

**California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board**  
**Open Meeting Minutes**  
**October 15, 2015, Board Meeting**

The California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (Board) convened its meeting in open session at the call of Marybel Batjer, Secretary, California Government Operations Agency, at 400 R Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, October 15, 2015, at 10:03 a.m. Also present was member Karen Greene-Ross, Chief Deputy State Controller and Chief of Staff, acting for and in the absence of Betty T. Yee, Controller, and member Michael Ramos, San Bernardino County District Attorney.

Executive Officer Julie Nauman and Chief Counsel Wayne Strumpfer were in attendance. Tisha Heard, Board Liaison, recorded the meeting.

The Board meeting commenced with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Announcement of the Great California ShakeOut Earthquake Drill**

Chairperson Batjer announced that the Great California ShakeOut, the annual statewide earthquake drill, would take place while the Board meeting was in progress at 10:15 a.m. She explained that the Board would not participate in the drill; however, she encouraged everyone to take steps to be prepared, including having family plan and neighborhood plan.

**Item 1. Approval of Minutes of the September 17, 2015, Board Meeting**

The Board continued the minutes of the September 17, 2015, meeting.

**Item 2. Approval of Minutes of the August 20, 2015, Board Meeting**

The Board continued the minutes of the August 20, 2015, meeting.

**Item 3. Public Comment**

The Board opened the meeting for public comment. No comment was provided.

**Item 4. Executive Officer Statement**

**Successful CalVCP Regional Conferences**

CalVCP held regional conferences at UC Davis and UCLA on September 23 and October 8, respectively. The conferences focused on strategic collaborations for reaching underserved victims of crime in California. Panel presentations included breaking down barriers to accessing benefits and making the criminal justice system more accessible to underserved victims of crime, among others. Elizabeth Smart, keynote speaker at the September 23 conference, shared her incredible story of being abducted from her Utah home while she slept at the age of 14 and being held captive for nine months before being reunited with her family. Ms. Smart spoke of perseverance in the face of unimaginable adversity.

Azim Khamisa, keynote speaker at the October 8 Southern California conference, chose the path of forgiveness and compassion rather than revenge following the 1995 murder of his only son, Tariq Khamisa, through a gang-related incident. That choice led to the establishment of the Tariq Khamisa Foundation that focuses on stopping youth violence. A renowned international speaker, Mr. Khamisa has collaborated with the White House, the Dalai Lama, and many other organizations around the world.

Executive Officer Nauman reported Member Ramos attended the UCLA conference. Approximately 400 people were in attendance at the conferences and the feedback was extremely positive.

**Our Promise: California State Employees Giving at Work**

On October 6, CalVCP held its annual Cake Auction kick off campaign to raise funds for the Our Promise Campaign. Executive Officer Nauman reported that the successful event raised over \$1,200 for Our Promise. Ms. Nauman thanked Kevin Kwong, CalVCP Our Promise Chair, for the very successful event.

### **Item 5. Contract Report**

At the June 18, 2015, meeting, in anticipation that the Board does not meet in July, the Board gave Executive Officer Nauman delegated authority to enter into a contract with a vendor for CaRES project management support. Ms. Nauman reported that Cambria Solutions was awarded the contract for \$586,850 from August 31, 2015, to November 30, 2016.

### **Item 6. Proposed Board Meeting Dates for Calendar Year 2016**

The Board approved the Board meeting dates for calendar year 2016. The meetings are scheduled to occur on the third Thursday of every month, with the exception of the month of July when the Board is silent.

### **Item 7. Legislative Update**

Wayne Strumpfer, VCGCB Chief Counsel, reported the following bills signed by the Governor:

#### **Assembly Bill 165 (Gomez)**

AB 165, the VCGCB's first Government Claims Bill of 2015, appropriates \$504,743.99 to pay claims approved by the Board from May 2014 through December 2014. It also appropriates \$968,400 to pay the erroneous conviction claims of Ronald Ross, Susan Mellen, and Brian Banks.

#### **Senate Bill 304 (Lara)**

SB 304, the VCGCB's second Government Claims Bill of 2015, appropriates \$3,277,141.90 to pay claims approved by the Board from January 2015 through April 2015 as well as two claims that were approved in 2011 but not paid for technical reasons.

