

# **CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)**

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

## **MEETING MINUTES**

**October 16, 2025, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

**Board Members Present:** Co-Chairs Andrea Guerrero and Angela Sierra, and Members William Armaline, D.J. Criner, Souley Diallo, John Dobard, Wade Forde, Darren Greene, Lily Khadjavi, Manju Kulkarni, Ameenah Qazi, Chauncey Smith, and Rich Randolph

**Board Members Absent:** Members Chad Bianco, LaWanda Hawkins, and Ronaldo Villeda

### **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**

Each RIPA Board (herein Board) member introduced themselves.

### **3. APPROVAL OF JULY 11, 2025, FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

Co-Chair Sierra asked the Board to review the draft meeting minutes from the July 11, 2025, full Board Meeting. Member Armaline moved to approve the minutes as presented and Member Criner seconded.

California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson assisted with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Angela Sierra and Members William Armaline, D.J. Criner, Wade Forde, Darren Greene, Lily Khadjavi, Manju Kulkarni, Ameenah Qazi, and Chauncey Smith,
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Co-Chair Guerrero, Member John Dobard, and Member Rich Randolph

The meeting minutes were approved as presented, with 10 ayes and 3 abstentions.

### **4. UPDATES BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Co-Chair Sierra opened the floor for DAG Simpson to provide DOJ updates.

DAG Simpson informed that the DOJ continued to incorporate the Board's feedback into the 2026 draft RIPA report. He thanked the Board for its feedback and stated that the DOJ has begun finalizing the report. He noted that this is the second to last full board meeting for the calendar year with the final meeting set to occur on November 18, 2025, where the Board will vote on the recommendations in the report and discuss what it will cover in next year's report.

He highlighted that today's meeting will include discussion regarding the annual publication date for the RIPA report. Each year, the DOJ collects stop data from state and local law enforcement and analyzes it for trends related to racial and identity profiling. By statute, the Board is required

to publish an annual report with its findings on law enforcement policy and training, and data trends to issue policy recommendations to eliminate racial and identity profiling. The statute states that the first RIPA report was to be published no later than January 1, 2018, but does not require that the Board's annual report be published on January 1 of each year. Although the Board has published its report on January 1 of each year, DAG Simpson explained that the Board could consider whether the publication date should be changed to maximize the report's impact and to ensure its full consideration by the California legislature and law enforcement agencies. To assist with this discussion, DAG Simpson went over the following time frames as a potential publication date.

First, law enforcement submits its data annually to the DOJ no later than April 1 of each year. Because the data is submitted on this date, the DOJ is unable to utilize the first three months of the year to analyze the data. Moreover, the data may take an additional month to prepare for analysis. When these logistical considerations also factor in the additional time required to finalize and prepare the report for publication, the current publication date of January 1st means that the Board only has six months to review the data. A publication date that aligns closely to law enforcement's data submission deadline would allow the Board more time for review and allow their first Board meetings to consider the current year's data.

Second, DAG Simpson explained that the Board should also consider a publication date that align with the legislative session. In California, bills must be introduced, moved through relevant committees, and be voted on by both the Senate and Assembly during the legislative session. Legislative sessions are two-year cycles and begin relative to when the last legislative session ended. He informed that legislators will normally develop the slate of bills they want to advance in the fall. With the current publication date, the RIPA report is released 10 months before legislative bills are developed. By aligning the publication of the report to the legislative session, the RIPA report may be timelier for legislators to consider.

Alternatively, DAG Simpson asked the Board to consider a publication date that aligns with the deadline to introduce bills. Similar to legislative sessions, the deadline to introduce bills for consideration also fluctuates year to year. This year, the deadline for bill introduction is February 2026. With the current publication date, the current RIPA report publication date would be too late for legislators to develop a bill to introduce. Aligning the report publication dates with the introduction deadline would also allow for legislators to properly develop bills.

In closing, he explained that the Board has the option of changing the publication date to better leverage the opportunities available with the proposed alternative publication dates. DAG Simpson explained that DOJ's recommendation was to move the publication date to March 1 of each year to more closely align the publication date with next year's data release and legislative sessions. He reminded the Board that there is currently no motion for the proposed publication date and that should the Board be interested in the proposal, it may do so in the upcoming agenda item today and the November Board meeting.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked DAG Simpson for his presentation and asked the Board to consider the proposal before moving on to the next agenda item.

