

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

**ACCOUNTABILITY AND CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

March 24, 2026, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chair LaWanda Hawkins and Members William Armaline, Angela Sierra, and Chauncey Smith

Board Members Absent: Co-Chair DJ Criner and Members Andrea Guerrero and Jordan Rall

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair LaWanda Hawkins called the meeting of the Accountability and Civilian Complaints Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Subcommittee member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Member Armaline moved to approve the September 2, 2025 meeting minutes as written. Board Member Sierra seconded the motion. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners assisted with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Hawkins and Members Armaline, Sierra, and Smith
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** None

With four ayes, the meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAGs Rebekah Fretz and Martha Gomez provided an update on behalf of the Department of Justice (DOJ). They presented proposed topics for the Subcommittee to consider for this year's RIPA Report.

DAG Fretz began the first half of the DOJ presentation.

PowerPoint Slide:

Upcoming Opportunity: Second Co-Chair Nomination

DAG Fretz thanked Co-Chairs Criner and Hawkins for their leadership and service as last year's Subcommittee Co-Chairs. For this year's report, Pastor Criner will continue to serve as a Co-Chair for this Subcommittee. Co-Chair Hawkins has expressed interest in transitioning out of the

Co-Chair position but remaining a Subcommittee member. This means there is an opening for a Co-Chair position for the Subcommittee. As a result, at the next Subcommittee meeting, members will have the opportunity to nominate themselves or another member and elect a new Co-Chair for the Subcommittee.

DAG Fretz asked Subcommittee members to please be prepared to nominate and vote for a new Co-Chair at the next Subcommittee meeting in June 2026. She encouraged Subcommittee members to reach out to the DOJ if they are interested in serving as Co-Chair or have any questions about the position.

Next, DAGs Fretz and Gomez presented several proposals for the Board to consider for this year's Report, starting with the Civilian Complaints chapter.

DAG Fretz noted that one issue raised by the Subcommittee was related to the low sustained rate of racial and identity bias complaints. In last year's Report, the Board expressed concern about the low number of sustained complaints and a desire to explore the cause of this low number in future reports. As shown on the screen, DOJ has identified some proposed areas of discussion for this year's report, in light of this issue:

PowerPoint Slide:

Civilian Complaints Proposed Topics

Subcommittee's Concern:

- Low sustained rate for racial and identity profiling complaints

Proposed Actions:

- Further analysis into the RIPA complaint data
- Evaluate the best practices for conducting investigations into complaints involving racial and identity profiling
- Other suggestions?

DAG Fretz explained that the first proposed area would be to look more closely at the RIPA complaint data. There are two categories of analyses DOJ could conduct for the Board: First, the Subcommittee could provide some context for the data on the low number of sustained findings by using summary statistics. This would include looking at dispositions across all complaints, dispositions across identity profiling complaints, and dispositions by type of identity profiling allegation over time. This longitudinal analysis would help the Subcommittee gain a more granular understanding of the data we are seeing with complaints and how many are sustained.

DAG Fretz explained that the Subcommittee could also look at the overall complaint dispositions, dispositions of profiling complaints, and dispositions by type of profiling allegation, broken down by agency over time. These tables are already included in the large appendix published with the RIPA Report every year. However, if it is helpful to highlight the agencies that do sustain complaints, this may be helpful to the Board if we can identify some commonalities or best practices.

DAG Fretz noted that DOJ has done some initial research into this issue, and the preliminary research indicates there are limitations on how granular we can go into this data, since it is summary data. Even if the Board had more detailed individual complaint information, because the low number of sustained complaints year to year, it may be difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from a more detailed analysis, partly due to re-identification concerns.

Another proposed area of discussion to address the low number of sustained complaints is identifying best practices for investigating civilian complaints. DAG Fretz explained that, in other words, the Board could conduct research into best practices for investigating racial and identity complaints, both in law enforcement and other contexts, to understand where there might be gaps in law enforcement investigation processes. She further explained that past RIPA Reports have focused largely on accessibility to the complaints process, so the next step is looking at law enforcement complaint investigation procedures.

