STATE OF FLORIDA

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

STATE IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT COUNCIL MEETING

CERTIFIED ORIGINAL

DATE TAKEN: April 9, 2025

TIME: 2:00 PM - 4:02 PM

LOCATION: Via Videoconference

1	APPEARANCES:
2	SHERIFF GRADY JUDD - CHAIR -POLK COUNTY SHERIFF'S
3	OFFICE
4	SHERIFF BOB GUALTIERI - PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S
5	OFFICE
6	SHERIFF T.K. WATERS - JACKSONVILLE SHERIFF'S OFFICE
7	SHERIFF BILL PRUMMELL - CHARLOTTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S
8	OFFICE
9	CHIEF CHARLES BROADWAY, KISSIMMEE POLICE
10	DEPARTMENT
11	CHIEF CIRO DOMINGUEZ - NAPLES POLICE DEPARTMENT
12	CHIEF ROBERT BAGE - FORT WALTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
13	CHIEF DOUG GOERKE - ST. CLOUD POLICE DEPARTMENT
14	MELISSA BUJEDA
15	TENILLE FROM GRANT OFFICE
16	LARRY KEEFE
17	JOE FOLSOM
18	DAVID BINDER
19	ZACHARY DURRETT, ORGANIZER
20	MEGAN NEEL
21	TENILLE FROM GRANT OFFICE
22	RYLEIGH M. WOGOMAN
23	DAPHNE JEAN-PIERRE, MDCR
24	LAURA RIVERA
25	MATT DUNAGAN
	<u> </u>

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	RANDA MATUSIAK	
3	THOMAS K. WATERS	
4	YUBERKY ALMONTE	
5	DOUGLAS GOERKE	
6	PATRICIA JONES CUMMINGS	
7	ROBERT S. BAGE	
8	DANNY BANKS	
9	HAILEY VANDERLAAN	
10	GINGER DELEGAL	
11	MARYDELL GUEVARA	
12	MELISSA A. CONGER	
13	LAURA MOREL	
14	WILLIAM GRISSOM	
15	LOUIS QUINONES	
16	DANA KELLY	
17	LESLIE KAMINSKI, COURT REPORTER	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

(Thereupon, the following proceedings were held at 2:00 PM)

SHERIFF JUDD: Good afternoon everyone. It's now 2 o'clock. Time for our meeting to start.

It's April the 9th, 2025, and it's State Immigration Enforcement Council meeting.

This meeting is a public meeting to discuss issues relating to illegal immigration in the state of Florida.

Please keep your microphone on mute unless you're a Council member and you want to speak.

Obviously, we're going to have a free flow of a lot of information today as we narrow down some of our resolutions so that we can advance them to the State Board of -- so Council members, I appreciate your willingness to serve, and I welcome your active participation in these proceedings.

Thank you for joining us today.

For those others that may be online, the State Enforcement Immigration Council values public input on the matters we discuss. At the end of the schedule -- agenda items, we'll open the floor for public comment.

When it's your turn to speak, please introduce

yourself by name. You will have up to three minutes to share your thoughts.

We will notify you when the public comment portion of the meeting begins, and this is a public comments portion.

It will not be a Q and A from the community or from the meeting, but for your opportunity to put what you believe or think on the record.

My name's Grady Judd. I have the honor of serving as the sheriff in Polk County, and it's also my privilege to be the chairperson of the Council.

We were just together in person a week ago discussing the very important and timely tomic -- topic of illegal immigration.

I'm pleased to see that, despite the distance, we're back together. And I want to do a lot of meetings this way, if we can, because it's just much easier on all of us.

We are going to have at least one more inperson meeting, but, because of the pressing time, we may have to have a couple of informal meetings or meetings that we do on the Zoom process.

Also, I've got a new system here that they're tweaking, so if it looks like I'm looking in the

25 twe

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

air or at the ground or at someone else, I'm really not. But I've got a whole wall of your pictures here, and you all look beautiful today, by the way.

The work we do here requires collaboration, open dialogue, and a shared commitment to finding practical solutions.

We must continue to engage with one another and work towards a unified approach of tackling illegal immigration in our communities.

Today, as we gather virtually, we have the opportunity to continue our work and discuss new strategies to address illegal immigration more effectively.

Some of us are from larger agencies, some from smaller agencies. We all bring unique insights to the table, and I'm confident together that we can coalesce around an answer.

And quite frankly, if there's a divergent opinion, then we'll obviously vote to -- and the majority rules on whether it is included in the resolution, or we move on.

Hopefully, that we can -- we can unanimously agree by the end of -- after hearing from everyone.

So with that, Melissa Bujeda from FDLE, would you call the roll, or have some of your colleagues

2425

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 2. MS. BUDEJA: Good --good afternoon. Sheriff Bob Gualtieri. 3 4 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I'm here. 5 MS. BUDEJA: Sheriff T.K. Waters. 6 SHERIFF WATERS: Present. 7 MS. BUDEJA: Sheriff Bill Prummell. 8 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Here. 9 MS. BUDEJA: Chief Charles Broadway. He let 10 us know he could not attend, Sheriff. Chief Ciro 11 Dominguez. CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: 12 Here. 13 MS. BUDEJA: Chief Robert Bage. 14 CHIEF BAGE: Ready to go. 15 MS. BUDEJA: Chief Doug Goerke. 16 CHIEF GOERKE: Here, everyone. Good 17 afternoon. 18 MS. BUDEJA: And Chairman Sheriff Brady Judd. 19 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, ma'am, I'm here. 20 MS. BUDEJA: You have a forum, Sheriff. 21 Thank you very much. We were SHERIFF JUDD: supposed to vote on -- have a -- have a motion to 22 23 vote on the Commission meeting notes, but to be 24 honest with you, I've been consumed with my day job 25 and my second day job, this. I haven't had a

chance to read the notes.

We weren't supposed to have a meeting except that we had to plug in some Zoom meetings.

So I'm going to push that to either our next Zoom meeting if we need it, or we'll approve the meeting notes at our in-person meeting that we'll hold here at the sheriff's office in Polk County.

So with that, our first agenda item is Grant Rules. As I explained to you all last week -- and it was a recommendation of Sheriff Gualtieri -- that, hey, let's look at these grant rules and prioritize them.

So what I did -- because, obviously, it being a public meeting, we can't talk together individually -- I sent out a list in this resolution 25001.

I sent out a list of five priorities, one through five being obviously one -- the -- that we make sure we fund first.

That doesn't mean that my number one will end up the number one. Some, you know, the other group -- group of you may say, hey, my number four should be number one. But we had to have a place to start.

So we put this together, and then we added

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

under number one all of your feedback and input.
You should all have that in front of you now.

So what I hope to do is -- obviously, the FDLE staff is going to coalesce around whatever answers that -- that we decide upon so that we can have a vote here today and move that as a resolution to the Board that they accept this as the grant process, one, the priorities and then, in addition to that, the grant rules and -- and how you apply.

I think we pretty much agreed on that at our last meeting, so this is just the priorities. We understand that there's \$250 million.

That's a finite amount of money. And quite frankly, pursuant to our conversation last week, so we can get down to business -- we have a lot of business to do -- the -- the goal is \$250 million.

In a state this size to the population of very, very large agencies to very small agencies, this -- this money can diminish quickly if there's not some oversight and priority.

So when you look through here, what -- what I recommended first was training and the WSO training, the jail-enforcement-model training, task-force-model training, and paying for that training for all law-enforcement officers. You see

1 the details there. 2. Sheriff Gualtieri is the first one that is 3 listed past my recommendations, so let's go through 4 them and then decide which way we -- what we want 5 to do as a final recommendation as the priorities. Sheriff Gualtieri. 6 7 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. So, do you want me to use my recommendations? 8 9 I have some comments on what is in your 10 section as well, as far as some accuracies. So you 11 want me to make those comments and then talk about 12 my stuff, or how do you want to do it? 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. We -- you should have --14 you should have my number one. 15 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Right. SHERIFF JUDD: And below that, we have put 16 17 input that you provided --18 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Right. 19 SHERIFF JUDD: -- specifically to number one. 2.0 And then when we get to my number two, then we have 21 2.2 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Right. 23 SHERIFF JUDD: -- all of the input there. 2.4 let's stick to the number one topic. That may not 25 stay the number one topic.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Right.

SHERIFF JUDD: But let's go over the things that's -- that -- that you think plugs into that, and then we'll just move through based upon the feedback that we received.

And then from that, we -- FDLE will put it together, and we will move forward from there. But my -- my belief was the first thing you had to -- had to have was training and education and how did we pay for that infrastructure?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. All right. So -so I'm a -- you know, as well or, you know, big
believer in eliminating ambiguity and making sure
we're accurate, so some of my comments are going to
be directed in that respect.

So in your number one, where it says under the jail-enforcement model -- so it's about halfway down paragraph one, and the sentence says in with the jail-enforcement model -- it says trained staff partners with ICE to identify and remove criminal aliens from the US.

The jail-enforcement-model personnel do not have anything to do with the removal process.

And I suggest you change that because it's not accurate. We have -- we have no decision making or

2.

anything in the removal.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

So it's trained staff partners to identify and process criminal aliens would be my suggestion on that because they don't have anything to do with removals.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Under A is -- I think we got to remove some ambiguity here. I think I know what the intent is, but it says reimbursable training costs should be additional costs. And then it goes on to say personnel costs associated with training up to time and a half.

I think what you're -- I -- I think what we're getting at there is this isn't going to be used to pay straight time. So, we're not going to pay for everybody that's doing it on duty.

If they're already being paid and they take two hours out of their day because the supervisor can let them go to spend two hours on the computer, then they're not going to be able to reimburse that. So it's going to be overtime costs incurred at up to time and a half. Is that correct?

SHERIFF JUDD: That's correct.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So can we -- can we change that? Because, again, we -- we -- you know, this

1 is going to go across the state. It's going to go 2. out to everybody, assuming the State Board adopts this. Is -- what does additional cost mean? 3 4 So I think it should say reimbursable costs 5 for overtime incurred up to time and a half because it doesn't -- it doesn't tell you what additional 6 7 costs mean. Under B, got to tell you, I -- I -- I'm 8 confused about this because -- so what does -- it -9 10 - it says in here we recommend the following 11 percentage reimbursement: 10 percent of sworn 12 certified for agencies with 500 or more. 13 So I -- I don't know what that means. So if 14 we have 700 sworn, but I've only nominated 50 15 people, then do I get to -- like, 70 people? 16 Up to 70 people can get overtime costs 17 reimbursed, so I got to identify those 70, and only 18 those 70 count. I just don't know what that means. 19 SHERIFF JUDD: Up to 70. If you remember from 20 the very beginning, when the -- before the 21 legislation was passed, they talked about -- and 22 this is where we came up with the number -- ten 23 percent of the force be dedicated to immigration enforcement. 24

So what we're trying to do -- for example, you

1 have an agency -- Broward Sheriff's Office has got 2. -- I don't know -- three or four thousand deputies. 3 And they go, we'll take overtime and train all 3 or 4 4,000. No. You get to train ten percent. 5 So, depending on the size of your agency -obviously the smaller agencies may need to train 6 7 more in order to get the 24/7 coverage. But what we want to do is, in order to manage 8 9 the money, is just to say you can train up to 70 10 that the -- the grant pays for. 11 You can train them all, but we just will only 12 reimburse for those -- for that number up to a 13 finite amount. 14 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: But -- and -- and for 15 those people, up to the 70 people, it -- it would be, as an example, only their overtime costs for 16 17 those 70 people --18 SHERIFF JUDD: -- overtime. 19 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So if those 70 people who 20 we identify, none of them incur any overtime costs, 21 then I get -- I get zero. I'm not saying I have a 22 problem with that. I'm just trying to understand 23 what the intent is. 24 SHERIFF JUDD: No. That's correct. 25 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay.

1 That you -- you're allotted up SHERIFF JUDD: 2. to that amount. Now -- and -- and that's part of 3 the problem with a finite amount of money scattered 4 all over the state. 5 Some -- some agencies may make the determination we're going to train everybody on 6 7 overtime, and we're going to go up to our limit. Some agencies may say, look, I'm going to try 8 9 to train the people on duty so that we can save the 10 money for something that's pressing someplace else. 11 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So, okay. So last -- last 12 question and I'll move on. 13 What happens if I identify these 70 people and 14 none of them incur any overtime costs, but a few 15 months later I take another 20 people. 16 And I've used 0 of the money, but I got 17 another 20 people now that I want to train. 18 they need to be done on overtime, so that means I'm out of luck. 19 2.0 SHERIFF JUDD: No. You still have -- you had 21 -- still have 70 --2.2 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. 23 SHERIFF JUDD: You can -- you can train --24 position. 25 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I got you.

