

CAPITOL OFFICE
1021 O STREET
SUITE 6620
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TEL (916) 651-4030

DISTRICT OFFICE
12501 IMPERIAL HWY.
SUITE 110
NORWALK, CA 90650
TEL (562) 406-1001

California State Senate

SENATOR
BOB ARCHULETA
THIRTIETH SENATE DISTRICT



STANDING COMMITTEES
MILITARY & VETERANS AFFAIRS
CHAIR
BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS
& ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
TRANSPORTATION
JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
ON EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

April 8, 2026

REVISED 4/8/2026

The Honorable John Harabedian
Chair, Joint Committee on Legislative Audit
1021 O Street, Suite 4350
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Audit Request – Information sharing between state and local law enforcement - updated request

Dear Assemblymember Harabedian,

I am writing to ask for a state audit of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, local Probation Departments including Los Angeles County and at least two other counties, and local District Attorney Offices to identify any roadblocks related to information sharing and identify best practices for supervised release.

State agencies do not currently share full criminal histories with local law enforcement agencies when individuals are released from state incarceration and directed to more localized supervision with stipulated terms of release. This has inhibited local response and resulted in loss of life. There is currently no reliable data related to best practices for things like supervised release, repeated violations, and graduated sanctions.

In my own City of Whittier, Officer Keith Boyer was tragically killed in the line of duty by an individual on post-release community supervision at the time of the crime. His killer, Michael Christopher Mejia, had violated the terms of his release at least four times, including new misdemeanor convictions. Had Officer Boyer and Whittier PD had better access to information about his killer, I am confident Officer Boyer would be with us today.

I am asking the Auditor to opine on the feasibility of increasing information sharing across agencies and identify any existing inhibitors for doing so.

Since 2017, multiple legislative efforts have been undertaken to improve information sharing between state correctional agencies and local law enforcement when individuals are released to community supervision. These efforts included proposals to require or facilitate the transmission of release, supervision, and violation-related information to local agencies.

Engagement through the legislative process has indicated that state departments maintain relevant data but have not provided comprehensive, standardized information to local law enforcement, citing operational, technological, and fiscal constraints. Similarly, local law enforcement agencies do not

consistently collect or share data related to individuals on supervised release, and there is no statewide mechanism to request or aggregate such information across jurisdictions.

While these steps have provided limited insight into current practices, they have not yielded the objective, systemwide data necessary to evaluate the effectiveness, feasibility, or equity implications of existing information-sharing frameworks.

Audit Scope and Objectives

What questions and objectives should the audit answer or address?

1. To what extent does the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation employ consistent and effective practices for sharing information on individuals in state custody with county probation departments and local law enforcement agencies prior to, and upon release or realignment to local supervision, including an evaluation of existing statutory authority, data systems, timeliness of notification, privacy and confidentiality requirements, technological capacity, interagency coordination practices, internal CDCR practices or protocols and any fiscal or operational constraints that may affect such information sharing. Review any past and ongoing efforts and make any recommendations to facilitate the sharing of information between the State and local agencies.
2. How do current CDCR practices compare with information-sharing models used in other large states with state-county correctional realignment structures?
3. What are best practices and evidence-based practices that are used by courts and county probation departments on responding to supervision violations, including the use of graduated or escalated sanctions, referrals to county district attorneys, and decisions to seek modification or revocation of supervision, and how do these practices get implemented with respect to statutory authority, local policy, operational capacity, and public-safety outcomes?
4. What are external factors that impede probation's ability, or the criminal justice systems ability, to address violations of supervision?

Thank you for your consideration of this request. For questions, please reach out to Ben Edelstein in my Office at 916-651-4030 or Ben.Edelstein@sen.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Senator Bob Archuleta

California State Senate, District 30