

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD

<https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board>

MEETING MINUTES

December 1, 2021 – 10:00 a.m. – 1:22 p.m.

Members Present: Co-Chair Steven Raphael, Co-Chair David Swing, William Armaline, Bill Ayub, Andrea Guerrero, Edgar Hampton, LaWanda Hawkins, Lily Khadjavi, Brian Kennedy, Manju Kulkarni, Ammar Campa-Najjar, Melanie Ochoa, Amanda Ray, Brendon Woods, Cha Vang, Ronaldo Villeda

Members Absent: There were no member absent

1. Call to Order by Board Chairs

Co-Chair Raphael welcomed everyone to the RIPA Board meeting and introduced the present Board Members.

2. Approval of the October 20, 2021 Minutes

MOTION

Co-Chair Raphael called for a motion to approve the October 20, 2021, minutes.

Member Hampton made a motion to approve the October 20, 2021, Board Minutes.

Member Guerrero seconded the motion.

APPROVAL: The minutes passed unanimously, without objection or abstention.

3. Update from the Department of Justice (DOJ)

DOJ Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Allison Elgart welcomed everyone to the last full Board meeting of the year to review and hopefully approve the draft report. Ms. Elgart announced that the draft report was provided to the Board and the public and that all related materials were posted on the RIPA Board website. Ms. Elgart pointed out some updates to the report that were made since the last Board meeting. Some additional updates that have not been reviewed by the Board are: The Executive Summary, a draft of the Quick Facts Sheet, and the list of Best Practices and Recommendations made by the Board have been added as an appendix to the Executive Summary.

DAG Elgart stated that DOJ is looking forward to the Board's discussion, feedback, final approval of the report to be published on January 1, 2022.

DAG Elgart then turned the meeting over to DAG Domonique Alcaraz. Ms. Alcaraz shared a change made by the Civilian Complaints Sub-Committee's to the definition of civilian complaint in that section of the report being recommended to the Legislature. She explained that the words "officers" were changed to "employees" to be more inclusive in the workspace to also include non-sworn staff. The word "policies" was added to the definition. The change was also updated to read "laws, rules, policies and regulations" with respect to violations.

4. Board Discussion of the 2022 RIPA Report

Senior Legal Analyst Anthony Jackson provided an update of the AB 846 Comment Letter.

The Board approved three recommendations that were sent to POST during the rulemaking public comment period. The following proposed AB 846 amendments were drafted by POST Sub-Committee Co-Chairs Melanie Ochoa and Brendon Woods:

1. The ability to access the peace officer's social media accounts to determine if there are any noted explicit biases.
2. To require investigators to report findings based on the target of constructs, such as behaviors, attitudes, traits, and attributes.
3. To require psychological evaluators to report findings that clearly explain the evaluator's assessment of biases, traits, and attitudes including identification of sources used, i.e., historical data. A full report should be written for the benefit of accountability.

Mr. Jackson explained that these recommendations were submitted to POST in a letter from the Board Co-Chairs. POST sent a response letter to the Board dated November 21, 2022, informing the Board that it would not have sufficient time to incorporate the RIPA Board's recommendations into the AB 846. regulations

Mr. Jackson then turned the meeting over to the Board for their feedback and next steps.

Member Woods stated that the POST response was very disappointing and it didn't provide any insight or give any consideration to the Board's suggestions. The responses didn't leave him feeling very positive about the work that POST is doing.

Member Ochoa agreed with Member Woods. She cited that the nature of the recommendations, which were essentially requesting POST to document the evaluations and the basis for the conclusions found, using the materials the Legislature specifically cited is what should have been reviewed. Member Ochoa stated that she too is very disappointed that POST didn't take the Board's recommendations into account. She added that as a board

tasked with identifying ways in which biases against individuals should be addressed at the local law enforcement agencies, POST plays a significant role of how these individuals are trained and screened. Finally, Member Ochoa added that the Board, should continue to consider the options available to engage depending on what the final regulations end up being and the Board's authority to challenge the substance of those regulations if they don't comply or protect our communities.