## 5. CO-CHAIR REPORT

Co-Chair Sierra provided the Co-Chair report. She informed the Board that Member Kevin Mensen, the Police Chiefs Association's designee, is unable to continue to serve on the Board and has resigned. Co-Chair Sierra thanked Chief Mensen for his contributions for this year. She stated that the Board will be informed once the Police Chiefs Association has assigned a new designee.

She also briefed the Board on her presentation to the Police Officer and Standards Training (POST) Commission at its regularly noticed commission meeting on September 9, 2025. She shared that the presentation was productive. Her presentation provided a short overview of the RIPA statute and the Board's POST-related mandates. The presentation also included observations of the annual report that have been issued to date with a focus on disparities in the data that the Board still sees to this day. Last, explained to the Board that she provided an update to POST on the Board's current work this year and that it will review field officer training for next year's report. Before closing her presentation to the POST Commission, she reaffirmed the Board's desire for stronger partnership between the two entities and encouraged them to invite the Board to make future presentations before the commission acts on RIPA related recommendations.

Co-Chair Sierra explained to the Board that the discussion following the presentation was productive. She relayed that the POST Commission appreciated the Board's interest in collaboration and affirmed their interest in continued cooperation. The POST Commission also relayed that rank-and-file officers with high activity shifts experience difficulties with reporting RIPA data; they recommended that the Board invite officers to share their experiences at Board meetings. The Commission encouraged Board members to perform ride-alongs with law enforcement officers to potentially develop recommendations, and explained that these efforts could help the Board bridge the gap between the Board and rank and file officers. POST commissioners also asked the Board to consider review of other areas of law enforcement in addition to the areas, such as the review of training, that the Board has done in the past. One item discussed was whether the Board could review the culture of a law enforcement agency. Particularly, they invited the Board to review how an agency measures awards; for example, some agencies measure outputs of officers by the number of citations or arrests performed, and the Board could assess whether there was any correlation or impact on the RIPA data observed. The Commission also asked whether the Board could help analyze the culture of an agency and make suggestions to change that culture. As one commissioner noted to Co-Chair Sierra, an agency could have as much training as they wanted, and even add training, but if the culture does not change, it will not be effective.

Co-Chair Sierra explained that the POST Commission also inquired about the Board's methodology. Commissioners observed that the Board no longer uses the "veil of darkness" methodology, which was used prior to the 2023 report before its use was discontinued upon a Board vote. Co-Chair Sierra noted that the POST Commission encouraged the Board to consider re-examining the Board's action on the "veil of darkness" and the reasons behind the

discontinuation. Lastly, the POST Commission encouraged the Board to provide more specificity on recommendations related to effective training.

Before moving on the next agenda item, Co-Chair Sierra explained that the Board could consider the POST Commission's suggestions for possible incorporation in this year's and next year's reports.

## **6. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Co-Chair Sierra opened the floor for the subcommittees to provide their updates.

### **Stop Data Analysis**

Member Khadjavi provided the Stop Data Subcommittee's report. The subcommittee last met on September 18. At the meeting, the DOJ presented on their analyses since the last full Board meeting and summarized a series of data elements. The DOJ also introduced its new co-occurrence analyses, which examine how often different actions occur together. The subcommittee discussed the DOJ presentation and also reviewed the current draft report section. Of note, the draft report section will cover the differences in perceived characteristics relative to stop data elements, common outcomes for demographic groups, and will cover new elements such as perceived housing status and cyclist stops. The report section also covers the effect of consent searches in relation to whether the consent was given verbally, was written, or implied.

The Stop Data Subcommittee also discussed how it can make their draft more accessible and discussed methods to do so; they considered providing an executive summary for the section and general formatting edits for their report section. Additionally, the subcommittee also revisited the importance of providing a public data dashboard. Member Khadjavi encouraged the Board to discuss the dashboard when possible and for the DOJ to present a status update. She closed by stating that the Board will also need to discuss how to present the subcommittee's overlapping findings with the Policies Subcommittee.

