

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD

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

MEETING MINUTES

April 23, 2026, 12:03 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Angela Sierra and Andrea Guerrero, and Members John Dobard, Chauncey Smith, Wade Forde, Rich Randolph, Sean Thuilliez, Jordan Rall, Jose Alatorre, Lily Khadjavi, Aameena Qazi, and DJ Criner

Board Members Absent: Chad Bianco, Souley Diallo, Lawanda Hawkins, Manjusha Kulkarni, and Ronaldo Villeda

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Sierra called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Co-Chair Sierra extended her welcome to the board, members of the public, and California Department of Justice (DOJ) staff.

Co-Chair Sierra stated this was the first full board meeting of the calendar year and the first meeting since the last report was issued on January 30, 2026. The last report, issued in January, was the ninth annual report issued by the Board. Since then, all of the Board's Subcommittees have met and outlined potential issues for discussion today.

Board Members then introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 18, 2025, FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Sierra asked the Board to review the draft minutes from the November 18, 2026, meeting of the full RIPA Board. Member Qazi moved to approve the minutes as presented, and Member Khadjavi seconded.

DOJ Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson conducted a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Criner, Forde, Guerrero, Khadjavi, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Sierra, Smith, Thuilliez
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** Alatorre, Dobard

The meeting minutes were approved as presented, with 10 ayes and two abstentions.

4. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Co-Chair Sierra next opened the floor for the reports of each of the four Subcommittees.

Accountability and Civilian Complaints

Member Criner reported that the Subcommittee met on March 24, 2026. During the Subcommittee meeting, Subcommittee members were informed that Co-Chair Hawkins would be transitioning out of her Subcommittee Co-Chair position, but would remain as a member of the Subcommittee. Member Criner noted there is an opening to serve as Co-Chair with him, and Subcommittee members will have the opportunity to nominate someone or themselves for the Subcommittee Co-Chair position at the next Subcommittee meeting.

Member Criner explained that DOJ staff also facilitated discussion regarding topics for the accountability and civilian complaint sections for this year's RIPA report.

Member Criner explained that the topic proposal for the Civilian Complaints section of the report was on the low sustained rates for racial and identity bias complaints. Member Criner explained to the Board that these low rates are a continuing issue, which the Board also raised in the 2026 RIPA Report. The Subcommittee would like to look more closely at the RIPA data to provide more context on the cause of the low rate of sustained complaints using a summary of statistics. The Subcommittee also discussed examining overall complaint dispositions and dispositions by types of profiling allegations broken down by agencies over time. During the Subcommittee meeting, DOJ staff notified the Subcommittee that there may be limitations on how the analysis could be generated, and that it may be difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about sustained complaints because the RIPA complaint data is summary data.

Member Criner explained that the Subcommittee also discussed analyzing the low number of sustained complaints by conducting research into the best practices for investigation of racial and identity bias complaints in law enforcement and in other contexts, to try and understand where there may be gaps in the law enforcement complaint investigation process. The Subcommittee decided to focus on looking at law enforcement agencies and investigatory techniques and proposed best practices for racial and identity bias complaint investigations in order to address any possible issues leading to a low number of sustained complaints. Member Criner noted that the Subcommittee raised the possibility of having a law enforcement agency representative talk at a Subcommittee meeting to discuss how the agency conducts complaint investigations and how they interpret the threshold needed to meet to sustain a complaint. Member Criner explained the Subcommittee's interest in qualitative data over quantitative data, such as assessing who is making the decisions about complaints and how the decision is being made.

Member Criner related to the Board that the Subcommittee agreed that diving deeper into the RIPA complaint data would not be as fruitful in addressing the issue of the low number of sustained complaints because the Subcommittee has already assessed those statistics.

Member Criner also presented the topic proposals for the Accountability chapter of the 2027 Report. The first topic proposal relates to immigration enforcement. Member Criner stated that the Subcommittee would like to explore ways to support state and local law enforcement officers in protecting California's diverse population. The Subcommittee discussed the exploration of the overlap between immigration enforcement and RIPA's objectives as an attempt to reduce racial and identity bias, as well as an assessment of whether the law enforcement officers could be held accountable for bias conduct while working in an immigration enforcement context. Member Criner explained that the Subcommittee also discussed whether existing legislation provides an accountability mechanism for prospective and existing peace officers who have previously demonstrated racial or identity bias while working for an entity that engages in immigration enforcement. As to existing peace officers, the Subcommittee also discussed evaluating whether SB 2 certification protections are broad enough to encompass peace officer's racial or identity bias that occurs with a current employer.

