CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD
https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/board

MEETING MINUTES

July 17, 2026, 9:03 a.m. – 12:26 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Angela Sierra and Andrea Guerrero; Members John Dobard, Chauncee Smith, Jordan Rall, Jose Alatorre, Lily Khadjavi, Ameena Qazi, Lawanda Hawkins, Manjusha Kulkarni, William Armaline, Rich Randolph, and Ronaldo Villeda.

Board Members Absent: Chad Bianco, Souley Diallo, Wade Forde, Sean Thuilliez, and DJ Criner,

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Sierra called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.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.

Board Members then introduced themselves.

Member Rall joined remotely from out of the country and stated she was not able to turn on her camera because others nearby were sleeping. Member Hawkins reported technical difficulties. Member Armaline joined after the initial introductions and introduced himself before the minutes vote.

3. APPROVAL OF APRIL 23, 2026, FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Sierra invited review of the April 23, 2026, full Board meeting minutes. Member Armaline moved to approve the minutes as presented, and Member Khadjavi seconded.

DOJ Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners conducted a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Alatorre, Armaline, Dobard, Guerrero, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Sierra, Smith
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** None

The meeting minutes were approved unanimously, with 12 ayes, no nays, and no abstentions

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND BOARD DISCUSSION

DAG Marisol León first notified the Racial Identity Profiling Board (RIPA Board) of Board Member Kulkarni's departure. She stated that Attorney Manju Kulkarni was appointed to the RIPA Board in 2021 by former California Speaker of the Assembly Anthony Rendon. Additionally, León stated that Member Kulkarni serves as the Executive Director of the AAPI Equity Alliance, a coalition representing more than 40 community-based organizations, representing the approximately 1.6 million Asian American and Pacific Islander residents of Los Angeles County. Further León informed the Board that Member Kulkarni is also a founder of Stop AAPI Hate, the nation's leading initiative for tracking and responding to Asian hate incidents. Prior to leading the AAPI Equity Alliance, Member Kulkarni served as the Executive Director of the South Asian Network and as a Senior Attorney at the National Health Law Program where she focused on access to health care for Asian American communities.

León noted that during her time on the RIPA Board, Member Kulkarni served as the Policies Co-Chair, as the POST Co-Chair, and on the former Calls for Service Subcommittee. Kulkarni contributed to the 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027 RIPA reports.

León thanked Member Kulkarni for her valuable contributions to the RIPA Board.

León then reminded the RIPA Board that on April 23, 2026, it expressed a desire to discuss whether the Board could remove or censure any of its members. She explained that when it comes to appointed bodies, such as the RIPA Board, as opposed to elected bodies, any power to censure or remove members must be articulated in the statutes governing the appointed body. Further, neither California Assembly Bill 953 (AB 953), which established the RIPA Board, nor its implementing statute, Penal Code section 13519.4, contained mechanisms for the removal or censure of a RIPA board member. Further she stated, that as such, the RIPA Board has no explicit statutory authority to take these actions against a board member. There are also constitutional concerns based on the RIPA Board censoring a member who is speaking in their individual capacity and not on behalf of the Board. In general, the RIPA-appointing entity may remove its appointee if it chooses, unless restricted by statute. Thus, when Board members are concerned about the statements or conduct of another Board member, Board members can contact the appointing entity of that board member. However, León noted that when contacting appointing entities Board members should do so in their individual capacity and not on behalf of the Board.

Co-Chair Sierra asked León if there would be an opportunity at the end to ask questions about censure or removal. León responded yes.

León then turned it over to Research Services for an update.

2027 Report Analysis Preview Presentation

Dr. Eric Van Holm introduced himself as the principal researcher on the RIPA portfolio of Research Services (RS) at the DOJ. He explained that the theme of the 2027 RIPA Report is "Past, Present and Future of RIPA," and that RS is looking at the years of data it has collected as part of the RIPA mandate. Van Holm noted that his presentation would focus on some longitudinal trends from the Stop Data section of the RIPA Report, and that he would also preview results from the Policy section of the Report and the effects of race and language fluency on stop actions and outcomes. Van Holm stated he would end with an overview of RS's analysis of data in the Civilian Complaint section and noted that his presentation would not encompass all data analyses that will be found in the 2027 RIPA Report. He explained that his presentation was meant to facilitate questions and make sure that the RIPA Board understands the direction that RS is going in, so that the RIPA Board can provide RS with suggestions and RS can make adjustments as necessary before the final 2027 Report is completed.

Van Holm first provided an overview of 2025 RIPA data. He explained that in 2025, RS received nearly five and a half million stops reported by 535 agencies, and these are both an increase from 2024 where RS received about just over 5 million stops and had 533 agencies report. Before discussing RS data analyses across multiple years, Van Holm showed the RIPA Board a 2025 RIPA data initial graph on a slide, with the racial breakdown of stops in blue paired against the statewide racial percentage in orange. He explained that in this 2025 graph, the blue bar rises higher than the orange, illustrating the share of stops for that group exceed their share in the State. He explained that as shown in the slide, Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Pacific Islander, and Middle Eastern/South Asian, are all stopped at a rate that exceeds what would be expected based on the State's racial demographics alone.

Conversely, Van Holm explained, Asian, multiracial, and white individuals are stopped somewhat less than would be predicted. He provided a disclaimer, noting that all of the data is perception data; the race and all other demographics are assigned by officer perception and so RS can say that 43.21% of stops were of individuals that the officer perceived as being Hispanic/Latinx. He noted that for this reason, RS cannot know for certain what the correct percentage is based on the individual's self-perception.

Van Holm then transitioned to RIPA data that RS has collected from 2022 to 2025, which is the period that all agencies have been reporting data. He explained that RS has collected data for

longer, but those are the four years that RS has data for all agencies across the state, in terms of demographics across categories. He explained that there are not large swings in who is being stopped and that creates difficulties for displaying different groups like races, because when zoomed out onto one graph, those groups that are stopped less frequently in the state get very much bunched together at the bottom and it is hard to distinguish them. He noted that for this reason, RS split the graph in two on the new slide he shared to try to show more detail. He explained that on the left, RS shows the three largest groups: Hispanic/Latinx, White, and Black, and the steady percentage of stops that occur for each of those groups. Van Holm noted that on the right, the graph only goes from zero to 10% (so it's a bit exaggerated) in order to show more detail for these less common groups. He noted that we see there is a small fraction of a percent change for Asian and Middle Eastern/South Asian over time, and that has been a steady increase, but overall, it has been very steady in terms of who is being stopped based on race.