#### **Senate Bill 635 (Nielsen)**

SB 635 increases the amount of the recommended appropriation for compensation of an erroneous conviction from \$100 to \$140 per day. The bill also provides compensation for days served in county jail that are considered to be a part of the term of incarceration and remove the requirement that a claimant prove pecuniary loss in order to receive compensation.

#### **Assembly Bill 1140 (Bonta)**

AB 1140 modernizes Victim Compensation Program statutes by making a number of changes to eligibility and benefits. The bill was amended to incorporate provisions from SB 519 (Hancock), including a requirement that all correspondence by the Victim Compensation Program to an applicant be provided in additional languages, if requested. SB 519 was amended and no longer affects VCGCB. Mr. Strumpfer thanked CalVCP staff, stakeholders, and everyone involved who worked on the bill over the past year.

### **Item 8. Consent Agenda (Nos. 1-354)**

Eric Rivera, Government Claims Program Analyst, requested the Board approve the consent agenda, with the exception of item number 51, which was removed pending review of additional information received.

The Board approved consent agenda numbers 1-354, with the exception of the item number 51.

### **Item 9. Claim of Christine Korling-Torres** **Claim Number G623817**

Christine Korling-Torres appeared and addressed the Board. Peter Vu attended on behalf of the California Department of Transportation. Susan Coats attended on behalf of the California Department of Human Resources.

Eric Rivera, Government Claims Program Analyst, explained that Christine Korling-Torres requested compensation from the California Department of Transportation, the California Department of

Justice, the Governor's Office, and the California Department of Motor Vehicles in the amount of \$11,760.00 for FlexElect program benefits. Mr. Rivera stated that Government Claims Program staff recommended that the Board partially allow the claim in the amount of \$5,662.50 under authority of Government Code section 965 (agency pay).

Ms. Korling-Torres explained that she filed a government claim because her current employer, the Department of Motor Vehicles, brought it to her attention that she never received her FlexElect benefit dating back to her date of hire. She stated she was unaware that the FlexElect benefit would be displayed as a line item on her payroll warrant; therefore, she did not notice that she was not receiving the FlexElect benefit. She explained that on her date of hire, the hiring supervisor told her that she qualified for the FlexElect program; consequently, she completed the required paperwork. Ms. Korling-Torres explained that when she filed her government claim, she did not take into account the fact that her claim should have been for a higher dollar amount as a result of being promoted in 2010; however, she stated would accept the partial amount recommended by Government Claims Program staff.

Mr. Vu explained that Ms. Korling-Torres was employed at Caltrans from September 2009 to April 30, 2010. Pursuant to Government Code section 911.2, she had one year to file her claim against Caltrans, which would have been on May 1, 2011. She did not file her claim until April 2, 2015; consequently, her claim was untimely. Although Ms. Korling-Torres stated she filed paperwork for FlexElect benefits, Caltrans HR could not find documentation to support the claim. Mr. Vu requested the Board reject Caltrans' portion of the claim.

Ms. Coats explained that Ms. Korling-Torres informed her that she submitted her enrollment as newly eligible when she was first hired; therefore, it was contingent upon Caltrans approving or rejecting the claim. She explained that in 2008, Ms. Korling-Torres thought she was receiving the cash; consequently, now none of the other departments could do anything for Ms. Korling-Torres until open enrollment because she is not newly eligible anymore unless she had another permitting event. She stated the circumstances described by Ms. Korling-Torres during her hire seemed plausible. According to Ms. Korling-Torres, she was offered a permanent, full time position, but when she began work, it was discovered that she was not on a list. Consequently, Caltrans made her a limited term employee while she took the test, then they promoted her permanent full time. She submitted her enrollment documents when she was initially hired as limited term; however, Ms. Coats explained that even if the documents had been processed and sent to the State Controller's Office, Ms. Korling-Torres was ineligible for the cash as a limited term employee. She commented that most new employees are unaware that the benefit is reflected as a separate line item on their paystub.

Chairperson Batjer recommended that human resource departments include training for new hires to ensure they are aware that the FlexElect benefit is reflected on their paystub.

Ms. Coats commented that she suggested the new employee orientation include explaining that the FlexElect benefit would show on their paystub as a separate line item. She remarked that she could only rely on the information provided by Ms. Korling-Torres because Caltrans stated they had no documentation in file. She stated that in terms of it being too late, it was all contingent upon Caltrans because none of Ms. Korling-Torres' other departments could start the cash benefit. Ms. Coats commented that Ms. Korling-Torres' work history supported her contention.

