inventory Order	Number of Inventory Notices Sent
Ventura (cont'd)	2010-VE-2	Ward, Special Agent	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 5/14/2010		7/21/2010	47
	2010-VE-3	Wright, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 6/8/2010		7/21/2010	7
	2010-VE-4	Wright, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 6/20/2010		7/28/2010	2
	2010-VE-5	Frawley, Chief DDA	Hon. McGee	7/11/2010		7/11/2010	73
	2010-VE-6	Wright, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	7/28/2010		7/28/2010	37
	2010-VE-7	Wright, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	7/28/2010		7/28/2010	3
	2010-VE-8	Fox, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-VE-9	Fox, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-VE-10	Russell, DDA	Hon. McGee	9/16/2010	12/20/2010		
	2010-VE-11	Fox, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-VE-12	Fox, Senior DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 9/26/2010			
	2010-VE-13	Russell, DDA	Hon. McGee	11/29/2010	12/20/2010		
	2010-VE-14	Russell, DDA	Hon. McGee	12/23/2010	12/20/2010		
	2010-VE-15	Russell, DDA	Hon. McGee	2/5/2011			
	2010-VE-16	Day, Senior DDA	Hon. Cloninger	(Inventory due) 1/25/2011			
	2010-VE-17	McAllister, DDA	Hon. O'Neill	(Inventory due) 3/8/2011			
	2010-VE-18	McAllister, DDA	Hon. McGee	(Inventory due) 3/15/2011			

N/A - not applicable

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Imperial	2010-IM-1	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-2	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-3	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-4	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-5	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-6	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-7	Cost not available			
	2010-IM-8	Cost not available			
Kern	2010-KE-1	20	96,000	8,168	104,168
	2010-KE-2	12 sworn law enforcement	48,000	5,000	53,000
	2010-KE-3	3 monitors	16,000	5,000	21,000
	2010-KE-4	25 law enforcement	48,000	5,000	53,000
	2010-KE-5	Costs related to 2010-KE-2			
	2010-KE-6	25 law enforcement	11,500	3,000	14,500
	2010-KE-7	Cost not available			
	2010-KE-8	26 law enforcement	57,600	4,000	61,600
	2010-KE-9	Costs related to 2010-KE-8			
	2010-KE-10	3 monitors	16,000	5,000	21,000
	2010-KE-11	9 law enforcement	22,500	2,000	24,500
	2010-KE-12	Costs related to 2010-KE-10			
	2010-KE-13	8 law enforcement	67,000	5,000	72,000
Los Angeles	2010-LA-1	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-4	26 monitors	171,142	14,400	185,542
	2010-LA-8	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2009-LA-10	2 monitors per day	27,000	1,600	28,600