Co-Chair Raphael asked if there were any other comments or questions of the Board.

Member Hampton stated that he understands the need to review social media feeds however raised a concern regarding who in bureaucracy would determine what is acceptable and what is not? What is considered a legitimate bias or just a personal opinion, belief or value presented on social media?

Member Ochoa stated that the Legislature has already defined the difference by requiring extensive background checks and interviews with families, friends, and employers. The Board's recommendations to the POST regulations is to merely ask that the investigators and evaluators document their conclusions with supporting data. This review for bias is already a legislative mandate. It's just not being documented by investigators and evaluators what they are basing their determinations on.

Co-Chair Swing asked Member Ochoa if her response to the comments made by Member Hampton specifically related to a particular part of the AB 846 comment letter? State agencies can already ask for social media access. However, it should only be for pre-employment inquires not for existing employees.

Member Ochoa stated that her comments were regarding biases in general and how they are documented during the investigative process.

Co-Chair Raphael asked if further action should be taken on this item based on the timeframe, i.e., drafting a response back to POST on the First Amendment question?

Member Ochoa stated that the public comment timeframe was now closed and POST may have submitted its final regulations. The next steps then would be to wait until the final regulations are published and perhaps consider taking legal action. DOJ was going to check with POST on where the regulations were in the approval process.

Co-Chair Swing suggested that since the regulations will be published January 1, 2022 that desired changes by the Board be made during the legislative process as opposed to attempting to take legal action directed toward POST. The legislative process can bring all stakeholders together to seek a collaborative solution.

Member Ochoa stated that this issue of POST rejecting the Board's comment letter does not require a legal solution.

Member Kulkarni asked what would be the downside or negative for actually responding to POST on the rejected recommendations.

Member Ochoa responded that currently there is no mechanism to make changes.

Ms. Elgart stated that as of now there is a placeholder in the report for the Board to respond to POST's November 16, 2021 letter.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General (SDAG) Nancy Beninati said another option is to hear from POST if they are on the line, to see if a representative could explain the status of the regulations and next steps.

POST Representative Megan Poulos stated that she did not know the current status of the AB 846 regulations, however invited a Board member to attend the POST Commission's meeting next week to provide public comments.

SDAG Beninati advised the Board that having a representative attend the POST Commission meeting is an option however it should be voted upon and the general statement that would be made. She then asked Ms. Poulos if the public comments could be made orally or in writing.

Ms. Poulos stated that she believes the Commission permits both written and oral comments and that there is a deadline.

Co-Chair Raphael stated he could go before the Commission to respond on behalf of the Board and that perhaps the Board would want to discuss what the statement would say; perhaps restating the Boards recommendations relative to AB 846.

Member Ochoa expressed concern that she would like it to be on record in the report that POST seems to have an unwillingness to engage in those items that the legislature already requires them to do. She added that throughout the year POST rejected some of the Board's comments and suggested amendments to training courses Board members had reviewed. She further stated that while the Legislature is continuously giving POST more authority, duties and money, the Legislature is potentially not actually achieving the goals they think they are when enacting such legislation. Member Ochoa stated that she thinks it is important that this context and background be documented in the report and provided to the Legislature who may be considering similar legislation that gives POST authority and funding around bias free policing. She stated that she is not sure that providing comments only to POST would be the most valuable approach.

Member Armaline stated that he agreed with Member Ochoa, especially when considering other law enforcement legislation such as (SB 2) which is the decertification of officers by

POST. He stated if POST is to be involved in addressing many law enforcement issues and its representatives are not responding to the RIPA Board in a way that indicates a willingness to collaborate is not a good sign. It would be better to clear these issues up on the front end, before additional money is provided to POST. He asked about what indication the Board had that POST will really implement the law. Member Armaline shared that he and others worked on the CLEAR ACT related to the hiring and recruitment of officers. These issues and types of legislation like the CLEAR ACT, SB 2 and AB 846 are not going away. There should be some mention in the report that there may be an assumption by the legislature that these issues will be addressed when perhaps based on POST's actions thus far that they may not be willing to work on these issues.

