

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

POLICIES SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 9, 2026, 12:03 p.m. – 1:49 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs John Dobard and Andrea Guerrero, and Board Members Souley Diallo, Wade Forde, Lily Khadjavi, Ameena Qazi, Rich Randolph, and Angela Sierra

Board Members Absent: Board Member Chad Bianco

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Dobard called the meeting of the State and Local Racial & Identity Profiling Policies Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Subcommittee member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Dobard asked the Subcommittee to review the draft of the March 19, 2026 meeting minutes, if they had not already, and invited Subcommittee members to make a motion to approve the minutes. Member Sierra moved to approve the minutes as presented, and Member Khadjavi seconded. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Kenneth Sugarman of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) facilitated a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Dobard and Members Diallo, Khadjavi, Qazi, Randolph, and Sierra
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** None

With six ayes, the meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ)

Dr. Eric van Holm, the principal researcher on the RIPA portfolio in the DOJ Research Services Bureau, introduced himself and explained that he would be providing an update on the work his team will be completing for the Policies subsection.

Dr. van Holm stated that DOJ had begun work with the 2025 RIPA data. As a baseline, he wanted to give an overview of the data received. In 2025, there were nearly 5.5 million stops from 535 agencies. These numbers are both up from 2024 data, with an 8.3 percent increase in terms of the number of stops, where there were roughly 5 million stops. He did not want to attribute that increase to any one cause, but noted that CHP reported 400,000 more stops, which is sort of a substantial part of where that increase comes from, although agencies always fluctuate year to year.

Dr. van Holm stated that, today, the emphasis of the presentation would be on the work planned for the Policies subsection of the 2027 Report — particularly, the two principal analyses that DOJ will be completing for this chapter. That includes a longitudinal policy analysis of some efforts in California to reform police work, both at the local and statewide level. He added that the presentation would describe the policies that DOJ will be analyzing within this section. as those analyses are just beginning and DOJ does not have preliminary data yet. Secondly, Dr. van

Holm stated that the presentation would discuss the work DOJ is doing on the intersection of race and language fluency and how that impacts actions and outcomes of stops.

Dr. van Holm stated that the first analysis for discussion was the longitudinal policy analysis. This year's report theme is the past, present and future, and here DOJ is looking at the impact of specific policies on the past, the present, and the future. DOJ began by reviewing policies passed either at the local or the statewide level for the breadth of time that RIPA has been collected. They only looked at the local level at Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies to have sufficient observations prior to a policy's passage to establish a trend, a baseline before a policy and after. All agencies have only been reporting for four years now, but Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies (which there are fifteen) have been reporting for a longer time.

Dr. van Holm explained that, as part of that, DOJ reviewed local news about those fifteen agencies. DOJ looked at press releases and at every source they could, trying to find anything that had been implemented that they could also tie to something specific in the RIPA data that they might see change. Also, each of the past RIPA Reports lists statewide efforts that have been enacted, so DOJ reviewed those as well. DOJ identified three policies they think are suitable for a policy analysis using the RIPA data: SFPD and LAPD implemented different versions of policies around pretextual stops, which were initially analyzed in last year's Report, so DOJ will update them. The state also passed AB 392 in 2019, which provides DOJ with a law that impacted all fifteen agencies. Dr. van Holm would talk more about each of those policies here.

To quickly review, first looking at SFPD and reviewing a graph from last year's Report, Dr. van Holm explained that the San Francisco Police Commission passed a policy in 2023 that deprioritized stops for nine specific categories of what they considered low-level offenses, such as license plate illumination or brake lights, which are typically pretextual stops. As shown in the presentation, there was a decline in stops following the implementation of that policy, which went into effect in July 2024. But, that was following the pattern from the year prior of a spike in the summer and then a decline in the winter, and November and December matched year to year. Dr. van Holm explained that, with only six months of data after the policy was implemented, this was a limited analysis, and DOJ would be able to update that with another year of data and continue to track what has changed in SFPD.

Dr. van Hom stated that LAPD also passed a pretext policy a few years earlier than SFPD, and what they were attempting to do was require a public safety concern before a stop, which was an effort to remove all pretextual stops. He displayed a graph showing the number of stops that involved the one hundred most common traffic violations, divided into moving and non-moving violations, because LAPD did not target specific codes as SFPD did. He explained that when the pretextual policy went into effect in March 2022, there was a drop in non-moving stops, and that is a new maintained level that LAPD had across those following years, so DOJ can identify some impact to that policy and will be able to again update with another year's data.

Dr. van Holm noted that this year, the DOJ team would add another policy at the state level, which would impact all fifteen agencies. He clarified that it impacted all agencies in the state, but DOJ just does not have data for more than those fifteen agencies. DOJ would look at this third policy, AB 392, which was passed in 2019 and took effect on January 1, 2020. It was passed in the wake of the shooting of Stephon Clark in Sacramento, and it changed the prerequisite for deadly force, from what was considered reasonable to when it is necessary to protect the life of the police officer or others. Dr. van Holm noted that there has been debate about how significant that change is in terms of the language, but it is the first time that the standard of deadly force was changed since 1872 when it was first established, so it is a worthwhile effort to see if there is a change in how police interact following the passage of that law. He explained that RIPA data contains three levels of force, so Research Services can see whether lethal force changes at either sort of an overall count of incidents or percentages and whether there was a shift towards less-

lethal or non-lethal force being used more as the law was established. Again, this will be limited to just those fifteen Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies.

Dr. van Holm stated that DOJ would analyze all three of the policies this year using what is called an “interrupted time series.” This is similar to the work DOJ performed last year for the Board, but for this year’s Report, DOJ will do an interrupted time series, which attaches precise figures to the changes observed. Dr. van Holm explained that an interrupted time series is a common method for policy analysis, and it identifies three specific time points: the trend or slope prior to an event (which, in this hypothetical example on the slide, is something increasing); the change when that policy goes into effect or when some event occurs (here, hypothesizing a drop in the hypothetical trend), and third, the slope or the trend after the policy (which might decline, stabilize, or go back to prior growth). Interrupted time series allows for the identification of those three points and to do hypothesis testing to understand how substantial those changes are. The outcomes that are being studied are determined by each policy, and it has to be sort of closely tied to what you would actually expect to change as a result, otherwise you will get a false negative.