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-11	6 monitors per day	39,492	5,400	44,892
	2010-LA-12	8 monitors	52,656	7,200	59,856
	2009-LA-13	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,800	21,800
	2009-LA-14	2 monitors per day	18,000	1,800	19,800
	2009-LA-15	5 monitors per day - Federal	21,000	2,000	23,000
	2010-LA-17	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-18	5 deputy monitors	23,520	5,000	28,520
	2009-LA-19	5 monitors (24 hour operation)	25,000	2,200	27,200
	2009-LA-20	10 monitors	38,400	7,600	46,000
	2010-LA-21	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-23	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-24	2 monitors per day	60,000	6,000	66,000
	2009-LA-26	2 monitors per day	19,727	2,000	21,727
	2010-LA-27	install, monitor, transcripts - 6 people	12,000	1,800	13,800
	2010-LA-28	translation, 4 monitors per day	60,002	3,700	63,702
	2010-LA-29	8 DEA Agents/2 monitors	42,014	2,000	44,014
	2010-LA-30	6 monitors per day	38,400	4,000	42,400
	2010-LA-31	5 monitors per day	42,000	4,000	46,000
	2010-LA-32	2 monitors per day	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-33	2 monitors per day	19,727	2,000	21,727
	2010-LA-34	18 monitors	180,000	5,000	185,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-35	8 DEA Agents/2 monitors	42,014	2,000	44,014
	2010-LA-37	Cost not available			
	2010-LA-38	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-39	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-40	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-42	translations - 2	19,849	1,075	20,924
	2010-LA-43	5 deputy monitors	23,520	2,500	26,020
	2010-LA-44	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-45	7 deputy monitors	32,900	5,000	37,900
	2010-LA-46	8 DEA agents/6 monitors	42,014	2,000	44,014
	2010-LA-47	2 monitors per day	19,761	2,000	21,761
	2010-LA-48	2 monitors per day	13,164	1,800	14,964
	2010-LA-49	2 monitors per day	19,747	1,800	21,547
	2010-LA-50	4 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	6,000	42,000
	2010-LA-51	2 monitors per day - Federal	72,000	8,000	80,000
	2010-LA-52	2 technicians and 3 monitors per day	59,242	3,500	62,742
	2010-LA-53	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-54	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-55	2 monitors per day	20,000	1,200	21,200
	2010-LA-56	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-57	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-58	4 monitors per day	39,494	1,800	41,294
	2010-LA-59	4 monitors per day, 1 tech	79,200	4,000	83,200
	2010-LA-60	8 DEA agents/6 monitors	84,027	64,341	148,368
	2010-LA-61	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-62	3 civilian monitors per day	23,000	4,000	27,000
	2010-LA-63	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-64	4 monitors per day	19,200	4,000	23,200
	2010-LA-65	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-66	Costs related to 2010-LA-50			
	2010-LA-67	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-68	Cost not available			
	2010-LA-69	2 monitors per day	19,747	1,800	21,547
	2010-LA-70	4 monitors per day	160,000	5,000	165,000
	2010-LA-71	8 DEA Agents	42,014	22,347	64,361
	2010-LA-72	18 monitors	180,000	5,000	185,000
	2010-LA-73	1 installer, 4 monitors	17,471	1,600	19,071
	2010-LA-74	8 sworn and 4 non sworn officers	25,000	5,000	30,000
	2010-LA-75	4 monitors per day, 1 tech	39,600	4,000	43,600
	2010-LA-76	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-77	5 deputy monitors	23,520	5,000	28,520

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-78	6 monitors per day	39,494	3,600	43,094
	2010-LA-79	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-80	3 monitors per day	19,000	2,000	21,000
	2010-LA-81	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-82	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-83	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-84	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-85	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-86	6 monitors	30,000	1,500	31,500
	2010-LA-87	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-88	5 monitors	16,000	2,000	18,000
	2010-LA-89	LA Clear, monitors, techs	19,800	2,000	21,800
	2010-LA-90	4 monitors per day/ detectives	150,000	2,500	152,500
	2010-LA-91	8 DEA Agents	42,014	22,347	64,361
	2010-LA-92	2 monitors per day	19,726	2,250	21,976
	2010-LA-93	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-95	4 monitors per day - Federal	72,000	12,000	84,000
	2010-LA-96	techs, monitor, supervisor	34,090	1,300	35,390
	2010-LA-97	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-98	installation, monitors	22,000	1,700	23,700