SHERIFF JUDD: We're only getting to pay --

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So really -- so you can draw down on up to 70 people. You don't have to identify the people ahead of time. It's just up to 70 that you could.

SHERIFF JUDD: Right.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. Okay. I got it. All right.

This next one on here that I have in the comment that's in red on what you sent out, again, my suggestion is -- because we talked about this with all the different operations and this is a one-time deal, et cetera, and it was just a suggestion to try and narrow this to save the money so that you don't have that situation we talked about where Vice calls.

We need two deputies, two officers to go out and support an operation. The patrol sergeant sends two officers from the squad, and it's a one-time deal -- is to limit the reimbursement to those who become credentialed DIOs who participate.

Because those are the people that I thought, when I read this at first, was really intended by the legislature to be those, not just somebody that's a one-off that happens to be a patrol person

schedule@lawsreporting.com

that goes out one time and does it.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And it was a way to create a bright-line framework, a bright-line rule that is consistent among all 67 sheriff's offices and the 350 police departments that are out there that -- and it helps to limit the money because it will only be DIOs.

And quite honestly, maybe it even incentivizes people to have more people go through the training process and become DIOs.

So that was the thought there, to create a specific framework, bright lines, easy to understand and easy to apply.

SHERIFF JUDD: If we -- if we don't do that, theoretically, you could rotate people through the operations and just burn through money.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Correct. So that's why it's real easy if we just limit it to credentialed, designated immigration officers in the task force.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. I -- that's good. Go ahead.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So I think for number one that you have here, Sheriff Judd -- I think under number one here as I'm following along in your -- you know, so I want to make sure. Yes. The next thing that I have is under number two, so that's

all I have for the moment.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. That's okay. Chief Bage.

CHIEF BAGE: Good afternoon. Thank you,

Chairman. I like your progressive structure where it goes up in percentage for the smaller agency.

The one thing I'd like to point out is that throughout the document -- and this may come up in other numbers -- different people made different recommendations for different agency sizes.

I think for consistency, we should really define what a small agency is, what a large agency is, and what a medium-sized agency is because we use different definitions.

And I can tell you the IACP's definition for large agency is over 999. Mid-size is from 50 to 998 and less than 50 is small.

The FPCA uses a slightly different scale where they use large as over 75, medium, from 31 to 75, and small, less than 30.

If you look at the Florida agencies under the FPCA standard, there are 66 PDs that are large and 41 SOs that are large.

There are 68 PDs that are mid-size and 13 SOs that are mid-size. And on the small one from the FPCA definition, there'd be 115 PDs and 11 SOs just

schedule@lawsreporting.com

2.

to kind of give you scale for some type of matrix to put them in.

But I think consistency is probably the key because it comes up in overtime and in some other areas in the document that we should have the same definition for large, medium, and small. And that was my only comment for section number one.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Now, as you see, what --we didn't do, large, medium, and small. What we did is 500 or more, 100 to 500, 50 to 99, and 1 to 49 in -- in our documents.

So -- so we went with numbers -- but it -- it makes no difference what standard we use as long as we're uniform in it.

CHIEF BAGE: Correct. And I think maybe as we flesh it out in the other sections, maybe we can come up to that standard for whatever groups we want to put the officers in.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. So -- so I think we agree that we've got to do it based on agency size. And then the question is, you know, where -- where do you cut it?

And we -- we want to make sure that -- that is -- that's -- that's good, so -- and it makes no difference to me which standard we use.

CHIEF BAGE: And I'd -- I'd be indifferent too. And the only other thing I would want to emphasize is -- I agree with you, Sheriff Judd -- is that the smaller agencies should have a greater percentage.

The larger agencies should have a smaller percentage because there is a comment further down in the document where one recommendation reverses that and gives larger agencies the bigger percentage.

SHERIFF JUDD: I -- the -- also, you talked about over time to backfill the position of the person in training as an allowable -- as an allowable reimbursement. And my -- my thoughts on that -- and -- and everybody -- you know, folks, jump in.

I don't think we should pay another person why [sic] someone goes to training. If -- if we want to pay somebody time and a half, we need to pay the person that's being trained. Just tell them to come in on your day off, come in early, stay late, or whatever.

CHIEF BAGE: I don't have an issue with that, Sheriff.

The -- where I got that from was under FEMA

2.

guidelines. FEMA allows for the backfilling of personnel when they're deployed.

2.

So I tried to look for other things that would give some direction, into some of these guidelines. And that was the only thing I could find was the FEMA guideline that allowed for backfilling.

But I'm good with that reasoning that if you come in early, stay late, there may not be a need to backfill.

SHERIFF JUDD: FEMA still owes me about \$250,000, so I don't have warm feelings about them right now. By the way, they told me they weren't going to pay me, so -- so I -- I -- the --

Chief Broadway's not here. I'll read for him. The number of personnel trained, and the amount of move time allocated should be based on size, resources, and budget constraints.

And, Chief, that's what you just said. Chief Goerke, you agree that this is the number-one priority? Any other input?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Sheriff Judd, can we back up for a second before you move on to this?

Because it -- it -- I think you already had that in there.

What you said you didn't want, I think is

1 already in there under A about the backfilling. Look at -- look at number A. It says, what's reimbursable is when that 3 4 sworn law-enforcement officer or certified 5 corrections officer is unable to perform their normal duties while training. 6 7 So I -- I think to that point, I -- I read that as -- if you want to take it out, I'm good 8 9 with taking it out. 10 But it says that it is reimbursable as 11 additional cost when that officer is unable to 12 perform their normal duties. 13 I read that as is that you can pay the person 14 that's backfilling for them when they're unable to 15 perform their normal duties. SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. That -- that's certainly 16 17 not what the intent was. The intent was --18 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. Okay. 19 SHERIFF JUDD: -- that you try to train your 2.0 guys on -- on time to save the money. 21 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Is it --22 SHERIFF JUDD: If not you -- you pay them off 23 duty. But yes, we can -- what language do you 2.4 suggest to make that -- that point --25 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: You can just put -- put in

there that -- that , you know, the reimbursement 1 2. for backfilling is not permitted. 3 And that takes care of it because, again, 4 removing ambiguity -- if I'm reading it that way, 5 maybe somebody else is. And it's all about just making sure 6 7 everybody's clear about what's permissible or not. You can just solve that by just putting in there 8 9 that right there, beyond that sentence, it's saying 10 reimbursement for backfilling is not permitted. 11 SHERIFF JUDD: Any opposition to that? 12 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: No. That's the clearest way 13 to say it. 14 CHIEF GOERKE: Yes. I agree. 15 SHERIFF JUDD: Chief Goerke. CHIEF GOERKE: Yes, Sheriff, I appreciate it 16 17

and --and the conversation's been perfect. right in line with where my comments are.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Training and education should be first. I agree with all the changes that we've actually made as well.

And actually the agency size was something that I was going to bring up, but Sheriff Bage or Chief Bage already grabbed that too. But I think we're --we're spot on. As long as it is consistent 2.

2.0

throughout the -- the resolution, I think we're in good shape.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Chief Dominguez?

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes. I'm in -- in agreement with everyone, except I want to specify something about the sizes.

One, I think initial training clearly has to be the first investment out of this \$250 million because that's what we're -- we're putting the majority of the money in initially.

That's our first investment on this program. But when it comes to the scale and size, I -- I have a different view.

Large agency, mid-sized agency, smaller agency, however we explain it, we also have to look how that affects the -- the geographics and the demographics of where you're working.

So a smaller agency of three with a smaller jurisdiction, the chances of those folks running into enforcing this is, I think, less than a larger sheriff's office that has more availability and more boots on the ground and a larger geographic area.

So I don't know what exact the science of -- what -- I think we need to talk more about this.

Laws Reporting, Inc. 305.358.2700

schedule@lawsreporting.com www.lawsreporting.com

2.

But if I have three small agencies and one large sheriff's office, my thought was the larger offices -- and I just threw the number out there, 300 plus -- they would have a -- a bigger share of availability where that smaller agency could call the sheriff's office to come over and do what have you in the task-force process.

But the smaller agency, if you have a -- a three-man agency, it's -- it's -- that also that your -- your jurisdiction is smaller, and the chances of you running in to an enforceable moment is lesser.

So I -- I'm just talking, you know, in regard to scale and actual use of the credentials and being a DIO.

And -- and to what the sheriff said, I -- I think I agree that all reimbursements of that nature needs to be actual DIOs.

Otherwise, we'll end up going to the well too many times, and -- and that's just not right to do.

SHERIFF JUDD: I think we're all on board with that. Okay. How -- how do you want to approach this?

Do you want to use what Chief Bage said, use either the IACP or the -- the state standards for

1 small, medium, and large, or how do you want to --2. CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: I think the -- I think the state standard is -- fits us better in Florida. 3 4 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Chief, you want to read 5 -- read that state standard for us one more time? CHIEF BAGE: No problem. So let me get to it. 6 7 So the state standard for a large agency is 75 or more, is what they consider a large agency in the 8 state of Florida. 31 to 75 is mid, and less than 9 10 30 is small. 11 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: And then we would assign 12 percentages to that, is what you mean? 13 CHIEF BAGE: Correct. 14 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Mr. Chair, if I could, Mr. 15 16 Yes, sir. SHERIFF JUDD: 17 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Thank you. I -- I -- I 18 understand where Chief Dominguez is going, but where he has his percentages, it wouldn't work for 19 20 the mere fact that, say, you use the example of a three-man agency -- he has here smaller agencies, 21 22 fewer than 60, 20 percent max. 23 Well, if you have a three-man agency and you 24 train one of them, that's 33 percent of your 25 agency.

1 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes. 2. SHERIFF JUDD: So that's over the number. 3 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Yes. So that wouldn't 4 work. 5 SHERIFF JUDD: And --SHERIFF PRUMMELL: So I think where we came up 6 7 with having the larger percentage for the smaller agencies is because of that reason. 8 9 Not necessarily training more but making sure 10 that they had a couple people they could train. 11 SHERIFF JUDD: And -- and quite frankly, let 12 me suggest this: if the police-chief's model says 13 75 or more officers is a large agency, then if you 14 have 75 people, you can only train -- what --15 seven. That's -- that's stretching it to get you 16 17 across. But under this model, if you have 75, the 18 numbers I've used, you can train -- but what is it? 19 -- 30 percent of your agency. 20 So you can train a heck of a lot more people 21 if you -- if you look at this matrix here -- as 22 you can if we use that state -- state standard. 23 Let -- let me -- let me read it to you. there's 500 or more law-enforcement officers or 24 25 correction officers -- if you get -- you have 20

1 percent, that can be -- I'm sorry -- ten percent --2. 20 percent can be trained between 100 and 499. 30 percent can be trained if you have between 3 4 50 and 99. And if you have between 1 and 49, what? 5 50 percent is 1 to 49. I'm sorry. Ten percent is the largest 1 for 500 or more. 6 7 20 percent is the next one down between 100 and 499. 8 30 percent is between 50 and 99. And no, 50 9 10 percent's between 1 and 49. 30 percent's between 11 50 and 99. 12 I'm not reading. I'm -- I'm trying to 13 superimpose this one up in my head, but at the same 14 time. 15 So, if you have between 1 and 49 lawenforcement officers, you can train up to half your 16 staff. So, I mean, you get to train more under 17 18 this scale than you do, you know -- so --CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes. 19 20 SHERIFF JUDD: I -- I just want to offer the 21 more training to the smaller agencies. 22 otherwise, if we hook 75 or more considering large, 23 that's only going to give you 10 percent. 24 Or we have to change the scale. And if you 25 change the scale and you put the people with 500 or 1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that first tier.

1,000 officers in with 75 as a large agency, at that point in time, you end up training twice or three times as many people in the larger -- and then they suck up all the money again. Yes, sir.

