

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

5th Meeting of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board

September 27, 2017, 10:00 a.m.

West Oakland Branch, Oakland Public Library

Multi-Purpose Room

1801 Adeline Street

Oakland, CA 94607

The fifth meeting of the California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board was held on Wednesday, September 27, 2017 at 10:00 A.M. in the multi-purpose room of the West Oakland Branch of the Oakland Public Library at 1801 Adeline Street, Oakland, CA 94607.

Members Present: Oscar Bobrow, Michael Durant, Jennifer Eberhardt, Andrea Guerrero, Honorable Alice Lytle, Reverend Ben McBride, Edward Medrano, Mariana Marroquin, Douglas Oden, Sheriff David Robinson, Tim Silard, Angela Sierra, Commissioner Warren Stanley, Timothy Walker, Alex Johnson, Pastor J. Edgar Boyd.

Members Not Present: Micah Ali, Sahar Durali

California Department of Justice Staff Present: Kelli Evans, Special Assistant Attorney General, Executive Office; Nancy A. Beninati, Supervising Deputy Attorney General, Civil Rights Enforcement Section (CRES); Catherine Z. Ysrael, Deputy Attorney General, CRES; Kathleen Radez, Deputy Attorney General, CRES; Shannon K. Hovis, CRES; Kelsey Geiser, CRES; Jenny Reich, Chief, Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation Services (BCIIS), California Justice Information Services (CJIS); Randie Chance, Program Manager, Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation Services, CJIS; Arwen Flint, Assistant Bureau Chief, CJIS; Kevin Walker, CJIS.

1. Call to Order and Welcoming Remarks

The meeting was called to order at 10:13 A.M. by Co-Chair Edward Medrano.

2. Approval of the July 12, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the minutes (inaudible by whom). The motion was seconded (inaudible by whom). No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali, Durali, Eberhardt, Walker, and Boyd were not present for the vote.

3. Welcome from Attorney General Xavier Becerra

Attorney General Becerra thanked the members of the public and members of the RIPA Board for all of the work that they have done to improve public safety. The Attorney General announced that the DOJ has submitted the AB953 regulations to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), which were a product of everyone's help and assistance. The regulations were a collaborative effort with so many stakeholders. He added that we hoped that the regulations would be completed by early November. The Attorney General stated the degree of work everyone put into the regulations and the various stakeholders and the Board is a testament to what people of good will can produce. The Attorney General noted that he had been stopped by police as a young man, that he has sat down with the men and women in uniform who are given very tough assignments, and he has met with family members of individuals who have lost their lives, that this is too important not to get it right. The Attorney General stated that we have the opportunity to build perhaps the most important thing with respect to public safety and that is trust. He further stated that these new laws will give us all a sense we are doing this together, there is no way we can have public safety without a team effort. Attorney General Becerra again thanked everyone who participated in the process and attended the RIPA meeting. In closing, Attorney General Becerra stressed that the regulations provide an opportunity to get to the point that when our law enforcement contacts the public that there can be trust, and that we are doing this as a team and there is real trust which is not only in the best interest of the people, but the State of California. He again thanked the co-chairs of the RIPA Board and the Board for their work and looked forward to working together.

4. Public Comment Period

Rosa Aqueel from PolicyLink and the Alliance for Boys and Men of Color suggested that the board include qualitative data in its annual report to show why the quantitative data is so important.

Diana Tate Vermeire from the American Civil Liberties union of Northern California encouraged the board to remain focused on improving the trust between law enforcement and the communities that it serves by looking at policies, practices, trainings, and solutions to a complex and difficult problem.

Kayln Dean from PICO California invited the board, in the absence of any data collected, to include qualitative data and written testimonies and to continue to allow public comment as a part of the board meetings.

5. Update from DOJ

Ms. Beninati further explained that the regulations were submitted to OAL and that our office hopes to have a final product filed with the Secretary of State in November. The DOJ has requested that the regulations be effective upon filing but OAL has not yet granted that request. If the request is not granted the regulations will be effective as of January 1, 2018 but the regulations will be final in terms of planning and moving forward. Ms. Beninati stated that all of the comments received during the 45-day public comment period and the 15-day public comment period are included in the finalized version of the regulations.