Member Hampton asked if there are known agencies that are not complying with the background check and the bias in AB 846. He was asking because he recently received a background screening request form to complete for an individual going through the recruitment process and a question about bias was on the form. Member Hampton further inquired as to whether there any agencies that can be named that are not complying with the law. Co-Chair Raphael agreed that the agency practices may vary and asked DOJ if they know.

SDAG Beninati stated that POST sets the standards but how each agency engages in the background screening process may differ. The Legislature is trying to improve the standards and to include them in the statute that is already in place.

Co-Chair Raphael suggested based on the discussion, the Board should draft a statement expressing concerns the Boards concerns. He suggested that perhaps the issue should be bifurcated: a place holder in the report and a public comment next week at the Commission meeting to respond to the POST November 16, 2021? He asked for more Board member comments to draft an agreed upon statement.

Co-Chair Swing said it would be important to highlight that POST is simply saying they will not incorporate our recommendations into the current regulations. They are also saying they are willing to continue to evaluate the recommendations and continue to work with DOJ staff to understand the Board's concerns and to evaluate the Board's input. He stated that POST was not shutting down the conversation, they are just saying there is not enough time to engage with evaluators and former work groups in advance of the January 2022 release date.

Member Ayub stated that he agreed with Chief Swing the letter sent to POST suggested there would be collaboration required between the background investigator and psychological evaluator and infers that the investigator will consider what the evaluator is looking into when documenting the conclusion of the investigation.

Member Kulkarni recommended sending a response letter to reiterate the Board's concerns which will keep the conversation open, however also make clear that the Board's concerns were not satisfactorily addressed. .

Co-Chair Raphael proposed drafting a letter addressing the Board's concerns to POST. Stating that the Board's concerns were not adequately addressed and discussions about the proper role of the investigator and psychological evaluator about bias continue into the coming year. It would also state that the Board hopes to collaborate with POST in the process and perhaps raise the issues of intent and implementation.

Member Ochoa expressed her concern that the issue of bifurcation, is a red herring. She stated that the Board was simply asking POST to document their existing evaluation sets, not to create new sets of evaluations and that was clearly stated in the Board's comment letter. Therefore the idea of creating a working group is not a real response to what the Board was asking POST to do. She stated that engaging in POST's response to the Board as if it is a legitimate critique of the Board's comments is not the way to go. Writing something that reasserts the Board's concerns are fine, but while there is a willingness to have further engagement going forward however that is not the issue. The real issue is considering past engagement with POST on other issues. And that POST refuses to acknowledge what the statute (AB 846) actually tells them to do as well as, which goes beyond ignoring the Board's recommendations.

Member Woods asked if there was Board consensus that the POST response to the Board's comment letter was sub-par.

SDAG **Beninati** stated that with consensus of the Board, DOJ could work with the co-chairs of the POST subcommittee or the Board co-chairs to draft a statement. If the consensus is to draft a letter it would be easier to include in the report or vice versa.

Co-Chair Raphael stated that if social media is of broad concern and recommending that the investigator and evaluator document their findings according to AB 846, then the Board should clarify that. Both should be included in the report.

Co-Chair Swing stated the Board will most likely not be in consensus on this item and that DOJ should therefore be directed to list the concerns in the report and move on to the remaining agenda items.

DAG Elgart stated that DOJ was not clear on what the Board would like to do on this agenda item and what to put in the report. If there is no direction provided, the report will not include an approved statement from the Board.

Member Ochoa stated she would make a motion regarding the Board's Letter to POST concerning the to AB 846 regulations.