The Board adopted the staff recommendation and partially allowed the claim in the amount of \$5,662.50 under authority of Government Code section 965 (agency pay).

**Item 10. Applications for Discharge From Accountability for Collection**

There were no applications for discharge from accountability for collection.

**Item 11. Request for Delegation of Authority to the Executive Officer to Approve Certain Government Claims Filed Against the Governor's Office of Emergency Services**

Executive Officer Nauman explained that on September 18, 2015, the Office of Emergency Services (OES) cancelled vacations of all employees for at least 30 days in order to best fight the wildfires burning in California. Some OES employees had pre-paid, non-refundable vacation plans during those 30 days. Those employees, upon proving financial loss, are now filing government claims with the Board to be reimbursed for unrecoverable costs relating to vacation plans. Ms. Nauman explained that OES was recommending approval of those claims, based on equity principles, as agency pay with available appropriations from current budget funds.

Executive Officer Nauman reported that to date there was one claim in house being processed. Since the Board only meets on a monthly basis, Ms. Nauman requested the Board delegate to her the authority to approve government claims filed against OES by employees suffering a financial loss due to the cancellation of their vacation time from September 18, 2015, to October 18, 2015, or beyond, if OES extends their mandate to cancel vacations based on operational need as a result of the numerous fires throughout California.

Chairperson Batjer commented that the Governor's Office was very concerned about State employees impacted by the fires. The Governor requested the Board work as expediently as possible.

Member Greene-Ross remarked that OES contacted the State Controller's Office; however, the Controller's Office did not have legal authority. Delegating authority to Executive Officer Nauman to approve those claims was the proper way to expedite the claims.

The Board granted Executive Officer Nauman delegated authority to approve certain government claims filed against OES.

**Item 12. Claims of Timothy Gantt and Michael Smith (Pen. Code, § 4900 et seq.)**

Chijioke Ikonte appeared and addressed the Board on behalf of claimant's Timothy Gantt and Michael Smith. Bob Snider attended on behalf of the Attorney General's Office.

Wayne Strumpfer, VCGCB Chief Counsel, explained that in 1994 Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith were convicted of the murder of Kalpesh Vardham while engaged in the commission of a robbery. Both men were sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole. In 2006, the U.S. District Court granted Mr. Gantt's writ of habeas corpus that alleged the prosecutor withheld exculpatory evidence. Eventually, the Los Angeles District Attorney dismissed the case against Mr. Gantt and he was released in 2008. Subsequently, Mr. Smith also filed a writ of habeas corpus that was not opposed by the District Attorney and Mr. Smith was released in 2009.

Mr. Strumpfer explained that both men filed claims as erroneously convicted persons and a hearing was conducted in March 2015 pursuant to Penal Code section 4900. Mr. Gantt was imprisoned for 5,125 days and asked for compensation in the amount of \$512,500. Mr. Smith was imprisoned for 5,640 days and asked for compensation in the amount of \$564,000. Following a hearing pursuant to Penal Code section 4900, the hearing officer recommended that the claims be denied.

Mr. Ikonte stated the case was based on an eyewitness identification. There was no DNA or physical evidence tying Mr. Gantt or Mr. Smith to the August 19, 1992, murder of Kalpesh Vardham and both men denied committing the crime. Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith were homeless when the

assault occurred; consequently, they could not account for their whereabouts on the day of the murder and it was almost impossible for either of them to provide an alibi witness. There was lack of evidence to support what both men were accused of doing. At trial four pieces of evidence were relied upon: a matchbook with a number written on it and the testimonies of David Rosemond, Kevin Shorts, and Jose Cubias. He explained that the matchbook with a number written on it was discredited; there was no linkage between Mr. Vardham and the matchbook. Neither the Attorney General nor the District Attorney could make a link to the claimants. Handwriting experts hired after the conviction could not make the link. Additionally, when the family who had that telephone number in Bangladesh was called, they could not make the link either. Neither Mr. Gantt nor Mr. Smith's fingerprints were found on the crime scene. In 1992, DNA was still an evolving science. Some blood samples were collected, but were never tested for DNA and those samples were destroyed. The closest they could get were the victim's nail clippings; however, he explained that they did not have legal authority to ask to have them tested to determine if they contained DNA evidence. Moreover, by the time it was discovered that the nail clippings existed, both Mr. Smith and Mr. Gantt had been freed.