For the pretextual policies, Dr. van Holm explained that DOJ would look at the overall trends in stops in Los Angeles and San Francisco. DOJ would also look at some of the racial differences that may arise as the ending of pretextual stops may impact different groups differently. DOJ could also look at discovery rates, as pretextual stops are used sometimes as a way to initiate a search. Dr. van Holm stated that there are a few outcomes they could look at in those cases. For AB 392, DOJ would primarily look at force used and whether there is less incidence of lethal force after the passage of that law.

Dr. van Holm stated that the second set of analysis concerns the interaction of race and English fluency. RIPA data does not directly collect anything on citizenship status, but there was an interest from the Board in understanding whether language fluency and race compound each other. Past reports indicate that there are differences in the rates of actions taken and outcomes that occur as a result of stops across different groups, and in the past, the Board has looked at race and language as two separate factors. But for minority groups, are there differences greater for those that are not perceived as being English fluent? Do individuals within minority groups that tend to have more unequal treatment have larger differences when English is a factor? Dr. van Holm explained that this can be considered a proxy for immigration since some immigrants do not arrive with language skills. Given the changes in the political landscape over the last few years, there was an interest in settling whether these differences may have grown over time as well, so DOJ will look at a number of actions and outcomes, which are listed on the slide and are a comprehensive look at stops, including: persons removed by vehicle by order, or by physical contact; whether a field sobriety test is conducted; whether curbside detention occurs; whether there is a psychiatric hold; whether there is handcuffing or a firearm being pointed; asked for consent to search; whether a search was conducted; and whether there was contraband found. Those were selected as a comprehensive look across the stop, but also things where there could be a hypothetical language barrier that may influence how the individual stopped and the police may interact.

Dr. van Holm explained that they were looking at most of the racial groups that are available, but DOJ did remove two groups because of small counts. DOJ removed Native American and Pacific Islanders because, for those groups, first, they are small in the state overall in terms of the number of stops. Second, when the numbers reflect this sort of minority within a minority of those perceived not as speaking English, this leads to very small counts of any of these things occurring. He noted that there are single digits of the number of Native Americans not perceived as speaking English that had field sobriety tests conducted, so it would be very hard to estimate differences when one group is so small. He explained that, for statistical reasons, it is better to just remove them from the analysis.

Starting with a broad overview, Dr. van Holm identified the percentages in 2025 of each racial group where the individual was perceived as being fluent in English. He explained that the only group below 90 percent perceived fluency is Hispanic Latin(x) at 89.5 percent, with Asian as the second most common group to not be perceived as English fluent at 91.5 percent. The vast majority of individuals stopped across all racial groups are perceived as being English fluent. For individuals perceived as Black, it is 98.7 percent stops. For individuals perceived as white, it is 98.06 percent. Dr. van Holm noted that we are looking at sort of a small minority within some of these racial groups, although, other than in the case of Pacific Islander or Native American, those groups are large enough to estimate differences.

Dr. van Holm stated that there is a long list of variables DOJ is looking at, and they have completed preliminary analysis. He shared one set of analyses to illustrate what will go into the 2027 Report and give the Board a better picture of what this analysis can kind of show. Today, as just a sample, Dr. van Holm will discuss the percentage of individuals removed by vehicle based on their perceived race and English fluency. He explained that there can be a hypothesis that a verbal order given by an officer may be more easily understood by those that are English fluent, and that may influence how an officer uses the verbal order, so how do the chances of that occurring differ across racial groups and how does that vary within races based on English fluency?

Dr. van Holm explained that the data is first broken down by perceived racial group, with the six different groups across the X-axis. The left bar of the bar graph shows the percentage of stops featuring this action (removal by vehicle by order), showing that for those that are perceived to be English fluent. The right bar within each perceived racial group (the slightly lighter one) is those that are perceived as not being English fluent. Working from left to right, first, Dr. van Holm reported that, for individuals perceived as Asian, we see that 0.97 percent (roughly 1 percent of stops) of those perceived with English fluency that are perceived as Asian are ordered out of their car by verbal order, while 1.32 percent of perceived Asians with limited no English fluency are removed by vehicle by order. That is a small gap of about 0.35 percent in 2025 between those two groups, and those with limited English language skills are being ordered out of their vehicle more often. The rate of removal by vehicle by order is larger for individuals perceived as Black regardless of language fluency, and the gap based on language fluency is larger for individuals perceived as Black as well. Those that were perceived to be English fluent had a rate two percentage points higher of having a removal order, and that is the opposite trend from individuals perceived as Asian, where those perceived to have limited English fluency were more likely to be removed by order. Again, the rate for individuals perceived as Black of being ordered to be removed by their car by order is higher, regardless of language. For individuals perceived as Hispanic/Latin(x), 3.27 percent of stops for those perceived to be English fluent were removed from their car by order, while 4.6 percent of stops for those without English fluency were removed by order, which is roughly 1.5 percentage points more.

Dr. van Holm stated that he did not want to belabor the data here and just read all the numbers because the greater insights come from looking across these things. He stated that we can see that in three groups, those that are perceived to have limited or no English fluency have higher rates of receiving an order to be removed from the car, including those that are perceived as Asian, Hispanic/Latin(x) and Middle Eastern/South Asian. Those are the three groups with the largest shares of limited or no English fluency, whereas those that are perceived as Black, multiracial or white, which have lower percentages of limited no English fluency in general in the data, had the opposite trend. He stated that the DOJ team is looking at a host of variables and pulling out some interesting trends out of this. As Dr. van Holm said previously, this is just a sample of similar work for all of those actions or results that he described earlier.

In light of the limited time, Dr. van Holm stated that he could give a preview of the multi-year longitudinal analysis, but that would take substantial time and even more data. It is this graph shown on the slide across different years for each group, so he would leave the presentation there

today. He invited the Subcommittee to provide any feedback of the things they would like to see added or changed, or to express any questions or comments.

Member Randolph stated that he had some questions. He wanted to confirm that they are going to remove the Native American prompt because the data numbers were low. Dr. van Holm responded yes.

Member Randolph suggested that, if they are going to do that, the directive needs to come from DOJ for next year that they are no longer going to collect that data. That data is still being collected and is an additional workload for peace officers and the people that are corroborating that data to DOJ. He asked the Subcommittee to think about that. Next, Member Randolph stated that he was concerned and wanted to confirm that they are not collecting data that they are taking people out of cars because they do not speak English. He asked if he was reading or hearing that correctly.