Member Criner also explained the second topic proposal discussed by the Subcommittee, which is internal auditing. At the last Subcommittee meeting, the DOJ suggested conducting research to evaluate the best practices for internal audits of the complaint and investigation process. Member Criner explained that the Subcommittee would like to focus on identifying key operational factors for success, such as alignment with strategic goals, confidentiality, competency, and objectivity. The Subcommittee also discussed identifying the challenges of maintaining independence when internal auditors are employees of the organization they audit. For the upcoming report, the Subcommittee proposed a focus on evaluating and proposing the best practices of internal audits of law enforcement complaints and investigation processes.

Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Training and Recruitment

Member Forde reported that the POST Training and Recruitment Subcommittee met on March 12, 2026. The meeting reviewed POST field training program materials and POST AB 953 guidelines on racial and identity profiling.

Member Forde stated that RIPA mandated the review and analysis of training courses to assess the effectiveness of the training and racial and identity profiling by sworn officers. The Board had already reviewed courses identified by POST as relating to racial and identity profiling. He discussed that the POST Subcommittee will continue its review of Field Training Program (FTP) materials, which has been a 2-year process. Member Forde explained that the draft report described FTP materials, the role of FTP officers, and the role of FTP supervisors and coordinators. The previous report also discussed the two consultants retained by DOJ, one of which has expertise in law enforcement academic research and the study of bias, and the other a former California law enforcement executive with 37 years of operational experience. Member Forde stated that this year's report will conclude the Subcommittee's review of FTP materials. He noted the POST Field Training was structured to bridge the gap between academia, training, and practical field application. Member Forde recounted that the plan for this upcoming year was to finish its review of the field training program materials. This year, the Subcommittee would like to focus on the review of FTP Section 6—Community Relations and Professional Demeanor, which POST had identified as most relevant to the RIPA mandate. During the previous meeting, DOJ consultants Rebecca Hetey and Daniel Hahn walked Subcommittee members through the Section 6 rubric to guide members as they review and solicit specific written feedback. All Subcommittee members were asked to participate in the review, and are expected to submit written feedback to DOJ by May 15, 2026. On April 8, 2026, following the Subcommittee meeting, DOJ emailed modified instructions in order to eliminate possible confusion on how to approach a review on Section 6. DOJ notified POST that it should not be evaluating the full FTP experience, pedagogy, instructional methods, or delivery quality. Member Forde reminded the Subcommittee that written feedback was due May 15, 2026.

Member Forde also noted that the upcoming report will also include a review of the AB 953 guidelines for racial and identity profiling. As background, AB 953 requires the POST Commission to develop guidelines related to racial and identity profiling. POST cited Subcommittee Co-Chairs as expert consultants during development of these guidelines. These guidelines were approved by the POST Commission on September 9, 2025. Member Forde stated the rest of the Subcommittee will do a full review of the guidelines at the next Subcommittee meeting which will likely take place in June 2026.

During the last Subcommittee meeting, Co-Chairs shared they were pleased to learn that POST included many recommendations made by RIPA, such as emphasis on community stakeholders, historical context of policing, use of RIPA data and related legal obligations and scenario-based training. Co-Chairs also shared they would like POST to consider using the Board's guidelines to align all RIPA-related courses and have AB 953 guidelines serve as a statewide framework. Member Forde stated POST expressed concerns that guidelines in practice would only apply to a 4-hour course. At the next Subcommittee meeting, all Subcommittee members will be asked to review the AB 953 guidelines, having completed review of Section 6.

State and Local Racial and Identity Policies

Member Dobard reported that the State and Local Racial and Identity Policies Subcommittee met on March 19, 2026, to discuss potential framing and topics and provide DOJ with guidance about the Subcommittee's overall direction and priorities. Member Dobard discussed using a past, present, and future frame to organize topics in the Policies section. Member Dobard explained that the section may include a longitudinal analysis of policies recommended by the Board and those adopted by agencies to analyze which policies have been effective. The section may also include an analysis of current law enforcement tactics that help drive racial and identity disparities seen today such as license plate readers. Member Dobard touched on ALPR data capabilities, which has expanded well beyond reading license plates to processing things like bumper stickers, specialty tags and ride share logos. Given these expanded capabilities, the Policies Subcommittee is interested in investigating the potential of this technology to increase disparities in police actions. The Subcommittee would also like to explore the extent to which federal immigration enforcement authorities may have access to California's ALPR data, which

may raise concerns that federal immigration authorities may be using this to target communities of color.