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-99	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-100	2 Monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-101	Detectives (8); LASD Deputies (15)	459,270	34,464	493,734
	2010-LA-102	Costs related to 2010-LA-101			
	2010-LA-103	Costs related to 2010-LA-101			
	2010-LA-104	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-105	4 monitors per day - Federal	72,000	12,000	84,000
	2010-LA-106	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-107	2 monitors per day/Fed \$ only	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-108	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-109	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-110	2 monitors per day	6,820	0	6,820
	2010-LA-111	2 monitors per day	19,747	1,600	21,347
	2010-LA-113	2 civilian monitors	6,334	2,000	8,334
	2010-LA-114	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-115	2 persons per day for 30 days	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-116	8 officers, 4 transcribers	12,546	9,780	22,326
	2010-LA-117	2 monitors per day	19,000	2,000	21,000
	2010-LA-118	2 monitors per day	15,000	6,000	21,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-119	Special Agents, monitors, technicians	62,250	4,950	67,200
	2010-LA-120	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-121	2 monitors per day	19,726	1,600	21,326
	2010-LA-122	2 monitors per day	73,600	0	73,600
	2010-LA-123	6 monitors and 1 tech per day	95,000	6,000	101,000
	2010-LA-124	3 monitors per day	19,747	1,800	21,547
	2010-LA-125	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-126	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-127	2 monitors per day	19,747	625	20,372
	2010-LA-128	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-129	3 monitors per day	19,747	1,800	21,547
	2010-LA-130	8 DEA Agents/6 monitors	42,014	21,447	63,461
	2010-LA-131	LA Clear, monitors, techs	1,200	9,300	10,500
	2010-LA-132	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-133	4 monitors per day	36,000	6,000	42,000
	2010-LA-134	Costs related to 2010-LA-50			
	2010-LA-135	Cost not available			
	2010-LA-136	4 monitors per day - Federal	72,000	12,000	84,000
	2010-LA-137	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-138	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-139	4 monitors per day	36,000	6,000	42,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-140	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-141	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-142	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-143	Costs related to 2010-LA-123			
	2010-LA-144	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-145	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-146	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-147	4 monitors per day	20,000	1,700	21,700
	2010-LA-148	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-150	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-151	SAs, Det., IA's, DA, monitors, tech - 30	62,250	4,950	67,200
	2010-LA-152	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-153	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-154	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-155	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-156	2 monitors per day	1,680	2,300	3,980
	2010-LA-157	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-159	2 monitors per day - Federal	40,000	2,000	42,000
	2010-LA-160	3 monitors per day	19,747	1,800	21,547
	2010-LA-161	3 monitors per day	20,000	0	20,000
	2010-LA-163	2 monitors per day	20,000	4,000	24,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-164	3 monitors per day	18,430	1,800	20,230
	2010-LA-165	SAs, DET, IA's DA, monitors, tech - 30	62,250	4,950	67,200
	2010-LA-166	2 monitors per day	20,000	625	20,625
	2010-LA-167	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-168	2 monitors per day	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2010-LA-169	2 monitors per day	45,000	4,500	49,500
	2010-LA-170	2 monitors per day	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2010-LA-171	18 monitors per day	180,000	24,000	204,000
	2010-LA-172	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-173	2 monitors per day for 30 days	20,000	4,000	24,000
	2010-LA-175	8 DEA Agents/2 monitors	42,014	2,000	44,014
	2010-LA-176	4 monitors per day	36,000	6,000	42,000
	2010-LA-177	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-178	Spanish monitors, tech operators	80,000	6,800	86,800
	2010-LA-179	2 monitors per day - Federal	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-LA-180	6 monitors per day	60,000	0	60,000
	2010-LA-181	Spanish monitors, tech operations	40,000	3,400	43,400
	2010-LA-182	7 monitors and 1 tech per day	56,000	4,000	60,000
	2010-LA-184	11 monitors/2 transcribers	70,000	12,000	82,000
	2010-LA-185	2 monitors per day	20,000	625	20,625
	2010-LA-186	Costs related to 2010-LA-182			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-187	11 monitors	62,841	3,600	66,441
	2010-LA-188	2 monitors per day	20,000	0	20,000
	2010-LA-189	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-190	2 monitors per day	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-191	2 monitors per day	21,000	1,700	22,700
	2010-LA-192	Spanish monitors, tech ops	20,000	1,700	21,700
	2010-LA-193	monitors, investigators, techs	930	1,500	2,430
	2010-LA-194	2 monitors per day	18,900	2,500	21,400
	2010-LA-195	Spanish monitors, tech ops	23,800	1,700	25,500
	2010-LA-196	2 monitors per day	26,000	1,286	27,286
	2010-LA-198	2 monitors per day	18,000	6,000	24,000
	2010-LA-199	Metropolitan Translation Agency	42,014	21,447	63,461
	2010-LA-200	5 monitors per day	20,338	1,600	21,938
	2010-LA-201	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2010-LA-202	3 monitors per day	40,000	4,000	44,000
	2010-LA-203	5 monitors	13,000	2,800	15,800
	2010-LA-204	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-205	2 monitors per day	1,500	1,000	2,500
	2010-LA-206	5 monitors	13,000	2,800	15,800
	2010-LA-207	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-208	2 monitors per day - Federal	36,000	4,000	40,000
	2010-LA-209	2 monitors per day	20,000	2,000	22,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2010-LA-210	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-211	2 monitors per day - Federal	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-212	2 monitors per shift	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-LA-213	2 monitors per day	27,000	2,000	29,000
	2010-LA-214		0	2,200	2,200
Merced	2010-MER-1	30 agents, 2 transcribers	172,800	19,000	191,800
	2010-MER-2	4 agents, 1 transcriber	92,000	20,000	112,000
Monterey	2010-MTY-1	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-2	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-3	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-4	Costs related to 2010 MTY 13			
	2010-MTY-5	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-6	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-7	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-8	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-9	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-10	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-11	Cost not available			
	2010-MTY-12	Cost not available			
Orange	2010-OR-1	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-2	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-3	Costs related to 2010-OR-4			
	2010-OR-4	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-5	Cost not available			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-7	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-8	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-9	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-10	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-11	2 monitors for 19 days at 16 hours per day.	12,464	2,000	14,464
	2010-OR-12	2 monitors for 14 days at 16 hours per day.	9,184	2,000	11,184
	2010-OR-13	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-14	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-15	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-16	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-17	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-18	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-19	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-20	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-21	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-23	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-24	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-25	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-26	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-27	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-28	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-30	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-31	Cost not available			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Orange (cont'd)	2010-OR-32	Cost not available			
	2010-OR-33	Cost not available			
Riverside	2010-RIV-1	2 interpreters, 1 tech specialist	239,591	4,125	243,716
	2010-RIV-2	2 interpreters, 1 technician	50,248	4,800	55,048
	2010-RIV-3	2 interpreters, 1 technician	17,225	2,600	19,825
	2010-RIV-4	2 interpreters, 1 technician	17,225	2,600	19,825
	2010-RIV-5	Cost not available			
	2010-RIV-6	7	59,242	8,250	67,492
	2010-RIV-7	5	10,532	2,700	13,232
	2010-RIV-8	5	19,747	2,600	22,347
	2010-RIV-9	8 officers, 4 monitors, 2 technicians	8,540	5,000	13,540
	2010-RIV-10	8 officers, 2 technicians, 2 monitors	42,014	21,447	63,461
	2010-RIV-13	8 officers, 4 monitors, 2 technicians	12,810	5,000	17,810
	2010-RIV-14	2 interpreters, 1 technician	47,081	3,000	50,081
	2010-RIV-15	2 interpreters, 1 technician	47,081	3,000	50,081
	2010-RIV-16	2 interpreters, 1 technician	80,046	2,450	82,496
	2010-RIV-17	2 interpreters, 1 technician	1,600	50,248	51,848
	2010-RIV-18	2 interpreters, 1 technician	174,121	4,800	178,921