Van Holm then noted that RS also collects similar data broken down by gender. He stated that cisgender individuals are consistently a higher percentage of stops across all four years with very little change. Referring to a new slide, he explained that the graph on the right has a Y axis that only goes from zero to one and so while changes might seem large, that is exaggerated in order to show detail and so the RIPA Board can see how infrequently the officer perceives an individual as nonbinary or transgender. In the data collected, RS sees some fluctuation in all three groups and an increase after 2023. Van Holm noted that these are, again, just a fraction of a percentage and do not represent large swings as to who is being stopped.

Van Holm then presented on language fluency with a new slide and indicated that the left chart is the percentage of stops for those who are English fluent. He reminded the RIPA Board that the data was broken into two graphs in order to see the detail in change. He noted that the left chart ran from 90 to 100 and illustrated a small decrease in the stops of those perceived to be English fluent. On the right, we see the inverse—that there was a small increase in those limited or lacking English fluency, though the change on either side is roughly 2 to 3%. Van Holm explained that it is a small change, but there was some uptick in the percentage of stops of those limited English proficient or lacking English fluency.

He explained that in this final set of demographics, RS illustrated stops of those perceived as having a disability and those perceived as being LGBT. He noted that for disability, there was a decrease from 2022 to 2025 of roughly half a percentage point, and the Y axis on both graphs run from zero to 1.5%. Van Holm explained it is a relatively small range, but RS illustrated on the right graphic that there are small fluctuations year to year as a percentage of stops for someone perceived to be LGBT. He noted the percentage is virtually unchanged from 2025 to 2022, but small fluctuations exist from year to year.

Van Holm then transitioned from presenting demographics of those stopped, to actions or outcomes of these stops. Due to time constraints, Van Holm focused on outcomes of stops based on race. RS provided collected data on the average number of actions taken across all stops from 2022 to 2025 for each race and observed small changes across different races. While Native Americans had the highest number of actions in 2022, they are second to Black individuals stopped in 2025. He stated that in general, as far as the number of actions, RS found only small changes in terms of the relative rank of racial groups. He noted that across all races though, we do see a consistent but small decrease in the average number of actions across those years. He pointed out that one of the larger changes in data was for Native Americans, since the average number of actions decreased by nearly .2 across those four years; he noted RS saw small declines across the board.

Van Holm next shifted to outcomes of stops, first looking at arrests. RS data illustrated that similarly, across racial groups, there appears to have been a decline in the percentage of stops resulting in arrests for each racial group. Referring to a new slide, he pointed out that how large those shifts are differed by race, with Native Americans declining by over 5 percentage points. He noted that the relative rank of all races remains fairly consistent across those four years, even

with the generalized downward shift. He noted that while stops are generally ending in an arrest less frequently since 2022, we see an increase in the percentage of stops resulting in warnings for all racial groups in 2025. He stated that Black individuals saw an increase of nearly five percentage points for stops resulting in a warning over that time period, and that the lines get very crowded [in the graph] in the middle, but that Middle Eastern/South Asian and Asian are consistently lower than all other groups in terms of stops resulting in warnings. For this set of analysis, RS looked at the percentage of stops resulting in a citation, and the percentage of stops resulting warnings increased across the four years for all groups. He noted that Middle Eastern/South Asian and Asians were one and two in all four years with an increase of roughly five percentage points for each of those groups.

Van Holm explained his presentation entailed just a brief preview of what the 2027 RIPA Report will contain. He explained that the Stop Data section will have additional analysis and RS will run the same annual demographics that folks would expect every report to have. He noted that in addition to some of this longitudinal data used to observe how things have changed over the four-year time period, there will also be an analysis of how public transit stops differ from other stops and an update on collaboration with federal agencies as identified in the RIPA data.

Van Holm then transitioned to presenting data that will be found in the Policy section of the Report. He explained that one set of analysis concerns the interaction of race and English fluency. He noted that the Board was interested in understanding whether language fluency and race compound each other, and that in the past, the Board has looked at race and language as two separate factors in a stop. This year, RS analyzed data among minority groups to see whether the differences in stops and actions/outcomes of stops are greater for those perceived as being limited in English fluency. He added that the Board sought to understand if minority groups that tend to have more unequal treatment in RS stop data show larger percentage differences when language is a factor.

Van Holm pointed out that this analysis can be considered something of a proxy for analyzing stops based on citizenship status, since some immigrants do not arrive to the United States with English fluency. Given the changes in the political landscape during the last few years, the RIPA Board was interested in understanding whether these differences may have grown over time. RS looked at a number of actions and outcomes which were listed in the slides to comprehensively look at stops from beginning to end. Van Holm noted that as a preliminary list to look at, RS analyzed whether the person was removed by vehicle by order, whether they were removed by physical contact, whether a field sobriety test was conducted, whether there was curbside detention, whether there was a psychiatric hold, whether handcuffing occurred or a firearm was pointed, whether officers asked for consent to search property, whether a search occurred, and whether contraband was found.

Van Holm explained that while RS looked at most racial groups in this analysis, RS did exclude Native American and Pacific Islanders and that is because non-English speaking groups of both are quite small, which also relates to their overall size in the population and the related RIPA data collected. Further, he noted that if RS had included that data, the RIPA Board would be tasked with estimating differences with very few instances of non-English fluency. Van Holm used Native Americans as an example, noting they only comprise 15,000 stops in the RIPA data, and in a slide, he illustrated that about 3% of those stops were stops where the officer's perception was that the Native American individuals lacked English fluency. He also noted that with some of these actions, RS found a very small bundle where there were less than 10 stops featuring a certain action, making it very difficult to estimate accurate differences based on such small samples. Given that reality and for statistical purposes, in order to make meaningful inferences from the collected data from 2022-2025, RS decided to exclude Native American and Pacific Islander because the results would not be reliable. However, Van Holm emphasized that those groups are represented in data analysis everywhere else in the 2027 RIPA Report.

Van Holm then explained using another slide that before the RIPA Board looks at how these issues impact actions and outcomes, RS looked at the percentage of each racial group that was perceived as lacking English fluency and that Hispanic/Latinx individuals were the only group that had more than 10% of stops at 10.43 based on the perception of limited English fluency, followed by Asian individuals at 8.52 percent. He also noted that Black individuals are the least likely to be perceived as lacking English fluency, with only 1.3 percent of stops, followed by White individuals at 1.94 percent of stops.