In addition, Member Dobard explained that the Subcommittee is looking into “Kavanaugh stops.” The term comes from a Supreme Court decision that stayed a California District Court injunction against racial profiling in immigration stops while case is being litigated. As the Board knows, RIPA prohibits state and local law enforcement officers from considering race or ethnicity to any degree in deciding whether to make a stop or in deciding what actions to take following a stop. The Subcommittee asked DOJ staff to look into the risks of these stops and where California agencies are in joint task forces with federal law agencies. Member Dobard noted that SB 54 does not prohibit participation in joint task forces where immigration is not the primary purpose. The Subcommittee is interested in exploring the exposures and potential risks of profiling by state and local officers.

The Subcommittee is also interested in reviewing disparities in POST stop actions related to non-English fluency to build on last year’s language fluency section. The Subcommittee considered looking at stops where officers perceived individuals as having little to no English proficiency and examining the differences across racial and ethnic groups in terms of what actions an officer took, the outcome of the stop, and its duration. Member Dobard expressed concern regarding the Subcommittee’s bandwidth, but has not ruled anything out.

The future section may focus on the use of technology to try and reduce racial and identity profiling disparities. Member Dobard discussed the potential topic for exploration is the use of technology assisted body-worn camera (BWC) footage. He noted most BWC is not reviewed after a stop take place, but stated how new technology could transcribe BWC audio to detect and notify leadership of potential issues. This section may be used to identify and address potential instances of racial profiling trends or patterns of apparent racial bias and other conduct that leads to racial disparities in police actions.

Stop Data Analysis

Member Khadjavi reported that the Stop Data Analysis Subcommittee met on March 17, 2026. During the meeting, DOJ stated the public RIPA data dashboard is expected to be released later this year. The focus of the dashboard is to make data accessible and transparent to the public. DOJ staff notified the Subcommittee they would be happy to take any feedback. During the meeting, DOJ walked the Subcommittee through the CJIS 2000 data collection form and shared an overview of immigration enforcement related data. Member Khadjavi noted the challenge that federal agencies are not reporting to RIPA or online despite the Truth Act requiring regional reporting. The subcommittee discussed how other sources of data could provide context on state and local agency interaction with local immigration enforcement, including the use of “pass off” data.

During the meeting, the following proposed topics were discussed:

- Immigration enforcement related data, even if the analysis is limited;
- Transportation related topics such as differentiating between types of vehicle stops, or stops of vehicles with large numbers of people;
- Pedestrian stops, which include door knocks;
- Differentiation of calls for service versus officer initiated actions; and
- Longitudinal analysis to discuss RIPA data over time and whether those changes are connected to particular reforms policies or practices.

As to this last point, Member Khadjavi explained that the Subcommittee was interested in seeing whether there have been changes over time, and in particular, whether there is a connection to particular reforms, practices, or policies outcomes. As an example, Member Khadjavi noted that the Subcommittee could look at pretextual stops or the use of consent as a basis for search.

The Subcommittee has looked at these items in the past, but now the Board has many years of data, and can know what changes can be found in particular. For example, when it comes to traffic stops, there may be agencies moving towards less of a focus on equipment violations that do not impact public safety. As the Board is hitting the 10-year mark, it might also mean looking at data pre-COVID and post-COVID to look for changes, or it might be over a shorter number of years, where the Board has data from more agencies.

5. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND BOARD DISCUSSION

2027 Report Analysis Preview Presentation

Dr. Eric van Holm from DOJ's Research Services team gave a presentation to the Board on the 2027 stop data. Dr. van Holm stated the goal of the presentation is to describe what DOJ staff has heard the board request so that additional requests and alterations can be received. Dr. van Holm reported the 2025 data is not available yet, as the reporting date for LEAs to submit data is March 31st, and the data submitted is standardized before its turned over to Research Services for data analysis. However, Dr. van Holm explained that DOJ received data relating to 5,065,428 stops for 2025, and that DOJ is analyzing this data, in addition to the standard analyses DOJ completes every year, breaking down various stops by the demographics collected in RIPA.

Dr. van Holm explained that the purpose of the presentation was to give an overview of some of the discretionary analyses DOJ had selected to include in this year's report responsive to the Board's request.