CHIEF BAGE: So, Sheriff Judd, I --I think your system works well if you maybe just cut off

And if you go with 20 percent, 30 percent and 50 percent and you use the FPCA model, so at 75 people, you could do 14 people.

If you're BSO and you had 3,000, you could do, then, do, theoretically, 600 people, and that would be the max.

Remember, this is only on overtime. Doesn't say an agency cannot train every single person if they desire to single every single person.

This just tells you what becomes reversible from the state of Florida on the overtime cost.

And the other thing that you may want to look in there is maybe we put a floor on it. So if you do have that small three-person agency, we say that any agency can train a minimum of ten people.

And then once you get above that, then you hit into your thresholds of that 20, 30, or 50. And that would ensure that, if you had a micro agency

1 somewhere, you would have a good amount of people 2. trained for 24/7 coverage. CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: I think that's a good 3 4 compromise. Yes. 5 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Hey, Sheriff Judd, I got a question. 6 7 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, sir. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So -- so does this mean --8 and just make sure we're clear on this -- is that 9 10 if the range is, let's say, 100 to 499, and you can do 30 percent, it's 30 percent of your actual. 11 12 that correct? 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. 14 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. Whatever you have, 15 actually. So it's going to be different from 16 agency to agency. 17 If somebody has 100, then they're going to be 18 able to do 30, and somebody that's got 480 would be 19 able to do 30 percent of that, right? 20 SHERIFF JUDD: That's correct. 21 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. All right. I'm 22 good. 23 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. So give us the numbers 24 that -- that you want in there, Chief. 25 CHIEF BAGE: I would say that every -- any

agency can do a minimum of ten on overtime.

And then once you get above the 10, you go to the percentages of 20 percent for a large agency, as defined by the Florida Police Chiefs
Association, which is greater than 75; for a midsized agency, 30 percent; and then for a small agency, 50 percent.

SHERIFF JUDD: You realize though, if you call 75 a large agency, then you're allowing me to pay double the people that I otherwise was going to train.

CHIEF BAGE: But I think I'm good with what
Chief Dominguez said, too, is that the large
agencies may be the savior for some of the smaller
agencies that can't have somebody out there all the
time, that, especially up here in North Florida,
northwest Florida, a lot of the agencies depend on
the sheriff's offices for collateral or secondary
services that are in addition to primary patrol.

So by sheriff's office training a few more people, that may benefit everybody in the long run.

And I think this is a good compromise to ensure that you have enough people trained, but you don't neglect the small agencies and allow them to still have sufficient for 24/7 coverage.

2.

Okay. Is there any opposition 1 SHERIFF JUDD: 2. to that? 3 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: No. 4 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: No. 5 SHERIFF JUDD: I'll take the extra money, thank you. 6 7 Melissa, do you have the numbers down? MS. BUDEJA: Yes. We are good. We have it. 8 9 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. And -- and I -- I heard 10 some -- are -- are we okay with training being the 11 number one priority? 12 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. 13 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes. 14 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. We'll move to the number 15 two priority here -- that's obviously, as I said, 16 subject to change; this is no more than a skeleton 17 to get us started -- cost associated -- associated 18 with detaining and housing unauthorized aliens. 19 Now, what we put in here was because of the 2.0 complexity of jail per diem cost calculations. 21 recommended \$100 per day. Now, I understand my cost, Sheriff Gualtieri's 2.2 23 cost, certainly Sheriff Waters's cost is much more 2.4 than \$100 a day. 25 But if we -- if we -- reimburse actual cost -

1 - and Sheriff Gualtieri will defend that in just a 2. minute -- we can eat through this money very 3 rapidly. 4 That's -- that's why I limit it even though we 5 would -- we would take -- you know, we would take a lick at the county level to house some of these 6 7 people for that 48-hour period of time. Because I think ICE reimburse \$50 a day. Is that accurate, 8 Bob? 9 10 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: No. And we need to make 11 some corrections to that that I can go through when you're ready for me to. That -- that's not right. 12 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Go ahead. I -- go ahead. 14 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay. So I -- I don't 15 have a problem with your suggestion that it be 16 capped at \$100 a day. 17 It makes it easy, whether you're a BOA 18 facility or an IGSA facility, and that you just cap it across the board at 100. I don't have a problem 19 with that. 20 21 But factually, what needs to get cleaned up for the rest of the discussion on it is where it 22

It's \$50 -- under the contract, it's \$50 for a

says that a jail facility not received or applied

for the \$50 per day. That's not how it is.

23

24

full 48-hour period. So whether you house them under the BOA for 5 minutes or 48 hours, it's \$50. So that needs to get corrected.

Where it says because of the complexity under a -- we recommend a straightforward 100 per unauthorized alien if a jail facility has not received or applied for the \$50 per day, what it should say is for the \$50 per stay reimbursement from ICE.

Because it's not \$50 a day, it's \$50 per stay.

Again, whether it's five minutes or 48 hours.

And then, where it goes on here, you got to fix this because it says: and \$50 for a jail that has received or applied for the \$50 a day.

You got it -- they fixed the math on that. So if you have -- I think that's got to be up to \$150, so a jail that has not received or applied for the \$50 per stay and 150 if the jail has received or applied for the \$50 per stay. You follow me on that?

SHERIFF JUDD: And certainly that was misunderstanding on my part because I didn't check with Chief Allen. I thought he was -- he told me \$50 a day.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Mm-mm.

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

SHERIFF JUDD: What he told me was \$50 a stay.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. Yes, it's \$50 a

stay, and anybody that has an IGSA, most of those

are, like, \$72 a day.

So remember, there's only -- right now, there's only seven county jails in Florida that have IGSAs.

Those are separate contracts up to 72 hours, and they get reimbursed 72 bucks. But the rest of it, the rest of the counties, which is the majority of them, are only housing under BOAs. And that's \$50 per stay.

So I think that this -- this gets fixed. And I, personally, I am -- whatever everybody else thinks.

I'm good with your suggestion about just capping it at 100, but you got to change the math on it. So it's \$50 a stay and then up to \$150 for a jail that has not received a reply for the \$50 stay.

And then under B. And this is -- may seem like semantics, but it's important -- it says under B, the last one, it says until the time the unauthorized alien leaves a jail facility and into ICE custody.

2.

Unfortunately and sadly, they all don't leave 1 2. the ICE -- the jail and go into ICE custody. 3 Sometimes ICE just doesn't come pick them up and 4 they have to be released to the street. 5 So it should be changed, leaves the jail facility or into ICE custody. Because if we held 6 7 it for 48 hours and we got to kick them loose because they didn't come get them, we should still 8 9 be able to get the money for that. So --10 SHERIFF JUDD: So we'll take -- we'll take the 11 \$50 per stay plus \$100 -- per day. 12 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes because you can get up 13 to -- reimbursement rates are 100 bucks. SHERIFF JUDD: So what you'll -- what you'll 14 15 end up with is \$125 a day. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes, however that math 16 17 works out. It -- it just the -- the -- the thing's 18 got to get changed. 19 You can figure out the math on it. You just 20 got to -- whatever you want the cap to be and back 21 it in. 22 It just has to be worded so that it's understandable in here that is that the -- the 23 24 most you can get from the Feds is \$50 a -- a stay. 25 If you get that, then you can -- you can only get

1 the balance from the state. 2. If you don't get anything from the state --I'm sorry -- from the Feds, then you can get the 3 4 whole amount from the state, so maybe my math was 5 even off on it. SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. T --6 7 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: And then that -- needs to get changed so that, if you do hold somebody and 8 you release them to the street, unfortunately, that 9 10 you could still get your reimbursement. SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. I think -- I agree with 11 12 that. I -- I think, for -- for the sake of 13 argument, since it's \$50 a stay, that's \$25 a day. 14 You take the federal \$25 a day; that means you 15 only get \$75 a day from this for a total of 100. 16 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: That works. 17 SHERIFF JUDD: Other sheriffs, you all -- you 18 all good with it? 19 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes, sir, I'm good with it. 20 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. All right. Sheriff 21 Gualtieri, I think you -- did you have any other 22 feedback on that? 23 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: No, that's all I had. 24 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Sheriff Prummmel, you 25 talked about eligible funding for detention beds

1

2.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

sublet to US Immigrations. You have any -- any --SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Yes, sir. The -- the way 3 they do now, each -- each jail in the state would 4 get -- does get reimbursed -- or I believe everybody gets reimbursed -- for some SCAAP funding for those illegal immigrants that are brought into 7 our custody. So how is this going to work with requesting the reimbursement of up to \$100? And because I 9

believe the rules, or the statute also read that that's going to be over and above what you already get -- reimbursed for.

SHERIFF JUDD: Sheriff Gualtieri, I'm -- I'm not sure about the SCAAP funding. Go ahead.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. Yes. So I --SCAAP funding only applies to people who have been convicted of two misdemeanors --

SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Or felony.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: or one felony, and they are in your jail for more than four days. has to be during the relevant period, and the relevant period is back one year.

So right now, as an example, the 2025 SCAAP money hasn't been released. So everybody is calculating it from 2023 until, I think, June to 1 2024.

And then you go back, and you look at the number of people who are illegal in your jail who are there for four days or more, convicted of two misdemeanors or a felony, and then you can recoup those days.

I don't think -- I -- I don't think it has much bearing, Bill, be honest with you. It's a great question and something that should be raised.

I don't think it has much bearing because of the nature of it. The limited amount of money there is there.

And most of these people that are going to be housed are not going to be convicted.

The majority of them, the absolute majority of them, are going to be pretrial detainees who are picked up and -- and don't meet the SCAAP criteria.

I -- I -- I don't think it's a big issue myself, but that's me.

SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Now, I do agree with you that the vast majority, it's not going to affect. But I believe, in the future, it's going to affect some of them.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay.

SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Because I'm guessing this

7

8

9

2.

3

4

5

6

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 money is -- is this just for the year, or are they 2. going to be carrying this forward? SHERIFF GUALTIERI: This -- this is for the 3 4 year. This is per year. 5 And I -- I think the easiest way to handle it is is to have your inmate record section that goes 6 7 back -- because everything in SCAAP, you're going back for a year. 8 So that it's not real time. It's not --9 10 there's no time crunch -- is just to have your 11 inmate record section not take the SCAAP money for 12 that individual if you've taken the money just to 13 make sure you don't have a -- a conflicting 14 situation. Because it's all paperwork in SCAAP, 15 and you're going back a year. 16 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Mm-hmm. 17 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So I think that that's how 18 you filter it out and you eliminate the problem. 19 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Okay. 20 SHERIFF JUDD: Any other -- any other input 21 from the sheriffs before we move to the chiefs? 22 Chiefs, as you've heard in the last couple of minutes -- you know, that's why I'm sure you all 23 24 thank the good Lord every day you don't have a 25 jail. So feedback, Chief Bage, on -- you had

1 listed some feedback on. 2. CHIEF BAGE: All my comments are irrelevant. I agree completely with Sheriff Gualtieri, and I'm 3 4 in support of what you guys discussed. 5 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Chief Goerke. Yes. Sheriff, I got to say the 6 CHIEF GOERKE: 7 same thing. God bless you guys for running these jails and 8 9 trying to recoup all this. 10 This is an absolute nightmare, and I can only 11 imagine what you guys are going through. So I'm in 12 full concurrence with where you are now. 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. So any other feedback on 14 the \$100 a day? So it's going to be \$100 a day 15 minus the -- the \$50 per stay, is that correct? 16 Melissa, we good on that? 17 MS. BUDEJA: Yes, sir, we're good. Thank you. 18 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. All right. I had as 19 priority three costs associated with transporting unauthorized aliens on behalf of the United States 20 21 Immigration and Custom [sic]. 22 So if we are -- and -- and this can open up --23 if we're involved in transporting for ICE, that we 24 -- we -- the agency will get the -- the approved 25 mileage rate, whatever the federal-approved mileage

1 rate is for the vehicle, plus that they'll pay time 2. and a half for up to two agency members as a 3 transport to and from. 4 So you pay -- you pay mileage, to and from the 5 receiving -- the IGSA facility, for example -- plus time and a half for up to two officers to 6 Sheriff Gualtieri. 7 transport. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. I think that covers 8 9 it. And -- and I think that my -- my comments were 10 taken from a different section in there and placed 11 there. 12 But I'm -- I'm good. I think it's -- you 13 know, you can reimburse for up to two people to do 14 the transports in up to time and a half, so I'm 15 good with it. SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Any other feedback on --16 17 on number three? 18 Section 4, 908.1033 allows reimbursement for 19 equipment, travel, lodging related to 287(g). 20 we were going to recommend --21 MS. BUDEJA: Sheriff. 22 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, ma'am. 23 MS. BUDEJA: Can we go back to the last one? 24 Our grant personnel have something they'd like to 25 add to see it can be added in there.