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-19	2 interpreters, 1 technician	103,362	7,800	111,162
	2010-RIV-20		8,490	2,000	10,490
	2010-RIV-21	8 officers, 2 technicians	9,215	62,000	71,215
	2010-RIV-22	2 monitors	16,400	2,000	18,400
	2010-RIV-23	2 monitors	11,808	2,000	13,808
	2010-RIV-24	2 monitors	17,712	2,000	19,712
	2010-RIV-25	2 monitors	11,808	2,000	13,808
	2010-RIV-26	2 monitors	4,592	2,000	6,592
	2010-RIV-27	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-28	2 monitors	18,000	4,000	22,000
	2010-RIV-29	1 monitor	9,000	1,800	10,800
	2010-RIV-30	2 monitors	18,000	1,800	19,800
	2010-RIV-31		0	1,800	1,800
	2010-RIV-32	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	21,323	2,600	23,923
	2010-RIV-33	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	7,107	5,200	12,307
	2010-RIV-35	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	21,323	5,200	26,523
	2010-RIV-36	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	21,323	2,600	23,923
	2010-RIV-37	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	22,235	2,600	24,835
	2010-RIV-38	3 agents, 7 TFO, 2 RSO, 2 linguists	28,835	2,600	31,435
	2010-RIV-39		22,235	2,600	24,835
	2010-RIV-40	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-41	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-42	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-43	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-44	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-45	2 monitors, 2 TFOs, 2 deputies	21,323	2,600	23,923
	2010-RIV-46	2 DEA, 2 TFOs, 2 deputies, 2 monitors	19,747	2,600	22,347
	2010-RIV-47	Cost not available			
	2010-RIV-48	2 DEA, 2 monitors, 2 TFOs 2 deputies	11,373	5,200	16,573
	2010-RIV-49	3	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2010-RIV-50	3	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2010-RIV-51	Cost not available			
	2010-RIV-52	6 monitors	322,456	12,325	334,781
	2010-RIV-53	Cost not available			
	2010-RIV-54	2 monitors	20,337	1,700	22,037
	2010-RIV-55	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-56	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-57	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-58	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-59	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-60	2 monitors	54,000	6,000	60,000
	2010-RIV-61	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-62	11	20,529	1,400	21,929
	2010-RIV-63	19	131,951	5,600	137,551
	2010-RIV-64	8	20,529	1,400	21,929
	2010-RIV-65	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Riverside (cont'd)	2010-RIV-66	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-67	2 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
	2010-RIV-68	2 monitors, 8 officers, 3 personnel	14,707	19,747	34,454
	2010-RIV-69	7 non-DEA personnel, 3 DEA personnel, 2 monitors	27,194	2,600	29,794
	2010-RIV-70	1 monitor	20,000	2,000	22,000
	2010-RIV-71	4	12,730	0	12,730
	2010-RIV-72	11	45,984	0	45,984
	2010-RIV-73	5 civilian, 8 state/local PD	19,510	985	20,495
	2010-RIV-74	5 civilian, 8 state/local PD	29,652	1,286	30,938
	2010-RIV-75		11,365	2,000	13,365
Sacramento	2010-SAC-1	1 tech to install, 1 agent to monitor	2,000	500	2,500
	2010-SAC-2	1 tech, 3 agents, 50 monitors	110,000	25,000	135,000
	2010-SAC-3		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-4		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-5		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-6		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-7		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-8		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-9		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-10		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		
	2010-SAC-11		Costs related to 2010-SAC-2		