1. Longitudinal Analysis

Dr. van Holm explained that, although not all agencies have been reporting for the full 10 years of reporting, enough time has passed to be able to see and analyze trends and conduct a longitudinal analysis, and that DOJ staff is currently reviewing statewide laws and local policies to identify potential notable efforts. He provided a model longitudinal analysis structure to look at various policies implemented and analyze trends over time for various outcomes of interest, such as disparities in stops actions taken. The primary goal of this analysis would be to see whether specific policies had an impact. Dr. van Holm noted that DOJ does not have data for all agencies to do this at a statewide level for all 500 agencies, and that many agencies have only been reporting for a few years. Because of this, DOJ was going to specifically be looking at Wave 1 and Wave two agencies, which gives DOJ enough time to identify significant trends.

2. Intersectional Work on English Fluency and Race

Dr. van Holm noted that past reports had separately analyzed the perceived English fluency and perceived race data elements. This year, the Board asked DOJ to analyze the impact perceived language fluency has on different perceived racial groups, and to see whether certain actions or outcomes occur at a higher or lower rate within perceived racial groups and are perceived to not speak English fluently, compared to those that are perceived to speak English fluently. Dr. van Holm noted that the RIPA data does not directly collect data on the immigration status of the individuals stopped. Dr. van Holm explained this analysis has been proposed to be conducted longitudinally, looking across years, in addition to the other longitudinal work to see whether there is a significant difference between the treatment of groups based on perceived language fluency between 2024 and 2025. Dr. van Holm noted that, given the changes in federal priorities, while federal policy should not have a direct effect on local LEAs, the question is whether there is anything in the climate that may have trickled down and changed the ways that LEAs were interacting with different communities. Some of the proposed data elements to be reviewed included removal from a vehicle, field sobriety test being conducted, curbside detention, psychiatric holds, handcuffing, firearm use, and search.

3. Transportation Stops

Dr. van Holm explained that the Board had been interested in analyzing differences in transportation stops due to people of color riding public transit at higher rates. The goal of this

analysis is to see whether there are any disparities in stops among racial ethnic groups. Dr. van Holm noted that there is no direct data element that captures whether a stop was a public transit stop, and the goal of the analysis is to identify those using a collection of different identified potential variables, such as the narrative location, the specific agency, and the type of infraction cited.

Dr. van Holm turned the presentation over to Dr. Daniel Harmon for an update regarding the RIPA Dashboard.

4. RIPA Dashboard Update

Dr. Harmon thanked and acknowledged the Office of Traffic Safety for funding the development of the RIPA data dashboard. He explained the goal is to present core stop data statistics as a foundation for the annual reports. DOJ intends to make all of the data from 2018-2024 explorable, visualizable, and examinable for the general public in a user-friendly way. Dr. Harmon previewed the initial page with all the main stop statistics, including the number of stops, whether the stop was a call for service, whether it was officer initiated, and then the actions during a stop, the reason for the stop, and the result of stop. He further explained the data may be filtered by year and agency and reported that race, gender, age, and housing status were the key demographics being analyzed, and could be filtered by year and by agency. Dr. Harmon explained that the dashboard would also allow users to take a deeper dive into particular data elements. For example, individuals using the dashboard could look at the result of stop within and between different categories; if an individual wanted to look at how the results of stop differ within individuals perceived to be Asian, they could use the dashboard to see the percentage of stops that resulted in an arrest for perceived Asian individuals. A person using the dashboard could also assess what that meant in the broader context of the whole population of California and could see that perceived Asian individuals end up in an arrest account for a little under one and a half percent of all stops. In this way, people using the dashboard can examine more closely what is happening within particular demographics, whether that be race, gender, disability, or others, and then contextualize that for all demographics within the whole population.

Dr. Harmon concluded his presentation and opened the floor for the Board to ask questions.

Member Alatorre inquired as to whether the dashboard would be limited to the categories showed, or if it will be broken down further to include the result of the stop and the duration. Dr. Harmon responded that the result of the stop is already included but noted there is no representation of stop duration.

Member Khadjavi thanked the DOJ team for their guidance and assistance. Member Khadjavi asked if newer data of vehicle, pedestrian, and cyclists could be included in future data sets. Member Khadjavi explained that historically, things like search rates sometimes are very different for pedestrians relative to cars, and sometimes they are much higher for pedestrians, so the dashboard may provide a different window or a better view to make that differentiation. Member Khadjavi noted that, in the past, it was more challenging to do that because it had to be done by looking at, for example, a particular violation code to assess whether something was a vehicle stop based on the violation code that was entered, and now it can be done directly. Dr. Harmon stated it is a possibility for future iterations of the dashboard.