### **POST Training and Recruitment**

Member Kulkarni provided the POST Training and Recruitment Subcommittee's report. The subcommittee last met on September 8. Their meeting centered around their report section and a presentation by DOJ consultants who will work on the field training program portions of the 2026 and 2027 RIPA reports. She mentioned that the draft report section will review the impact of past Board recommendations to POST, the two past POST workshops that the Board attended, and potential guidance that POST can issue to law enforcement agencies to measure the effectiveness of RIPA related training courses. Of note, the subcommittee is awaiting to hear POST's plans to implement two of the five recommendations the Board provided in its 2025 report. Additionally, they are also awaiting to receive the anticipated completion date of the expanded Museum of Tolerance trainer course.

Member Kulkarni also informed the Board of the subcommittee's efforts to develop a revised definition of bias conduct. She informed that at the workshop, subject matter experts and

subcommittee members collaborated and developed a definition which could be used for purposes of screening during the hiring process and for internal affairs investigations. She reported that POST ultimately decided not to implement the definition developed. Although the subcommittee is disappointed by this decision, it is nonetheless hopeful that the definition will help law enforcement agencies improve their decision-making recruitment efforts.

Member Kulkarni provided detail about the presentation by DOJ consultants. The field training program is an important part of every peace officer's training as it transitions newly assigned officers from basic course academy to patrol field training. As a result, the subcommittee opted to review this subject over the course of two years. To assist, DOJ consultants have provided their initial review of the material which the subcommittee and the Board will review. In closing, she reported that the subcommittee will continue its work with POST and its review of RIPA related training.

### **Accountability and Civilian Complaints**

Member Criner presented the Accountability and Civilian Complaints Subcommittee's report. The subcommittee last met on September 2, 2025 to discuss both the Accountability and Civilian Complaints draft report sections with DOJ staff. Updates to the Civilian Complaints draft section include civilian complaint trends and case updates on the *LA Police Protective League v. City of LA* matter. The report discusses the case, which will determine the legality of Penal Code section 148.6(a)(1), which makes it a crime to file a knowingly false allegation of misconduct against a police officer and requires the filer to sign an acknowledgment of this consequence. The Board's position on the statute is that it creates a chilling effect that deters the public from filing valid complaints. Member Criner noted that if the California Supreme Court renders its decision on the case, the subcommittee will review and incorporate the decision into the 2026 RIPA report.

Member Criner also provided updates to the Accountability report draft section. The report draft section will cover how civilian oversight agencies (COAs) can work to address racial and identity profiling and improve public safety. He highlighted that this portion of the report highlights the importance of COA independence in ensuring that COAs will address the issues they see, including racial and identity profiling. The Board's recommendation, found in the report, is that COAs should incorporate the elimination of racial and identity profiling as part of their efforts and implement practices that correlate with this mission. As noted in the report, COAs should have unfettered access to the RIPA data related to the agencies they oversee, analyze the data to propose changes to policies and practices aimed at remedying disparities in stops, and continue to monitor those disparities over time. Second, the report section will also continue to assess SB 2 data and officer decertification. He directed the Board to the finding that of the 1,552 racial and identity profiling 2024 complaints, only three were sustained. He expressed that the subcommittee was concerned about the significantly lower number of sustained complaints. Member Criner explained that the subcommittee was interested in taking a closer look at RIPA reporting agencies' methods, investigations, and adjudications. He informed that in the coming years, the subcommittee would like to further examine internal processes for collecting, investigating, and deciding the outcome of these complaints.

## **State and Local Racial & Identity Profiling Policies**

Member Dobard provided the State and Local Racial & Identity Profiling Policies subcommittee's report. The subcommittee last met on September 24 to discuss its draft report section. At the meeting, the DOJ provided an overview of the report section and revisions made so far. The report section focuses on how public safety can be improved through reductions in racial and identity profiling. First, it will examine the factors that contribute to a community's feelings of safety with attention on how racial profiling affects public safety. The report section will also cover how profiling impacts public safety, including the impacts on public health, the economic impacts of racial and identity profiling practices, and how profiling erodes public trust in law enforcement, diminishes civic engagement, and negatively impacts the mental health of individuals in the community. Second, the report draft section will review the law enforcement practice of oversaturation which occurs when law enforcement concentrates its presence and resources in a community. The section will discuss oversaturation's negative impacts and how alternative enforcement technologies are utilized in oversaturation, and contribute to the negative effects of oversaturation. Third, the report section will cover data driven research supporting the elimination of pretextual stops to improve public safety. Fourth, it will include 2024 RIPA data analyses on *Terry* stops (i.e., pat down searches), particular elements of stops, stops on those perceived to have limited English fluency, and assess the data at an agency level to identify any racial and identity profiling disparities. Member Dobard noted that the aforementioned analyses may be moved to the Stop Data report section as a matter of convenience for readers.