1 Yes, ma'am. SHERIFF JUDD: 2. MS. ROBINETTE: Hi. This is Tennille 3 Robinette from the grants office. 4 Under DFS, Department of Financial Services, 5 guidelines, we are unable to reimburse at the federal per diem rate or mileage rate unless it is 6 7 specifically spelled out in rule that we reimburse it that. 8 So that just needs to be explicitly stated in 9 10 the rule because we can point it back to DFS and 11 say here it is in the rule that allows us to do it. 12 SHERIFF JUDD: And whose rule? Our -- our 13 rule, the board's rule or --14 MS. ROBINETTE: The board's rule. The board's 15 rule that we're creating right now. Okay. So do we just need 16 SHERIFF JUDD: 17 different language that we recommend to the board 18 that they reimburse at the federal rate? I presume 19 that --2.0 MS. ROBINETTE: Yes. 21 SHERIFF JUDD: I presume that's more than the 2.2 state rate. 23 MS. ROBINETTE: Yes, it is. 2.4 FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. 25 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. If you would just tweak

the -- the language the way we need to -- to present it to the board for their passing. Oh, thank you very much.

MS. ROBINETTE: All right. Thank you.

SHERIFF JUDD: Number four allows for the reimbursement for equipment, travel, and lodging related to 280-C.

And as you can see, we recommend the State
Board of Immigration prioritize and reimburse these
categories only to the extent that the equipment,
travel, and lodging are directly related to
detaining and transporting unauthorized aliens or
directly related to active participation in the ICE
task force.

We further recommend the State Board of Immigration prioritize reimbursement for -- for actual additional costs related to the participation in 280(c) -- 287(g). Sheriff Gualtieri?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. I -- I think this is something we can sit here and have a really, really robust discussion about as we maybe did a little bit ago at the in-person meeting about all the -- the stuff.

So as opposed to trying to do that, you know,

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

that was my thought, is to say that what can be reimbursed under here does not include extraordinary equipment unless purchases are approved in advance.

Because this is a reimbursement grant, you have to be careful that somebody can't just submit it for reimbursement.

That would -- it would have to be approved in advance, and I'd suggest kicking it to the executive director.

Is -- I don't know how we can be all encompassing about what people should not be doing. And unfortunately, you might have some that push the envelope.

And we don't want the envelope pushed. We want it to be tight and right and legitimate and not be a drain on all this monies we've talked about.

So, you know, it was just a way of -- of -- of planting some thought to have a discussion about it and -- and how we do this so that it doesn't become a runaway train, and you don't have people getting stuff like boats and armored vehicles.

All that other stuff we talked about is that it has to be usual stuff and anything that is --

outside of that has to be approved ahead of time by the executive director. So those are my thoughts on it.

SHERIFF JUDD: The only thing on -- on your -- all right. I was -- I was tweaking. Instead of being approved in advance by the -- the executive director, I wanted it to go to the state board.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Okay.

2.

SHERIFF JUDD: So the executive director is going to look through this stuff. But if the director says, hey, look, you know, we're not going to do that, I think it needs to go to the state board for them to sign off on it and let the director filter it.

And he'll know the difference between someone trying to get a -- you know, a armored personnel carrier versus somebody that needs a -- some kind of a program.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. I'm good with that.

Or, you know -- or perhaps even -- because then,
you run into, you know, what is extraordinary
equipment.

I mean, should we recommend that equipment above a certain dollar value has to go to the state board so that you don't have somebody -- again, and

unfortunately, you have to have these kind of rules.

You have to have this kind of oversight.

Because the reality is there are some people that,
you know, might try and push this envelope, and we
don't want that.

So I -- I'm good with that going to the state board. The only other thing I would throw out is - is as opposed to using extraordinary equipment that we set a dollar value on it. Those are -- that's just a thought.

SHERIFF JUDD: I think the board already -- already -- I think the executive director has to take anything above 25,000 to the board anyway, so that may be --

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: But that's for reimbursement, though. I believe that -- that he has the authority to approve anything to submit it for reimbursement.

So what I'm saying is is that -- so you don't run into a -- a haggle with somebody -- well, I went out and spent this \$400,000 on that. Now I'm seeking reimbursement. You didn't tell me I had to get preapproval for it.

So what the executive director has is approval

2.

1 authority up to 25 grand, but that's for money 2. that's already spent. So what I'm saying is, is that anything that 3 4 is above a dollar amount, don't go out and buy this 5 and then start asking for reimbursement of it. SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, exactly. I was just going 6 7 to stick the same dollar value on it so that --SHERIFF GUALTIERI: 8 Okay. 9 SHERIFF JUDD: -- so that it's all the same, 10 that he --That's fine. 11 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: SHERIFF JUDD: -- that if he gets above that, 12 13 it has to go to the board. SHERIFF JUDD: Chief Goerke is --14 15 CHIEF GOERKE: Yes. I -- I put a few things 16 in my comments also: and to keep it small, things 17 that are potentially related to immigrant and --18 immigration operations would be live-scan devices, 19 fingerprints, mobile biometric devices, things on 2.0 those lines. 21 And -- and along Sheriff Gaultieri's line, 22 too, I -- I think that's 100 percent correct. We 23 should -- kind of like aiming towards exactly what 24 he's saying is potentially asking for the 25 permission prying [sic] to -- prior to buying

something so extravagant that now we're in a battle to try to get the money back. I -- I really do kind of agree with that.

I think that's -- and -- and the approval process shouldn't take that long to come back to you.

If you really feel that that's something that's operationally outside of your wheelhouse and you can afford it, then you put the submission in, and you have to wait for it.

Because if you didn't have it in your budget to buy anyway, you wouldn't necessarily have it available.

SHERIFF JUDD: Sure. And I think that, you know, if the executive director can do up to 25,000, if somebody starts trying to roll in any big stuff or daisy-chain 25 this, 25 that, say, hey wait, that's just two different pieces for the same thing, then we'll deal with it. Sheriff Prummell?

SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Yeah. I think we're all on the same page. I agree with what Sheriff Gualtieri and Chief -- Chief Goerke said.

You know, when we spoke at the last meeting, we talked about potentially eliminating all equipment.

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1 But I do agree that there are some smaller 2. pieces of equipment that some of the fiscally-3 constrained counties probably can't get. That 4 would be helpful. 5 I know that Sheriff Gualtieri basically put some high-dollar vehicles, but I also question why 6 7 would an agency need to just purchase any type of vehicle? I would question that. 8 I mean, every -- we all have vehicles to 9 10 transport people, so I don't see the need for us to 11 authorize the purchase or to include the purchase 12 of any type of vehicle in there. 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Is there any disagreement with 14 -- with that? 15 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: No, sir. 16 SHERIFF JUDD: Sheriff Bage? 17 CHIEF BAGE: I don't have a true disagreement. 18 I just have more of a two questions and a comment. 19 So one of my questions was I think all 2.0 reimbursement grants from FDLE always require 21 preapproval. I think that's pretty standard, any 2.2 reimbursement grant. 23 So any of the preapproval issues, I don't know if we need to define it in rule, whether it's 2.4

training, equipment, travel, that all that dollar

amount should be preapproved before anything is expended. And that's pretty standard in any reimbursement grant.

My other question would be, is there any opportunity for regional or statewide equipment to be purchased?

Because we talk about local agencies

purchasing. But would FDLE be able -- would FD -
could FDLE be an applicant in the grant process to

buy regional equipment if a region needed

equipment, or that be an impermissible expense?

SHERIFF JUDD: Melissa.

MS. BUDEJA: FDLE does not have the ability to take funds from this grant program.

CHIEF BAGE: Okay. And then my only comment that was going to say is that with -- like Sheriff Gualtieri said, an equipment limit -- and I had 25,000 in my comments because that matched up, like you said, Sheriff Judd, with the executive directors. So I think that's a good price point of 25,000 for equipment.

But I also had a subitem in there that says 5,000 per item. And that would really keep the fingerprint scanners, maybe some of the low-dollar items, and not get these wish-list items into this

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

grant because it's very limited funding, like you said. So I don't know if we want just a total price or a price per item.

SHERIFF JUDD: Other input? I think we just put in there that you have to request it in advance, and we will trust the executive director.

If the same agency keeps banging us for 20,000 at a time, then -- then he can either -- he can either -- he can either -- he can reject it and let them appeal that to the state board if they want to. Sheriff Dominguez?

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: I'm in agreement with that, and I also think limiting it like this will keep folks from trying to take advantage of it. It has to stay specific to immigration enforcement and not turn into a boondoggle.

SHERIFF JUDD: I agree. Any other input on that?

SHERIFF PRUMMELL: I -- I just got a question, kind of, with the discussion that went here and then, kind of, going back up into training, what Chief Bage said, he's right. Normally with your grants, you got your preapproval. You got to apply for it and be approved.

How is that going to work with this training

2.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

since, like with the -- I know all the sheriffs have submitted the names to those they want to train with the task force.

So once -- and that is -- that training is supposed to be released to us here pretty soon now that the troopers are -- are trained and credentialed. So do we need to wait to fill out the application to get possible approval?

And -- and again, we don't know if we're going to be training some of these guys on duty, if some of them are going to be overtime, so that's kind of hard to gauge ahead of time.

So how are we going to say that's going to be preapproved and not a reimbursable expense?

SHERIFF JUDD: Melissa, give us your input because you deal with these grants.

My -- with -- with this -- with this -because this training is going to come in fits and
spells, do we train them and then seek
reimbursement and we just won't, then, let them
fill the grant paperwork out? And as long as they
stay within the parameters, then it'll go through
at that time?

What -- what's' your input, Melissa, on how we would work something like this? Because this is

1 not like we apply for a piece of equipment. It's like we don't know when it's coming or how it's 3 coming. 4 MS. BUDEJA: Right. I'm going to -- I'm going 5 to let grants answer that for us. MS. ROBINETTE: Hi. This is Tennille again. 6 7 When an agency submits their application, they will have to do a best-quess estimate of how many 8 9 officers they think they will train and base the 10 cost off of that. 11 If later, it seems like you may need to train 12 more, there may be a process for amendments, but it 13 will require preapproval just through the 14 application process.

SHERIFF JUDD: Let me ask you this question. They finished training the troopers, so, supposedly, we're next, okay, being we local law enforcement.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So we get a call this afternoon that says, hey, we're going to do an online 40-hour class starting Monday morning. There's no way. I mean, we don't even have these grant rules locked down.

So do we, in this recommendation to the board that they accept, say, you know, as long as you're not asking for reimbursement after the fact for

1 above the limit of the -- of the number of people 2. we've allowed you to train. So say I train 100 3 next week, and the grant says, based on my number 4 of personnel, I can have 80. 5 So I file the grant paperwork after the training's over, and you come back and say it's 6 7 great, Grady, that you trained 100, but the grant's only going to pay you for 80 because that's the 8 9 percentages. Is that -- is that --10 MS. ROBINETTE: That's correct. Yes. 11 SHERIFF JUDD: Is that okay? 12 MS. ROBINETTE: Yes. 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Because we don't have the --14 the opportunity to apply in advance for that. Now, 15 when it comes to equipment and that sort of stuff, we won't let them run out and buy equipment in 16 17 advance. 18 But this training thing, you know, they may 19 tell us, you know, before the week's out, we got to 20 -- we got to train Monday.

MS. ROBINETTE: Yes. And it's important because it's -- it's a timely thing, and we're going to work with you guys to make sure that it can get handled as expeditiously as possible.

21

22

23

24

25

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Is there any other input

on number four? Yes, sir, chief Bage.

2.

2.4

CHIEF BAGE: Hey, just one comment. It's probably for the grant section. I've seen in other grants -- and it goes to Sheriff Prummell a little bit, his question where you don't need the specific names; you just need numbers.