Member Qazi asked Dr. van Holm whether DOJ had implemented the methodology of deriving data from other sources, such as narratives from police reports before in other RIPA reports. She further asked how that has worked and whether Dr. van Holm believes there will be a critical mass of data in a few months. Dr. van Holm clarified the narrative reports are not completely ideal, as officers generally have a 240 character limit for the narrative field. He stated that because police narratives are generally a very indirect reiteration of what the infraction is, a complete data set may not be completed, but may still serve as a way to identify many transit stops.

Member Randolph asked whether there would be a need to alter the data collection of law enforcement agencies in regard to the dashboard. He asked for confirmation that the dashboard can function with all the current data and for confirmation that there will not be a request for additional platforms, a concern many chiefs share. Dr. Harmon responded he cannot speak on requests for different platforms, but confirmed that the dashboard has been constructed to function on the data that has already been recorded.

Member Alatorre asked when this would go live and whether the dashboard was built as an in-house product. Dr. Harmon confirmed the research services branch is creating the dashboard themselves. The anticipated release date is mid-to-late Summer.

Member Randolph asked if the dashboard was fully funded by the Office of Traffic Safety or if there was another funding source in the state or anywhere else. Dr. Harmon responded it was partially funded by the Office of Traffic Safety through a grant. He stated he could not speak much to the economic side but that it was funded by programs at DOJ. Director Jans further clarified that partial funding was through Office of Traffic Safety and the remaining funds came from DOJ to create the dashboard.

Member Thuilliez asked if the research center had unfettered access to the data or if they were they given specific data sets to analyze in terms of the dashboard. Dr. Harmon stated the full RIPA data was used and confirmed it was not a subset of data. Thuilliez asked if anything was withheld. Dr. Harmon confirmed that nothing was withheld.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked Dr. van Holm and Dr. Harmon for their work on the dashboard and their presentations. Co-Chair Sierra asked DAG Simpson whether there were any additional updates. DAG Simpson confirmed those were the only updates from DOJ, and thanked the Board and Subcommittee members. DAG Simpson invited board members to ask any questions at any time.

Member Thuilliez asked whether there would be a time for the Board to discuss the reports drafts, and whether there would be an opportunity to ask specific questions about those drafts. Co-Chair Sierra confirmed that the Board would be coming back to that when the Board talks about the plans for the 2027 report, since a lot of what is discussed is also in those drafts.

6. BREAK

The Board adjourned for a ten-minute break, reconvening at approximately 1:17 p.m. Once quorum was re-established, DAG Simpson turned it over to Co-Chair Guerrero.

7. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2027 REPORT

Before discussion began, Co-Chair Guerrero thanked the DOJ team for the presentation.

Co-Chair Guerrero recapped what was discussed prior to the break. Each Subcommittee reported its potential work moving forward. The DOJ presented the work DOJ has been working on. Co-Chair Guerrero expressed that the Board will have the opportunity to reflect on the plan for the 2027 report.

Co-Chair Guerrero turned to the DOJ staff to add anything before opening the floor up for discussion. DAG Simpson thanked Co-Chair Guerrero and stated the DOJ is most interested in hearing any feedback or any additional areas of research or focus. DAG Simpson expressed it would be helpful to come to a consensus about what the theme of this year's report, so that DOJ can present the Board with a draft report that is most responsive to the Board's interests. Last year, the theme was public safety and its relationship with racial and identity profiling; the theme the year prior was youth interactions with law enforcement.

Member Forde stated he is unsure what the direct connection is between the federal policing enforcement versus local and state enforcement as it pertains to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Member Forde invited dialogue regarding how these agencies overlap. Member Forde expressed feeling that some of the lines of separation are being blurred between those relationships.

Co-Chair Guerrero responded this was something that came up in the committee reports. Under state law, local and state law enforcement agencies cannot participate in immigration enforcement; however, there is an exemption for joint task forces, allowing state and local law enforcement officers to engage in joint enforcement operations as long as immigration is not the primary focus. The Board has suggested it may be interested in investigating joint task forces to address the spillover effect concern or ways in which federal enforcement is pulling in local and state law enforcement. Co-Chair Guerrero stated she heard Member Forde's suggestion to sharpen what the intersection would look like in the report.

Member Forde asked if one could call the police when being threatened by ICE. Co-Chair Guerrero responded that they could do so, and referred to the Board's discussion in its October 9, 2025 meeting regarding a law enforcement officer's duty to intervene in ICE operations. Co-Chair Guerrero invited Member Forde and the public to view the October 9, 2025 full Board meeting. Several committees have suggested the Board sharpen the public's awareness, understanding, and analysis through the data RIPA collects.