Member Dobard explained that the draft report section will make the following data-based policy recommendations to the California Legislature:

- The Legislature should enact legislation, similar to already-implemented policies in multiple jurisdictions discussed in the section, to limit or prohibit the use of pretextual stops, and enact legislation to limit stops only to specified offenses considered to impact public safety;
- The Legislature should enact legislation to limit or prohibit policing practices that rely on oversaturation of marginalized communities; and
- The Legislature should enact legislation to study and make further recommendations to limit the use of alternative enforcement technology, such as facial recognition, gunshot detection, and predictive policing to determine whether these technologies exacerbate racial and identity profiling.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked the subcommittees before turning the meeting to Co-Chair Guerrero for the second half of the meeting.

## **7. BOARD DISCUSSION RE: DRAFT 2026 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Before Co-Chair Guerrero moderated the Board through discussion on its draft 2026 report by sections, she opened the floor to DOJ Research Services for their presentation on current data analyses by Research Services Lead Analyst Dr. Eric van Holm.

Dr. Eric van Holm presented on updated RIPA data analyses to be included in the report. The presentation covered Research Services' final analyses, an overview of the 2026 Stop Data report section, and a detailed look at findings from the analysis of inter-stop co-occurrence. He began by reminding the Board that the scope of the analyses was from data sourced from 5,065,428 stops in 2024 from 533 reporting agencies. At a high-level, the data shows stop disparities by perceived race/ethnicity to negatively impact the Hispanic/Latine(x) and Black communities; they are stopped more than their proportion to the state's population; conversely, individuals perceived as Asian were stopped less frequently compared to their proportion of the state's population. Moreover, those perceived to be Black, Hispanic/Latine(x), Multi-racial or Native American experienced, on average, more actions taken when stopped compared to those perceived as Asian or Middle Eastern/South Asian. However, when stops consisting of more than one action occurred, the disparities were muted.

Dr. van Holm also discussed disparities identified by perceived gender. He reported that when reviewing the actions an officer can take during a stop there are disparities that negatively impact the transgender community. He reported that both transgender men and women communities encounter more instances of being asked about their parole status; being detained; getting handcuffed; undergoing consent searches; and searches generally by officers than the cisgender or non-binary communities.

Dr. van Holm continued his presentation and reported on findings related to perceptions based on housing status. He explained that Research Services reviewed the RIPA data for disparities between those perceived to be unhoused and those perceived to be housed. In regard to disparities considering the same actions presented on in the presentation's gender analyses, he reported that those perceived to be unhoused experience significantly more instances of these actions occurring than those that are perceived to be housed. Significant disparities continued to be found between these two groups in that those perceived to be unhoused were more likely to experience stops initiated by a call for service or on reasonable suspicion and were more likely to result in their arrest. Dr. van Holm explained that by looking at multiple elements at once, the Board could better understand the source of the disparities that are seen in the data.

Dr. van Holm also reported on Research Services' cooccurrence analysis. Per the Board's request to identify what actions occur together and to determine how actions taken during a stop influence subsequent actions taken, Research Services utilized co-occurrence analysis. Co-occurrence analyses can be used to answer what actions are most likely to co-occur during a stop, how perceived demographics influence the odds of certain actions being taken, and how both demographics and actions taken during a stop impact the odds of the stop's outcome with similar conditions. The first co-occurrence analysis he presented was on positive correlations between actions. He explained that one of the highest positive correlations was found between uses of force and searches, meaning that when one of those actions occurs, there is a high likelihood that the other action occurs. Research Services found a similarly high correlation between detainment and use of force actions.

The second co-occurrence finding presented was whether actions were more likely to occur with certain perceived demographics. To perform this review, Research Services used regression

analysis which isolates the element to be studied with the action taken while keeping all other elements the same, and compares it to a comparison group. Using regression analysis on four actions — handcuffing, detention, search, and asking for consent — Research Services found strong correlations that such actions were more likely to occur to those perceived to be Black and Hispanic/Latine(x) than those perceived to be White, the comparison group. Dr. van Holm also presented on perceived demographics correlations with these actions for gender (cisgender man/boy as the comparison group), age (youth perceived to be 10-14 as the comparison group), sexual orientation (LGB+ as the comparison group), English fluency (English fluent as the comparison group), disability (no disability as the comparison group), housing status (housed as the comparison group), and reason for stop (reasonable suspicion as the comparison group).