And I've also seen where grants allow for an expenditure period. So you could say anything from the start of the state fiscal year, which was July 1st, through the end of the state's fiscal year is eligible for reimbursement.

And it could technically cover cost that were already expended, even though it's not guaranteed. Is that correct?

SHERIFF JUDD: Melissa?

MS. ROBINETTE: Yes. So the project period for this grant will go back to when this law was signed, which I believe was February 17th, and you will just need numbers.

And we can put in there that the max the grant will reimburse is X number of officers based on that percentage and your agency size. So we can definitely go back and do that.

SHERIFF JUDD: I think that's important. And -- and it goes without saying, you know, we -- we

Laws Reporting, Inc. 309 schedule@lawsreporting.com www.1

305.358.2700 www.lawsreporting.com

have the full trust in -- in our grant team in Tallahassee.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

You all -- you all are going to keep us out of trouble with this. So if -- if a chief or somebody asked for something and it's like, no, we can't do that, you're -- you're going to -- you know, you're going to throw the flag on that and say, we love you, but that doesn't work.

Anything else for number four? Okay. Bonus payments. As you know, 908.1033 describes basic criteria for bonus funding.

And let me -- I'll read through this real quick. Local law enforcement may apply to the State Board of Immigration to provide bonus payments for the agency's local law-enforcement officers who participate in homeland security at large task-force operations.

And we talked about this briefly. Thousand dollars for each law-enforcement officer within the agency.

Local law enforcement must certify to the board the local law-enforcement officer participated in one or more operations. We recommend the board prioritize funding to those law-enforcement officers who directly and

1 meaningfully participate in the task-force 2. operation. I like Sheriff Gualtieri -- saying, look, if 3 4 they're not DIOs, it's a no-go to -- to begin with. 5 We recommend FDLE propagate rules defining participation at a \$1,000 bonus. And we -- let me 6 7 see -- I'm -- I'm trying to skip through this. We recommend the following reimbursement. 8 To 9 limit the number of people and which, for example -10 - and I think we -- we can follow the same 11 standards. 12 We said 20 percent for 500 or more, 30 percent 13 for 100 and 499, but we can use the same standards, 14 obviously, as before. 15 So I think -- Sheriff Gualtieri, I'll let you jump in here again. You -- I think you pretty well 16

hammered this down before.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. I -- I think it's exactly what we said under number one, and just that would be included here. And I don't have any concerns.

I support the -- the concept that you have here about limiting it to those same caps and percentages that we're using for the other one. So I -- I think we're good on this one.

1 Sheriff Prummell, you had some SHERIFF JUDD: 2. specific --SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Yes, and I think FDLE 3 4 answered the question because I actually heard --5 heard it both way that the bonus was just a once in a lifetime and then I had heard other people say 6 7 that it was once annually. But FDLE seems to have answered that question. 8 I just want to make sure that that's clarified. 9 10 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Other input. 11 Dominguez? 12 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: No, sir. I'm good. 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Anyone else? Yes, sir. 14 Sheriff Bage. 15 CHIEF BAGE: The only thing I would have is you say that FDLE to set rules for participation. 16 17 I thought that's what they wanted us to do here was 18 set the rules. And I don't know if we need to define what 19 2.0 participation is or if we can leave it open-ended 21 for FDLE to find at a later date and time. SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. I -- I think -- I put that 22 23 in there for us before, you know, we had this 24 discussion today. Sheriff Gualtieri has gone over 25 it, and I think that's -- should be how we -- the -

- how the -- the rule of participation. 1 2. CHIEF BAGE: So our rule would just be anybody that's credentialed as a designated immigration 3 4 officer --5 SHERIFF JUDD: And --CHIEF BAGE: -- that participates in an 6 7 operation? SHERIFF JUDD: And -- and is certified by the 8 9 agency. And quite -- quite frankly, this -- this 10 is going to be a bear to wrestle because, you know, 11 somebody does one operation for one day, you know, 12 and -- and gets a thousand dollars. Or, you know -13 - I don't know. It's -- it's going to be 14 difficult. 15 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I -- I think that that by limit it to DIOs, is the chances are -- and every 16 17 agency's going to have their own amount -- that 18 within a year period -- because you're only going 19 to have -- like, I -- I -- we have a, you 20 know, total of 1500 sworn across the board, and I have only nominated -- well, and I'll do more if we 21 need to -- but only 50. 22 23 So as we're doing stuff, there's no doubt that 24 those 50, in a year period, they're going to be 25 engaged. So I -- I think that this is -- by

1 limiting it to the DIOs, I really think it's going 2. to take care of itself. That's my take. SHERIFF JUDD: So if we limit it to DIOs and 3 4 they have to do -- I think the statute said one or 5 more operations --SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. 6 7 SHERIFF JUDD: -- then -- then that's the -then that's the language we want in there as 8 9 opposed to what -- what -- the --the placement 10 language we -- that I put in there. 11 CHIEF GOERKE: And, Sheriff, if I can add to 12 that too. You know, they're going to have to go 13 through a 40-hour training program. They have to 14 get certified; they have to go through backgrounds 15 and everything else. I think Sheriff Gaultieri is 100 percent spot-16 17 You do the -- use the DIOSs, and that's the 18 way you can do it because they're the ones that are 19 going to be participating in these operations. So 2.0 I think that'll take care of it, like you said. 21 Quick question. SHERIFF WATERS: 22 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, sir, Sheriff. 23 SHERIFF WATERS: So it's a one-time bonus. 24 mean, say we have officers that are involved in

several operations.

Are they going to be able to apply or get a
bonus more than once, or is this just a one-time,
annually?
SHERIFF JUDD: One time.
SHERIFF WATERS: Perfect. That's what I
thought. Just making sure.
SHERIFF PRUMMELL: And Sheriff, and it's once
in a lifetime. It's one not one time annually.
SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Also, I've I've got a
note here. State Immigration Enforcement Council
9081-1032 recommends to the board the the
following funding criteria.
Whenever possible, we want to add this:
fiscally-constrained counties, as defined by
Florida statute 218, will be prioritized. We do
not recommend the board reimburse capital
equipment, which is the same.
No agency receives more than a million dollars
in grant funds in the '25/'26 fiscal year.
Reimbursement for overtime expenses shall not
exceed 500,000 per agency.
I put that in as a placeholder. Is there a
discussion about that.
CHIEF BAGE: Sure
SHERIFF PRUMMELL: When you're talking about

Page 63

1 capital equipment, is that 5,000 and above --2. SHERIFF JUDD: I'm sorry. I -- the -- we were on -- on to number six. I jumped to the bottom of 3 4 the page. 5 So it -- we --we talk about low priority for reimbursement is what we're after here. 6 7 this is -- this is the -- the six is the catch-all category, everything that's left, hardware, 8 9 software, because we can run cost up really 10 quickly. So we're trying to cap anything else that 11 doesn't fall in the priorities is in number six. 12 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: All right, Mr. Chair, I 13 believe you -- you read that, no, we wouldn't 14 purchase any capital items. 15 So isn't capital item defined as anything over \$5,000? I think some pieces of equipment may go 16 17 over 5,000. 18 SHERIFF JUDD: It's a placeholder for discussion. 19 20 MS. BUDEJA: From FDLE --FDLE's perspective, 21 the capital equipment is anything -- we're --we're 22 getting reverb here -- reverb here. That would be 23 placed in your inventory, \$5,000 or more, correct? Tennille? 24 25 MS. ROBINETTE: Yes.

1 MS. BUDEJA: Yes. If we -- if you -- how we 2. would interpret that capital would be that unless it's described differently. 3 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Sheriff Judd. 4 5 SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, sir. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I -- I don't think you 6 7 need it based upon the prior discussions we had with given the authority up to the limits we 8 described and having to go to the board itself. 9 10 You know, with that oversight that we talked 11 about previously, I don't think that section is 12 necessary anymore. 13 CHIEF BAGE: I would also agree that the 14 capital cost doesn't need to be in there. But. T 15 had a question to you -- for you, too, Sheriff 16 Judd. 17 The number three, where it says no agency 18 shall receive money more than a million dollars in 19 the grant funding during the '25/'26 fiscal year --2.0 I know in our in-person meeting we spoke about 21 operational overtime. Would that fall within that 2.2 cap right there? 23 So you add up your training, your expenses, 24 your equipment, your jail beds, and everything

else. And then whatever that margin left over

could be used for operational overtime at an agency?

SHERIFF JUDD: We put -- that's what I put it

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

in there for --for discussion that -- that we're capped and how much money you can get from the grant.

CHIEF BAGE: And -- and I'm good with that because the only thing that I didn't see in here was the operation overtime.

And that's really where my backfill comment came -- was not for filling of personnel and training, but it was for if you had to do an operation with ICE and you had to, then, backfill at the agency.

And that's where I got the FEMA framework from. And I was just going through the notes to figure out where I put the backfill in, and it was really for operational overtime.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Sheriff Judd?

SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, sir.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I -- I -- I would just ask that -- that whatever you put in there, the last sentence and those regarding the million-dollar cap and the \$500,000 cap, that you just add the phrase in without the express approval of the state board.

Because you could have a situation.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's a lot of money here, and maybe there is, and maybe there isn't. You get towards the end of a fiscal year or somewhere in there and you got a whole pot of money that hasn't been used, then, if you're just capping it, then it would sit.

I just think it should say -- I'm good with your numbers -- but it -- it should say without express approval of the state board. And if they - if they want to free up some money and use it, then they could. That would be my thought on that.

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Agree.

CHIEF GOERKE: I agree to that.

CHIEF BAGE: And Sheriff Judd, I had one more comment about that, too, going on what Sheriff Gualtieri said, is I had a comment that said after the second quarter of the fiscal year, they could take supplementary requests.

So after the second quarter, depending on how much money is left in the grant, you may want to open it up for supplementary requests to ensure that the money is properly used.

And in that first go around, you might have very strict limits, but the executive director, then, could possibly loosen up some of the

requirements after the second quarter if the money is not being spent the way we thought it would be spent or there's additional money left over.

FDOT does that in a lot of their grants, that

FDOT does that in a lot of their grants, that they'll take secondary applications to allow for the expenditure of the grant funds before the end of the year.

And the only other comment I wanted to add was -- I did a little bit of research on your overtime number.

And the Bureau of Labor Statistics -- the best report I could get was from May of '23 -- it had the average salary in the state of Florida for a law-enforcement officer at \$78,000 a year.

So that's \$37 an hour or \$56 for an overtime rate. So at \$100,000 -- or actually, what number do I -- at your number -- not -- at 500,000, that works out to 1,700 hours of overtime.

So I think that's a good number of overtime, 1,700 hours per agency at \$500,000. So I'm in alignment with your number.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Sheriff Gualtieri?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I don't have anything.

SHERIFF JUDD: The --- going down through the notes here because we had a lot of -- Sheriff

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

1 Goerke, you talk about documentation for 2. reimbursement, overtime, participating agency be required to submit time sheets for overtime. 3 You 4 know, you want to dig into that a little bit? 5 It's just that -- I think it's CHIEF GOERKE: the standard request through FDLE that we actually 6 have to track what we do. 7 So we actually show the operational -- we're 8 9 going through a few of them right now with FDLE, 10 and we usually have to have supporting 11 documentation whether or not it has to be submitted 12 or not. 13 We just have to ensure that it's in a proper 14 file that, if an audit does come, we can actually 15 share those documents. 16 Melissa, I don't know if I'm speaking out of 17 school for that, but I think I'm pretty much in 18 line. MS. BUDEJA: Yes, that's accurate. 19 That would 2.0 be the same for this grant. 21 CHIEF GOERKE: So as long as we're just 22 tracking all that -- so there'd have to be a 23 separate pay code or something if you're doing 24 these operations.

So any agency that's actually participating in

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that, they'd be asking for overtime reimbursements.

They should just have the documents prepared that, when an audit does come, if FDLE wants to come look, it's in one area; it's in one file. And it can be viewed to verify its accuracy.

SHERIFF JUDD: Is there any other discussion on this?

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: No, sir. No.

SHERIFF JUDD: If we -- so we can eliminate six and -- and plug it in -- in our previous discussion. Any -- any other discussion about this resolution one that we send to the board?

Okay. Think through this with me for a second. So we've given DLE some changes to make, and ultimately, we have to vote on that.