Ms. Beninati mentioned that AB 1518, additional amendments to the Racial and Identity Profiling Act, has been sent to Governor Jerry Brown along with a letter from the Attorney General asking for the Governor's approval. If this bill is approved, data collection for agencies that employ over 1,000 peace officers will begin on July 1, 2018 as opposed to January 1, 2018 to allow the systems for data collection to be created. Nothing will change with regard to the time period in which any law enforcement agency will have to report that data to the DOJ and the first wave of data reports will come into the Attorney General's office in April of 2019 as originally planned in the statute. AB 1518 also clarifies that the data will be available to the public except for badge number or unique identifying information of the officer and it makes law enforcement agencies responsible for ensuring that any personally identifiable information of the individual stopped that is exempt from disclosure is not transmitted to the Attorney General in any open text fields.

Ms. Reich informed the Board that CJIS is in charge of the technical aspects of collecting this data and is in the process of developing a web application to easily collect this data and submit it to the DOJ. The next phase will include outreach to the first and second wave of agencies that will begin to collect this stop data in July of 2018 to discuss the data dictionary and how they will have to build out their record management collection systems in order to submit that data. CHIS will also hold a meeting with the vendors that work with the different law enforcement agencies to get them on board with the collection data dictionary and schemas.

➤ **Board Member Questions**

Member Silard asked for the DOJ's perspective on how federal policy and comments from the United States Attorney General effects the California Attorney General's office as well as its perspective on how the board should take on the ambitious challenge posed by AB 953 to end racial and identity profiling in the period before there is data.

Attorney General Becerra responded that any dysfunction in Washington D.C. will not keep California from doing what is appropriate to build trust and provide public safety with all stakeholders who want to participate. Attorney General Becerra encouraged communities to work closely with their law enforcement officials to implement AB953's regulations and to figure out how best to balance implementation with time and labor cost. In the period before any stop data is reported to the DOJ, the Department will continue working with law enforcement agencies and communities and encourage participation in the data collection.

Co-Chair McBride asked what assurances the Attorney General can give the public about how the data that is captured and the recommendations made by the RIPA Board will be effectively implemented.

Attorney General Becerra responded that the RIPA Board will continue to guide the Attorney General's office and provide the necessary expertise to ensure that the legislation is working correctly and effectively. Attorney General Becerra mentioned that once data is collected the Board will help the DOJ refine the law.

Member Lytle asked Attorney General Becerra emphasize that the system is unequal understanding that the board is limited in what it can do to change law enforcement practices within an unequal system.

Attorney General Becerra responded that for the first time there will be data to provide clarity to this contentious issue. The more data collected that supports the desired direction will enable this board to have a powerful voice to direct the nation.

6. Swearing in of Acting California Highway Patrol Commissioner Warren Stanley

Ms. Beninati swore in Acting California Highway Patrol Commissioner Warren Stanley as an official member of the RIPA Board.

7. Public Comment Period

Member of the public with LIVE FREE commented that there is a fear in the community of the forces meant to protect community members and law enforcement needs to work with the community to give its members a sense of recovery.

Jesus Ruiz recounted a personal story where a mother taught her children not to call the police when there was an issue out of fear that her children would be suspected. Mr. Ruiz asked the board at what point did protect and serve become comply or die.

Sameena Usman, the Government Relations Coordinator for the Council on American Islamic Relations commented that she has seen a fear in the community of reaching law enforcement officers. Ms. Usman asked that the board implement the data effectively to allow for meaningful legislation and policy changes. Ms. Usman mentioned that religious affiliation has been removed from AB953, but asked to consider the board how data will be collected on religious profiling.

Terrance Stewart with Inland Congregations United for Change detailed a personal story where he called the police and he was harassed and questioned that has made him hesitant and fearful to call the police for help in the future. Mr. Stewart continued saying that racial profiling creates a distrust in the community and makes the entire community less safe.