DAG Fretz explained that DOJ has conducted some preliminary research into the complaint investigation procedures used by the largest law enforcement agencies in California, and many do not have investigation procedures specific to investigations of racial and identity bias complaints. Most agencies have very general procedures to be followed, but these procedures do not provide specific standards or benchmarks for investigating these types of complaints. DAG Fretz noted that there are currently very few studies on best practices for complaint procedures in the law enforcement context, so the Board might need to look outside law enforcement to other contexts, such as employment.

DAG Fretz noted that there may be potential limitations to this proposal and the research. For example, there may not be best practices specific to law enforcement complaint investigations, so it may take more than a year to develop best practices for complaint investigations.

DAG Fretz stated that DOJ is always open to other proposals or topic areas the Subcommittee might have, and if the Board wanted to discuss them more during today's discussion period, DOJ would take notes. Next, DAG Fretz turned the discussion over to DAG Gomez to provide an overview of potential topics the Board may want to consider for the Accountability chapter of the 2027 RIPA Report.

PowerPoint Slide:

Accountability Proposed Topics

Subcommittee's Concern:

- Holding law enforcement officers accountable for biased conduct that occurs during work performed in the immigration enforcement context.
 - **Proposed Actions:** Assess current legislation. If gaps, propose legislation.

Subcommittee's Concern:

- Low sustained rate for racial and identity profiling complaints
 - **Proposed Actions:** Evaluate the best practices for internal audits of the complaints and investigation processes.

DAG Gomez explained that last year, in light of federal immigration enforcement actions in California, this Subcommittee and the Board at large expressed a desire to explore ways to support state and local law enforcement officers in protecting California's diverse population. The Subcommittee expressed concern around immigration enforcement practices. As such, this Subcommittee may want to explore the overlap between immigration enforcement and the RIPA objective of reducing racial and identity bias. More specifically, the Subcommittee could assess whether law enforcement officers can be held accountable for biased conduct that occurs during work performed in the immigration enforcement context.

DAG Gomez explained that, first, the Subcommittee could assess whether existing legislation provides an accountability mechanism for prospective peace officers who have previously demonstrated racial or identity bias while working for an entity that engages in immigration enforcement. For example, as to prospective peace officers or applicants, the Subcommittee could analyze the background check mechanism provided under Penal Code § 832.12, which requires that a peace officer seeking employment with a law enforcement agency in this state shall give written permission for the hiring law enforcement agency to view the officer's general personnel file in any separate file designated by the department. Penal Code § 832.12 also provides that, before employing a prospect, the law enforcement agency shall request and review records provided by previous employers. The employment information that may be sought includes performance evaluations, disciplinary actions, eligibility for rehire, and other information relevant to a peace officer's performance, except when the disclosure is prohibited by state or federal law. DAG Gomez explained that the Subcommittee could assess whether these background checks give law enforcement agencies the capacity to determine whether a prospect or applicant has previously engaged in inappropriate racial and identity profiling in their past immigration enforcement work, including whether there are limitations and, if needed, propose legislative updates to improve this accountability mechanism.

Second, the Subcommittee could assess whether the legislation provides an accountability mechanism for existing peace officers who demonstrate racial or identity bias while moonlighting for an entity that engages in immigration enforcement. DAG Gomez explained that, specifically, as to existing peace officers, the Subcommittee could evaluate whether Senate Bill 2's decertification protections are broad enough to encompass peace officers' racial and identity bias that occurs with a concurrent employer. Effective January 1, 2022, California Senate Bill 16 mandates that all peace officers immediately report all use of force to their employing department or agency. This requirement was codified as Penal Code § 832.13. However, DAG Gomez explained that there is no ongoing requirement for peace officers to report all complaints related to racial or identity bias, much less for those that occurred during a federal moonlighting. The Subcommittee could explore existing legislation to address any gaps in reporting. It could assess if it is feasible for legislation to mandate ongoing self-reporting by peace officers related to racial and identity bias that occur in concurrent employment or volunteer positions.