MOTION: Member Ochoa

Move to include as part of the Board's response to [POST] to POST's rejection regarding mandatory social media investigation both ignores a significant body of evidence regarding the relevance of that to identify officer bias and was specifically directed by the Legislature to do so, and with their refusal to adopt the Board's recommendation that the investigator or evaluator document the decision making process and we are concerned that is not a good practice and will undermine the ultimate process they were tasked to undertake by the Legislature. **Member Kulkarni** seconded the motion.

Co-Chair Swing offered a friendly amendment to the motion to add an acknowledgment of POST's willingness to work with the Board and to continue to maintain an open dialogue to address concerns by the Board.

Member Ochoa agreed to accept the amendment provided it was acknowledged that this was a statement made by POST and would not be a statement of fact. **Member Kulkarni** deferred to Member Ochoa regarding the amendment. Co-Chair Raphael asked if Co-Chair Swing would agree to the modification of his amendment. **Co-Chair Swing** stated it did not satisfy his concerns and stated that because it was not accepted as recommended he would withdraw his motion and vote against it instead. **SDAG Beninati** asked for clarification that Chief Swing had indeed withdrawn his motion to amend and **Chief Swing** confirmed yes since it was not adopted as proposed.

Co-Chair Raphael, then asked for a clear restatement of the motion. **SDAG Beninati** agreed to restate the motion made by Member Ochoa.

MOTION:

SDAG Beninati restated Member Ochoa's motion as follows: move to draft language for the report that reflects that the mandatory social media should be evaluated, and that the response ignores significant evidence to identify officer bias. With respect to adopting the Board's recommendation that the investigators and the psychological evaluators document the factors that went into the decision, it is not a good practice and will undermine the ability of the legislative intent. Member Ochoa agree that was the correct motion but stated that the first part should include that the Board believes ignoring social media goes against the legislative intent to include social media in the analysis.

Member Woods asked Member Ochoa to clarify her addition regarding Legislative intent, which she did.

Chief Swing stated that he believes that the inclusion of that language was over stated and undermines the work and relationship between the Board and POST.

There was a brief discussion regarding the concerns in the Board's letter to POST. Member Guerro clarified that the motion is to include language in the report not to direct anything to POST and that the report will follow the tone of the report and be respectful and professional in reiterating the Board's concerns.

Member Guerrero Seconded the motion.

Amendment: Co-Chair Raphael offered an amendment motion to include that the Board hopes to work with POST productively in the coming year to address the Board's concerns about the implementation of AB 846. **Member Ochoa** accepted the amendment. **Member Guerrero** seconded the amendment of the motion.

Co-Chair Raphael called for the vote to approve the Motion and Amendment:

A roll call vote was taken, with the results as follows¹:

AYE Votes: Member Guerrero, Member Armaline, Member Kennedy, Member Woods, Member Khadjavi, Member Hawkins, Member Kulkarni, Member Ochoa, Member Vang, Member Campa-Najjar, Member Villeda, and Co-Chair Raphael

No Votes: Member Ray, Member Ayub, Co-Chair Swing, and Member Hampton

There were 16 members present for the vote. **Twelve Aye Votes, and Four No Votes.**

APPROVAL: The **Motion as Amended passed.**

Co-Chair Raphael asked if there were any more DOJ updates.

¹ During the roll call vote Sheriff Ayub had procedural question about the motion which Co-Chair Raphael addressed. SDAG Beninati clarified that because this is language that will be included in the report, then the co-chairs would still have the opportunity to review the specific language. Pastor Kennedy also asked a question but stated that he would vote "yes" so long as the co-chairs made sure that the report would reflect the Board's desire to work with POST moving forward.