Dr. van Holm explained that, when looking at stops where one of the actions taken was the use of handcuffs, individuals perceived to be Asian were less likely to be handcuffed than individuals perceived to be White. Similarly, individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls or non-cisgender were less likely to be handcuffed than individuals perceived to be cisgender men/boys. As to disparities in age, Dr. van Holm noted that handcuffing is more frequent with individuals perceived to be entering adulthood. Youth perceived to be 15-24 and individuals perceived to be 25-64 were more likely to be handcuffed than youth perceived to be 10-14. As to individuals perceived to have a disability, Dr. van Holm noted that individuals perceived to have no disability are less likely to be handcuffed than those with a perceived disability. Individuals perceived to be heterosexual are less likely to be handcuffed than those that are perceived to be LGB+. Individuals with perceived limited or no English fluency, or perceived to be unhoused, are more likely to be handcuffed as part of a stop than those with perceived English fluency or perceived housing. Dr. van Holm noted that there are other factors that affect whether an individual is handcuffed, such as whether the stop began as a call for service, or whether the reason for the stop was a traffic or other stop.

Dr. van Holm also explained that Research Services also reviewed other actions taken during a stop, such as whether the individual was detained, and saw similar racial and identity disparities, although there were some differences. For example, individuals perceived to be non-cisgender were slightly more likely to be detained during a stop individuals perceived to be cisgender. In addition, individuals perceived to be unhoused were much more likely to be detained than individuals perceived to be housed.

Research Services also conducted a co-occurrence analysis for both actions taken and perceived demographics as predictors to stops resulting in arrest. As to actions taken, individuals who are detained, handcuffed, or searched are more likely to be arrested; individuals who are asked for consent to search are less likely to be arrested.

As to perceived demographics, Dr. van Holm noted that, individuals perceived to be Black are less likely to be arrested than individuals perceived to be White, the comparison group, when specific actions—being detained, being handcuffed, being searched, and being asked for consent—are taken during the arrest. Although this would seem to suggest that those perceived to be Black are less likely to be arrested, he explained that this is not the case. Instead, the data supports the theory that stops where those specific actions are taken are disproportionately



occurring to individuals perceived to be Black. He concluded his presentation and invited the Board to ask questions.

Member Qazi thanked Dr. Eric van Holm for the work performed. She asked how moving the report publication date would impact his team's analyses. Dr. Eric van Holm said that the analyses took 2-3 months to conduct, but that future co-occurrence analyses can be completed more quickly, because they now have a framework to work with. She also asked him to expand on the Co-occurrence analyses with age groups. Dr. van Holm explained that Research Services found there was only a very small difference in the likelihood of arrest between youth perceived to be 1-9 years old and 10-14 years old, indicating that there is no difference between whether they are more likely to be arrested or not. Dr. van Holm stated that the larger takeaway from these analyses was that the likelihood of arrest increases as an individual approaches adulthood. Member Forde asked clarification on whether there could be any conclusions drawn from the disparities identified. Dr. Eric van Holm stated that while the data can reveal that disparities exist it cannot articulate why the disparities are occurring. However, Dr. van Holm stated that many of the disparities seen in the data are seen year over year, and there have not been substantial decreases in those disparities since the data was first reported.

Member Khadjavi observed that there is a strong correlation between being asked for a consent search and the consent search occurring. She explained that this can be interpreted to mean that no one declines consent searches from being performed and that the public may not understand their right to decline searches. Co-Chair Guerrero added that the RIPA Board has visited the topic of consent searches in the past and found it to be affected by the power dynamic between the officer and person stopped. Moreover, the data has also suggested that when one declines a consent search, the time detained is significantly extended. She noted that more recently officers are now required to inform individuals of their right to decline consent searches but that in light of the related factors, that the RIPA Board has recommended prohibitions to consent searches without reasonable suspicion or probable cause.