Van Holm explained that with all groups, the vast majority are perceived to be English fluent, and in some groups, RS was looking at a really small minority of stops featuring individuals who lacked English fluency. He noted that as he mentioned earlier, there is a really long list of variables RS looked at. He noted that RS completed the preliminary analysis and they wanted to share just one set of analysis today to illustrate what will go into the 2027 RIPA Report. He explained that today, as a sample, RS will discuss the percentage of individuals removed from a vehicle based on their race and perceived lack of English fluency.

He noted that RS can hypothesize that when a verbal order is given, the officer may have concerns about how easily it is understood based on their perception of the individual's English fluency. In effect, there may be differences in how often an individual is removed by a vehicle after a verbal order is given based on perception of English fluency and their race. He explained that the data is broken down by racial group, and so for the chart on the slide shown, the left bar for each race group displays the percentage of where that action occurred and whether they were English fluent, and the right bar is for those with limited or no English fluency. Van Holm then noted that with Asian individuals, RS saw that in .97% of stops, those perceived with English fluency were ordered out of their car while in 1.32% of stops Asian individuals who lacked English fluency were ordered out of their car, showing a higher rate for those lacking English fluency. He noted that Black individuals had a larger gap with those that were English fluent having two percentage points more stops, and that that was the opposite trend for Asian individuals in terms of how language impacts the difference in stops. For Hispanic/Latinx individuals, RS saw that in 3.27% of stops those perceived with English fluency were ordered out of their car, while in 4.6% of stops for those lacking English fluency were ordered out of their car. He noted that represents a roughly 1.5 percentage point gap based on perception of English fluency.

Van Holm also noted that the RIPA Board can look across this analysis and see some trends. For Asian, Hispanic/Latinx, and Middle Eastern/South Asian individuals, we see higher rates of removal for those lacking English fluency and the opposite trend for the other groups. He further noted those are also the groups that had the highest percentage of individuals who were perceived as lacking English fluency. He noted that RS is still looking at these results and trying to identify everything that it can learn from the data and stated that there will be many more actions and outcomes analyzed in the 2027 RIPA Report.

Van Holm then explained that the RIPA Board was interested in seeing how these things have changed over time and shared a slide where the Board can observe the longitudinal change for one racial group. He explained that to breakdown this data for all six groups, RS would have to take more time than it was allotted for this presentation. However, he noted that RS would preview what it has observed for Hispanic/Latinx individuals to provide one example. Van Holm reminded the RIPA Board that in the former slide, the Hispanic/Latinx category had one of the highest rates of being removed from vehicle after a verbal order, and we can see that such orders have decreased since 2022 for the group regardless of English fluency. While Hispanic/Latinx individuals with limited or no English fluency were removed from vehicles 1.36% more frequently than Hispanic/Latinx individuals with English fluency in 2022, there was a 1.36 percentage gap between those two groups in 2022. That difference had shrunk to 1.32% in 2025. The change in how often the action occurred over the four-year period was a larger change in terms of a downward shift than sort of the change in how much language fluency impacted those orders being given. Van Holm explained that RS will continue to analyze these results and try to

understand whether English language fluency has an additive impact on stops beyond an individual's race.

Van Holm noted that this concluded the part of RS's presentation on data analysis that will be found in the Policy section of the 2027 RIPA Report. He noted that RS planned on doing an interrupted time series analysis on a few policies that have specifically been enacted. Specifically, RS will be analyzing two local efforts around pretextual stops from Los Angeles and San Francisco, and that is an update on an analysis RS did in last year's RIPA report. Lastly, this year, RS be adding a statewide effort, AB 392, which changed the standard of use around deadly force. RS plans to analyze how that affected use force in the years since AB 392 was passed.

Van Holm then directed the RIPA Board to the Complaints section of the 2027 RIPA Report, where RS began with an overview of the complaints received in 2025 that alleged racial or identity profiling. He explained using a new slide, that these stops are categorized into what identity type the complaint concerns, and RS observed that the vast majority of complaints dealing with identity were related to race and ethnicity, at nearly 1600 complaints. The next largest category was gender complaints at 136. However, Van Holm noted that these identity-related complaints are generally not sustained. Referring to the current slide, he stated that by looking first at the complaints on the left (which included complaints alleging racial or identity profiling) RS saw that over half of those complaints resulted in being unfounded, and 24 percent saw the accused exonerated; only 9% of these complaints were sustained. Looking more specifically at those complaints alleging racial or identity profiling, RS found an even more stark outcome: In 2025, only 14 complaints were sustained while 84% were unfounded. Van Holm noted these are specifically complaints alleging racial and identity profiling. He noted that these dispositions are on complaints decided through 2025 though, so some 2025 complaints are still being investigated. However, Van Holm explained that these trends generally stay consistent over years. He further explained that as a final analysis, RS analyzed the number of complaints filed since 2016 and observed a sharp increase in non-identity profiling after 2022—after years of few changes. For identity complaints specifically, RS observed a slow increase in a one-time jump in 2024, but otherwise the data showed a consistent slow increase.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Stop Data Analysis

Member Khadjavi reported that the Stop Data Subcommittee had their second Subcommittee meeting on Thursday, July 9. She stated that the Subcommittee received an initial analysis of the 2025 Stop Data from DOJ Research Services and that the Subcommittee reviewed that initial draft. She noted that in the draft 2027 Stop Data RIPA Report Chapter, there are new sections on public transportation stops and immigration-related stop information to the extent that that information is available. She stated that there were over 5 and a half million stops made in 2025 with over 500 agencies reporting in, an 8% increase in the number of stops that were reported in the previous year. She explained that in general, this section of the report will provide an overview of the 2025 stop data, the trends in number of stops, key stop characteristics like what initiates a stop or the mode of transportation, the reason for a stop, and then the demographic analysis. Member Khadjavi emphasized that the RIPA Board's demographic analysis is always based on officer perception as opposed to how an individual may actually identify. She shared that the Subcommittee is really interested in focusing on the actions of officers relative to their perception, so perceived identity is exactly what they want to be focusing on.

During the July 9 Stop Data Subcommittee meeting, the Subcommittee discussed the fact that this year's draft will include expanded analysis on immigration enforcement, public transportation stops, and also mode of travel, which reflect issues previously identified by the Subcommittee and the RIPA Board. The Subcommittee also discussed ways to strengthen the 2027 RIPA Report, including, for example, searches and discoveries during public transportation stops and also the role of fare enforcement. This is an area where the Subcommittee can look to

research that has been done in other municipalities about the impacts of fare enforcement activities, who those are centered on, and what the impact is on communities.