SDAG Beninati announced that the press release for the annual report would likely be held on Monday, January 3, 2022, although the report will be published on January 1. She stated that normally each Board co-chair will provide a quote about the report. She also stated that Board members may be directly contacted by the press and that is okay to speak to the press however each Board member should be mindful that they are not speaking on behalf of the full Board. If you get contacted by the press, DOJ would be happy to assist you with a response and would like to be advised. The report will also be sent out to the public via the list serve and to a coalition of community organizations. This is the 5th year of the report, and SDAG Beninati expressed pride for the work the Board and the DOJ staff has done over the past year.

The Report is available in multiple languages

SDAG Beninati reported that Anna Rick and other bilingual certified DOJ staff normally translate the Executive Summary into Spanish. However, this year DOJ outsourced that effort so that the Executive Summary would be translated into multiple languages. In addition to Spanish the top four languages are, Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog and Korean.

Open Discussion of Report Rollout

DAG Elgart requested that formatting, consistency, and spacing issues should be emailed to her. She can then make sure the DOJ design team receives those updates. DAG Elgart also noted that Board members should submit email comments by Friday December 3, 2021 in addition to comments being taken today.

Member Ochoa made the following recommendations:

Include page numbers in the document when it is circulated.

Page 1, Executive Summary - Paragraph 1 the words “improve public safety” should be incorporated instead of “policing”

Page 8, Pretext Stops – Should include directions for entities to consider ways to eliminate Pretext Stops.

Page 10, provide explicit recommendations and alternatives to arm police for mental health crisis.

Page 13, Should include a list of the actual recommendations for proposed POST Regulations.

Member Ochoa also suggested the rewording of the section that stated that Board worked closely with POST.

Member Ochoa recommend that wording be deleted that POST receive research funding pursuant to AB 846 to study bias.

The word consider should be removed from the Recommendations text.

Member Guerrero acknowledged the outstanding work done by the contributors of the report.

Page 8, Executive Summary: The recommendations in the full report on Pre-Text Stops (page 155 of the Full Draft Report) be pulled into the Executive Summary. **Member Guerrero agrees** with **Member Ochoa** on the removing the word “Consider”

DAG Elgart asked the Board for feedback on separating the Recommendations from the Best Practices. She explained why some of the Recommendations and the Best Practices include the word “consider” throughout the document.

Member Guerrero thanked DOJ for the explanations. Regarding the explanation and clarification regarding the Recommendations and Best Practices she feels it makes sense to combine them.

Member Kennedy commended the Executive Summary as being informative highlighting how Black people in particular are treated unfairly.

Member Khadjavi stated she liked the idea of sending a transmittal letter to the Legislature highlighting the recommendations and elevate them as action items for the work that needs to be done. She suggested subcommittees work on the recommendations from the list for next year and to amplify to the Legislature.

DAG Elgart reminded everyone that the Board voted and approved sending a transmittal Letter with the report at the October 20, 2021, full Board meeting.

SDAG Beninati suggested that each sub-committee could work to develop a transmittal letter for the Legislature to be subcommittee specific to highlight their recommendations.

Member Guerrero suggested that the transmittal letter be sent at the same time as the full report, with a bullet point list highlighting specific recommendations and a reference locator to find the corresponding details. Then follow up with the sub-committee transmittal letter.

Co-Chair Swing queried that in looking at community caretaking stops, is there a way to understand calls for service as opposed to stops? He stated that there is a disproportionately higher number of calls for service related to contacts with individuals with perceived disabilities as opposed to officer initiated contact or stops. Officers are stopping individuals with perceived disabilities on a self-initiated context higher than others. He does not think that is the correct representation. Kevin Walker with the DOJ Research Center asked if Co-Chair Swing was asking about information in the Quick Facts chart? If so the Quick Facts only give a brief amount of information. Chief Swing said yes and wondered if information is looking at the data holistically? **Co-Chair Swing** suggested that the Quick Facts section

reference the corresponding section and page number of the full report so that the reader can determine where in the full report to find more information

5. Public Comment

Karen Glover - Southern California stated that her comments referred to page 16, footnote 22. It refers to prioritizing when officers indicate the reason for a stop: traffic over reasonable suspicion. This goes to pretext and a 1996 Federal court decision. It doesn't matter the subjective mind set of the officer. What matters is the objective reason for making the stop. She suggests if the methodology or regulations suggest that if reasonable suspicion is the precursor for the stop, you are silencing and erasing a lot of data that would tell us about pretext stops as they happen in a racialized society.