Member Randolph asked for confirmation that the co-occurrence analyses include incidents resulting in arrest. Dr. Eric van Holm confirmed that incidents resulting in arrests were included in the analysis. Member Randolph also asked whether the RIPA data suggests a downward trajectory. Dr. Eric van Holm explained that the data has generally remained consistent across the years but that there have been no longitudinal analyses conducted to verify.

Co-Chair Guerrero then directed the meeting to discuss its draft report.

### **Stop Data Analysis**

Member Khadjavi asked that the request for a public data dashboard be made as a recommendation for this year's report and invited the Board to discuss its merits. She expressed that the data required tremendous efforts from both law enforcement agencies and the DOJ. Because some agencies are unable to create their own dashboards, a public data dashboard from the RIPA Board would be seen as beneficial. Co-Chair Guerrero agreed. She stated that access to the data would be helpful to both law enforcement agencies and the public.

Member Qazi asked law enforcement members of the Board how officers can determine the housing status. Member Randolph stated that officers will perceive a person as unhoused if they determine that they are either living in their vehicle or residing in an RV or motor home that is no longer operable. Member Qazi also asked how the determination would be made during a traffic stop. Member Randolph responded that the determination could be made when either the detained individual provides that information when officer's ask for purposes of a citation or in the performance of another inquiry.

Co-Chair Guerrero suggested several edits to the draft section report. First, she asked that paragraphs describing percentages be made clear by including the total number from which the percentage is derived from. She stated that the recommended edit would allow readers to understand the magnitude that is discussed. She also asked that the Calls for Service subsection be rewritten for clarity. To achieve this, she suggested that the section distinguish between calls for service and discretionary stops. She requested that the disparities in the charts on pages 27-29 be acknowledged in the text as well. Additionally, she recommended that the charts available on page 37 include a totals column or row to help the reader understand the chart's orientation. Lastly, she asked that examples be provided on agencies that refused to use consent searches on page 38.

### **POST Training and Recruitment**

Member Randolph thanked Co-Chair Sierra and Member Kulkarni for their presentation to the POST Commission and informed that their work had been positively received. As a recommendation, he asked that the Board include its law enforcement members to participate on their future endeavors regarding field officer training programs; he noted that their institutional knowledge will be relevant and useful. DAG Simpson explained to the Board that any member of the POST subcommittee who expressed interest in review and assessment of the topic would be able to participate. He encouraged participation as it would allow for a range of opinions that can contribute to the assessment. He also assured that the DOJ consultant who developed the assessment tools and rubric is a former chief of police and will be available for the Board to confer with.

### **Accountability and Civilian Complaints**

Member Randolph thanked the subcommittee for its work on the Civilian Complaints report section. He addressed some of the report section's findings, explaining that the number of complaints included additional sources outside of formal complaints such as texts messages received and asked the Board to consider an alternative theory that the low number of sustained complaints could be an indicator of law enforcement's good work in serving their communities well.

Co-Chair Guerrero praised the Accountability report section for its explanation on how oversight agencies can utilize RIPA data. For the purposes of visibility, she asked to increase the font-sizes of the "x" and "✓" marks in the table on page 9. She also recommended that the report section define the meaning of a case getting "closed" on page 21, and asked for additional revisions to clarify charts provided on pages 23-25. Co-Chair Sierra agreed with Co-Chair Sierra and

appreciated the report section's review of various COA models' strength, weaknesses, and correlation to reduction in racial and identity profiling. Member Qazi also appreciated the draft report section and stated that its recommendations complement the Policies draft report section on hotspot policing and pretextual stops.

Member Randolph also appreciated the thoroughness of the Accountability report section but cautioned on proposed recommendations that may potentially overreach the mandate of the Board. He also asked the DOJ on its selection process that listed law enforcement agencies as not having any COAs in the report section. DAG Simpson explained that the law enforcement agencies presented in the chart are the Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies, and that DOJ reviewed these agencies to determine whether or not they had an oversight agency.

### **Policies**

Co-Chair Sierra appreciated the report section's immigration issues integrations as discussed at the last Board meeting and asked the Board to consider including the material used to present on that topic in the appendix of this year's report. She also asked the Board to consider adding clarifying statements to its recommendation to legislature that it should enact legislation that prohibits or limits oversaturation policing of marginalized communities; including language that would base the recommendation off the effort reduce racial and identity profiling will be helpful. She also noted that the recommendations can possibly be made more specific so that they are more actionable.