Dr. van Holm provided clarification on both points. He stated that Native American and Pacific Islander are removed from that analysis, not because there are so few Native Americans total in the data, but in the case of Pacific Islander and the case of Native American, there are very few that are perceived as not English fluent, so we would be comparing one group to another that has three instances. They would be comparing 100 to three. When looking at the rate of something happening for three people, the numbers just fluctuate and you do not get a very accurate impression of whether that is happening. So, it is not that there are very few Native Americans or Pacific Islanders in general in the data; it's just specifically looking at some of these specific actions because we are breaking it down into very small barrels or cuts of the data. That is the reason why we removed Native Americans and Pacific Islanders for this analysis, because the analysis is getting narrow and DOJ is trying to do statistical testing to analyze the differences between these groups.

When looking at the removal by order variable, Dr. van Holm clarified there is nothing implicit about language in the action of an officer removing someone from a vehicle by order. DOJ is looking at whether the person is removed by order more often or less often if they are perceived as being non-English fluent and trying to understand how stops differ for those groups based on English fluency and the ability to communicate. So, there are no separate actions collected based on language. It is just one of the demographics.

Member Randolph thanked Dr. van Holm and responded that when we are talking about taking someone out of a vehicle, the correlation is confusing because if he walks up on a car and there is a gun or a weapon in the vehicle, he is going to take that person out of the vehicle. He stated that they do not know whether the subject is wanted for an arrest or things of that nature. If he walks up on a vehicle and someone speaks Spanish, he is going to get a translator. He is going to use his phone to do translation. Law enforcement can actually do their dialogue on the side of the road. He wanted the Subcommittee to think of the damaging statements of saying that law enforcement is ordering people out based on people's language preferences because the perception is inaccurate. Lastly, as he has noted before, Member Randolph stated that if the Board is going to start talking about data here, then he wants to know if people went to jail, if they were arrested, because we are not collecting that information.

Member Sierra followed up on Chief Randolph's comments and observations. She stated that maybe what the Subcommittee can do in this chapter is make very clear in this discussion that this is not to draw any conclusions from this one data point alone. This is one factor that could be relevant in thinking about future policies. If more often than not, folks in one community who are not English speakers, for example, are being removed from the car, are there actions like Member Randolph noted, such as translators and other things, being employed? As Member Sierra understands Dr. van Holm's explanation of this, DOJ is going to be adding other data points to this analysis, so after people are removed from vehicles, what are we seeing in terms of next actions taken, broken down by English speaking, non-English speaking? Again, it will

probably be impossible to draw any one conclusion, but it is data in which we might start seeing trends and may have more issues to explore because of that. Member Sierra stated that it is going to be really important to see what other steps are after individuals are removed from a vehicle are happening, to the extent we can also look at that data. She understood from Dr. van Holm's presentation that those added data points will be in the 2027 Report, or so far that is the intention.

Dr. van Holm responded yes, there will be about ten actions and outcomes that DOJ will be studying to try and provide a comprehensive look at the entire stop. He presented one variable, one analysis today, as a snapshot. That was not meant to imply that that was all we were doing. There is not a special interest in removal from car by order; we also look at removed by car by physical contact. There are many other things that we are going to look at to try and understand the differences in experience.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Co-Chair Dobard asked DOJ to proceed with their update.

DAG Jeanelly Orozco Alcalá introduced herself and stated that today, she and DAG Sugarman would be discussing the draft chapter of the Policies section for the 2027 Report. She stated that she would cover the first half (Sections I through IV), and DAG Sugarman would cover the remainder of the chapter.

DAG Orozco Alcalá stated that, as the Subcommittee has discussed, the central theme of this year's Report is past, present, and future, and the DOJ drafters of the Policies subsection kept this lens in mind while drafting. Starting with Section I, the introduction which can be found on page one of the longer draft that was circulated to the Subcommittee, DAG Orozco Alcalá stated that the introduction presents the theme of past, present, and future and provides a brief overview of the material in the rest of the chapter. Section II is titled, "Longitudinal Analysis of Racial and Identity Group Disparities Following Reforms," and this is also on page one of the longer draft. It examines the past by assessing whether the adoption of RIPA recommendations by California law enforcement agencies has led to measurable changes in the data that the agencies report to RIPA. This is something that the Subcommittee discussed at length during the March meeting, and the Subcommittee just heard more about this analysis from DOJ Research Services. Right now, the draft does note that this content is under development, but we expected that it will be further developed by July 2026 full Board meeting.

Turning to the present, DAG Orozco Alcalá explained that Section III analyzes the impact of recent immigration enforcement actions on state and local policing. This can be found on pages two through 10 of the longer draft that was shared. First, the section provides a brief overview of the case *Noem v. Vasquez Perdomo, et al.*, a case in which three Pasadena men were detained without warrants by immigration agents who were in unmarked cars and did not identify themselves as immigration agents. The Supreme Court's stay order in that case has essentially indicated that immigration agents may conduct stops to inquire about someone's immigration status based on a combination of factors, including someone's perceived race or ethnicity, whether that person speaks Spanish or English with an accent, their perceived profession, and their location. Justice Kavanaugh issued a concurring opinion in this case, noting that these factors in combination may establish reasonable suspicion that someone is unlawfully present in the United States. This has led to the rise of the term Kavanaugh stops, which refers to immigration stops based on the above four factors. The section also includes a discussion of recent media reporting of U.S. citizens detained during immigration enforcement stops in the first nine months of this presidential administration. The media reporting has helped California residents understand how immigration enforcement has affected California's diverse communities. It also highlights for state and local law enforcement officers how immigration enforcement may impact the individuals they serve. This discussion can be found on pages three to seven of the longer draft.