Greg Jones with Inland Congregations United for Change discussed the implementation of Proposition 64 and questioned what happened to the marijuana or other possessions that are removed from citizens who have been arrested or investigated. Mr. Jones encouraged the board encourage transparency and accountability among law enforcement agencies.

Alice Lynch of People Acting in Community Together emphasized the urgency of moving forward with the work of AB953 and detailed a personal story in which a police officer behaved in a threatening manner towards a member of the public.

9. Subcommittee Reports

Member Silard asked that DOJ staff circulate minutes from all of the subcommittees to all of the board members rather than just the minutes for the subcommittees each member sits on. This request was echoed by Member Johnson.

➤ **Stop Data Subcommittee**

Stop Data Subcommittee Co-Chair Oden stated that the goal of this Stop Data subcommittee is to identify comparison data to be used in the report. The subcommittee has begun to look at other existing reports on stop data to compare and contrast the best practices. Among these reports were studies done by the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement and from academia. Co-Chair Oden commented that the subcommittee is seeking to create a baseline for the current state of racial and identity profiling to allow for comparison when the new data comes in. Co-Chair Oden added that the subcommittee is also addressing the collection of the data including differences in rates of incidents based on geographic location, age, time of stop, probation or parole status, and crime rate of the community.

Stop Data Subcommittee Co-Chair Medrano added that the subcommittee is also addressing how to build in contextual data to the analysis of the data including data from nontraditional sources.

○ **Board Member Comments**

Member Silard asked if the subcommittee had come to a conclusion regarding the inclusion of use of force data. Member Silard also encouraged the subcommittee to include any data that may exist that covers racial and identity profiling after the stop as well as at the time of the stop.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Medrano said that no conclusion had been reached but it is being discussed.

○ **Approval of Subcommittee Minutes**

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the subcommittee minutes by member Bobrow. The motion was seconded Subcommittee Co-Chair Oden. No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

○ **Citizens’ Complaints Subcommittee**

Ms. Hovis informed the Board that this subcommittee also discussed how to highlight the problem and the vision for solution.

Ms. Chance informed the Board that the data analysis will be broken out to cover contextual data as well but the post stop data is something that the DOJ will look further into. Ms. Chance encouraged board members to submit any suggested data sources to this subcommittee.

➤ **Citizen Complaints Subcommittee**

Citizen Complaint Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson stated that this subcommittee is delving into what each agency does with regard to citizen complaints because while it is required by law that law enforcement agencies accept complaints, there is no uniform complaint process across the state of California. Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson mentioned that the subcommittee is interested in focusing on the agencies that are required to report stop data first as well as agencies that fall within the different DOJ geographic zones.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson explained that the subcommittee has suggested that a survey be sent to all law enforcement agencies in the state that are also required to eventually submit stop data to the DOJ that asks basic questions on complaints and racial and/or identity policies. Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson emphasized that this survey will provide the board with baseline information on what agencies do to provide citizen complaint policies and forms and will highlight best practices of some of the state agencies that other agencies can adopt or learn from.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson mentioned the subcommittees intent to include the existing DOJ data on the agencies with the greatest and least number of complaints and adding some contextual information to this data such as the population and the calls for service. The subcommittee will also include legal definitions of the potential citizen complaint outcomes (sustained, not sustained, founded, and unfounded).

Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson commented that the subcommittee will include plans for future use of data and will lay out future reports as well as potentially provide recommendations surrounding a model citizen complaint form or policy. Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson clarified that the subcommittee will focus on data for school-age complaints on.

Member Oden added that anecdotal complaints and the public's input will be included in the report.

○ **Board Member Comments**

Member Silard voiced concern over the ability to create a uniform complaint form given the timeline for the first report but recommended that the subcommittee instead highlight best practices in existing citizen complaint policies and forms.