Would -- I think it would be better for DLE to strike and add, forward that to us for a final review, and maybe we notice a public meeting for seven days.

If nothing -- and there probably will be more issues before we finish that we -- that we vote this -- we vote this in seven days from now so that we have a chance to read through it and ensure that what we think we agreed to is what FDLE heard or what they write is what we want to do.

MS. BUDEJA: F -- FDLE is good with what you proposed. We can have that ready and have the meeting next Wednesday if that's what you'd like.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. We'll check calendars at -- for the end of the day to see which -- which day is the easiest for the most of us.

Okay. Let's go on to -- to resolution 25-002. This has to do with data collection. Before we start our discussion on that, Mr. Larry Keefe has requested -- he would like to speak to the panel on this topic. So Larry, before we get into the discussion, it's your floor.

MR. KEEFE: Yes, sir. Thank you so much,

Sheriff. From -- from where I stand, stated as

simply as possible, when it comes to data

collection, although it's a very complex area, I'm

glad we're here at FDLE that -- that certainly

knows about data collection, dissection, and how

all that works.

And you all, as our local law-enforcement Council, know what's required in the field and what that really looks like when you're out there in the street, the onerousness, the burden of it relative to the benefit of it and why you're doing it.

But my understanding is that the legislature

2.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

has charged the board that the Council and I are here to serve with monitoring best efforts to make -- that's the standard.

That's the statutory standard. And monitoring is the word that's actually used in the statute toward this effort of helping the federal government -- helping the federal government in being effective in rapid mass deportation.

And the only way I know to do that in terms of meeting our obligation of monitoring best efforts by local law-enforcement agencies is to somehow have measures, to somehow have readily available data.

And it seems that that is boiled down to are the local agencies that have their 287(g) task force, that are all certified and ready to go, out there being the force multipliers that the president wants, the governor and cabinet want, and the legislature wants.

All of this discussion of 287(g) and being out there to be force multipliers is largely measured in encounters.

Are there encounters? Are our local lawenforcement agencies out there in the street making things happen or passively and reactively waiting for the phone to ring and then responding as directed by ICE? Are they out there generating encounters and contacts?

And so, you got to keep count of that, and you've got to keep count of it regularly in order to have feedback on how we're doing in this endeavor. The more often, the better, except to the extent that it becomes so burdensome that it becomes a -- a paperwork nightmare for the officer in the street.

So the second thing is -- I know Sheriff Judd and I have spoken with the chief -- state of Florida level point of contact for the federal government -- is the federal government keeps track of data when there's an encounter and there's a call, but it doesn't differentiate what local agency was involved. It just says that there was a federal encounter; there was an apprehension. And it's kept on a statewide basis.

And the federal government has communicated to Sheriff Judd and me would like to see the state data where the state is keeping track of what local law-enforcement agency, sheriff's office or police department, is having an encounter.

They would like to reconcile the Fed side of

2.

2.0

2.

that with the state side of that to hone in on what parts of the state, what particular jurisdictions, are having these encounters.

The second thing that the federal government wants to know, and I would submit that the state of Florida would like to know and local law enforcement like to know, was when Florida puts all of that great 287(g) training, effort, and energy to work, is out on the street rather than sitting by the phone waiting for it to ring, but out on the street having these encounters, and makes the call to the Feds, and the Feds say, yes, those are illegal aliens that you have, but let them go or, no, we're coming to get them.

What is the count on the federal declinations where the state and local folks have done everything that they can to meet their charge, but, for whatever reason, the federal law-enforcement agents that offer the phone say, for whatever reason, we're not coming or let them go.

That, I know, that has been an issue. And so the Feds, to their credit, want to see that.

Because from my observation, in about a month and a half on the job, is the highest levels of the federal government are not aware because no record

is kept on the federal side when there's an oral telephone conversation between a state local lawenforcement officer on the side of the road and an ICE representative at the lowest level and the ICE representative says let them go.

There's no recording of that; there's no record of that on the federal side. So the Feds actually want to see that so they can deal with that and take appropriate action.

So that's really my summary or distillation that I, as in just about every single matter, defer completely to you, Sheriff, in particular, Sheriff Judd, but all the sheriffs and police chiefs on the Council, to know what works or what doesn't work in the field.

But I have to be the voice that comes back to

-- there's got to be some measure of what it is

that we're doing, not just in a report that we send

out in December, but some regular feedback. The

Feds want it. From my perspective, the state and

legislature, the governor, the cabinet will want

it.

That will be my recommendation. So that's what, kind of informs my desire to make this statement before we got into the particular details

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

of data collection.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

SHERIFF JUDD: Thank you, Mr. Keefe. Let me - let me give an introduction and -- and then some
-- some introductory comments and then turn it over
to Sheriff Gualtieri. And then I want to open it
up for feedback.

First off, as you know, the day after we left our last meeting, we received this -- this information from Guthrie from Emergency Management under 252.

We're adding this topic and that -- you know, you have to collect this data and send it directly to FDLE.

That -- that was an easy solution for getting the data to FDLE, but there was a -- there was a fatal flaw in that -- in that it -- it -- it in-ran -- the entire command staff of every police agency in this state which is absolutely unacceptable.

So we paused that until we could meet today, and then we recommend to the board. And I believe the board needs to vote on this before we start data collection.

This does not need to be done unilaterally. I appreciate the energy and enthusiasm of -- of those

schedule@lawsreporting.com

2.

2.0

that were involved in the process trying to get data put together quickly, but, you know, quick wasn't -- and we're going to modify that recommendation.

And -- and quite frankly, I don't think there was any malice, but it totally ran --in-ran the Council; it in-ran the board, the immigration board.

So we're going to -- we're going to tweak that today with our input. The feedback that -- that I provided as a skeleton for us to start was that the data that we compile would be from law-enforcement officers during their normal course of performing their official duties with those who appear to be in the United States illegally.

And I'll give you the example. The example is that we do a traffic stop for someone who runs a red light, is speeding.

We determine that the driver, as -- as a normal course of business, when we stop this person, the -- what we do is we do a -- a warrants check on everyone in the car because, obviously, not only are those that are driving have outstanding warrants, but many time [sic] passengers do.

Well, what we would add to that is an -- because the data is not in the FCIC/NCIC system, we have to check two databases as opposed to one.

During that -- during the course of that, we determine, well, not only is the driver violating the law and say they're here illegally and there is a warrant for deportation, but we determine the same thing is true of two of their passengers that they have in the car or not.

Now, if they're -- so as a part of the check, you run a FCIC/NCIC check, and then you'd also call the ICE number. And ICE goes, yes, those folks are -- are legal. They're illegal.

They're illegal, but they're in the process, and we know who they are. We don't need any updated data. They're good to go. Don't take them into custody, or they order you to take them into custody.

So what we did after that, we -- because this was a well-thought-out form that was put together, that ultimately was -- was released before the Council and board approval, I tried to get back to the source of this.

And the -- and maybe this helps to a small amount -- I -- to -- for understanding. We go,

2.

what of this data is going to help the federal government? So that's what we did.

2.

We -- we went back to -- specifically, we talked to Scott Sherman (phonetic) for Border Patrol.

We also talked to the chief from Border

Patrol, Denise (phonetic). And -- and Denise gave

us some information. For example, Border Patrol's

database is not ICE's database.

So -- and I asked specifically. I said, look,
I have no idea how the federal system works.
Chief, do you operate out of the same database that
ICE does? And they said, no, we don't.

So we now find out that from the Border Patrol

-- Scott Sherman specifically was a subject-matter

expert the chief referred us to -- that, yes,

Border Patrol can use this data for being able to

locate or to have information on people they may be searching for.

So with that, what we sent to you today was a modified version -- I hope a shorter version -- of -- I think there was 14 -- 14 collection points here -- that if you did a warrants check -- as you know, you do a warrants check. It's clear. You may or may not, depending on your agency, do a

field-interview report.

Same thing would be here. You do a warrants check, and it's clear. You do your regular field-interview report and -- or, if you find out that this is somebody that is deportable or detainable, then you would fill out this information which would amount to -- which would -- which would then be collected by the agency. And it would be collected by the agency from the officers.

Once it goes through supervisory review, as dictated by the various agency, then FDLE's got to figure out what -- what collection format they want the agents -- want the various agency to report to them.

And I suggested by the fifth of the month for the previous month, so that gives the agency five days to get it to FDLE.

So the challenge -- and we'll -- we'll give FDLE the opportunity to weigh in in a minute after we get through the -- the -- the matrix of -- or the input on the matrix.

But then it will be up to FDLA to figure it out. How do they -- how do we send this to them as an agency, and then how do they put it together in a usable format for the federal government and for

2.

2.

us to -- to -- to see what progress we're making in assisting the federal government.

So with that, I will first turn it over to Sheriff Gualtieri. He had several -- several important notes here and one that was not covered by this form and which -- which to me is a cornerstone of this report that this questionnaire we have here needs to be supplemented.

It --obviously, this is not the -- the jail piece of this does not need to be intermixed for the street officer or the city police departments.

But I'll let Sheriff Gualtieri give you what I think is a remarkable piece of work here on capturing information on the jail side. Sheriff Gualtieri?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: All right. Thanks,

Sheriff Judd. So, you -- you know, first, I -- is

I did, I think, what we should do with this. And
and I -- and, you know, I don't know.

Mr. Keefe, you said that -- that -- you know, about the stuff that had to be collected. And I look at the statute which says - 901.10313(e) says the report may contain recommendations to the legislature to improve state's cooperation and coordination with the federal government.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I like that this is and any data collection, what's the purpose of collecting the data?

And, you know, I hope you had a chance to look at the analysis that I wrote up titled

Recommendations for Immigration Reporting.

And, you know, if somebody out there -- and there's a whole lot of different federal agencies.

And the people that I talk to within -whether it's HSI, ERO, ICE on the ICE side -- I've
not talked to people on the Border Patrol side.

I personally see no purpose that is served by creating a duplicate dual ghost database at a state level of people that are here illegally when those people are already in the federal system.

So as I say here, is -- is that the initial data collection that was suggested through state Division of Emergency Management to those -- it was so overly broad, it was totally unworkable.

And -- and even, Sheriff Judd, your proposed resolution has been revised since it was initially put out.

Initially it was put out, and it said that data question should be on anyone that a law-enforcement officer comes in contact with during

1 the

2.

the ordinary course of their duties which --

What -- what -- what we got a little while ago, a couple hours ago, narrows that even more, which I think is appropriate to narrow it, is -- is that if somebody is just out there and they are already fully documented within the ICE system and we check with the Law-Enforcement Support Center or we check with the immigration response center and they already have this person well documented but the person is simply here illegally and doesn't meet their criteria because they're a visa overstay, what are we accomplishing by getting all this information and all these photographs and all this biographical information?

We can collect a tremendous amount of data and metrics that is useful to improve -- again, in the statute -- cooperation and coordination without creating a secondary federal immigration database at a state level.

If these people are being arrested and are going to the jail, why are we putting this -- why are we collecting all this information?

Because when they go to the jail, the process at the jail is going to take care of this all inherently. Their fingerprints are going to be

taken.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

They're going to go up to the lLaw-Enforcement Support Center; the biometrics are going to be checked. Everything's already being collected up there at the state level.

So I -- I think that -- you know, and -- and the first thing that came out didn't do anything with this jail data, which is very important to knowing when people are not being picked up, to know, even on the street, when ICE isn't responding out, the number of bed days, all those things I have laid out in here.

But I think, Sheriff Judd, to your -- to the thing you mentioned in -- in what you all put out just a little while ago, a couple hours ago, if this was to be -- and on the last page of it, I think that what it says is data is to be collected, reviewed, and approved by supervision and according to each agency's policy.

This allows the way I read this, and I can live with it the way you put it out here in this last version a couple hours ago, is is that each agency gets to set the parameters under which its officers or deputies engage people and collect this, is -- is that it --

schedule@lawsreporting.com

2.

It cannot be where every single person that we come in contact with, we're acting like ICE. Our job isn't to be ICE.

Our job is to assist ICE and to be as effective as we can in helping them and not to create some massive state database.

And it -- it will cause relationship problems if people know that every person we're coming in contact with, we're going to ask them whether they're foreign-born, what their citizenship status is, and we're going to be taking pictures of everybody and submitting this where you got tens of thousands of people in some state database.