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Sacramento (cont'd)	2010-SAC-12	Costs related to 2010-SAC-2			
	2010-SAC-13	4 Special Agents/monitors, 6 surveillance	300,000	16,000	316,000
	2010-SAC-14	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-15	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-16	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-17	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-18	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-19	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-20	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-21	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-22	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-23	Costs related to 2010-SAC-13			
	2010-SAC-24	1 tech, 6 monitors, 4 interpreters	161,318	17,266	178,584
	2010-SAC-25	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-26	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-27	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-28	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-29	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-30	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
	2010-SAC-31	Costs related to 2010-SAC-24			
San Bernardino	2010-SBD-6	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-7	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-8	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-9	Cost not available			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-10	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-11	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-12	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-13	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-15	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-16	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-17	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-18	4 officers, 1 tech	8,074	1,750	9,824
	2010-SBD-19	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-20	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-21	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-22	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-23	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-24	2 monitors, 1 tech	40,000	4,000	44,000
	2010-SBD-25	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-26	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-27	1 monitor	10,000	40,000	50,000
	2010-SBD-28	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-29	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-30	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-31	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-32	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-33	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-34	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-35	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-37	Cost not available			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-38				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-39				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-40				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-41				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-42				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-43				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-44				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-45				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-46				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-50				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-51				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-52				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-53				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-54				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-55				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-56				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-57				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-58				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-60				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-61				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-62				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-63				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-64				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-65				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-66				Cost not available
	2010-SBD-67				Cost not available