Member Sierra asked how the subcommittee plans to finalize the service and suggested that the DOJ Division of Law Enforcement could be helpful in this process.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Robinson responded that the board is not expecting response from all agencies given the time constraint but plans to follow-up with the 8 or 9 agencies that will be required to submit stop data first as well as a sample of large and small agencies in the DOJ geographic regions.

Ms. Hovis clarified that the draft survey was created on behalf of both the Citizen Complaints Subcommittee and the State & Local Policies and Accountability Subcommittee but the survey will be distributed on behalf of board as opposed to being a survey from the DOJ.

Ms. Evans suggested that the board should vote on whether a survey such as this should be sent out and if the topics in the draft are on the correct path. Then, if it is approved, the co-chairs of the Citizen Complaint Subcommittee and the State & Local Policies and Accountability Subcommittee will work with DOJ staff to finalize the wording of the survey.

Member Guerrero clarified that this survey will just provide baseline information on what agencies already have in place and the results will then provide the board with the opportunity to do a deeper dive in future reports.

- **Approval of Subcommittee Minutes**

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the subcommittee minutes by member Durant. The motion was seconded Member Oden. No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

- **POST Training and Recruitment Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Co-Chair McBride stated that the subcommittee discussed the new racial profiling training that will be developed in partnership with POST and the DOJ by nature of AB953. This training will educate officers about racial and identity profiling, how to avoid these types of profiling, and holding up the procedural justice and implicit bias training that has recently been implemented. The subcommittee spoke with Ralph Brown, the Bureau Chief of POST’s Training Delivery and Compliance Bureau to understand the status of the training that is being developed. The subcommittee has discussed the effectiveness, uniformity, and financing of the new training and implementation.

- **Board Member Comments**

Member Lytle suggested that the new POST training cover power balances and imbalances, complications around hate-motivated racism, unconscious racism, and the wider societal, economic, and historical in which all racial activities take place. Member Lytle suggested that the subcommittee cover recruitment of law enforcement agencies in the next subcommittee meeting.

Member Lytle made note of a section of the subcommittee meeting minutes that did not accurately capture her point regarding the responsibility of peace officers to report unjust activities of fellow peace officers.

Member Silard suggested that the subcommittee include recruitment, hiring, and promotions in the report and asked the subcommittee how it plans to approach the training collaboration with POST.

Subcommittee Co-Chair McBride responded that the next subcommittee meeting will cover a more detailed draft of the training in development and the subcommittee has requested the recruitment of a subject matter expert on racial profiling and POST training to assist in addressing the training outline.

Member Durant suggested that the board focus on the impact POST budget cuts have on training implantation and requested that a letter be sent to the Governor or the Attorney General that draws attention to these issues.

- **Approval of Subcommittee Minutes**

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the subcommittee minutes with edits suggested by Member Lytle (inaudible by whom). The motion was seconded (inaudible by whom). No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

- **State and Local Racial & Identity Profiling Policies and Accountability Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Co-Chair Stanley commented that the subcommittee suggested that a survey be sent to all law enforcement agencies in the state that are also required to eventually submit stop data (the same universe of agencies as the citizen complaint survey). This survey will ask the agencies what racial and identity profiling policies, training, implementation policies, and what risk management or early warning systems they have. The survey will provide the board with baseline information that can then be analyzed to identify best and worst practices and to compare the policies to existing model policies.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Guerrero emphasized that the initial understanding of the racial and identity profiling and related policies law enforcement agencies have will be achievable for the first year. The subcommittee plans to analyze these policies deeper in future reports.

- **Board Member Comments**

Co-Chair Medrano suggested that the Citizen Complaint Subcommittee and the State & Local Policies Subcommittee be combined.

- **Approval of Subcommittee Minutes**

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the subcommittee minutes by Member Robinson. The motion was seconded (inaudible by whom). No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

- **Evidence-Based Research and Best Practices Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Co-Chair Eberhardt commented that the subcommittee has two goals. The first is to define the most effective trainings, policies, and practices to reduce racial and identity profiling and the second is to develop recommendations based on those academic findings. Subcommittee Co-Chair Eberhardt detailed the below 7 deliverables that would be completed over 2018 for the annual report release in January 2019.