Next, the section discusses California laws and how RIPA prohibits racial and identity profiling and the way it interacts with federal immigration efforts. The section also discusses SB 54 (the California Values Act), which allows state and local law enforcement officers to participate in joint task forces with federal agents under certain restrictions. This discussion can be found on pages seven through ten. The section also provides an overview of arrests made by joint task forces, as well as those made for the purpose of immigration enforcement by all task force participants, including federal law enforcement agencies. These figures may be found on page ten of the draft. DAG Orozco Alcalá provided a link in the chat where all of the reports from 2018 to present are available. For details on SB 54, DAG Orozco Alcalá noted that there is an information bulletin issued by the California DOJ in 2025, which she also provided a link to in the chat. Lastly, Section IV, which begins on page eleven, is dedicated to an analysis of perceived English fluency. DAG Orozco Alcalá explained that this analysis will build off last year's Report, and this section will be built out further in time for the July full Board meeting.

Next, DAG Sugarman turned the Subcommittee's attention to Section V of the Policies chapter draft, which is found at pages 11 through 36. He explained that Section V is divided into three parts: automated license plate reader technology (found on pages 11 to 16), technology-assisted police body worn camera footage review (found on pages 16 to 34), and RIPA stop data (found on pages 34 to 36). DAG Sugarman stated that each of these will be discussed in turn.

Turning to the first section regarding automated license plate reader (ALPR) technology (found at pages 11 through 16), DAG Sugarman stated that this subsection looks at ALPR technology—both what it can do and how it can be used. As noted in the draft, California law requires public notice and comment before ALPR systems are implemented, and some jurisdictions may have implemented ALPR systems that are now being used for purposes that go beyond what was initially presented to the public. Most of the critical attention directed at ALPR systems does not relate to racial or identity group profiling or disparities, but there is a potential for bias in some circumstances. DAG Sugarman noted that DOJ has also updated last year's reporting on California ALPR data being shared with non-California agencies, including immigration authorities, which leads to potential concerns that our state's ALPR data could be used by immigration authorities that may be engaged in racial profiling in California.

The next subsection of the draft is, “Technology-Assisted Body Worn Camera Footage Review,” and this is found in pages 16 to 34 of the draft. DAG Sugarman stated that here DOJ has provided some foundational information about police body worn cameras, their hoped-for benefits, and some of the critiques of how their use has worked in practice. The draft discusses some emerging technologies that can be used to automate the review and analysis of body worn camera footage review, including some information and findings related to racial and identity profiling and disparities. Notably, the technologies marketed to law enforcement can be used to spot officer conduct, requiring training or other interventions, as well as officer conduct to reinforce positive behaviors and discourage negative behaviors. The draft also notes how technology-assisted body worn camera footage review could be used in the future to help reduce racial and identity profiling and disparities. DAG Sugarman noted that this can be found on pages 26 to 29. He stated that one area discussed is how law enforcement agencies should make body worn camera footage and technological review tools available to the public and researchers so that more of the potential in this area can be realized. DAG Sugarman stated that the claims in this section are largely predictive, but DOJ thinks they are well grounded in the facts of what the technology can do. He stated that if the Subcommittee has any concerns that the statements are too speculative in this section, DOJ would like to hear what the concerns are and how they may be addressed.

DAG Sugarman explained that the draft also notes some additional concerns or topics with body worn camera footage review, for the Board's consideration, found on pages 30 to 34. He stated that there is value in having a large volume of police body worn camera footage to review, but there are also storage costs to consider, as well as existing California law on body worn camera

footage retention periods. The draft also discusses the potential risk that technology assisted body worn camera footage review could be used as a civilian surveillance and investigatory tool and the risk that this tool may be disproportionately focused on communities that are already subject to overpolicing. The draft also discusses other considerations such as privacy issues, public input, and transparency, which are all important topics for any emerging technology.

DAG Sugarman stated that the next section of the Policies draft is titled, “Stop Data Analytics Tools for Law Enforcement Agencies,” and is found on pages 34 to 36. He explained that this section discusses the value of law enforcement agencies having tools for analyzing their own RIPA stop data on a continuous basis. In general, the discussion is responsive to the Board's stated desire that RIPA stop data be more actionable by individual law enforcement agencies.

The draft also includes a section, Section VI, on potential recommendations, which is found at pages 36 to 37 of the draft. DAG Sugarman explained that these recommendations stem from the discussions in the prior portions of the chapter, and they are presented to the Board for their consideration. Some of these may change depending on the ongoing drafting and the data that DOJ is currently working on. DOJ is presenting them here for the Subcommittee's consideration.

DAG Sugarman stated that DOJ is eager to hear the Board's comments and questions on the policies section draft, and in particular, DOJ staff welcome suggestions from the Board about how to position the topics in the Board's chosen framework for this year's report, which again is past, present and future.

Co-Chair Dobard thanked DAG Sugarman and asked if the Subcommittee members had any clarifying questions for DOJ staff before opening up Board discussion.

Member Khadjavi stated that the Report includes tremendous detail, and she is looking forward to the Subcommittee's discussion. She wondered if there was also an update about the data dashboard. She knows that it is not explicitly tied to the draft, but while we have folks at hand here, she did not know if that is something Dr. van Holm could speak to. She stated that she is sure she will ask again when the Board has their Stop Data subcommittee meeting as well.

Daniel Harmon, Senior Research Supervisor at DOJ Research Services, responded that they do not have any large updates on the dashboard other than from the prior meeting. DOJ is going through the review and testing process right now and are on track to meet their goals for when it will be released.

Member Khadjavi thanked Dr. Harmon.

Co-Chair Dobard had one other clarifying question. He knows there is more to come on the longitudinal study, but DOJ has identified three policies for further exploration. His clarifying question is whether or not DOJ has already thought about how those three policies will be presented? Co-Chair Dobard stated that he is going to phrase this as a question, and depending on the response, he may have a recommendation. For the local policies, he inquired whether DOJ has already talked about how they will talk about those in relationship to the Board's actual recommendation? He is thinking about the two policies that have already been identified, which are on pretextual stops and their attempts to reform it or limit them in particular ways. But as he reads the Board's recommendation, the Board's recommendation was to prohibit pretextual stops. That is what the Board recommended the Legislature and law enforcement agencies do. The clarifying question is, has there been discussion about how DOJ will discuss the Board's recommendation in relationship to the local policy that was actually adopted, so that it is clear, here is what the Board recommended, here is a policy we are looking at, that policy is not exactly what the Board recommended, but there is enough relationship to it for the Subcommittee to explore it. He wondered how DOJ is thinking about that, and if they had conversations about that.