Richard Hylton – San Diego, California stated that he was adding to Karen Glover's statement. They are dependent on the narratives. The narrative information written by officers and submitted into the data base are not available to the public. Mr. Hylton stated that he has seen the narrative fields of officers in San Diego. You cannot talk about pretext stops without the narrative fields. Mr. Hylton shared that sometimes the data is not necessary. He was aware of a law suit against Kern County that was heard without the data. Also that 40 % of the use of force data he has reviewed has not been reported.

Scott Loggins – POST Executive Director and author of the November 16, 2021 letter to the RIPA Board advised that the Board's comments to AB 846 could not be addressed. The reason for the last sentence in the letter was due to the important nature of AB 846. It's not only important to the Commission on POST but to the law enforcement community as well. The letter was to express the fact that due to the expedited POST was under based on the Administrative Procedures ACT (APA), POST would not have been able to under consideration the recommendations from the RIPA Board with of the mandate of the start of the legislative Act. POST is more than willing to work with the Board and is actively seeking impact from the Board to fine tune those concerns and to make sure that they comport with Federal and California constitutional concerns. POST also wants to have further collaboration with experts in the field, specifically the psychologists. Mr. Loggins reiterated that POST was asking for a delay so that there was no delay in implementing the regulatory ACT codified in statute. Mr. Loggins invited a co-chair or representative on behalf of the Board to come before the POST Commission next week. POST will listen to the Board's concerns and further the conversations towards this cause.

6. Final Discussion of the RIPA Report and Any Further Action

Co-Chair Raphael asked if there are any other comments from the Board.

Member Hawkins indicated it was good to get clarification from POST.

Member Guerrero commented on the powerful stories that are depicted in the report. The data from the report showed the most common reason for a stop was traffic related. A deeper dive and more in-depth data analysis is needed to determine whether these stops were moving or non-moving violations and to determine how pretext stops are occurring. Also the powerful stories around the data points that Black community members are being disproportionately stopped, searched, detained, curbed, handcuffed, and removed from their cars at twice the rate of White community members. The data also indicates that the discovery rate for contraband and illegal substances is much higher with White Community members than Black Community members. There should no longer be any dispute on where the racial profiling is occurring. Going forward, these data points should be amplified by the Board and what the Board should do next with this data. The stories don't represent the California she wants to raise her son in and she is sure others don't want it either.

Member Armaline shared his concern that the report may need to be written in a way that is understandable to the general public. He cited an example from the Quick Facts Mach ups for Racial Disparity, reveals that Black individuals are stopped 2.3 times as often with no action taken, as White individuals. The public reading that statement would probably think Blacks are not being discriminated against in this example. However, we know that this statement really means that Blacks are being stopped simply because of harassment. It is imperative that we know our audience and be clear on our message.

Member Ochoa shared a discussion item for consideration next year regarding the training, processes, and funding of POST as well as, how RIPA data is being used to improve their training and processes going forward,

Member Kulkarni iterated how important this work and data is to the Asian-American and Pacific Island communities and access to it because they don't feel safe nor have a lot of trust in public agencies that provide public safety accessibility and the data is scarce.

There were no further discussions.

Co-Chair Raphael thanked the Public, the Board, and DOJ for an amazing year. He also announced that **Co-Chair Swing** will be transitioning out of his RIPA responsibilities.

MOTIONS

Motion: Co-Chair Raphael moved that the Board has sign off on the 2022 RIPA Report and that the Co-Chairs will assist DOJ with any additional wordsmithing and finalizing of the Report. Member Hawkins seconded the motion.