1. Stop data report repository.
2. Trainings and solutions repository.
3. Electronic tutorial on how to write a stop data report aimed at law enforcement agencies.
4. Electronic tutorial on how to read a stop data report aimed at the public.
5. Electronic tutorial on how to write about a stop data report aimed at the media.
6. Researcher-practitioner partnership guide.
7. Implementation showcase.

- **Approval of Subcommittee Minutes**

MOTION: A motion was made to approve the subcommittee minutes by Co-Chair Medrano. The motion was seconded Member Oden. No objections were raised.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

9. Break

The Board recessed for a break, reconvening with a quorum of members present at 12:45 PM.

10. Public Comment Period

Lois Corrin, a Piedmont resident thanked the board and meeting attendees.

Joyce Guy of the West Oakland Job Research Center detailed a personal story about an interaction with law enforcement that made her afraid of the police and will influence her interactions with law enforcement for the rest of her life.

Reverend Damita Davis-Howard of the First Mt. Sinai Missionary Baptist Church emphasized that racial profiling applies to women as well as men and encouraged the board to take their task seriously.

Sister Mary Amora commented that she is impressed with the work that is being done to improve Oakland but is disturbed by the trauma and the agony of its citizens due to violence.

A member of the public encouraged the board not to just talk about change but to implement it so it can affect members of the community.

A member of the public detailed a personal story of a case of mistaken identity with law enforcement.

Justin Pierre agreed that the board should focus on the historical context around racial profiling and commented that the system is not just broken it is working as it was designed. Mr. Pierre mentioned that the corruption needs to be replaced with compassion.

Terrance Stewart with Inland Congregations United for Change voiced a concern that the data will be collected but not translated into change. Mr. Stewart commented that the stops are just one part, but the board needs to focus on search and seizure as well as well as how stops and arrests can affect the rest of someone's life.

Member of the public with LIVE FREE encouraged law enforcement officers be more engaged in everyday activities in the community out of uniform.

Toni McNeil from LIVE FREE and Faith in the Valley commented that she had assessed attendees in the room quickly just as police officers assess members of the community very quickly. Ms. McNeil asked the board to take into consideration how offensive it is to quickly assess someone based on looks and said that the board must take advantage of the power it has been given to make adjustments that are necessary for members of the community to stop needing to adjust daily.

Tia Rounsoville of the Oakland Peace Center commented that people should not be criminalized for using their voice and standing up for their communities and commented that she must choose

between engaging with activism and living in fear. Ms. Rousoville detailed a personal story about an interaction with the police.

Greg Jones from Inland Congregations United for Change asked what law enforcement officers want from people of color.

Kayln Dean from PICO California commented that HEAT is a problem that works to build trust with law enforcement and through broken communities and mentioned that a way that we can encourage further trust is lifting up organizations that already do that work. The community wants a partner in brining about training that has already been vetted and by getting the implicit bias courses implanted throughout the state.

11. Board Discussion of Subcommittee Reports and Approval of Report Outline and Content as Described by Subcommittee Chairs

Co-Chair Medrano commented that a solution will not be just one course that will be offered to officers but rather sustained training efforts through an officer's career and mentioned that at the moment POST cannot do this at this point in time. Co-Chair Medrano encouraged the board to focus on organizations that can make this sustained training a reality. Co-Chair Medrano suggested that a member of the RIPA board be a part of the POST Commission.

Co-Chair Medrano asked the board to consider what the report will look like without data and encouraged a focus on uniform definitions of terms, a framework for future deliverables, and a discussion of what is working now. Co-Chair Medrano suggested that the report include a video of the board members discussing the importance of the board and its dedication to implantation and change.

Member Oden suggested including officer accountability to be mindful of police misconduct among fellow officers in police officer training.

Member Lytle suggested that the report begin with a brief history of policing in the United States. This suggestion was seconded by Co-Chair McBride and said telling the truth about history is not political, but rather responsible.