Dr. van Holm responded that that is a bit downstream at this point to have fully fleshed out, but he thinks what Co-Chair Dobard is suggesting is right—that any policy that connects to a recommendation will tie in the sort of limitations of how it was enacted, whether it was fully adopted or in a limited sense, and how that kind of limits what we are showing. The fact that two police forces have adopted the recommendation, out of 535, of course is a limitation. Dr. van Holm stated that there is room for discussion of that, in addition to how things have changed after the policy was enacted.

Co-Chair Dobard thanked Dr. van Holm and moved to the next agenda item to discuss the draft Policies chapter.

5. DISCUSSION OF POLICIES SECTION OF DRAFT 2026 REPORT

Co-Chair Guerrero opened discussion of the Policies section and thanked the DOJ staff for the draft overview. She noted that the Subcommittee now had an opportunity as Board members to provide input or reflection on the draft, and while they had already had some discussion by way of questions to DOJ staff, it would be great if folks had other reflections.

Member Qazi stated that she had a couple of things and would go in order of the Report. On pages 9 to 10, the draft starts talking about the joint task force reports, then the first paragraph on page 10 talks about the number of arrests made by participants in joint task forces that were reported as arrests made for immigration enforcement purposes. She noted that in 2025, arrests went all the way up to 300, which is a huge increase. Here first question about that is she is a bit confused about how participation in a joint task force can be permissible under SB 54, such that the primary purpose of the task force is not immigration enforcement, yet it can lead to arrests made for immigration purposes, especially at that large level. She wondered what is such a scenario where the participation is lawful, yet it leads to these arrests made for immigration purposes? That is the first part of that question, and then the second part is the draft just kind of ends and says this could raise concerns. Member Qazi stated that it is raising concerns, so she would love to see that fleshed out a lot more, including what does the Subcommittee or DOJ staff think is accounting for such a tremendous rise in joint task force arrests, in just this one year? What could that point to? Member Qazi thinks that should be addressed based on what DOJ finds in the Board's recommendations below.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Qazi and stated that it is a very important question. She asked if DOJ staff wanted to address that now or if the Subcommittee should keep going.

Member Randolph responded that he did not think DOJ is going to be able to answer that because they are just looking at the reports. On the numbers, the task forces, he stated that he would roll the dice that that is not going to be all immigration, if that, but a lot of that is going to be tied to human trafficking, child pornography, and missing persons. Member Randolph stated that it has spiked immensely because of the border traffic here in our state, so he clarified that at least the number has increased at that level.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that it would be great if DOJ staff could provide more context for those arrest numbers and understanding. She thanked Member Qazi for raising the issue and stated that the request is clear.

Member Forde stated that Member Qazi mentioned something that triggered a thought as it pertained to the joint task forces. There is a concern, and it is not a question, that in his city of San Bernardino, they have been piloting cameras in a particular area. The area is this downtown area of San Bernardino. It is not a very large area, but they are pitching them as a pilot. In some of the committees he sits on, they are ensuring that there is no access to the federal government with these cameras. These cameras are purely piloting and attempting to see how they impact traffic stops, for instance. He stated that when the Subcommittee talks about joint task forces, one of his concerns is what accessibility should we ever be concerned with, that those may go

beyond the boundaries of where there is a separation between the two? When they continue to tell us that nobody is going to get access to these cameras, there is a certain concern that Member Forde has with the implementation of them. If nobody is using them, is it purely going to be the city, or is there, at some point, because of whatever parameters there are of separation between the two in the joint task force, that somehow it could go well beyond that? Member Forde noted that this is just a comment that concerns where we are heading with some of these implementations.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Forde for his comments. She stated that there are a lot of questions around joint task forces, and to the extent that this Report could help clarify for the public how they are used and how they interact with the potential for racial or identity profiling, the more context, knowledge, clarity, or open questions we have around that, the more helpful that is going to be in the Report. She stated that they are asking questions that can be answered and provided in the Report, which would be extremely helpful, including where the Board might land in terms of recommendations around joint task forces. She noted that, for SB 54, there was a lot of conversation around joint task forces and their role and connection to immigration enforcement and how that could slide. She noted that this is something for the Subcommittee to keep in mind. They are still going to be looking at the data and the policy content of this chapter, and they will be wanting to consider policy recommendations as well.

DAG Sugarman asked Member Forde to describe a little more specifically what he was referring to by the pilot study of cameras, so that DOJ could look into this for the next draft.

Member Forde responded that one of the things that they are doing in the city of San Bernardino, where he works, is that there are cameras that have been added to assist the police department in a particular area. It is a specific area in the downtown San Bernardino area right off of the 215 Freeway, going north on the east side. When presentations were made at one of the committees, possibly the executive committee for the gang and drug task force that Member Forde is a part of, one of the things that they were talking about were these cameras. Member Forde stated his concern was the accessibility to these cameras, as they are pitching these cameras to extend not just the cameras, but also access to cameras that other NGOs and nonprofits may have around their facility that you could add a box. It was free. There is a free box that you could add to. They said to any of the organizations who have cameras with their facilities, if you connect to this box, it will also help them to support you all by giving them access to your cameras. This made Pastor Forde think about movies, such as *Enemy of the State*. When thinking of joint task forces, one of Pastor Forde's concerns is how clear and defined are the parameters, and then at what point do they become a little bit more flexible, always under the auspice of safety, where we relegate our securities and our rights. Regarding the implementation of these, Pastor Forde does not start thinking about the immediate values; he starts thinking about the long-term effects of some of these things and how it affects the work of the RIPA Board.

DAG Sugarman responded that Member Forde sounds as though he is referring to both a combination of ALPR cameras and then surveillance cameras that an NGO or another entity might be running. He asked if those are the two different types of cameras Member Forde was referring to?

Member Forde responded that, truth be told, he was not sure if a license plate reader camera is distinctly different from any camera. He inquired how the parameters for, say, the city operate to ensure the joint task force from ever getting access to those things?

Co-Chair Guerrero responded that Flock Surveillance, for example, is a subject that is under discussion up and down the state, including concerns about how that data is shared or used. She stated that the question she hears pretty clearly from the Board is whether joint task forces become a mechanism to access surveillance technology of any kind, and if they are something we should be worried about, concerned about, have more visibility on, or greater understanding of, including there are enough parameters. She stated that could inform a policy recommendation

to the state Legislature. Maybe there is a need for more parameters around the joint task forces; maybe there is a clearer need for limiting, at the state level, how they can be used.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that these are great questions and good discussion. She reiterated that the Subcommittee has heard questions around joint task forces, around ALPRs (which is part of their Report), and other surveillance as it relates to these topics.