Member Khadjavi then inquired when the Subcommittees or RIPA Board might get a timeframe for when the DOJ Stop Data Dashboard will be completed. Van Holm responded that RS is hoping to have it completed in the next few weeks and then it will go through review processes but the RIPA Board will have a demonstration of the Dashboard sometime in the next couple of months.

Member Khadjavi then explained that the Stop Data section will be responsive to the Board's interest in understanding how transit stops may be different from, for example, pedestrian stops. She stated that we all know immigration enforcement activities have changed in 2025 relative to previous years and that is a huge cause for concern. The Subcommittee has requested more information on joint task force activity and so in a later iteration of the draft we could see more about that. She explained that relative to the recent draft, the Subcommittee discussed adding information to include for the final draft. In particular, for example, the Subcommittee would like to include analysis on the intersection between parole inquiries and the use of consent searches; intersections between search or relatively looking at the relationship between search justification and outcomes; and also race, age, and use of force. She explained that this is looking more at the intersections between these rather than just reporting out for a given criteria what the number of actions were. Member Khadjavi also noted that there has also been interest in differentiating officer-initiated stops from calls for service with the goal of teasing out which stops are more discretionary on the part of officers. She noted that the Subcommittee will also discuss suggestions for possible improvements to the presentation of information presented throughout the report. Lastly, she noted the Subcommittee received a Dashboard update, which the entire RIPA Board now had as well.

Accountability and Civilian Complaints

Member Smith reported that the Accountability and Civilian Complaints Subcommittee meeting was held on June 23, 2026. He noted that Member Hawkins stepped down from her position as Co-Chair but will continue to serve as a member of the subcommittee moving forward. The Subcommittee then elected him as Co-Chair, and DOJ staff then presented an update on the draft Accountability and Civilian Complaints chapters of the 2027 RIPA Report.

Smith noted that as in past years, the Civilian Complaints chapter of the 2027 RIPA report includes an analysis of 2025 civilian complaint data reported by California LEAs, including an overview of the aggregate complaint data reported in 2025, the disposition or outcome of those complaints, and a cross-year comparison by agency. Notably, this year's Civilian Complaints chapter also includes a comparison of the rate of all sustained complaints in 2024 and 2025, and a comparison of sustained racial identity profiling complaints in those two years. Smith noted that the draft shows that in 2025, a total of 169 RIPA agencies reported receiving civilian complaints alleging racial or identity profiling, constituting 32.44% of all RIPA agencies or 40.43% of agencies receiving any complaints. Smith explained that these figures represent a slight decrease in the number of agencies reporting racial or identity profiling complaints compared to 2024, where 173 agencies reported receiving a complaint of racial identity profiling. Smith noted that those agencies who did receive such complaints reported that 2,103 of them alleged racial identity profiling, constituting 12.91% of the complaints reported in 2025. This also represented a decrease relative to 2024, where agencies reported receiving 2,282 profiling complaints that year, constituting 17.55% of the total complaints received in 2024.

Member Smith then explained that the Civilian Complaints chapter also includes a chart comparing the dispositions of all complaints and racial identity profiling complaints from 2016 to 2025, as well as an analysis of sustained complaints from 2016 to 2025, and that chart is found on pages four to six of the draft. He stated that the remainder of the Civilian Complaints chapter focuses on LEAs' internal complaint and investigation procedures, including an overview of the current practices used by California's 15 largest LEAs to investigate complaints. He added that

there was discussion of general principles for complaint investigations and best practices for conducting internal investigations into racial identity profiling complaints, including setting criteria for determining whether bias, influence and officer's conduct, best practices for conducting interviews, and the proper documentation of investigations and effective disposition and resolution of complaints. Smith also noted that the Civilian Complaints chapter includes recommendations for further research into best practices for internal investigations of complaints alleging racial identity profiling and into possible deficiencies in California LEAs' complaint investigation procedures that may be contributing to low sustained rates for racial identity profiling complaints.

Smith then explained that in the Accountability chapter, this year's report explores the role of internal auditing procedures for LEAs as applied to complaint investigations, especially for complaints alleging racial identity bias. The chapter focuses on factors that are correlated with effective internal auditing and is broken up into five main sections, including the following: (1) A discussion of internal audits and their impact, (2) an overview of best practices for auditing the investigations into racial identity profiling complaints, (3) a landscape review of existing auditing practices and procedures, (4) a look at the 15 largest law enforcement agencies in the state, including whether those agencies have an internal audit unit and whether that unit evaluates the investigations into racial identity profiling complaints, and (5) potential Board recommendations related to internal audits of the investigations into profiling complaints.

Smith explained that many of the standards identified in this chapter come from the Institute of Global Internal Audit Standards, which is used globally in the public and private sector, and from the Government Auditing Standards, which is issued by the Controller General of the United States. He stated that although both of these standards are not specific to law enforcement, their principles are discussed and broadly applied to this context. He explained that the Accountability chapter identifies seven best practices for internal auditing of profiling complaint investigations, and they are the following: (1) Independence, or freedom from pressure that could compromise impartial judgment, (2) objectivity or the impartiality and fairness with which auditors perform their duties, (3) clear organizational structure, including the creation of a formal audit charter, a clear reporting line and express authority and autonomy to access all relevant information and autonomy to report on its findings, (4) top management support is vital for internal auditing effectiveness, (5) a code of ethics and maintain objectivity and independence in their professional framework for auditors behavior, (6) related data systems trend analysis and early intervention to remain effective in the modern age and last, (7) ongoing professional development helps auditors stay up to date with industry standards, regulatory changes, and emerging risks.

Smith also noted that DOJ's initial review indicates that only 5 out of the 15 largest LEAs in California have some form of an internal audit unit, suggesting that there may be a need for the RIPA Board to issue recommendations related to internal auditing of complaints and especially for profiling complaints. He noted that some potential recommendations presented in the Accountability chapter include: (1) The agencies conduct regular systematic audits of their responses to individual civilian complaints and use the data and information they receive from these audits to improve their complaint procedures overall, (2) Law enforcement agencies should also augment their existing audit procedures or ensure that those to ensure that those audits utilize integrity testing, are independently reviewed and are data-driven to address the low rate of sustained complaints, and last, (3) academic and professional communities should conduct deeper research empirically to identify exactly what constitutes an effective internal auditing framework in the law enforcement context.

Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Training and Recruitment

Member Kulkarni reported that the POST Training and Recruitment Subcommittee met on June 10, 2026. Before addressing Subcommittee matters, she thanked the POST subcommittee members who attended the meeting and POST. She noted that today is her last meeting with the

RIPA Board and said it has been a real honor and privilege to serve on the RIPA Board for the past five years. She expressed gratitude for Board insights and expertise, as well as the lived experiences that Members bring to the work of the Board. She also expressed appreciation for Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra and also to her POST Subcommittee Co-Chair Villeda, for their thoughtful leadership. Kulkarni also thanked DOJ staff and consultants for their tireless dedication. She noted that she had the opportunity through the POST subcommittee to work most closely with DOJ staff members Manner, Simpson, León, and Martin-Walton, and noted how dedicated they have been and expressed her appreciation.

Kulkarni then noted that in terms of the POST chapter of this year's RIPA report, the primary focus of the draft is on the review of the POST Field Training Program, or FTP for short, and the RIPA Course Guidelines. This year's report is broken down into five primary sections that include 1) the introduction, 2) an overview of the Subcommittee's work over the past 10 years, 3) the FTP review and related recommendations, 4) the AB953 Course Guidelines review and related recommendations, and 5) the vision for future reports.

She noted that POST chapters in the past have focused on the RIPA Board's reviews of individual courses and related recommendations to POST. This year's POST chapter identifies several common themes and repeated recommendations the RIPA Board has made to POST across its review of POST-certified courses. Kulkarni explained that in addition to these recurring recommendations, the chapter examines patterns that have persisted over the past decade and considers implications for ongoing implementation, oversight, and future policy development.

Kulkarni then noted that the RIPA Board has made recommendations to POST relating to the following areas: training and curriculum content to ensure that POST training is evidence-based, research-driven and embedded across all relevant courses and accountability and officer responsibility, making sure that training translates into clear expectations, reporting obligations, and enforcement consequences for biased behavior. She explained that the goal is measuring the effectiveness of training outcomes so that POST moves beyond checklists and satisfaction surveys to more meaningful performance-based evaluation systems. She also noted the importance of increasing community engagement and transparency so that POST trainings are more transparent and inclusive of community voices.

She noted that in addition to recommendations made directly to POST, the Board has made many recommendations to the Legislature. She explained that in terms of the Field Training Program, the Subcommittee is currently in its second year of a two-year review of the Field Training program and the AB 953 RIPA Course Guidelines. She stated that the Board's review of the FTP is limited to Section 6, "*Community Relations/Professional Demeanor*," which POST identified as the most directly related of its 18 core field training competencies to issues of racial and identity profiling, community engagement, professionalism, cultural awareness, and procedural fairness.

Kulkarni stated that for the Board's reference, a summary of the Subcommittee and Consultants' review and assessment can be found in greater detail in pages 6 through 21 of the draft. She also noted that a few key observations include: adding community interaction and legitimacy within the current evaluation structure; more explicit guidance and evaluation criteria related to fair and equitable policing; direct discussion of racial and identity profiling, including practical examples and accountability measures; greater emphasis on procedural justice and respectful treatment; broader discussions of culture and history in Section 6; better alignment between Academy instruction and field training; and integrating RIPA requirements more fully into POST trainings. She explained that at the POST Subcommittee meeting, they spent considerable time discussing Section 6 review questions and POST's initial written responses to those questions. Subcommittee members agreed that FTP remains a valuable framework for training and evaluating new officers, but that it can be strengthened to better align with Penal Code section 13519.4 and contemporary evidence-based policing practices. She also said that the

Subcommittee plans to engage with the consultants and POST about the FTP during their next subcommittee meeting in September.

In terms of the Subcommittee's AB 953 Course Guidelines Review, Kulkarni noted that the Subcommittee's review focuses on four main documents. These consist of 1) Penal Code section 13519.4, 2) a POST Commission report on the RIPA Course Guidelines, 3) the updated POST RIPA course guidelines, and 4) the POST Commission Bulletin on the approval of the RIPA Course Guidelines. She explained that in terms of next steps, the Subcommittee is currently working on providing brief written feedback and recommendations and they will be discussing them during the next Subcommittee meeting in September.

Kulkarni then reported on the vision for the future and next steps. She noted that the Subcommittee hoped that POST will continue to assist the Board in understanding Commission processes, procedures for RIPA-related trainings and its standards, guidelines, and course certifications. She expressed hope that through these continued combined efforts with POST, the Board can address the Legislature's concerns surrounding RIPA and identity profiling and that the Subcommittee will be looking at how we can reach LEAs that are not POST member organizations. She noted it would be helpful to the Board's work to get a better understanding of the number of entities that do not go through POST's FTP and what those training programs look like.

Member Quazi inquired whether there will be discussion or updates on SB 2 and the decertification process in this year's POST Chapter of the RIPA Report. Co-Chair Sierra responded to Member Quazi's question on SB 2 by stating that she believed the Board has covered it in the past in the Accountability and Civilian Complaints chapters.

State and Local Racial and Identity Policies

Member Dobard reported that the most recent Policies Subcommittee meeting was on June 9, 2026, and during that meeting, the Subcommittee discussed the draft Policies section of the 2027 report, which is also oriented within the past, present, and future framework. He explained that the Subcommittee focused on four topics. First, they discussed the topic of past board recommendations. He explained that during the meeting, Research Services reported on reforms related to when the San Francisco PD and LAPD will make vehicle stops, as well as a changes to the state law standard for when deadly force may be used. Dobard noted the Subcommittee's desire to point out in the report where reforms being studied deviate from reforms recommended by the board. Specifically, the board is recommending an end to pretextual stops. He noted that the SFPD and LAPD reforms move in that direction but stop short of ending all pretextual stops.

Second, the Policies Subcommittee discussed the topic of "Kavanaugh stops" and how California law protects individuals from racial and identity profiling. Dobard noted that this section of the draft looks at racially driven immigration enforcement practices by federal officers and how, for the time being, the Supreme Court essentially has allowed such practices to continue in Los Angeles, where they had been temporarily blocked by a federal judge. He expressed that the section explains that California law protects individuals from racial and identity profiling by state and local officers, and that California law restricts state and local officers from cooperating with immigration enforcement, subject to certain exceptions.