This has to be done selectively and narrowly, in my view. What you have here, where each agency gets to set its own policies on when we do this and how we do this -- so if I want to limit it to people who are suspected of being involved in criminal activity who are not already in the ICE database, and this would be probative and helpful in some fashion that -- then I can do that. That I can live with.

But just a -- a massive dump of data into some FDLE system that just sits out there and creates a -- a duplicate of what is already in the ICE system

2.

of everybody who -- majority of these people aren't even going to be deportable and removable.

And when we talk about removable, it means they meet the ICE criteria. The person who's just sitting here for 15 years who's a visa overstay doesn't meet their criteria, and -- and in our lifetime, they're not going to get to them.

So I think we have to be very careful with this whole data-collection thing and what it -- data is important; metrics are important. Why are we getting all these names and dates of birth and all this other stuff that we can't do anything with? So that's my --

I -- I like what you sent out a couple hours ago. I think we -- if we did the jail stuff and we did this and left it within the discretion that is on page 2 at the bottom, to me, I -- I can live with it.

SHERIFF JUDD: Other input?

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Hi, Sheriff. I -- I agree with that. We have to be very careful that our mission doesn't creep into being ICE junior. It's not good for us to get in that role. As the sheriff said, we're here to help ICE, but we shouldn't try to be ICE. That's going to -- that's

going to go back on what we're all trying to do in our communities.

CHIEF BAGE: Sheriff Judd?

SHERIFF JUDD: Yes, sir.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHIEF BAGE: I -- I would agree with what everybody said. And data has a weird relationship. The more you ask for, the less you get sometimes.

And the more burdens or the more hindrance the data collection becomes, I think agencies will be less apt to participate.

And I just had some questions in looking at the Sheriff Gaultieri's items. On number ten, that appears that it's going to be summary data, Sheriff, that it's not going to be individual numbers that we would just sum the number of contacts that we made throughout the month and just turn in summary data.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: You're correct. I think that that accomplishes what we're trying to accomplish.

We don't have to have names and dates of birth and biographical information so that -- report the number of people that you have contact with who there's probable cause to believe are removable and the ones where ICE does respond to pick them up and

the ones that they don't. So just keep numbers.

Just keep the data.

That's helpful to show the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the system and what's going on.

If we -- if we call them and they are removable and the person's in the ICE system and we say -- either because they have a 205, a 200 -- they got a warrant or other circumstances.

And ICE says, yes, you're right, and they just don't come, then why are we getting -- they already know who they are and they -- the problem isn't who they are.

The problem is that ICE didn't show up. So, yes, summary reporting as to numbers, as to data, as to metrics, I think that --

CHIEF BAGE: I agree. No. I agree 100 percent. I think summary is much easier and better, and I think you'll get more participation from summary data. And then for number 11, I had a question for you too, Sheriff.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Sure

CHIEF BAGE: When you mention out some of the stuff for the DIOs would we want to know the number of 200s and 205s that they obtained or attempted to attain and just call those two things out

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

specifically?

2.

Because I know that's one of the targets that we talk about in a lot of other areas is the 200s and the 205s.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: And I think -- I think that in 12, I don't use the -- I don't use the -- it -- it's really the -- the 205, they're not going to obtain because that has to come from a final order and that's got a result from an immigration judge. And then that's really something that just ERO would enter.

But I think I do that in 12, Chief, where it says each law-enforcement agency that has DIOs shall report the number of times an officer seeks approval.

Seeking approval -- every time you get approval, there's going to be a 200 that goes hand-in-hand with that inherently.

So if you seek approval for an arrest and you get the 205 -- or the 200 -- I'm sorry -- then that would be captured.

And also the number of times that the DIO -- and again, this is -- I think this is something very important for everybody to know and for the state board to know and people who are looking at

schedule@lawsreporting.com

this to know.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

The number of times the DIO seeks approval for an arrest and the SDDO who is a supervisor at ERO declines it and says, no, you're not authorized to make the arrest and doesn't issue the 200, I think that's very important information.

But again, to your point, is this is summary data. And I'm 100 percent fully supportive of that. I think that has a lot of value.

Without, again, creating an individual database of all these people that is a duplicate that just sits there for -- it -- and it -- which is going to be hard to get and we're going to get pushback on.

CHIEF BAGE: And then, Sheriff Judd, I just have two other quick comments. I think this one is kind of irrelevant, but, on the initial fillable PDF form that FDLE had sent out as the example, that form would be very hard to get supervisor approval if we went to it.

Because as soon as you hit submit, that form went directly to FDLE. But if we're no longer using that setup, I think that comment is probably a null-and-void comment at this point.

And the only other comment that I would have

is that I don't know if we could integrate this somehow. And that's one of the reasons I asked in the grant proposal about FDLE being a grantee.

Because it would be nice, very similar to how we have the use-of-force data that gets submitted through FIBRS, that if somehow this could become an automated system where we could export it right from our CAD RMS to FDLE, but that may be several years down the road.

SHERIFF JUDD: Yes. We -- we're not going to use that form because that -- that in-runs -- the entire command staff of any individual agency.

And Melissa will speak to wherever that may be in just a minute, but they're working on a process now.

And -- and here's what's important. The state and the Feds have been talking together. This form that you see that I just sent out is a form that the Feds agree can have important data to help them or to update their data.

Because they may not have had an interaction with -- with an illegal immigrant since -- since they crossed the border. Or we may determine through interviews that this person's illegal and they never had any interaction. That's -- that's

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

what's important.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

There's -- there's -- who knows -- tens of thousands, millions of people that actually checked in at the border illegally.

But there's also a lot of them that have never been documented in the -- in the ICE system at all. They're just clearly here illegally with no data. So ICE says this will help.

And here's how I envision this form working.

And -- and this is what we do in our agency. We do
a traffic stop. And we'll use the traffic stop
because that is the interaction.

And we are going to do a warrants check on everybody in the vehicle which is part of the protocol.

Whether or not we issue a citation, whether or not we make an arrest is certainly the discretion of the deputy depending on the circumstance.

What you add to that is you do the -- the immigration check through the FIRC or the 800 number. They come back, and they say we've never heard of this person.

Well, they're standing in front of us, and they're telling us their place of birth is Mexico City, Mexico, and that they've -- they're -- they

have no identification, but they're foreign-born, we fill out this form.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Or we -- we call that number, and they say, hey, this person is in our system and they're good to go. They are here illegally, but they have court dates.

They've stayed in contact with ICE; they're not removable. Then you don't do anything. Just like you run a warrants check and there's no warrants, you don't do anything.

Now whether or not the officer does an FIR because they're slinking around buildings in the middle of the night and you need data for the detectives the next day when they figure out that they broke into something overnight and you've gone home and gone to bed, that's another thing.

But this form is when ICE says, well, they came; they checked in; they're not deportable, but we haven't heard from them in five years.

Gather this information for us. So we gather it; it goes through supervisory review; we dump it to FDLE; FDLE shares it with the federal government.

So it -- it is based upon the interaction. It is not -- and I underscore -- it's not designed to

is not -- and i underscore -- it's n

2.

show up at the -- the local church, the local soccer field, the local basketball court, and start filling out forms.

Because today, as a normal course of business,

I would submit to you that nobody shows up in at

any of those places and does warrants checks just
- just out of the blue. This is when you come into

contact with people in your normal scope of

business.

And I'll give you an example. We worked a vehicle crash this last week, and we determined that two of the people in the crash were here illegally.

We called the -- the 800 number, and they said, yes, they're here illegally. We have them set for a court date. They have continued to check in with us. They're good to go.

We -- don't take them in custody. So we said you got all the data? You got names, addresses, phone numbers? We got it all. We're good to go.

That's something that -- that you don't report because -- now, on the other hand, if we -- if we stop this person, and ICE says hey, we want them, and they don't get there for two hours or three hours and it -- you have already let them go, you

schedule@lawsreporting.com

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

need to fill this form out and say, hey, we had an interaction with this person. They were illegal.

ICE wanted them, but they no-showed us. They didn't show up. Or yes, we -- we -- we had an interaction with this person, and we --we held them.

And ICE showed up in 30 minutes, and we turned them over to ICE agent, you know, 932. And that's -- that's the end of it.

But it -- it is not -- I -- and I underscore - is to collect data to either update or provide to
ICE when there is insufficient, there is old, or
there's no data.

And if you do it like any other check or stop, you stop them. They're clear. You know, you -- you send them on their merry way. That's my idea.

CHIEF BAGE: So, Sheriff Judd, just one comment. Because I'm up here in central time, so I'm an hour behind you. So things travel a little bit slow up here, so I just want clarity.

We have to do two reporting mechanisms. One would be the summary data that Sheriff Gualtieri described, and that's due on the 5th of each month.

And then what you just described; we do in the finite situations where we believe that there is

schedule@lawsreporting.com

some type of illegal alien.

That's where we provide the detailed information under the prescribed protocol of our local agency.

And once it's approved by a supervisor, it'll be transmitted to FDLE under the prescribed format that FDLE sets forth.

SHERIFF JUDD: First off, the -- anything pertaining to the jail will not appear on this form. It'll be a -- a second report, okay?

This report is only for police involved in -what was the terminology I used -- their normal
course of performing their official duties with
those who appear to be in the United States
illegally and in violation of the Nationality Act.

Now, you -- you -- you make the call as -just like you're going to run a warrants check on
this person, you're going to run an immigration
check on this person, and they're clear. That's
the end of it.

You do that same -- same evaluation that the officer would normally do, and -- and ICE tells you we've not heard from this person since they came across eight years ago.

We don't know where they are. We want them.

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.

Hold them. Or they -- they -- you -- you do this check, and they want them, and they no-show. So we can see whether ICE shows and picks them up or doesn't pick them up.

But the piece of it that has to deal with the jail, you know, is -- is not something on the street you need to fool with at all. Sheriff Gualtieri?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. Just -- just for clarification, I think it -- it -- just the -- of the 13 data points that I suggested in there, Sheriff Judd, they're not all jail-related.

I think that's where some of the confusion may be is this Chief Bage is mentioning. Some of those are related to data collection that would be on the street.

So we probably need to break those out, if we're -- if we're going to adopt these, is that some of them would be jail, but a -- a -- a fair number of them relate to police operations on the street.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Let's start at the top.

What -- what do you want to, -- you know I -- I -
do we need to get down in the weeds on -- or do we

just need to say this is the form and how do -- you

know, the -- the way you do warrants checks on traffic stops, vehicle crashes, it may be different than the next agency.

I don't -- I don't think we need to get down in the weeds on that. We just need to say, during your normal course of business when you would check on somebody, you know, we just have an extra database to check now.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: I -- I think the way you described it is perfect, is -- is exactly right.

Is -- is that it -- it incorporates the -- what you said incorporates good judgment, common sense, and it -- it has a lot of the stuff that I have in my analysis in here, is we're not just out there, which the original suggestion was heave-ho.

Go out. Everybody you come in contact with, get all their information and dump it and -- no, no, no, no.

So we're beyond that. So now we're being more surgical, and we're being more narrow. And we're using judgment, and we're doing an investigation.

And we got somebody that appears to be a foreign-born, may be illegal, and we're going to look at it if it's helpful, if it's probative and valuable.

2.

Like you just said, you're looking at this person. You call them up; they say no, no, we --your car -- your car-wreck example, we know everything about these people; they're already in the system; we don't need anything.

So we're not going to fill this thing out.

No, we don't know who these people are and whatever the circumstances are, so we're going to fill it out.

That's totally separate than the summary metrics that are in 1 through 13 or whatever else that we may add or delete from this list that I had.

And what I would suggest is, is that FDLE creates some sort of a system where every agency knows that this is the data you have to collect.

It gets reported on the 5th of each month, and that somebody goes in once a month and just puts -- and fills in these summary data points because everything in here is summary.

And then during the month, they could collect this -- if you wanted to -- collect the -- the -- I'll call it the biographical information that -- that -- that you have proposed. And after it gets approved, is that it all goes up.

2.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

You could do the summary data on the 5th, or you could have the -- the other data on the individual biographical information, that could get reported on an ongoing basis as it's approved.

But I think the way you described it -- for me, as far as collecting individual data -- works, and the summary data could be reported once a month.