Member Randolph wanted to check. He knows the Subcommittee did meet on this, and they also talked about the future. He thanked DOJ staff for the phenomenal report and noted that the Subcommittee talked about the future of where we are at, since the RIPA Board has been around now for about ten years. He stated that the Subcommittee had talked about moving forward, like what progress they have done. He did not see, in the DOJ breakdown, where our progress is on the positive side.

Co-Chair Guerrero responded that she was on a few different subcommittees with Member Randolph and was trying to remember whether that was a Policies subcommittee discussion or whether they had that discussion as a full board or in another committee. She asked if anyone remembered.

Member Randolph responded that he knew Co-Chair Dobard was in that meeting because they agreed to it. Member Randolph stated that, for the first time ever, he saw a lot of nodding heads agreeing, but Co-Chair Guerrero is correct that they are on multiple committees together, so hopefully it does pop up in the next committee meeting. He stated that there is a lot of talk about moving forward, so he wants to make sure that the Board is not going to forget that.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that she recalled that was during a full Board meeting, and that was something they were interested in doing in the Report to mark the ten-year anniversary of RIPA. She inquired how DOJ absorbed that prior feedback, where it might sit, and whether it was in a full Board or a particular subcommittee meeting.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General (SDAG) Alexander Simpson responded that, having just reviewed the minutes in preparation for this meeting, he did not recall that discussion happening in this Subcommittee meeting. He stated that he would go back and review the transcript for the last full Board meeting, which is where he thinks that discussion took place. He added that, as a more full response to Member Randolph's question, a discussion of look back, look forward, and also including an explanation of the work that law enforcement, community members, and Board members had made in getting the RIPA Board started was also one of the things discussed at that full Board meeting, so that is going to be reflected in the 2027 Report.

Co-Chair Guerrero agreed and thanked SDAG Simpson for that explanation. She asked if the Subcommittee had any other thoughts on the Policies draft, and expressed that she would like to focus their attention on the policy recommendations.

Member Sierra stated that there was one area she wanted to reflect on. She stated that she is really interested in the discussion about the review of body worn camera footage and how it could be really instrumental for law enforcement agencies to help them examine the use of new technologies and help them examine their body worn camera footage. She thinks it is really important and seems like it could be really helpful to the agencies and to help reduce profiling, so she is glad they are tackling that. The one issue she thinks they could expand on is, to the extent that the Board may be recommending that that footage be available to researchers or to the public, while this is brought up in parts of the chapter, it could expand what are, to her, the real issues of how to protect privacy rights and issues, if they are going to make those type of recommendations, both the privacy of anybody who is captured on body worn camera footage and the privacy of officers. She knows that the proposed recommendation talks about how, if there is any legislation, that should be taken into account, but it may be helpful to the extent there are any examples anywhere of how that issue could be tackled, or even some ideas that

researchers or experts have about that, that could be helpful because that could be a real barrier and make the sharing of that information problematic. Member Sierra stated that the other issue with respect to how agencies can use new technologies in examining their own officers' body worn camera footage, it is important for the Subcommittee to be really clear that, while there exists some really promising technologies and advances that law enforcement may be able to use, the Board is not endorsing a particular product and that they themselves have never tested these products, but that these are just really emerging, very potentially helpful technologies.

Member Diallo commended the draft and DOJ staff. He thought the draft covered a lot with respect to the issues at hand. To follow up on Member Sierra's comments with respect to body worn cameras and transparency, in terms of how that could lead to alleviating racial disparities, Member Diallo stated that one of the potential continued challenges that may occur at the agency level, which he knows from his work as a criminal defense attorney dealing with body worn camera footage widely, is that it is widely available and being used in all sorts of cases. There are still prosecutorial agencies, as well as law enforcement, insisting on pretty extensive court orders in terms of its dissemination and use outside of the context of a criminal court case. He thinks a lot of that has to do with potential use in litigation, which is understandable on one level, but to the extent that the Board is making policy recommendations on the increased use and study of body worn cameras as a policy tool and asking for increased transparency, that is something where there may be some obstacles at the agency level, and maybe that is something that should be taken into account and addressed.

Secondly, Member Diallo stated that he sees the use of the ALPRs as looking to the future of where we are with body worn cameras, in terms of its widespread use, dissemination, relative transparency, comfortability in using, and understanding how the policies are at the agency level on how body worn camera footage is used. We have yet to have that with things like license plate readers and with Flock cameras, and it is really a black box in terms of how it is being used from agency to agency and how it is being shared. He mostly encounters, and increasingly encounters, the use of these technologies as what are called investigatory tools, so from a criminal defense perspective, oftentimes they get things in discovery in terms of things they are intending to use in evidence. That does happen, but much more rarely so because sometimes it is used in combination with other things to the extent that, even when issues go to trial, it could be a tool that is used internally within law enforcement and the combination of other things. There is not necessarily the same transparency in terms of how it is being used because it could be used internally with combination and where the law does not necessarily require disclosure or the discovery statutes do not require a real transparent use, such as saying that they are using these particular technologies for a particular purpose. Again, at the agency level, there might be some concerns about disclosing some of that information to compromise investigations, but Member Diallo knows from a defense attorney's perspective that is oftentimes a tension, just trying to get an understanding on how these technologies are being used and exactly what way, even when it goes to court. So, stepping back from a policymaker's perspective, Member Diallo stated that if the Board is having trouble at that level, encouraging increasing transparency and understanding policies on how these technologies are being used are really critical, as they are being implemented at a rapid pace and we do not have a good idea or track of what the full scope of how, why, and for what purposes they are being used.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Diallo and noted that he and Member Sierra had moved the discussion into policy recommendations, unless members have other thoughts about the body of the Policies draft.

6. BREAK

The Subcommittee took an agendaized break and resumed at approximately 1:22 p.m.

7. FURTHER DISCUSSION OF POLICIES SECTION OF THE DRAFT 2027 REPORT

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the Subcommittee had left off in their discussion of the Report by starting to talk about recommendations. She wanted to check in to see if there were other comments about the body of the draft Policies section before discussing recommendations.