Dobard noted that the Policies chapter also explains that California's prohibition against racial profiling extends to state and local officers working on joint task forces with non-California law enforcement agencies. He explained that the Subcommittee discussion in this area focused on concerns about participation and joint task forces, which have recently seen a steady increase in immigration enforcement arrests. Subcommittee members asked DOJ to try to provide additional context that might give insight into whether state or local officers are being impermissibly drawn into immigration enforcement and racial profiling through their participation in those task forces. During the Policies Subcommittee meeting, members also raised a question about whether

California LEAs participating in joint task forces might share data from automated license plate reader cameras or other cameras with their task force partners.

Dobard explained that the third topic discussed by the Subcommittee was a data analysis of the effect of being perceived as not speaking fluent English, and more specifically, does being perceived as not speaking fluent English have a disparate adverse impact on certain racial or identity groups as compared to others? Dobard noted DOJ used the example of removal from a vehicle to demonstrate the type of analysis that will be conducted. He noted that the Subcommittee expressed concern about drawing inappropriate conclusions based on a single data point, and DOJ explained that the analysis will examine 10 different actions and outcomes associated with a stop. Dobard stated that to provide a comprehensive understanding of the stop, the Subcommittee also asked DOJ to include an overview of policies and trainings that exist, if any, related to individuals with limited English proficiency, including any POST trainings.

Lastly, Dobard explained that the Subcommittee discussed the topic of technologies in the future, and this section of the draft looks at automated license plate reader technology, assisted body worn camera footage review, and tools for individual agencies to analyze and report on their RIPA stop data. He noted that license plate reader technology is looked at through the lens of its potential to contribute to racial profiling and disparities, and that the other two technologies are looked at through the lens of their potential to help reduce profiling and disparities. Dobard stated that one of the suggestions in the section is that police body worn camera footage might be made more broadly available to the public and researchers for study using technological tools. He indicated that Subcommittee members focused on the privacy concerns and asked for the discussion about potential privacy protections to be expanded.

Dobard then stated that the draft report includes nine potential policy recommendations, and that the Subcommittee is awaiting further development of the Policies chapter before endorsing these recommendations. Additionally, the Subcommittee is evaluating whether the Board could make a policy recommendation related to California LEAs' participation in joint task forces. He noted that the information needed to explore this may not be reasonably available and that the Subcommittee will continue to provide feedback on the draft during its next meeting in September.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Tarek Shah, a member of the public, thanked everyone for the work done with the report and the analysis. He introduced himself as a data scientist at the Human Rights Data Analysis Group. He indicated that he was reaching out because he works with a lot of public defenders and people accused of crimes for whom this stop data is a really valuable resource. He said that people who have been convicted of crimes need to be able to access jurisdiction level statistics about stops. He noted that in particular, he is concerned about people who are doing this without representation because you need to meet a bar of evidence in order to even get representation. He stated that he heard something about a dashboard, which might solve some of the things that he is talking about. He expressed that one of the things that he found in going out and talking to people about how they might try to use this data is some concerns about its accuracy and whether it is correct. He also pointed out that there was a study at the LA Sheriff's Department on stops where they were under reporting stops relative to what was seen in the catalogs. Then he noted that in San Francisco there was an instance where somebody was misreporting the race of drivers intentionally in order to change the statistics. He stated that he points this all out to say that he thinks it is important for people who have so much to benefit from accessing this data to be able to use reliable data. Additionally, he stated that his interest is in making sure that when people go to court with these numbers that they are defensible.

7. **BREAK**
8. **DISCUSSION OF THE 2027 REPORT**

The Board reviewed draft sections of the forthcoming RIPA report. Co-Chair Guerrero explained that the Board had received drafts covering Stop Data, Policies, Civilian Complaints, Accountability, and POST, and that most sections had already incorporated committee and public feedback. The Stop Data draft was an exception because its most recent Subcommittee meeting occurred too close to the full Board meeting for DOJ to incorporate all the Subcommittee's feedback.

The Board proceeded section by section, offering substantive comments about the content, organization, evidentiary support, feasibility, and recommendations contained in each chapter. A recurring theme was that recommendations should be specific, evidence-based, feasible, clearly placed in the appropriate chapter, and sufficiently developed before the Board adopts them.

Stop Data Section

Co-Chair Guerrero suggested that the report should do more than simply announce the availability of the RIPA data portal. She proposed including a short section or walkthrough explaining how members of the public can use the portal, what types of questions it can answer, and what information can be drawn from it. Co-Chair Sierra supported the proposal and emphasized that such guidance would benefit not only the public but also researchers and smaller law-enforcement agencies.

The discussion reflected a broader concern that making RIPA data publicly available is not enough if users are not also given tools for understanding and interpreting the information.

Co-Chair Sierra strongly supported adding more longitudinal analysis, particularly information showing how stop patterns and disparities have changed over multiple years. She also recommended explaining what constitutes a statistically significant change in terms understandable to readers without statistical backgrounds and acknowledging that a statistically significant change may have multiple possible causes.

DOJ clarified that the main longitudinal analysis was currently planned for the Policies chapter, although the Stop Data section also contained references to year-to-year changes. Board members supported cross-referencing the sections and incorporating particularly significant longitudinal findings directly into the Stop Data chapter where appropriate.

Board member Khadjavi noted that the recent subcommittee discussion had generated several additional analytical ideas that were not yet reflected in the draft. Among them were:

- Separating *Terry* frisks from searches rather than combining them;
- Examining how consent searches interact with factors such as parole or probation status; and
- Using those analyses to inform future policy recommendations.

The Board understood that further material would therefore be added to this section.

DHS Referrals, Immigration-Related Data, and Joint Task Forces

Board member Kulkarni asked for clarification regarding the DHS referral data referenced in the draft and what information could ultimately be included.

The Board identified several data sources available to DOJ outside the core RIPA dataset under the California Values Act, including:

- The number and/or geographic placement of joint task forces;
- Potentially mapping joint task forces statewide;

- Arrest information associated with joint task forces; and
- Transfers from California law-enforcement agencies to DHS.

Board members discussed presenting those sources alongside the RIPA referral information so that the public could better understand the relationship among RIPA data, DHS referrals, joint task forces, and the California Values Act. The discussion also noted that joint task forces are treated differently under the Values Act limitations.