Mr. Ikonte explained that in 1992 David Rosemond was the only person who claimed to have witnessed the crime. In 2008, he recanted his identification of Mr. Gantt. At that point, the District Attorney could not continue with the prosecution. Mr. Ikonte stated that Mr. Rosemond was pressured to identify someone. When asked why he picked them, Mr. Rosemond said the police told him there were two of them. Because there were two of them, Rosemond said he had to give them someone and he picked Mr. Smith at random. Mr. Ikonte stated that Kevin Shorts' physical description of Mr. Smith never matched Mr. Smith. Mr. Shorts said he a low haircut and had a beard like someone who had not shaved for several days. Mr. Ikonte explained that Mr. Smith had dreadlocks, which are grown over a period of time, and he was wearing a very thick beard. He explained that Mr. Shorts saw Mr. Smith from his forehead to his nose, two car lengths away in a rear view mirror. When Mr. Gantt was arrested in 1992, the police wrote a statement for him. When the police read the statement back to him, Mr. Gantt told them they were putting words in his mouth and he refused to sign it. Mr. Smith was told that if he signed the statement, they would let him go.

Mr. Snider remarked that he agreed with some of the statements made by Mr. Ikonte; however, he disagreed with a few of them. He stated that Mr. Ikonte suggested that there was no linkage between the matchbook and the crime. He commented that his statement was incorrect. The victim of the murder was Indian and it just so happened that Mr. Gantt was found with a matchbook in his pocket from an Indian restaurant 27 miles away. He explained that the handwriting was not completely discredited. The People's forensic expert said that the numerals inside the matchbook showed a good possibility that they were written by the victim. The victim recently graduated from UCLA. His job as social chair of the Indian Student Union was to locate restaurants for the Indian student's banquet, which was the reason the victim may have had the matchbook in his pocket. He agreed that Mr. Rosemond was a difficult witness, which was the reason the District Attorney did not retry the case in 2008. Mr. Rosemond was a drug addicted schizophrenic and continues to be to this day; however, his latest testimony given in a federal civil rights lawsuit that he brought in Los Angeles was the following with respect to Mr. Gantt: "I wasn't sure it was him. It could have been him. He might have did it, but I'm not sure and that's what this was all about. I wasn't sure without a shadow of the doubt he could have did it. Maybe he did. I don't know, but I wasn't sure." Mr. Snider stated Mr. Rosemond's testimony was different from a recantation in which he said it definitely was not Mr. Gantt.

Chairperson Batjer asked Mr. Snider to explain his interpretation of the statements he quoted that was made by Mr. Rosemond.

Mr. Snider explained that the statements were ambiguous with respect to Mr. Rosemond's identification. Mr. Rosemond was certain at trial in 1992 and in 2008. He stated that the deputy district attorney stated Mr. Rosemond flipped out and for that reason, he was unable to testify. Mr. Snider stated there was no question that if the case depended entirely on Mr. Rosemond, it was difficult for the Attorney General; however, two witnesses point to the defendant's lack of innocence. Additionally, Mr. Shorts picked Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith out of separate photo line ups of six similarly looking people.

Chairperson Batjer explained that the Board did not have additional information such as the minutes of the trial; however, they had the information in the proposed decision which stated that Mr. Rosemond was the suspect for the murder of Mr. Vardham and he only gave law enforcement Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith to spare himself.

Mr. Snider commented that it was Mr. Rosemond's story, not law enforcements. Mr. Rosemond was never arrested when he was taken in for questioning and he was not in custody. He initially insisted on immunity for other crimes, but at the actual trial, he waived immunity. The parking attendant who gave the ticket to Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith and received it back a few minutes later was able to give a positive identification for two men. In a six-person line up with six similarly looking men, he picked Mr. Gantt two months later. He stated there was no question that the evidence was not strong and contributed to the District Attorney not trying the men again. He explained that the burden under the *Diola and Tennison* cases was on the claimants. The claimants have to show that they can prove their innocence to a preponderance of the evidence more likely than not that they are innocent than guilty. He stated that even though they were homeless, their innocence must be proven which had not been met yet.

Member Ramos asked Mr. Snider to confirm whether Mr. Rosemond went back and stole the victim's ATM card after the victim had been stabbed multiple times.

Mr. Snider confirmed that Mr. Rosemond stole the ATM card; however, Mr. Rosemond stated he left the victim's wallet.