Member Qazi stated that, related to the second potential recommendation, she felt that the Report and the data section on those with perceived limited English fluency, she knows that still needs to be fleshed out, but it would also be helpful to include an overview of what policies and trainings do exist, if any, for those with limited English proficiency, including POST trainings. She stated that she did not believe there were, and having that overview of what exists or what does not will help inform the recommendation as well.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Qazi and asked if members wished to share additional thoughts. Hearing none, she directed the Subcommittee's attention to the Policies draft section around recommendations. She stated that she imagined that the potential recommendations could shift as the Policies draft section is deepened, some of the context that has been requested is provided, and the Board clarifies some things. She stated that these are proposed recommendations and could change, but that it is always good for the Subcommittee get their eyes on the recommendations early because if they want to take these in a substantially different direction or add to or subtract from them, it is helpful for the DOJ staff to know. She noted that, as a matter of practice in the past, the Subcommittee has endeavored to make sure that the recommendations flow from the Report, so if the Subcommittee wants to make a recommendation that does not have any content in the Report, they should consider either dropping the recommendation or adding content in the Report so that it is the culmination of what readers have read. She noted that the DOJ staff have suggested nine recommendations in the draft and gave the Subcommittee members a chance to review them again. She stated that the Subcommittee has been making comments already about how to get some clarity or provide more context for these potential recommendations, and those comments are noted and appreciated.

Member Qazi asked for clarification about Co-Chair Dobard's comment about relationing policy changes to past Board recommendations. She knows that in previous reports, the Board has used boilerplate language restating the Board's prior recommendations, but she wondered if, because this is a backward-looking report as well, the Board should restate any of those that they have seen. Should they have a special section to restate any of those that they have seen have made a difference? Should they pull those out, and what would be the process for pulling out or calling attention to prior and past recommendations?

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that they definitely do not want to restate recommendations in the recommendation sections. They can always reference recommendations and restate them for reference, but they do not want to state them as a new recommendation if they have already been made. Co-Chair Guerrero asked Co-Chair Dobard if he wanted to clarify what he was thinking in terms of how this Report interacts with prior recommendations.

Co-Chair Dobard stated that, in reviewing the potential recommendations section, he was thinking something similar to what Member Qazi just mentioned. What he was mentioning earlier was just ensuring that they clarify what, with respect to the longitudinal analysis and policy, that in the Report they are clear about what the Board recommended and then, at the local level, what their policy actually is (which may be a variation of the Board recommendation, but not the actual recommendation), and making sure that they are clear where that is the case. That said, Co-Chair Dobard was thinking also about, along the lines of what Member Qazi just mentioned, and he wondered if it could be useful. He agreed with Co-Chair Guerrero about not needing to restate all the Board's prior recommendations and not wanting to present prior recommendations as though they are new recommendations, so there are moments where they

can maybe restate recommendations elsewhere in this section, but he wonders if it is worth having a placeholder here for those policies that are mentioned in the longitudinal section to put a spotlight on those—not those that passed at the state level, but if there is something related to the local-level policies. He stated that the point would be to spotlight the policies that they mention in the longitudinal section because it is not going to be everything; right now, they have only heard less than a handful that would really be the focus—they have heard really two, but with three different examples. Co-Chair Dobard wondered if it could be worthwhile to, for now, have a placeholder just before or near the potential recommendations section where the Subcommittee may want to state a variation on an old recommendation or restate an old recommendation. But, because they are mentioning it in the longitudinal analysis portion, that is why he thinks it could make sense to at the end make sure that they spotlight that so that it does not get lost in the chapter. It would be narrowly focused on the ones the Subcommittee identifies. That would be the lens for it.

Co-Chair Guerrero responded that there was not much in the draft on the longitudinal analysis because it was content was in development, but it could be that She stated that DOJ drops it in as a block quote so it is pulled out and clear that it was a prior recommendation and it is in the part of the Report where it is relevant as a suggestion.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that Member Diallo had, in his earlier comments, pointed to an issue of this black box—that they do not have the same policy framework for ALPR systems and surveillance that they do for body worn cameras. She noted that Member Diallo shared some of the ways that happens, and he wanted to encourage increasing transparency, balance privacy and transparency. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that she did not know if Member Diallo was starting to form a recommendation around that, or if he thought that what was in there sufficed or could be improved on, or if there was something else the Subcommittee should be considering.

Member Diallo responded that it was more of a general thought. Looking at the policy recommendation actually, it kind of hits what he was getting at with more specificity, in terms of making specific requirements as to reporting of public agencies who are using this technology and exactly why and suggesting amendments of the Civil Code. He thought this encompassed a lot of his concerns. His recommendation would be, if anything, more general than that, but the potential recommendation is even more specific as to addressing issues which he thinks are important.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that Member Sierra had also made some statements about balancing privacy protections on body worn cameras. Now looking at those recommendations, she was not clear whether Member Sierra thought those were sufficient or whether something needed to be added or changed.

Member Sierra responded that she thought they were sufficient because they do call out in potential recommendation number six that any legislation would need to also protect active, ongoing investigations, protect individually identifiable personal information, and protect privacy rights and interests. Her thought was it is more about discussion in the Report, that to the extent they have guidance or ideas, or they can look at examples of how the Legislature can accomplish that. She stated that she thought those are pretty significant challenges, so if there is anything that they can point to that could help the Legislature, if they are going to be asking them to enact this type of legislation, the Report should do so, and if not, for the Board to be clear to really emphasize that these are significant issues. It is more about the body of the Report than the actual recommendation, and once the Board sees what they come up with, it may color how realistic their potential recommendation is or whether they alter it as we learn more about what academics or researchers are thinking about this area.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that Member Qazi and Member Forde both brought concerns around joint task forces. She wondered if they saw a need for anything additional or different. She stated

that she did not see language around joint task forces at all in the potential recommendations and wondered whether the Subcommittee should consider including something.

Member Forde stated that he thought, slightly piggybacking on what Member Diallo mentioned, that it feels like technology is outpacing policy. Co-Chair Guerrero asked if he was referring to a specific recommendation in the draft or the discussion in the content of the draft. Member Forde responded that he thought somewhere around the area addressing joint task forces just needs some doubling down maybe.