Member Guerrero commented that the first report can serve as a foundation, context, and acknowledgement of what the board has heard from the public about the urgency of now. Member Guerrero commented that without data, the board has the opportunity to spend more time describing what is at stake and with the bassline information from the survey will allow the board to better receive the data in the future and show that the board is listening, responsive, and ready to move forward.

Member Durant mentioned a comment from the public about how her life has been changed forever has impacted him greatly and suggested working collectively to bring work legislation and bonds within the communities.

Member Boyd commented that the board must be transparent about its intentions and to let the public know that the process is necessary. Member Boyd encouraged the board to look not only at training but also recruitment.

Co-Chair McBride commented that the history portion of the report must also include gender identity and religious minorities and to do so that reflects imbalance of power.

Member Lytle commented that the report introduction must discuss that there has not been just a perception of misconduct but a reality.

Ms. Beninati informed the Board that the next full board meeting will be November 27, 2017 in Stockton, CA and the goal is for the board to have a full draft by that time. In the meantime, the co-chairs will work with the DOJ and other subcommittee members can submit information or drafted sections to the DOJ staff and discuss during the subcommittee meeting or the next full board meeting. The goal is to have a near final product by the teleconference full board meeting on December 19, 2017.

Member Guerrero suggested that the board Co-Chairs work on the introduction, historical section, and a conclusion and the subcommittee co-chairs work with DOJ staff to drafts on the subcommittee sections of the report while keeping in mind the themes of where we are, how we got here, and where we are going while drafting the report.

Ms. Beninati commented that the DOJ will work on wordsmithing and putting the report together.

Ms. Sierra suggested that the board agree on some report components such as the inclusion of a section on historical context, the survey and the future report deliverables.

MOTION: A motion was made that Co-Chair McBride and Co-Chair Medrano will work with DOJ staff to draft a preamble and conclusion to present to board members before the next full board meeting by Co-Chair McBride. Member Silard suggested that the history section should be a separate section rather than a part of the preamble and encouraged that the deliverables focus on 2018 rather than this year. Member Durant seconded the motion.

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

MOTION: A motion to send authorize DOJ to work with the co-chairs of the Citizen Complaints and State and Local Policies and Accountability Subcommittees to release a survey that will be edited and finalized to all law enforcement agencies that will also be required to submit stop data to the DOJ. Member Silard suggested that other subcommittees take time to assess whether they would like to request additional information from law enforcement agencies as well. Member Guerrero disagreed and stated the importance of sending the survey out as soon as possible to get the baseline information and the deep analysis of the policies will come in later reports. Board members can provide one-way feedback on the survey contents to DOJ staff. The motion was seconded by Member Guerrero

APPROVAL: The subcommittee minutes were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Members Ali and Durali were not present for the vote.

Ms. Beninati made an announcement that Governor Brown signed AB1815.

Member Eberhardt cautioned that it would take a long time to analyze the results from the survey but to use the baseline information for the first report would be fine. Member Eberhardt also suggested that each subcommittee’s sections should include the goals of subcommittee, deliverables, and timeline. Member Eberhardt commented that the POST training has a section on the history of policing and racial profiling which could be useful in the drafting of this section and potentially speak with POST about releasing that section to the public.

Member Silard suggested that the subcommittees have a monthly standing meeting.

Member Durant suggested that the board recommend that the vacant position on the board be filled by a member of POST.

Co-Chair McBride suggested that the recommendations should be sent to the Senate Pro Tem by the individual members of the board rather than from the board together. This suggestion as seconded by Member Silard.

Member Bobrow asked if there was a suggestion by the POST subcommittee to change the POST racial profiling training video and asked if the board can make that recommendation.

Co-Chair McBride said that the board can make a recommendation to POST.

Member Eberhardt clarified that other videos are being developed.

Ms. Hovis clarified that POST creating an entirely new racial and identity profiling training and are interested in having the board consult with them on the creation of the training.

12. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Co-chair McBride at 2:30 p.m.