Member Armaline stated that this would not be the current understanding of the public. Armaline also expressed the concern of cooperation at the jail level in terms of release. Armaline noted there have been multiple protests, and suggested to take as holistic an approach as possible. Co-Chair Guerrero stated it might be worthwhile to do a "level-set" with the public and that the information exists in many places. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that counties can do more than what state law allows, which has led to problems between the two.

Policy Framework and Future Planning

Co-Chair Guerrero welcomed suggestions on what a theme could be that runs through all of the sections.

Member Dobard suggested the past, present, and future theme he discussed in the report for the State and Local Racial and Identity Policies Subcommittee. He explained that the Subcommittee had discussed how this past, present, and future approach would help organize and look back to see what can be learned, what is going on now, and what should be happening. Member Dobard proposed this theme, and suggested different subcomponents to be added under each component, and expressed that this theme was consistent with a discussion that the Stop Data subcommittee had.

Member Qazi stated she recalled discussing the longitudinal study aspect at several meetings last year. Member Qazi seconded Member Dobard's comments that it is time to look at changes across the years. Another common thread was the impact of policing and immigration enforcement on our local communities. The Board had a special session where the Board agreed to focus on this threat in this year's report, and expressed her belief that this should be the bulk of this year's report. Member Qazi noted that issues surrounding language fluency ties in really well with the theme of the impact on those perceived to be a part of immigrant communities or of limited English proficiency. Member Qazi also stressed that, although this might not be borne out in the data, but she would like the Board to look at a gray area with how local law enforcement enables immigration enforcement. She explained that some of the work her organization does is centered around protesters and protest movements. Sometimes it is a planned protest, and sometimes it is a very organic thing where people show up when there's ICE enforcement activity, and then local law enforcement activity, and then local law enforcement is called out for crowd control and ends up using force, arresting people, or stopping and searching people who are stepping out as community members to protect their own. Member Qazi noted that there was an incident where ICE was in pursuit, and the Fullerton Police Department built a perimeter enabling ICE to go in and capture the individual. Member Qazi stated this ties very well with Member Forde's proposed theme and would like to discuss how the Board could explore this in a meaningful way that holds up the integrity of the report.

Co-Chair Guerrero recapped there is a proposal for a past, present, and future theme with the possibility of exploring the interplay of immigration enforcement with local and state law enforcement as the present analysis. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the ALPR new technology could be used as part of the future analysis.

Co-Chair Sierra stated the tenth RIPA Report is a good opportunity to reflect on this past, present, and future theme. A longitudinal study analyzing policy changes and recommendations would be of great benefit to law enforcement agencies and the public.

Member Randolph expressed his support for the past, present, and future theme. Member Randolph discussed the importance of discussing RIPA's progression and that racial disparities have declined over the past 10 years.

Co-Chair Guerrero expressed her support for the past, present, and future theme. Co-Chair Guerrero stated the reason for identifying and addressing racial and identity profiling is because people have the fundamental right to be free of searches and seizures without cause and such profiling. This theme ties into topics such as pretext stops, consent-only searches, and immigration enforcement. Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Randolph and reiterated the importance of analyzing progression and where there has been improvement as well as where there are gaps.

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor to Board members to discuss any further thoughts. Co-Chair Guerrero asked the Board if the past, present, and future theme resonates with the Board Members. Board members nodded and gave thumbs up through video call. Member Forde stated he believed the theme is a great idea because it gives validity and clarity to the current work being done and the work that needs to be done.

Hearing no further comments, Co-Chair Guerrero moved to the next agenda item.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Karen Glover thanked the Board for the work it has been doing. Karen Glover stated she is a sociologist, criminologist, and a professor at California State University San Marcos, and that she began attending RIPA meetings in 2017. Karen Glover expressed she felt compelled to state what had occurred the night before at the gubernatorial debate. Karen Glover recounted that one of the RIPA Board members stated that racial profiling was garbage. Ms. Glover stated this incident was published in the New York Times, and she pasted the direct quote into the meeting chat. Karen Glover expressed she found it discordant with the purpose of RIPA to have this member on the Board. Karen Glover thanked the Board.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Karen Glover for raising her concern and stated that the incident has come up in committee hearings. Co-Chair Guerrero notified the public that the seat Sheriff Bianco holds on the Board is an appointment from the sheriff. The seat is one of the seats that is held statutorily for the sheriff to determine.