Co-Chair Guerrero agreed and thanked Member Forde. She asked if Member Qazi had any thoughts on this.

Member Qazi responded that, unfortunately, she did not at this point. As stated that, as Co-Chair Guerrero mentioned at the beginning, it will depend on the context and fleshing out that section so that they know what is leading to this huge number of immigration related arrests on these joint task forces.

Co-Chair Guerrero suggested adding a placeholder for possible additional recommendations related to that.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that more longitudinal content was still to come. She noted that Co-Chair Dobard had shared his recommendations on how to clarify the relationship to prior policies and asked if he had any more specific thoughts on this. She noted that it might be too soon, but she just wanted to connect dots.

Co-Chair Dobard responded that the short answer is no. Of what DOJ has already identified, the pretextual stop one jumped out at him just because he knows that this is particularly the case for LAPD's policy. While it did develop and adopt that policy, that policy does not one hundred percent reflect the Board's recommendation.

Member Qazi stated that on page 15, in Section III, the last full paragraph before the footnotes says, "It is important for all California jurisdictions that use ALPR systems to take all reasonable measures to ensure that the data is not being used for immigration enforcement purposes." She stated that if that is an actual recommendation, that should probably be pulled out as such. Secondly, with that same language, she felt that the language is almost too permissive and she would like to see it, even in this section of the report, say that these jurisdictions that use ALPR systems ensure their ALPR data is not being made available. Member Qazi stated that the qualifying statement "to take all reasonable measures" may allow for too much wiggle room, and she thought having some bolder language there would be helpful.

Member Khadjavi wanted to circle back to what she thought Co-Chair Dobard was suggesting for the longitudinal section. She understood this to mean that the section could include, "Here were past Board recommendations relevant, for example, to pretext stops, here are some examples of the actual policy that was adopted, and then here is was the analysis showed for San Francisco and Los Angeles." Member Khadjavi thought it sounded great if that is where things are headed because it will put the data into context. She wanted to emphasize that there is a list of other possible elements to analyze, in addition to pretext stops, including: consent searches, uses of force, and so on. Member Khadjavi stated that the use of consent has very much been a focus of the Board in years past, so, if push comes to shove, that is a topic she would really like for the Subcommittee to keep in for analysis in the longitudinal section. She hoped that this would be a section where we might see progress too. She knew, for example, that Member Randolph had asked to point to progress that has been made, but in particular, Member Khadjavi really liked this structure without reiterating past recommendations. She expressed that they do not want to be shouting into the void, but it is put into context with this section.

Co-Chair Guerrero agreed and echoed all of that. She stated that they had seen big shifts in consent searches that are tied to policy changes. Co-Chair Guerrero asked the Subcommittee if there was anything else that they wanted to provide input on at this juncture.

Member Khadjavi added that she was really struck by the depth of the research in the draft about the analysis being done from body camera footage, but, at the same time, there are huge privacy concerns for those who are stopped and for officers, so this just reiterates concerns that were raised, but there is still a lot to hash out here about what the right balance to strike is or how to analyze information that is coming in, but in a way that really moves us forward in terms of the experience people are having and protects privacy. She was still admittedly looking through this section of the report, and she appreciated the many references that were cited there and thanked DOJ staff for that.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Dobard welcomed members of the public to address the Subcommittee. He stated, as a reminder, under Bagley Keene, neither the Board nor DOJ staff are required to respond to public comment, but can choose to do so. Individuals can submit public comment by raising their hand in the Teams app, unmuting themselves if they are on the phone, or submitting a comment after the meeting to AB953@doj.ca.gov.

Michele Wittig of Santa Monica stated that she placed in the chat a reference to a new article that has appeared in the Journal of Public Economics titled, “Pretextual Stop Restriction and Policing Evidence from Los Angeles.” She stated that the paper analyzes data from the LAPD since it made stop policy reform in 2022. It focuses on racial disparities and policing outcomes following curbs on pretextual stops. Dr. Wittig stated that she also put in the chat a reference to an L.A. Times article from last month, indicating that the L.A. City Council passed a recommendation to further restrict pretextual stops. In response to these two pieces of information, Dr. Wittig stated that it is her understanding that this Board is concerned with racial profiling—a very difficult concept to measure and infer from data. One possible proxy for addressing racial profiling is to look at racial disparities. However, in the larger sense, what we are all about, she thought, is making sure that traffic stops are valid, justifiable, and efficient in the sense of actually detecting scofflaws or people who break the law. One very interesting aspect of the recently published article is that LAPD has experienced more efficient traffic stops—that is to say, traffic stops that actually detect what they are looking for. However, the data show that this policy reform has not reduced racial disparities. Dr. Wittig stated that what we learn from that is that racial disparities should be of concern because they are an indicator of possible inefficiency, injustice, and unjust stops. However, the larger goal is to ensure that stops themselves are valid, justifiable, and result in outcomes that find people who are breaking the law. She stated that maybe it is a good idea for us to step back a little bit and take a look at why racial disparities are of concern. It is because they may be indicators of unjust stops. However, when we have data like we have got from LAPD, the reform resulted in more efficient and justifiable stops, but not necessarily a reduction in racial disparities. How do we square that circle? Dr. Wittig stated that one of the other outcomes of that data is that the number of total stops was lower without having any connection with increased crime, so perhaps what LAPD is doing is really a good thing, and racial disparities may not be the be all and end all of measuring whether stops are efficient, justifiable, and valid. The good news is that stops were reduced for all groups of people, so perhaps it is the best we can hope for—fewer stops, but more efficient and better outcomes. Dr. Wittig stated that LAPD may be doing the right thing.

Co-Chair Dobard thanked Dr. Wittig for sharing those resources and comments. He asked if anyone else from the public wished to provide public comment. Hearing none, he moved to the next agenda item.

9. NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Dobard summarized that the next steps are for DOJ to continue updating the Policies chapter, particularly with the recommendations that the Subcommittee discussed today in mind. That includes quite a bit around joint task forces, what surveillance data they may have access to, and issues around privacy. Folks should anticipate that we will see an updated version with those things included at their next meeting.

He thanked DOJ staff for their work and this update, the Subcommittee members for their time, energy, and effort today, and members of the public for the same.

10. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Dobard adjourned the meeting at 1:49 p.m.