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-68	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-70	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-71	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-72	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-73	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-74	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-75	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-76	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-77	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-78	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-79	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-80	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-81	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-82	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-83	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-85	Costs related to			
	2010-SBD-86	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-87	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-88	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-89	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-90	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-92	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-94	1 officer	500	425	925
	2010-SBD-95	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-96	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-97	Cost not available			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Bernardino (cont'd)	2010-SBD-98	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-99	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-100	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-102	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-103	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-104	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-105	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-107	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-109	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-110	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-111	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-112	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-113	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-114	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-115	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-119	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-123	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-124	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-125	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-126	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-127	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-128	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-129	Cost not available			
	2010-SBD-130	4 officers, 6 monitors	18,000	2,000	20,000
San Diego	2010-SD-1				359,055
	2010-SD-2	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-3	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-4	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-5	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-6	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-7	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-8	Costs related to 2010-SD-1			
	2010-SD-9		48,544	4,290	52,834
	2010-SD-10		19,100	1,430	20,530
	2010-SD-11		19,100	1,430	20,530
	2010-SD-12		116,700	5,700	122,400
	2010-SD-13		64,542	4,290	68,832
	2010-SD-14	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-15	foreign language monitors	38,200	2,860	41,060
	2010-SD-16	foreign language monitors	19,680	3,130	22,810
	2010-SD-17		28,788	2,000	30,788
	2010-SD-18	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-19	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-20	8 DEA agents; 6 SDPD detectives	10,560	2,950	13,510
	2010-SD-21	8 DEA agents, 6 SDPD detectives	21,000	2,500	23,500
	2010-SD-23	foreign language monitor	3,800	1,400	5,200
	2010-SD-24	foreign language monitors	8,300	1,400	9,700

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-25	foreign language monitors	4,400	1,400	5,800
	2010-SD-26	foreign language monitors	26,200	1,400	27,600
	2010-SD-27	foreign language monitors	8,300	1,400	9,700
	2010-SD-28	Costs related to 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-29	Costs related to 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-30	Costs related to 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-31	Costs related to 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-32	Costs related to 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-34	18 foreign language monitors	307,085	11,930	319,015
	2010-SD-35	Costs related to wiretap 2010-SD-34			
	2010-SD-36	installation, monitors	7,000	3,000	10,000
	2010-SD-37	installation and monitors	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2010-SD-38	installation	0	1,500	1,500
	2010-SD-39	installation monitors	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2010-SD-40	installation	0	1,500	1,500
	2010-SD-41	installation and monitors	30,000	3,000	33,000
	2010-SD-42		92,400	8,925	101,325
	2010-SD-43	Costs related to 2010 SD-42			
	2010-SD-44	Costs related to 2010 SD-42			
	2010-SD-45	monitors	47,087	2,800	49,887
	2010-SD-46	monitors and installation	23,212	2,800	26,012

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-47	monitors and installation	33,260	2,800	36,060
	2010-SD-48	Costs related to 2010-SD-46			
	2010-SD-49	Costs related to 2010-SD-46			
	2010-SD-50	monitors and installation for multiple wires for investigation	500,000	100,000	600,000
	2010-SD-51	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-52	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-53	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-54	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-55	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-56	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-57	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-58	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-59	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-60	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-61	Costs related to 2010-SD-50			
	2010-SD-62		0	1,765	1,765
	2010-SD-63		0	2,200	2,200
	2010-SD-64		0	5,900	5,900
	2010-SD-65	foreign language monitors, installation	15,000	9,000	24,000
	2010-SD-66		0	450	450
	2010-SD-67	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-68	0 agent hours, 608 TFO hours, 779 support hours	31,667	4,000	35,667

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
San Diego (cont'd)	2010-SD-69	approximately 20 officers/agents	19,112	12,000	31,112
	2010-SD-70	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-71	Costs related to 2010-SD-70			
	2010-SD-72	Costs related to 2010-SD-70			
	2010-SD-74	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-75	20 officers and agents	22,934	12,000	34,934
	2010-SD-76	Costs related to 2010-SD-75			
	2010-SD-77	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-78	Cost not available			
	2010-SD-79	Cost not available			
San Joaquin	2010-SJ-1	7 monitors	54,819	0	54,819
	2010-SJ-2		0	2,920	2,920
	2010-SJ-3	4 monitors and 1 technician	13,938	840	14,778
	2010-SJ-4	4 monitors	20,869	1,170	22,039
San Mateo	2010-SM-2	8 monitors, 1 installer	16,500	2,500	19,000
	2010-SM-3	1 to install, 18 to monitor	4,578	12,585	17,163
	2010-SM-4	Costs related to 2010-SM-3			
Santa Barbara	2010-SBA-1	approximately 11 monitors/Spanish speaking	28,000	4,000	32,000
	2010-SBA-2	3 monitors	19,847	2,100	21,947
	2010-SBA-3	3 monitors	9,924	1,750	11,674
	2010-SBA-4	3 monitors	39,694	1,750	41,444
	2010-SBA-5	3 monitors	19,847	1,750	21,597
	2010-SBA-6	3 monitors	19,847	2,100	21,947