Michelle Wittig stated the theme suggested is excellent for the 10 year anniversary of the Board. Ms. Wittig asked what evidence is present that law enforcement agencies in California are committed to reducing the racial and identity disparities that they are documenting. Ms. Wittig asked if there was a way to monitor the extent to which law enforcement agencies actually believe that there is a connection between the racial and identity disparities that they are showing exist in their agency are worthy of their effort to reduce by changes, for example, in pretext stop policies as seen in SF and LA police departments. Michelle Wittig stated she believes this matter is worth a couple of paragraphs in the 2027 report. Michelle Wittig thanked the Board.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited other public members to share their thoughts live, in the chat, or via email. Seeing no other members of the public wishing to express public comment, Co-Chair Guerrero then moved on to the next agenda item.

9. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON ACTION ITEMS

Co-Chair Guerrero stated there are no action items to vote on.

Co-Chair Sierra wanted to reflect on what was discussed during the Subcommittee report readouts. Co-Chair Sierra noted it seems there is a general consensus on the past, present, and future theme for the 2027 RIPA report. She stated her interpretation of the Subcommittee's reports fit well into the three aspects of this year's proposed theme.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated DOJ has been provided with guidance and input on an organized theme (past, present, and future). She expressed her hope that DOJ will work to place the topics that the Board had mentioned into a structure to analyze the data. Co-Chair Guerrero suggested an introductory section that discusses what has been procedurally put into place to serve as a preamble to the report.

Co-Chair Sierra noted that the outlines received will be discussed in Subcommittee meetings, but invited people who are not in those Subcommittees to reach out to DOJ via email with any reflections.

10. NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that DOJ will be helping the Board schedule Subcommittee meetings. She stated the past, present, and future structure will be implemented into the upcoming meetings.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted the month of April is when the Board receives data from 500 or so law enforcement agencies. She stated the DOJ will be using the data to put together the report within the structure the Board suggested.

Member Qazi took a moment to reflect on Member Bianco's statement and the role of the RIPA Board. Member Qazi stated she had not heard about the incident that occurred the night before. She has served on the Board for 2 years and emphasized the importance of RIPA having the common goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling, which she considered to be a prevalent issue. Member Qazi stated that hearing a comment like that from a fellow Board member, undermining RIPA's work, was very disturbing. She acknowledged nothing can be done as to his appointment but inquired as to whether a level of censorship can be imposed or whether the Board could issue a statement to clarify its goals and ensure the public that the members of the Board show up and serve to promote the goal of eliminating racial and identity profiling.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the issue has come up before regarding one or another Board member. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the Board has never gone beyond expressing dismay in their individual capacity but is open to receiving DOJ guidance on any mechanisms or options to consider.

Member Randolph stated he has feedback on the State and Local Policies Subcommittee report page 8 section C data collection and analytics report relating to the Values Act. He recapped that the Subcommittee discussed the Values Act and cooperation of law enforcement agencies and local law enforcement agencies with the federal government. Member Randolph shared that all law enforcement agencies must complete a Values Act form every year by law including any transfer documentation which will be shared with the DOJ through DOJBCIIS Form 5854-2 reporting for Values Act. Member Randolph noted he asked DOJ to look into it and DOJ reported that they could not get that information. Member Randolph believes this information should be included in the report and stated that every law enforcement agency in the state of California have to complete this form, therefore it is already at DOJ. Member Randolph asked if DOJ can put Supervising Deputy Attorney General Joel Marrero's follow up e-mail that DOJ cannot provide that information into the report.

Member Randolph noted that smaller law enforcement agencies subscribe to data collection services. He stated he supports Veritone, but expressed he does not think it is fair that Veritone is being identified in the report through DOJ because it shows RIPA is being biased.

Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed Member Randolph is referring to the Subcommittee report.

Member Qazi reiterated that she hoped DOJ can provide possible steps to take in response to Member Bianco's statement. Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Qazi and raised concerns regarding Member Bianco's long absence. Co-Chair Guerrero expressed that she was unsure how to approach the situation, but related that she believed the absence is notable and contributes to problems meeting quorum.

Member Armaline expressed his full support for Member Qazi's comments. He emphasized the importance of making a timely response to avoid appearing out of touch. Member Armaline confirmed there is no other sheriff representation on the Board now and expressed concerns that there is nobody to speak on their position on this Board.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated Board members may speak up now. She explained that the Board needed to gain a better understanding of what they can do as a body. Co-Chair Guerrero reminded the Board that under RIPA, there are specific seats held by the Sheriff's Association and Police Chief's Association. Co-Chair Guerrero invited DOJ staff to share any information they have now.