Member Green-Ross asked how long Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith they were in incarcerated.

Chief Counsel Strumpfer explained that Mr. Gantt was imprisoned for 5,125 days and Mr. Smith was imprisoned for 5,640 days. If the Board approved Mr. Gantt's claim, he would receive \$512,500. If the Board approved Mr. Smith's claim, he would receive \$564,000.

Chairperson made a motion to oppose the hearing officer's recommendation and Member Greene-Ross seconded the motion.

Member Ramos commented that he was troubled by the case. He explained that the standard of proof was different; it was lower. Member Ramos stated he is always concerned about the victim. The victim suffered. He explained that he had a huge problem with the identification of the eyewitness who went back and stole the victim's ATM card while the victim was laying there after being stabbed multiple times. Because of that, he would disregard Mr. Rosemond's testimony. Additionally, he stated the matchbook was weak circumstantial evidence. He explained that if all of the circumstantial evidence were pieced together, it would go the other way. Mr. Shorts' identification although consistent, was troubling because of the position in which he placed himself. Mr. Ramos stated he opposed the hearing officer's recommendation.

Chairperson Batjer commented that Mr. Rosemond's testimony was beyond weak and she believed he recanted. Mr. Shorts only saw briefly through a rear view mirror and Mr. Cubias never identified

Mr. Gantt or Mr. Smith. She remarked that the timeframe from the point when the vehicle entered the garage, went up six stories, the victim was murdered five minutes later, then the vehicle left the garage was not discussed. She questioned whether it could have been done in five minutes. Additionally, she stated the matchbook evidence was also weak. All things proved that innocence was proven in the case.

Member Green-Ross commented that both claimant's served significant jail time given the holes in the case.

The Board unanimously rejected the hearing officer's proposed decision and granted the claims of Mr. Gantt and Mr. Smith.

### **Victim Compensation Program**

The Board commenced the Victim Compensation Program portion of the meeting at 10:55 a.m.

### **Proposal to Modify Compensation Benefits for Crime Victims**

Executive Officer Nauman gave a presentation on the status of the Restitution Fund to make the Board aware of the ramifications to making changes to program benefits. Ms. Nauman explained that the information in the PowerPoint was for discussion purposes only to provide a snapshot of the Restitution Fund with the implementation of AB 1140, the bill that modernizes CalVCPs statutes by making a number of changes to eligibility and benefits.

Ms. Nauman explained that the total cost of implementation on an annual basis was projected to be \$700,000; however, the total in the Restitution Fund would change as it related to claims payments. In 2014-15, claims payments were \$25.6 million. There would be substantial growth in 2016-17, the first full year of implantation of AB 1140 adjustments to the claim payments under the program. Based on new expenditures, in 2019-2020, the Restitution Fund would remain very healthy with over a 50 percent reserve. Ms. Nauman explained that the payments were a combination of federal and state funding.

Mindy Fox, Deputy Executive Officer of CalVCP and the Government Claims Program, explained that at the June 18, 2015, meeting she presented the findings and conclusions from research that was made possible by the Office for Victims of Crime, 2013 Crime Victim Compensation Program Initiative grant. The findings and conclusions of the Baseline Data, Needs Assessment, and Gap Analysis Reports identified several unmet needs and barriers to accessing compensation. The recommendations from those reports included increasing several current benefit limits and authorizing new benefit categories, which the proposed modifications would address. To determine the cost of the possible modifications, staff took into account compensation program utilization, extrapolated expenses, California demographics, market research data, and other states' compensation program benefits information to determine the cost projections. She explained that the suggested benefit caps were intended to enable CalVCP to more fully cover the actual cost of the services victims seek. Additionally, staff analyzed whether legislation, regulatory, or policy changes were necessary to implement each proposed modification.

Ms. Fox presented the following proposed modifications to compensation benefits for crime victims for Board discussion and action:

### **Raise the Relocation Cap to \$4,500**

CalVCP has not increased the benefit limit for relocation since it was established in 2000 and relocation reimbursement has not kept up with increases in costs for moving and rent. If the cap is increased to \$4,500, then 98 percent of victims requesting relocation will have their needs met.