Member Qazi noted that the report section offers recommendations to the Legislature and to COAs but that recommendations to localities were absent. She asked the Board to consider formulating a recommendation that would encourage localities with similar recommendations on hotspot policing and pretextual stops. Particularly, she asked whether it is best to encourage or formally recommend localities to explore the practices mentioned in the report. Co-Chair Guerrero understood both Co-Chair Sierra's and Member Qazi's comments and recommended that further specifying the recommendation's language could resolve both comments raised. She also recognized that some edits from the last subcommittee may not have been implemented and asked that the edits be reflected in the future draft report.

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

### **8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor to the public for their comments.

The Jamaican expressed concerns with the RIPA data's integrity. He stated that the RIPA report drafts make no mention on its efforts to ensure the data used is accurate. Although he understood that completely accurate data is impossible, he urged that efforts be made to ensure the data is as close to the truth as possible. He noted that upon independent review, some of the data submitted by law enforcement agencies are significantly inaccurate. He concluded and stated that while he values some of the efforts made by the Board, it is paramount to ensure that the data is complete.

### **9. BREAK**

The Board adjourned for a five-minute break and reconvened at 12:00 p.m. Once a quorum was re-established, Co-Chair Guerrero then moved to its next agenda item

## **10. BOARD DISCUSSION RE: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND REPORT PUBLICATION DATE**

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for Board discussion on the DOJ's comments on changing the RIPA report's publication date. Member Smith appreciated the options presented by the DOJ and for uplifting the merits for each proposed alternative publication date. He acknowledged that the current publication date encumbers real time constraints on both the DOJ and the Board. Despite this difficulty, he asked the Board to err on a solution that would make the recommendations available to Legislature in the same calendar year. Member Randolph agreed with Member Smith and sought for clarification by the DOJ on logistical tasks that may impact data analysis. He asked the DOJ to clarify what is involved with cleaning the data prior to its analysis. Dr. Eric van Holm informed that the task of cleaning the data involves organizing and formatting the data so that it can be used for analytical processes. He explained that Research Services consists of six to seven staff members and that cleaning the data may take one to two months to complete.

Member Qazi asked whether the report's publication also coincides with the public's access to the RIPA data. She recognized the concern that pushing the publication date to a later date may delay the public's access to the RIPA data generally and asked the Board to consider, as a compromise, if the data can be published earlier than the report. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the finalized data aggregates are submitted in the form of statutorily mandated tables. While the Board has customarily published both the report and the tables at the same time, she agreed that this was a possible solution to consider.

Member Kulkarni stated that she was in favor of moving the publication date. She recognized the concern that a later publication date may amount to legislators unable to adopt or develop recommendations into bills but noted that the current publication date presents its own obstacles. The January 1 publication date may stifle the RIPA report's impact because it may be subdued other news coverage and with legislators possibly out of office for the holidays. The later publication date, while giving less time for legislators to develop related bills, would afford the RIPA report to have a stronger impact upon publication and would allow the Board to strategize on a communication strategy that would support it.

Co-Chair Guerrero acknowledged the Board's concerns and asked whether January 31 would be a feasible alternative. Although not a lot of time, she stated that it may be sufficient enough to allow more time for the DOJ to continue its work and would allow the report some space to garner media attention. She also reminded the Board that they have other tools available to alert legislators of the report and informed that legislative briefings have been performed in the past to achieve this. Member Smith agreed on the viability of this alternative as it would allow legislators to develop bills before the deadline to introduce bills in the Legislature, which is on February 20 of this year. Co-Chair Sierra agreed that, at a minimum, it should be pushed to the

end of January. She also expressed that the subcommittees could work more closely with Research Services to shorten development times and adjust the scope of research questions.

#### **11. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for public comment but upon hearing none moved to the next agenda item.

#### **12. SUMMARY OF NEXT STEPS AND VOTE ON ANY ACTION ITEMS**

Co-Chair Guerrero summarized that the Board had a robust discussion of the report and that at the next Board meeting, the Board will vote to finalize the recommendations presented on. As there were no action items to vote on, Co-Chair Guerrero moved to the next agenda item.

#### **13. ADJOURN**

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked the Board for their attendance and adjourned the meeting.