DAG Gomez stated that DOJ also welcomes any other proposals the Subcommittee may have regarding accountability for peace officers who have worked in immigration enforcement or who will concurrently perform such work.

The next potential topic DOJ identified for the Subcommittee's consideration is auditing. DAG Gomez noted that, as stated in the discussion of Civilian Complaint topic proposals, the Subcommittee had serious concerns with the low sustained rate for racial and identity profiling complaints in the RIPA data. Here, the Subcommittee could conduct research to evaluate the best practices for internal audits of the complaint and investigation processes with an eye toward identifying the key operational factors for success, such as alignment with strategic vision, confidentiality, competence, objectivity, and also identify the challenges of maintaining independence, especially when internal auditors are employees of the organization they audit.

DAG Gomez stated that, likewise here, DOJ is open to additional proposals and ideas from the Subcommittee. With that, she turned the discussion over to the Subcommittee members for further discussion.

5. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2027 REPORT

Co-Chair Hawkins the Subcommittee's discussion of proposed topics for the 2027 Report. She explained that this is the Subcommittee's opportunity to decide what they would like to focus on in this year's Report. The Report could include the topics proposed by the DOJ or other topics. Now is the Subcommittee's opportunity to discuss these topics, then decide as a group what they would like to move forward with.

Member Sierra stated that she had a clarifying question for DOJ regarding the differences between the two slides presented by the DOJ. She asked how the topic on the Civilian Complaints slide about the proposal to investigate best practices for investigations is different than the issue of the low rate of sustained complaints in the Accountability slide. She was not sure whether those are just different aspects of the same topic or if they are different topics.

DAG Gomez explained that the first part regarding Civilian Complaints is looking into the best practices for investigations themselves, including the processes, protocols, benchmarks, and metrics that are used in the investigation process. She also noted that one thing the Board has to be mindful of is that there may not be existing best practices for racial and identity profiling investigations, so this would involve looking through the literature to other existing practices that are best practices in investigations and bringing them over to this context.

For the Accountability component, DAG Gomez explained that the research is related to internal auditing. One of the mechanisms for accountability is whether the policies and practices are being implemented. Some internal auditing offices have employees that are designated to audit and file complaints, go through the process, and evaluate and assess it. It is a way of including an internal accountability mechanism that is not the commission or somebody else; it is an internal accountability mechanism. That accountability process has its own best practices in literature as well, so the Board would be looking into what it would take, based on the literature, to have internal auditing that is going to be competent, effective, independent, equipped with the right tools and construction, and political buy-in to be effective. The Subcommittee would be trying to identify the success factors.

Member Sierra expressed that DAG Gomez's response was very helpful. She stated that the topics go hand in hand, and she thought they could be a really ripe topic for the Subcommittee to

look at. She was not sure if the Subcommittee would be able to get any agencies to come speak to them about why these rates of sustained racial and identity profiling complaints are low, but she suspected it may be that it is very hard to investigate or, for some agencies such as small or mid-sized agencies, it has been difficult identify what they are looking forward and they could really benefit from some guidance from the Board, perhaps by making analogies to other areas. Member Sierra noted that there may be analogies in the SB 2 context because a part of SB 2 involves the evaluations when hiring an officer and looking for bias; maybe there is an analogy there.

Member Sierra stated that she would be very interested for the Subcommittee to look into those questions and try to develop some best practices for those investigations and auditing as well to make sure that, if they are in place, they are actually being implemented. She suspected, and maybe with more research the Board will know, that may be a reason for the low sustaining rate. Member Sierra also expressed that she would love to know, to the extent they could hear from some agencies about what they are doing, how they are interpreting whatever threshold they feel they need to meet to be able to sustain a complaint. It would be very interesting to hear from some agencies about that, as well.