There had also been an effort to determine whether narrative fields in the data could shed additional light on immigration-related activity. There was concern that the narrative information might be too limited or inconsistent to support a comprehensive analysis. Research Services clarified, however, that some narrative analysis of references or referrals to DHS agencies would be possible, although it would be relatively limited.

The Board regarded this as an area for continuing work, particularly given current federal immigration-enforcement activity in California.

Possible Recommendation Concerning Fare-Evasion Stops

Board member Smith highlighted a new analysis concerning the mode of travel, including stops involving people using buses and trains. Fare-evasion enforcement showed significant racial disparities affecting Black and Brown individuals. Smith also stated that searches arising from those stops had relatively low discovery rates, raising questions about whether such enforcement is an effective crime-prevention strategy. He proposed considering a recommendation that local law enforcement and public transportation agencies deprioritize fare-evasion stops and redirect resources toward public-safety practices that may be more effective. The Board also wanted the report to examine how other jurisdictions have approached fare enforcement, including research on racial disparities and broader community impacts. That comparative research could strengthen both the analysis and any eventual recommendation.

Policies Chapter

The Board then moved to the Policies chapter, where several major themes are being developed in this section:

- Examples of reforms by San Francisco Police Department and LAPD involving vehicle stops;
- California law concerning deadly force;
- What the transcript calls “Kavanaugh stops” and protections against racial and identity profiling;
- Impacts associated with perceived limited English fluency; and
- Emerging technologies and future policy questions.

Board member Kulkarni urged the drafters to explicitly include the experiences of Asian American and Pacific Islander communities in the portion addressing the immigration-related stops also known as “Kavanaugh stops.” She emphasized that Asian individuals, including immigrants and refugees, may also be affected by federal immigration enforcement and should not be omitted from the discussion.

Number and Placement of Policy Recommendations

Co-Chair Guerrero asked DOJ to consider whether every recommendation was in the most logical chapter. For example, a recommendation involving data-analysis tools might fit more naturally in the Stop Data chapter rather than the Policy chapter. The broader concern was that the final report should have a logical organizational structure rather than grouping recommendations based simply on where they originated during drafting. She also suggested that

the Board consider narrowing the number of recommendations to those providing the greatest value, particularly recommendations that are new, high-impact, concrete, and actionable.

Proposed Local Racial and Identity Profiling Policies

One proposed recommendation called for all AB 953 covered LEAs to adopt local policies prohibiting racial and identity profiling that incorporate RIPA's definition and require officers to be trained on that definition. Board member Randolph questioned the need for the recommendation because California already has statewide law and mandatory training addressing racial profiling. He expressed concern that another recommendation could create the impression that California LEAs are simply refusing to comply with existing requirements. Co-Chair Sierra similarly questioned whether requiring each agency to adopt its own policy could undermine statewide consistency, because California already has a uniform statutory definition and statewide standards. Board member Smith agreed that statewide consistency matters but saw value in reinforcing the state prohibition at the local level, particularly in jurisdictions with recurring concerns involving racial bias. He also pointed to complaint data and prior audits as reasons not to assume that having statewide requirements necessarily means every agency is achieving full compliance. He referenced extremely low sustained rates for profiling complaints and described past discrepancies between local agency information and RIPA reporting as examples suggesting continuing implementation problems. Co-Chair Guerrero shared concerns about local policies potentially diverging from statewide policy and questioned whether the underlying issue might be better addressed in the Accountability Chapter. She also raised a broader principle for the final report: recommendations should be narrowed to the Board's strongest, most useful, and most actionable proposals.

Board member Qazi explained that the Policies Subcommittee had not fully developed all its recommendations because substantial portions of the underlying analysis were still incomplete. She proposed returning to the recommendations after the relevant sections—particularly the limited-English-proficiency section—were more fully developed. The Board generally treated the recommendations as works in progress, not final Board positions.

Limited English Proficiency and Technology

A proposed recommendation involving language access generated concerns regarding feasibility.

Board member Alatorre cautioned that a recommendation involving real-time translation capabilities could effectively push agencies toward a particular body-camera technology or vendor. He noted that the relevant technology could be expensive and could require extensive supporting infrastructure, creating significant burdens for both large and small agencies.

Board members generally agreed that the report should apply a fiscal and operational feasibility lens to recommendations involving emerging technology. Co-Chair Guerrero suggested that where technology is not yet broadly feasible, the Board might use language such as "explore" rather than framing adoption as an immediate expectation. Board member Alatorre nevertheless emphasized that language access is a significant civil rights and public-safety issue and urged the Board to make the relevant protocols as comprehensive as possible. Board member Randolph cautioned against relying too heavily on incidents or training comparisons from other states because California's training system and requirements may differ substantially.

Automated License Plate Readers and Body-Worn Camera Audits

The Board briefly discussed a recommendation concerning Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) systems, including potential statutory amendments aimed at greater transparency. The issue was left for further committee development. Extensive discussion concerned proposals involving audits and retention of body-worn camera footage. Board member Randolph raised concerns about the substantial workload and cost associated with reviewing large volumes of footage, particularly if agencies were expected to examine footage specifically for language-related interactions. He also emphasized that the burden could affect agencies regardless of size.

Co-Chair Sierra responded that emerging AI or analytical technologies may eventually make large-scale or sampled footage review more practicable. Board Member Board member Qazi explained that the chapter was deliberately looking toward future technologies capable of analyzing very large quantities of video. Board member Smith pointed to the LAPD Office of Inspector General as an example of an entity using sampled body-camera review to compare recorded encounters against reported data and identify possible inconsistencies. He viewed the recommendation as permissive rather than mandatory and therefore believed agencies could take their resources and capabilities into account.

Funding for Stop Data Analytical Tools

The final policy recommendation discussed called for the Legislature to provide funding to state and local agencies for data-analysis tools that would help agencies interpret RIPA information. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the recommendation might belong in the Stop Data chapter. She also acknowledged that law-enforcement representatives have previously identified a need for resources to interpret increasingly complex data, particularly among smaller agencies. The forthcoming data portal may address part of this need but might not eliminate it entirely. Board member Kulkarni urged the Board to make its language-access recommendations as thorough as possible, emphasizing that inadequate language access can have serious consequences for individuals with limited English proficiency and can undermine trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. She referenced an incident discussed during the POST Subcommittee meeting involving an elderly South Asian man visiting family in Alabama who was reportedly seriously injured during a law-enforcement encounter after officers interpreted his inability to communicate in English as evasive behavior; the incident was reportedly documented through body-worn camera footage. Board member Randolph acknowledged the importance of the example but cautioned against relying too heavily on incidents, training standards, or law-enforcement practices from other states when developing recommendations for California. He emphasized that California peace officers receive more extensive academy and ongoing training, including mandatory RIPA and racial-profiling instruction, and urged the Board to ensure that any out-of-state examples included in the report are appropriately contextualized against California's training requirements and standards.