Co-Chair Raphael called for the vote.

AYEs: Member Guerrero, Member Armaline, Member Khadjavi, Member Ayub, Member Ochoa, Member Kennedy, Member Hawkins, Member Campa-Najjar, Member Woods, Member Kulkarni, Member Hampton, Member Vang, Co-Chair Swing, Co-Chair Raphael

There were 14 members present for the vote: **AYEs: 14, NAYs: 0, Motion Passed**

7. Election of New Co-Chairs for 2022

Co-Chair Raphael called for nominations for the position of Co-Chair of the 2022 RIPA Board.

Co-Chair Raphael first acknowledged member Hampton who shared that he is retiring on March 1 from law enforcement and the RIPA Board. The PORAC representative will be Corporal Rich Randolph from the Colton Police Department.

Member Guerrero then nominated **Co-Chair Raphael** and **Member Ochoa** to serve as the 2022 Co-Chairs of the RIPA Board.

Co-Chair Raphael called for the vote for **Member Ochoa** to serve as a Co-Chair to the 2022 RIPA Board.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General Nancy Beninati called for the vote:

AYEs: Member Guerrero, Member Armaline, Member Khadjavi, Member Ayub, Co-Chair Raphael, Member Kennedy, Member Hawkins, Member Campa-Najjar, Member Woods, Member Kulkarni, Member Hampton, Member Vang, Co-Chair Swing

There were 14 members present for the vote: **AYE: 14, NAYs: 0, The Motion Passed**

Co-Chair Chief Swing called for the vote for **Co-Chair Raphael** to serve as a 2022 Co-Chair of the RIPA Board.

Deputy Attorney General Nancy Beninati called for the vote:

AYEs: Member Guerrero, Member Armaline, Member Khadjavi, Member Ayub, Co-Chair Raphael, Member Kennedy, Member Hawkins, Member Campa-Najjar, Member Woods, Member Kulkarni, Member Hampton, Member Vang, Co-Chair Swing

There were 14 members present for the vote: **AYE: 14, NAYs: 0, The Motion Passed**

Closing Remarks

Co-Chair Swing congratulated the DOJ Staff on a job well done and getting the 2022 Report completed. While serving on the Board for four years, Co-Chair Swing said he learned a

great deal, expanded his perspective, and considered it to be a great experience. Chief Swing's last day will be approximately January 5, 2022. His replacement will be the recently appointed Chief Abdul Pidgeon in San Leandro. Chief Pidgeon is currently the outgoing president of the California Police Chiefs Association. Chief Swing will be missed!!

Deputy Attorney Nancy Beninati thanked Chief Swing for his important contributions to the Full Board and many sub-committees. She also stated he offered the leadership for this necessary work.

Deputy Attorney Nancy Beninati also announced that **Dominic Alcaraz of DOJ** will also be transitioning off the RIPA Board assignment in DOJ. Her hard work. She will continue to do the AB 953 training and expertise will be greatly missed.

Ms. Alcaraz said this was an incredible experience. Sad to be leaving but policing and constitutional rights are what she wants to do in her career. She is very proud of the work the Board has done and is very hopeful for where the board will go and what the Board will do and hopes it will take its charge to eliminate Racial and identity Profiling all the way home. It is personal important as someone who is a Latina and grew up in a low income community that is heavily policed and knows the effects that happen because of racial and identity profiling in law enforcement. She thanked the Board for allowing her to do this work alongside the Board.

8. Adjourn

Chief Swing officially adjourned the RIPA Full Board, December 1, 2021 End of Year meeting by honoring the men and women of Law Enforcement who valiantly serve each and every day through challenging times and also through the Pandemic much like other essential workers. Our Peace Officers and Deputies courageously run towards danger every day to help serve our communities. Special honors go to the Peace Officers of California.