Finally, Member Sierra expressed that she was not sure how much diving deeper into the statistics would be fruitful for the Board. Member Sierra explained that, as DAG Fretz had noted, there would be some challenges there, and she felt that the Board had done a fairly deep dive into these areas and comparing complaints that have different topics in their other reports. To the extent the Subcommittee has to decide among their resources and where to use them, Member Sierra stated that she would be in favor of looking at investigatory techniques and best practices.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked Member Sierra.

Member Armaline stated that he agreed with Member Sierra and wanted to respond to a couple of the questions. He thanked DAGs Gomez and Fretz for their great presentation and stated that he loves the work that this Board is doing here. Member Armaline agreed with Member Sierra. He thinks what the Subcommittee is looking at here is needing more qualitative data over quantitative data here. The Board needs the who and now — who is making these decisions, and how are they making them — because, statistically, that is a complete anomaly: 3 out of 2,000 complaints. Member Armaline stated that no statistics professor is going to let that fly and remark, “Oh, there’s nothing wrong here.” There has to be some kind of purely qualitative investigation at this point — not quantitative data because we can see the numbers and crunch those in every which way. That is not the problem. Out of 2,000 complaints, only 3 are sustained. Member Armaline expressed that they don’t need to do more crunching. This is a purely qualitative investigation at this point. The Board needs to know the who, the how, the why, and all that kind of stuff. On top of that, why didn’t anyone see this internally as odd? They saw this internally, that they had almost 2000 complaints, but only 3 of them were legitimate? Member Armaline stated that this was a very interesting question — what is the internal dialogue when they see this data? The public are liars? We police a bunch of imbeciles? Member Armaline clarified that he was not saying that to be funny. He said this because he would be very interested to hear what their narrative explanation is for their own data; it would be an interesting, revealing kind of narrative. Member Armaline stated that the fear is that they are going to look into this

and find what they are finding with DOGE, where it is some single, very interesting way of making decisions. He thinks the Subcommittee needs that qualitative data, and it sounds like the DOJ is really on top of that, which sounds really good.

Member Armaline also mentioned that AB 655, or the CLEAR Act, might also offer some opportunity here for discipline of officers that are involved in some of this stuff outside. He explained that the CLEAR Act refers to any kind of organizational affiliation with a white supremacist or hate group, or anything like that, which a lot of folks playing around in the ICE game are also Oath Keepers. He stated that all those guys qualify under AB 655, and you can SB 2 them for being an Oath Keeper in California. No one is doing it yet, but you can do it. We have the tools to do this stuff, but the question is will anyone will prosecute? Will anyone do it? Member Armaline suggested again that the Subcommittee take a look at the CLEAR Act, since no one has been using it, even though it is ripe to be used.

Member Armaline also remarked that they may have to have some uncomfortable conversations about other members of this Board who are directly involved in some of this activity. What are they going to do then? Member Armaline noted that a member of this Board is literally seizing ballots as they speak in the state of California, against the Attorney General's wishes. They are talking about going after people that are cooperating with this project. One of them is on this Board, so he thinks they have some things to address. Member Armaline expressed that he does not know the best way to address it, but they are not going to sit here, just like the ICE stuff, and pretend as if this is not happening. He loves that they are doing this, but if they are doing it then they have to do it, and that means being really clear about all that stuff. Member Armaline stated that he knows it is going to take a little courage on their part, but that is the way this is going to have to be.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked Member Armaline for sharing.

Member Smith echoed the sentiment offered by Member Armaline and stated that he had nothing further to add at this moment.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked Member Smith. She stated that Members Sierra and Armaline have said quite a bit for them as the Board. She stated that quality data is very important, and it is very important to understand why they did not notice it before they sent the data in. She stated that someone should have noticed this. There was something wrong. That speaks volumes.