DAG Simpson thanked Co-Chair Guerrero and confirmed that the determination of who sits on the RIPA board is by appointment of a number of different agencies who are appointed by the state legislature. DAG Simpson noted the Board that DOJ can do research and provide a framework regarding the Board's capacity to take action in any capacity that the Board would like, with the understanding that the statute that has enacted RIPA controls the limits of what the Board is looking at as a state agency.

Co-Chair Guerrero welcomed Board members to use their platform now and speak on this issue. Co-Chair Guerrero offered to work alongside Co-Chair Sierra to work with DOJ to act on whatever available actions there are in the interest of time if the Board prefers a more immediate action, though she noted it is not ideal since the Board would not have time to discuss the options.

Member Forde expressed his belief that silence is always complicit. Member Forde stated he has not watched the gubernatorial debate but the statement itself could not be explained to be acceptable in any form. Member Forde expressed his strong belief that the moment necessitates a response, especially from RIPA who represents something so significant. He noted how Member Bianco being an officer of the law makes it a bit scarier.

Member Rall stated it is disheartening that a colleague is going against something that RIPA is actively working to try and fix and bring awareness to. She expressed the importance of bringing awareness to the situation and acting as fast as possible to avoid looking like RIPA shares Bianco's view.

Member Randolph expressed his gratitude to all Board members for taking the time to be part of this Board despite having other obligations. In regard to absences, Member Randolph stated he hopes that if there will be action taken against Member Bianco, that DOJ takes action all across the Board. He noted there are many members who have many absences, all of which are being tracked. Member Randolph noted that he knows and understands that people have to miss meetings, they have families, they have jobs, but he hoped DOJ would be looking at all Board members across the board. Co-Chair Guerrero noted there is no current precedent or policy on conduct or appearance. She expressed that it was possible that there is something can be developed, though there is currently no policy. Co-Chair Guerrero emphasized what the Board has now is a platform to speak their mind during today's meeting and invited members to speak now. She pointed out that it is election season, and noted the Board should be very thoughtful regarding how they proceed.

Member Forde stated that he understood there was no prescribed rule of conduct, but asked if there was not a presumption of conduct. He expressed concern for individuals who operate

directly contrary to the sentiment of the group. Member Forde asked if there had to be a pre-implemented policy. He stated that he feels a tension between somebody who is part of the Board, but operates as the antithesis to the values and goals of the Board.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated the Board always needs to be careful about the First Amendment and how that interplays with government bodies. She explained that a time, place, and manner restriction may be implemented under the First Amendment. Co-Chair Guerrero explained that there could be a possible policy or code of conduct that could outline what constitutes cause for someone to be excused.

Co-Chair Guerrero reminded the Board it is a tricky situation right now because there is an ongoing election and nothing in the statute that provides any time, place, and manner restrictions. Co-Chair Guerrero reiterated that there are no restrictions on any of the Board members to speak right now or outside of the meeting on the conduct of another that the Board does not agree with.

Co-Chair Sierra stated there are many alternatives on how to approach the situation. She stated RIPA is very engaged in its mission. Co-Chair Sierra seconded Co-Chair Guerrero's suggestion to have Co-Chairs work directly with DOJ.

Member Khadjavi stated Board members need to attend meetings in good faith. She values the different experiences and viewpoints while noting that all members took an oath.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked the Board members for expressing their concerns and stated she shares all of it. Co-Chair Guerrero reiterated the Board must be consistent in what they do as a body in regards to oath violations and absence policies. She invites the Board to suggest specific recommendations.

Member Qazi recommended that Co-Chairs look into the issue and reach out to the Sheriff's Association as the Board waits to hear back from the DOJ. Member Qazi stated she would like to empower Co-Chairs to take whatever steps they feel are appropriate and necessary to address the issue.

DAG Simpson noted that Member Randolph had left the meeting, and that the Board no longer had a quorum. However, DAG Simpson stated DOJ can take a look and explain to the Board its limits, scope, options, and capacity.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked the Board and stated Co-Chairs will assess authority with DOJ. Co-Chair Guerrero encouraged Board Members to feel free to reach out to the Sheriff's Association and speak up in public. She expressed her appreciation to Board members for speaking up in the meeting. Co-Chair Guerrero stated this particular Board member has been making these types of comments since inception and anticipates these types of comments will continue to be made. She reiterated DOJ will review and get back to the Board.

11. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked members of the public for their attendance and the DOJ for its support. She then adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.