SHERIFF JUDD: And -- and this -- you know, this is not chiseled in stone. We -- when we come out with this initial data-collection system, if we find we're asking for too much or we need to add something else, you know, the next meeting we recommend to the board that we add another topic.

CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Yes.

SHERIFF JUDD: Any other --

CHIEF BAGE: Oh, I completely -- I completely agree with that. And just the only thing I would add to your paragraph there, Sheriff Judd, where it says, therefore State Immigration Council recommends the State Board of Immigration Enforcement adopt the following data collection, I would say detailed data collection just so we know that's the detailed data.

And then I would add a new paragraph that

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would say summary data -- or it's actually in that second paragraph right there that the summary data would be due by the fifth day of each month.

Because I think that's the only distinction we need to make for the agencies is that you have a detailed form that needs to be turned in and by some day -- we have here the 5th of the month. I think is fine -- is that's when the summary data gets turned in.

And the only thing, if we wanted to refine it, the detailed data might want to be somewhat timely.

So even if we put a time frame in there within 10 days or 14 days or something that -- of the encounter, at least the agencies don't hold it for a whole month.

And now you let somebody that ICE was looking for flounder around for 29 days. So I think the detailed data should be somewhat timely and the summary data could come in on a monthly basis, and the 5th of the month is fine.

SHERIFF JUDD: Theoretically, when that goes to ICE, they get that information immediately if they want it or need it.

Because that -- that's going to be a conversation over the phone. But I think if we

schedule@lawsreporting.com

don't hard stop everything on a certain date, then it -- it's going to be confused. You send this in here; you send that in there.

The reality -- the -- the officer on the street's going to have communication with ICE immediately because that's what's going to trigger the form one way or the other.

So we give them the information, and then we tell them, hey, we -- here -- here's the person, or they don't pick the person up or whatever the circumstances are. And then all of -- then -- then it goes through and is there on the 5th.

I agree, Chief, that they need it sooner rather than later. And the goal is they have it immediately for their purposes. And then we document it, and it all goes in on the 5th.

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Is FDLE capable of doing - setting up a system -- so for this monthly
reporting on the metrics where everybody can just
go online and enter these 1 through 13 metrics, can
-- can they set that up?

SHERIFF JUDD: Well, that's the conversation, and I'm going to kick it over to Melissa. They -- that's how they had it set up. But the way they had it set up, there was no supervisory approval.

2.

2.

It in-ran everyone so -- and that is absolutely a nonstarter, so we've -- Melissa and her team have been working.

And I was going to -- I was going to wrap this thing at the end that the goal is we're going to -- we're going to do our checks.

When it's appropriately -- appropriate, we're going to fill out the form. And then, by the 5th of the month, we're going -- FDLE is going to tell us how we give it to them and then they figure out how they -- how they coalesce it and -- and provide it to the Feds.

Melissa, are you ready?

MS. BUDEJA: Yes. In reference to summary data, that's not going to be an issue. We could set up a similar form where someone from the agency can input that summary data once a month that you're referencing. I don't think that's an issue.

However, in reference to the -- the detailed - right now, we do not have a mechanism where an
officer could send something to a supervisor of
another agency for approval before it were going to
-- come to us. So we're going to have to get with
RIT and with our individuals here, have some
meetings, and determine what capabilities we have.

2.

Because we do not have the ability to use any of the funds from the grant to purchase anything. So we have to see what we have available in-house, and then we'll have to report back to you.

SHERIFF JUDD: Melissa, let me ask you a question, and you brought it up originally. I think, you know, data spreadsheets are common, right?

If -- can -- can we code it and send it to -- with a -- just a data spreadsheet. And then, you know, line one is their first name; line two is the second name. And then -- then I -- I think that's simple, and everybody uses those Excel spreadsheets now.

And can we all just use a -- can you -- can you set up a format so that everyone see -- the data is -- that the officers do in the field goes into Excel spreadsheet that goes to you all.

How -- however you all deal with that is -- is good as long as we don't have our officers -- before we have supervisory review and oversight sending that stuff in.

MS. BUDEJA: Yes. That's something we're going to have to check on and get back. I have to have the IT people in the room to see exactly what

FDLE Hearing April 09, 2025 Page 104

the capabilities currently are.

SHERIFF JUDD: Any other feedback or input there?

Here, let's do this. We're -- we're going to have to have another meeting next Wednesday or Thursday or whenever we decide.

Let us hammer out what we've talked about here today and shrink this down utilizing this data-collection sheet as the starting point. And I underscore that, that we can add or take away from it.

And -- and -- and then we'll try to have that in a form that's ready for a vote. And hopefully, by next week, also FDLE will have some answers about how they collect the data from us.

I mean, we -- we already send them data anyway. There ought to be some way that we can figure that out.

Anything else on Resolution 2025-002?

These last two resolutions are really checking a box because we -- we have to address this according to the statute. I'm going to open it up.

Florida statute 908.1032 sub 4(f) requires

State Immigration Enforcement Council to enhance
information-sharing between state entities, local-

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

government entities, law-enforcement agencies, the federal government, immigration laws within the state.

The statute states that the recommendations must provide for enhanced use and coordination of the following federal government centers, including but not limited to the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center, United States Customs Border Protection National Targeting Center, the United States Department of Homeland Security Fusion Centers, United States DEA Special Operations Unit.

So what we put down here as the starting point for the discussion was that the -- that our Council finds that the most logical and effective mechanism to accomplish this coordination is the Florida Fusion Center operated by FDLE.

The Fusion Center already collaborates with the federal, state, and local agencies including the four agencies referred above.

We recommend staff at the Fusion Center immediately -- if they've not already. I think they have -- contact representatives at the list of specific centers, actively coordinate immigration-enforcement information-sharing intelligence initiatives.

And wherever possible, this information intelligence should be strategically shared with the local and state -- enhance the assistant [sic] provided to the federal agencies regarding the removal of the criminal aliens of Florida.

We recommend that the data collected by lawenforcement and detention agencies envisioned by the SIEC and Resolution 25-002 be systematically shared with the Fusion Center so that, in turn, the data can be shared with federal partners.

So anyway, the law specifically says we have to address this. And this is, to me, the way to check the box the -- as a recommendation to the board. Any other feedback or input on this?

CHIEF GOERKE: Sheriff, I -- I actually served as a deputy commander at our Fusion Center in Central Florida, and I'm very, very aware of the Florida Fusion center. They're fantastic.

And I think you're spot on with this. They do have contact with all these places. If you've never visited some of these, I -- I definitely encourage you to go see them. But very, very strong collaboration, usually between state and federal partners.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. If we're ready to vote

25

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

1 on this, do we hear a motion and a second to accept this? CHIEF GOERKE: 3 I'll make a motion to accept. 4 SHERIFF JUDD: Second. 5 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Second. SHERIFF JUDD: We have a motion and the 6 7 second. Is there any further discussion? All in favor of 25-003 say aye. Aye. 8 9 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Aye. 10 CHIEF GOERKE: Aye. 11 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Aye. 12 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: Aye. 13 SHERIFF JUDD: Any opposed? 14 Okay. 25-004. Once again, we're checking the 15 box to make sure that we comply with the law of 16 908.1032 sub 4(g) requires State Immigration 17 Enforcement Council to provide recommendations on strategies to increase the number of available 18 19 detention beds for use by the United States 2.0 Immigration and Customs Enforcement. 21 The Florida sheriffs have already produced a 2.2 list and location of surplus beds in Florida jails. 23 US Immigrations and Custom Enforcement has 2.4 partnered with the Glades County Sheriff's Office 25 to use 500 more beds for ICE detainees.

We recommend that the SBIE, working with the Florida Division of Emergency Management and The Florida Department of Corrections, continue to identify more temporary housing options among state assets or potential state assets.

Kevin Guthrie's talked about this in great detail. To assist the federal government, the SBIE will continue to work with sheriffs, police chiefs, and jail administrators to identify detention beds that can be made available for the use of ICE.

The only thing I want to add to that is we may want to recommend to the board that we have to report our county jail bed openings once a month or once a quarter so that we continue to have current information. We've already reported initially, but, as you know, that's the moving target. Any feedback?

SHERIFF GUALTIERI: If you're going to do or continue to report it, I would suggest once a quarter. I don't think the numbers fluctuate enough to do it once a month.

SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Melissa, can we -- can we simply add that we report once a quarter from all county jails?

MS. BUDEJA: For sure. Yes. We can get -- we

2.

2.0

1 can get -- we can get that in there. 2. SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. Any other input? that one addition and -- do I hear a motion and a 3 4 second to adopt 25 --5 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: -- motion. Prummell. SHERIFF JUDD: Prummell. 6 7 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: I'll second. SHERIFF WATERS: Waters. 8 SHERIFF JUDD: We have a motion -- by Sheriff 9 10 Waters. Any further discussion? All in favor, 11 aye. 12 CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Aye. 13 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Aye. 14 CHIEF GOERKE: Aye. 15 SHERIFF JUDD: Aye. All right, let's look at 16 -- we need to come back and address those first two 17 which were the most complicated. 18 I know that Larry Keefe wants to get this grant funding going. Before -- before we get to a 19 20 -- a date, let me get my next set of notes here. 21 Before -- before we turn this back over, is 22 there any further discussion today, before we get to the public comment, on something we need to work 23 24 on or that you know of that we need to add to next 25 week, other than, hopefully, the final changes and

1 agreements so that we get this -- these issues 2. taken care of? 3 If you will, check your calendars, and see how 4 you look next week. And we have -- we can't do it 5 before Wednesday. Is that correct, Melissa? MS. BUDEJA: Yes. We need to be able to 6 7 notice seven days. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: So -- so, Sheriff Judd, I 8 9 can tell you we're going into a holiday weekend 10 with Easter that weekend. 11 I can -- Wednesday is good for me. 12 and Friday are not good for me. So if you do it on 13 Wednesday, but I don't have to be here either, so -14 - but Wednesday would be a strong preference for 15 me. 16 SHERIFF JUDD: I -- I can't imagine a meeting 17 without you. 18 SHERIFF GUALTIERI: Yes. 19 SHERIFF PRUMMELL: I can do Wednesday 2.0 afternoon. 21 SHERIFF WATERS: I'm good for Wednesday also, Sheriff. 2.2 23 SHERIFF JUDD: How about -- this should be a -24 - a short meeting. How about Wednesday at 1500 25 hours Eastern Time? Does that work? Everybody's

1 good? 2. CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Wednesday, yes. SHERIFF GUALTIERI: All good. 3 4 MS. BUDEJA: Yes. 5 CHIEF GOERKE: Yes, sir. SHERIFF WATERS: Good. 6 7 SHERIFF JUDD: Melissa? MS. BUDEJA: We're good. We are good. 8 9 Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. next week. 10 SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. All right. The -- I'll 11 go on to public comment. The State Immigration 12 Enforcement Council invites and encourages all 13 members of the public to provide comment on matters 14 before the Council. 15 Let me reiterate, the topics must be about the matters before the Council that the Council has 16 17 discussed today. 18 Members of the public shall limit their 19 comments to three minutes. Please raise your hand 2.0 online to be called upon to speak. 21 When you're called upon, please state your 22 name and who you're with. And if you represent an 23 organization or an entity other than yourself, 24 please -- please so stay. 25 Do we have anyone wanting to speak today,

1	Melissa?
2	MS. BUDEJA: I do not see anybody raising
3	their hand, and nobody has contacted us directly.
4	SHERIFF JUDD: Okay. If there's no further
5	business before the board today, I'll accept a
6	motion and a second to adjourn.
7	CHIEF GOERKE: Motion to adjourn.
8	CHIEF DOMINGUEZ: Second.
9	SHERIFF JUDD: Motion and a second.
10	Gentlemen, ladies, thank you all very much for your
11	time today. I appreciate you. We're working at
12	lightning speed with this. We are adjourned.
13	CHIEF GOERKE: Have a good day, everyone.
14	
15	(Thereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at 4:06
16	PM)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 | THE STATE OF FLORIDA

4 | COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:

I, LESLIE KAMINISKI, Court Reporter in and for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the proceedings in the above-styled cause before the State Immigration Enforcement Council, at the time and place set forth; that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 through 113, inclusive, constitute a true and complete record of my notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or Counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties', attorney or Counsel with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

DATED on this 8th day of May 2025.

Leslie Kaminski

LESLIE KAMINSKI, Court Reporter