### **Raise Crime Scene Clean Up Cap to \$2,000**

There has been no modification to the crime scene clean up rate since the inception of this benefit in 2002. The current limit of \$1,000 does not cover the increased costs of this service because hourly rates for this service often range from \$150 to \$300 per hour. Analysis indicates that an average of 61 percent of crime scene clean up payments are paid at the statutory \$1,000 limit. Increasing the benefit limit to \$2,000 would enable 80 percent of the qualifying requested expenses to be compensated.

### **Increase Residential Security Cap to \$2,000**

There has been no modification to the residential security benefit since inception of this benefit in 2000. Analysis indicates that an average of 40 percent of the residential security requests are paid at the statutory \$1,000 limit. Increasing the benefit limit to \$2,000 would enable 99 percent of the qualifying requested expenses to be compensated.

### **Add Transportation and Child Care Benefits**

CalVCP does not currently cover transportation to crime-related appointments, such as meetings with advocates, going to court to obtain a restraining order, or going to the DMV to get a new license. Offering reimbursement for childcare will reduce barriers that prohibit victims from obtaining needed medical and mental health treatment and attending other crime-related appointments.

### **Enhance Income Loss**

Research suggests that CalVCP provide income loss for victims to attend legal appointments and parents and caretakers when they miss work to take minor victims to medical, mental health, and crime-related appointments. Existing statute allows for reimbursement of wage loss for victims to attend medical or mental health appointments; however, the aftermath of crime often includes a multitude of other needs including meeting with a victim advocate or prosecutor and or an insurance agent. Offering reimbursement of income loss for attending a range of appointments related to a crime will further reduce the out-of-pocket losses victims endure. There is no provision in the current law for parents and caretakers who must take minor children or dependent adult victims to appointments. For a parent making minimum wage, often with no benefits, the cost of taking time off work to bring a child to therapy for 40 sessions can have a huge impact on the entire family. By reimbursing these parents for lost wages, the Board could reduce the cost incurred as a result of crime and improve treatment outcomes.

### **Restore Statutory Cap to \$70,000**

The benefit limit increases and proposed benefit types have the potential to increase a claimant's reimbursements by \$7,286. Due to these increased limits and benefit types, it is recommended to reinstate the total award limit of \$70,000 to ensure the victims with the greatest needs, such as survivors of homicide victims and those who have suffered catastrophic injury. These victims will benefit from the additional compensation for medical expenses, income loss, and support loss for dependents and minor children.

### **Add Case Management Benefit**

Many mental health providers provide case management services, but not all victims have access to this service through CalVCPs delivery system because it is not covered. Adding case management services as a benefit allows mental health treatment providers to assist a claimant with obtaining needed medical, educational, social, vocational, rehabilitative, or other community services. It is recommended that case management services not count against mental health sessions, instead it would be reimbursed at \$75 per session hour, and have a five-session limit per direct victim application.

### **Increase the Funeral and Burial Limit**

Ms. Fox remarked that the need to raise the benefit cap for funeral and burial to \$7,500 was discussed at the June 2015 meeting; however, it was removed from the cost table presented because the estimated costs were included in the AB 1140 costs outlined in Executive Officer Nauman's PowerPoint presentation. The passage of AB 1140 dictated that the current regulation would be repealed and restored to the \$7,500 limit.

Ms. Fox explained that the following modifications to program benefits required legislative action: raising the relocation cap to \$4,500; raising the crime scene clean up cap to \$2,000; raising the residential security cap to \$2,000; allowing reimbursement of child care and transportation expenses related to medical, mental health, and crime-related appointments; and enhancing income loss. Regulatory action would be required to restore the statutory cap. Adding case management as a benefit would require amending the mental health guidelines

Christine Ward, Executive Director of Crime Victims Assistance Network (iCAN) Foundation and Crime Victims Action Alliance, commented that her client base increased by 400 percent over the past year. She explained that their top three issues were housing, childcare, and transportation.

The Board authorized CalVCP staff to pursue statutory, regulatory, and policy changes regarding relocation, crime scene clean up, residential security, appointments, income loss, funeral and burial, maximum award amount, and case management.

### **Closed Session**

Pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(3), the Board adjourned into Closed Session with the Board's Executive Officer and Chief Counsel at 10:55 a.m. to deliberate on proposed decision numbers 1-60.

### **Open Session**

The Board reconvened into Open Session pursuant to Government Code section 11126 (c)(3) at 11:24 a.m. The Board adopted the hearing officer's recommendations for proposed decision numbers 1-60.

### **Adjournment**

The Board meeting adjourned at 11:38 a.m.