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Santa Barbara (cont'd)	2010-SBA-8	3 monitors	9,874	1,750	11,624
	2010-SBA-9	3 monitors	19,847	2,100	21,947
	2010-SBA-10	3 monitors	19,847	625	20,472
	2010-SBA-11	3 monitors	16,537	625	17,162
	2010-SBA-12	3 monitors	10,579	2,100	12,679
	2010-SBA-13	3 monitors	15,875	1,700	17,575
	2010-SBA-14	3 monitors	3,310	2,100	5,410
	2010-SBA-15	3 monitors	17,861	625	18,486
	2010-SBA-16	3 monitors	11,254	2,100	13,354
	2010-SBA-17	5 monitors	37,111	4,000	41,111
	2010-SBA-18	5 monitors	37,111	4,000	41,111
	2010-SBA-19	5 monitors	37,111	4,000	41,111
	Santa Clara	2010-SCL-1	Cost not available		
2010-SCL-2		Cost not available			
2010-SCL-3		Cost not available			
2010-SCL-4		Cost not available			
	2010-SCL-5	1 technician, 6 monitors/transcriptions	62,000	5,600	67,600
Sonoma	2010-SON-1	Cost not available			
Stanislaus	2010-STA-1	3 agents	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2010-STA-2	6 monitors	40,000	2,000	42,000
	2010-STA-3	3 monitors	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2010-STA-4	3 monitors	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2010-STA-5	3 monitors	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2010-STA-6	Cost not available			
	2010-STA-7	6 monitors	50,000	2,000	52,000
	2010-STA-8	3 monitors	20,000	2,500	22,500

Table 6
Costs of Electronic Interceptions
During Calendar Year 2010

Reporting Jurisdiction	EICOS No.	Nature and Quantity of Personnel Used	Personnel Costs (\$)	Resource Cost (\$) (Installation Feed, Supplies, Equipment, etc.)	Total Cost (\$) (Personnel + Resource)
Stanislaus (cont'd)	2010-STA-10	2 monitors	27,926	2,000	29,926
	2010-STA-11	2 monitors	27,926	2,000	29,926
	2010-STA-12	2 monitors	27,926	1,000	28,926
	2010-STA-13	3 monitors	20,000	2,500	22,500
	2010-STA-14	3 monitors	15,000	1,600	16,600
	2010-STA-15	9 monitors	66,000	7,500	73,500
Sutter	2010-SUT-1	10 monitors	19,918	1,480	21,398
Ventura	2010-VE-1		70,679	0	70,679
	2010-VE-2		106,685	7,430	114,115
	2010-VE-3		101,885	1,858	103,743
	2010-VE-4		40,675	2,572	43,247
	2010-VE-5	4 monitors, 1 Room Supervisor, 3 case agents, 1 technician	100,000	2,843	102,843
	2010-VE-6		142,359	9,000	151,359
	2010-VE-7		81,348	5,144	86,492
	2010-VE-8		119,000	0	119,000
	2010-VE-9		1,200	0	1,200
	2010-VE-10		21,000	1,200	22,200
	2010-VE-11		988	0	988
	2010-VE-12		780	0	780
	2010-VE-13		21,000	2,100	23,100
	2010-VE-14		2,100	1,200	3,300
	2010-VE-15		40,675	2,572	43,247
	2010-VE-16		20,875	7,200	28,075
	2010-VE-17		137,585	0	137,585
	2010-VE-18	Cost not available			

Table 7
***Jurisdictions Reporting No
 Electronic Interception Activity During
 Calendar Year 2010***

Alameda	Kings	San Benito
Alpine	Lake	San Francisco
Amador	Lassen	San Luis Obispo
Butte	Madera	Santa Cruz
Calaveras	Marin	Shasta
Colusa	Mariposa	Sierra
Contra Costa	Mendocino	Siskiyou
Del Norte	Modoc	Solano
El Dorado	Mono	Tehama
Fresno	Napa	Trinity
Glenn	Nevada	Tuolumne
Humboldt	Placer	Yolo
Inyo	Plumas	Yuba