Civilian Complaints Chapter

The Civilian Complaints chapter included proposed recommendations directed primarily to independent researchers. The first encouraged researchers to develop or refine best practices for investigating racial and identity profiling complaints. The second encouraged research into current complaint data and internal law-enforcement investigative practices to identify reasons profiling complaints have such low sustained rates. Co-Chair Sierra recommended making greater use of a 2022 California State Auditor report concerning investigations of bias complaints. She suggested extracting concrete examples and possibly best practices from that report to demonstrate how investigations may overlook indicators of bias. She viewed the State Auditor material as potentially useful both for explaining why sustained rates are low and for developing more concrete recommendations. Board member Randolph asked what role independent researchers would have and whether they were being empowered to challenge DOJ or agency data. Co-Chair Guerrero clarified that the recommendation simply encourages independent researchers to use publicly available data and their expertise to develop analytical methods and identify gaps. It does not transfer governmental authority or special access to researchers. She later read the substance of the recommendations: researchers would be encouraged to develop effective practices for investigating profiling complaints and to examine complaint-investigation processes for possible deficiencies. Board member Randolph again urged the report to acknowledge whether racial profiling or related disparities have improved during RIPA's existence, stating that progress should be recognized alongside deficiencies. Co-Chair Guerrero indicated that this broader framing would likely belong toward the front of the overall report, which had not yet been circulated.

Accountability Chapter

Board member Qazi raised the issue of SB 2 and officer decertification. She recalled that earlier RIPA reports had considered SB 2 related recommendations, but some proposals had been deferred because the decertification process was too new. Given that additional time and data are now available, she urged the Board to preserve institutional memory and revisit those issues, either this year or in a future report.

Three recommendations in the Accountability chapter concerned audits.

Co-Chair Sierra identified an apparent tension in the draft: the text said auditing had not been extensively examined empirically as an accountability mechanism, yet other portions of the report appeared to present audits as promising or effective. She questioned whether strong recommendations should be made if the report itself says the evidence base remains limited. Board member Smith suggested resolving that tension by explaining that auditing appears promising based on the relatively small group of agencies that use auditors or inspectors general, while acknowledging that additional empirical analysis is necessary. The Board agreed that the language and recommendations should receive further committee consideration so the recommendations flow logically from the evidence presented in the chapter.

POST and Officer Training Chapter

Board member Villeda summarized concerns arising from a two-year review of field training materials, Section 6 materials, and RIPA course guidelines. The central concern was that current training materials may state appropriate values and legal principles but do not consistently convert those principles into observable, measurable competencies.

The discussion suggested that:

- Field training is heavily framed around prohibited conduct rather than demonstrated competency;
- Evaluation instruments may not contain explicit measures addressing equity, procedural justice, de-escalation, or bias;
- Academy instruction may not be systematically reinforced during field training;
- No single entity appears to aggregate field-training evaluation information statewide; and
- There is therefore no strong statewide feedback mechanism for determining whether the training is reducing racial and identity profiling.

He also argued for establishing clearer minimum standards across RIPA-related courses and creating mechanisms to evaluate those standards against stop data. The discussion pointed to California's use-of-force training model as a possible conceptual framework—not something to duplicate mechanically, but an existing model demonstrating that POST can establish common minimum standards. Board member Randolph emphasized that academy instruction is only the beginning of officer development. He stressed the importance of the subsequent field-training and probationary periods, during which supervisors and field-training officers can identify unacceptable behavior. He also emphasized that community policing is an ongoing career-long practice, not merely a course taught by POST.

Board member Qazi observed that the POST chapter read differently from other chapters almost like meeting minutes reporting that one person thought one thing and another thought something else—rather than presenting a unified Board analysis and conclusions. Co-Chair Sierra explained that some of the different structures are because the Subcommittee was performing an unusually detailed, micro-level evaluation of training standards and incorporating input from both board members and outside experts. She believed that showing differing perspectives increased transparency and could strengthen the credibility of eventual recommendations. Board member Kulkarni added that the Board's relationship with POST differs from some other subject areas

because a major goal is to secure POST's continuing engagement and response to Board concerns. She said detailed written recommendations in prior RIPA reports had sometimes generated stronger responses from POST than feedback delivered in other settings. Co-Chair Guerrero nevertheless agreed that readers should be warned at the outset that the chapter intentionally uses a different approach. She suggested a clearer introduction explaining why the section looks different, while also avoiding an overly conversational "he said/she said" presentation. The goal should remain a processed Board analysis that leads readers efficiently to findings and recommendations.

DOJ staff explained that this year's POST chapter differs because the subcommittee is engaged in a two-year review of Section 6 field-training programs. Experts in academia and law enforcement helped construct a review rubric. Individual board members then separately reviewed the material so their assessments would not be influenced by one another. The feedback was therefore anonymized in the draft, which explains formulations such as "some members thought…" rather than presenting every observation as an agreed subcommittee position. Board member Smith said the explanation made the structure much more understandable and suggested that DOJ focus on improving the chapter's formality, readability, and through-line while preserving the substance of the review.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

After completing discussion of the report sections, the Board opened the floor for public comment and reminded the public that comments could be submitted to DOJ electronically.

No members of the public engaged during this portion of the meeting.

10. ACTION ITEMS AND NEXT STEPS

The agenda then called for "discussion and vote on action items," but Co-Chair Guerrero stated that there were no formal action items at that point. Instead, the substantial feedback provided during the meeting would be taken back to the respective subcommittees and DOJ drafting teams. The Board would revisit recommendations after receiving revised drafts. Co-Chair Guerrero emphasized that the next full Board review would be particularly important because that is when the Board would begin to "lock in" the recommendations.

DOJ outlined the remaining schedule:

- Another round of subcommittee meetings, anticipated in September;
- A subsequent full Board meeting in October; and
- A final meeting in November to approve the final revisions to the 2027 report.

Board members were encouraged to submit additional written feedback before the September subcommittee meetings so that drafting teams could incorporate it.

The meeting then adjourned after confirmation that there were no additional matters requiring discussion.