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

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Alameda	2008	4/22/2008	08-01				Assault, Narcotics, Gang Related Offenses, Illegal Firearms	1	0	2	0	7	Attempted Murder, Carjacking, Possession of Narcotics for Sale, Illegal Firearms
	2009	9/25/2009	09-02			4	Narcotics; Firearms						
Los Angeles	2004	9/24/2004	04-70			1	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2005		05-136			3	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Proceeds Derived from Controlled Substance; Possession of Marijuana for Sale					2	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession of Marijuana for Sale
	2006	7/5/2006	06-126			4	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Transportation of a Control Substance					1	Transportation of a Controlled Substance
	2007	2/2/2007	07-42			4	Possession of Money; Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime					2	Possession of Money; Transportation of a Controlled Substance
	2007	1/18/2007	07-06; 07-19; 07-25; 07-30; 07-36; 07-50; 07-59; 07-68; 07-76 and 07-78			3	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Possession of Money or Instruments over \$100,000.00; Narcotics					1	Possession of Money ofr Instruments over \$100,000.00
	2007		07-171			3	Transportation of a Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale					1	Transportation of a Controlled Substance

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

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2007	12/7/2008	07-308			6	Narcotics; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Proceeds Derived from Controlled Substances					3	Narcotics; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2008	2/22/2008	08-31 Ext 2 and 08-31 Ext. 3			4	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Narcotics					3	Narcotics
	2008	11/21/2008	08-205			3	Narcotics					3	Narcotics
	2008	2/6/2008	08-02			2	Narcotics; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Accessory after the fact;					1	Narcotics; Accessory after the fact
	2008	11/26/2008	08-198			3	Possession of Money; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Narcotics; Firearms; Perjury					3	Narcotics; Firearms
	2008	7/2/2008	08-128			1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime						Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
	2008	9/19/2008	08-178; 09-58			1	Conspiracy to Commit a Crime; Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	7/2/2009	09-160			2	Sale/Transportation of Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale; Possession of Marijuana for Sale; Maintaining Place for Selling or Using Controlled Substance	1				1	Sale/Transportation of Controlled Substance; Possession for Sale

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

Reporting Jurisdiction	Report Year	Date of Application	Reference No.	EICOS No.	Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested		Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress			Persons Convicted	
						Number	Offense(s)		Granted	Denied	Pending	Number	Offense(s)
Los Angeles (cont'd)	2009	9/28/2009	09-167			3	Possession for Sale; Manufacturing a Controlled Substance; Child Abuse					3	Possession for Sale; Manufacturing a Controlled Substance; Child Abuse
	2009	11/24/2008	08-206, 09-04, 09-23			1	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	11/15/2008	08-190			1	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	4/20/2009	09-55			1	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	11/15/2008	08-190; 08-214 and 09-70			2	Narcotics	0				1	Narcotics
	2009	12/22/2008	08-214			2	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	1/15/2009	08-190 Ext. 2			3	Narcotics					2	Narcotics
	2009	5/12/2009	09-70			2	Firearms; Narcotics					1	Firearms
	2009	11/15/2008	08-190; 08-214; 09-70			2	Narcotics					2	Narcotics
	2009	9/22/2009	09-160			1	Narcotics					1	Narcotics
	2009	4/3/2009	09-48			2	Narcotics					2	Narcotics
	2009	11/13/2009	09-190			1	Narcotics; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime					1	Narcotics; Conspiracy to Commit a Crime
Riverside	2009	2/3/2010	10-06		243,716	2	Possession for Sales	0	0	0	0	0	H&S 11357(a), 11358, 11359, 11378
Sacramento	2007	7/18/2007	WT-07-05			14	Narcotics	1	0	1	0	1	Narcotics
	2009	12/22/2008	WT-08-03			11	Narcotics	0	0	0	0	10	Narcotics
Stanislaus	2009	11/4/2009	09-04									1	Narcotics

Appendix A: Penal Code Section 629.62

Report by Attorney General

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

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

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

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

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