Co-Chair Hawkins asked if any other Subcommittee member would like to share their thoughts before moving on to public comments. Hearing no comments, she proceeded to public comments.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Hawkins invited members of the public to provide comments regarding the Accountability and Complaints sections of the Report. She instructed the public to please raise their hands using the Teams function, and if they cannot use it, to please unmute themselves.

Public Comment #1:

A speaker who identified themselves as Andrea Thomas provided the first public comment. She stated that her son's name is Risean Williams. They came to this Board meeting not too long ago, just last year. She remembers Miss Angela Sierra and know Andrea Guerrero was there too. She just had a meeting too for racial bias profiling.

Ms. Thomas stated that she and her son know that they are being monitored by a system that they should not be in by 702 FISA foreign intelligence. It is called prison, they are in prison. They are outside in prison because they are being harassed daily by, of course, the congressional personnel who implemented this, who passed their names to the NSA. However, their data location is open through this, so they are using their artificial intelligence. She wanted to say that the local police have their artificial intelligence on their dashboards so that they can locate her and her son. However, just yesterday they were outside of the library by a school, and her son was just out there with a marker, and somebody said that he had a gun. And so, he had guns drawn on him in Wilmington, CA, at the Wilmington library, Karen Bass, one of her libraries, whatever.

She stated that they are homeless because of this. They won't let her get a job, they won't let her get an apartment. This is all artificial intelligence. So, she agreed with what Mr. William Armaline was saying. She does believe that part of this regime is like a KKK Black Marxist. Across the Board, there is bias geared towards her son because they can track them with artificial intelligence anytime they want. Basically, they could have killed him because he had two guns on him. She has the video and everything of all the police who were out there. They had to get her from the library. She believes that this is pure bias, it is white supremacist, and she can also say that this is a Black Marxist who has joined in.

Basically, they have their data location open. She has been crying out to Rob Bonta about this, writing to him about every incident. They are being followed, chased, and targeted. They also were targeted through Metro because they know Metro is linked to Metro Transportation. That is another way to target the with racial bias through artificial intelligence. They keep having these attacks through, she wants to say it's just through the police. She was attacked by somebody and still had the scars on her hands to prove it, and then her son was attacked. She did not go to the hospital and she should have, but her son was just attacked on Metro. A guy bit him in the neck, and they believe that it is the police who keep coming for them. It has to be. But, because of the artificial intelligence and the open data location, they could send anyone for them.

Ms. Thomas believes there is some inside, deep-state work going on, and that is one reason why they are being targeted. She wanted to know what to do in this instance and expressed that police having our artificial intelligence is not a good idea because they have our whole genetic makeup, everything. They can track us down, they have our data location, and they can send anybody to us. They said that they do not even know who called. She asked them who called, and they said they do not know. They are being monitored, so anybody can come for them.

She stated that this is a case that she is fighting, and this is one of the biggest investigations right now because this is human trafficking. You guys have trafficked us under 702 FISA foreign intelligence, and it just keeps getting passed and passed and passed. She stated that she is an

individual and so is her son. They want to get out of 702 FISA, so the FBI will not have their data and the local police will not harass them. She has the video of her son being handcuffed, and that right there, he could have gotten killed yesterday. And it is almost like they're saying, 'Oh yeah, we know that you guys are going to this board meeting, and we can kill you if we want, and we can do whatever it is.' They said, well, he had the biggest marker that there was — how could that be misconstrued as a gun? And why would he have a gun by a high school in a library? He was sitting outside smoking a cigarette. So that was just pure bias, and then they were like, well, "Why are you mad?" She stated why would not she be mad if she saw them having her son handcuffed out here? They could have killed him. She would have never even known. But that was a threat, and they are being chased and stalked by this regime. She feels like it is the KKK working from within, so she feels like they need to be investigated and they need some oversight because everybody has IP and everybody is in some chat, Signal or something, where they can all be cut. The Black Marxists, too, because they are a part of it.

Ms. Thomas stated that her son would come up. He is outside because they got pepper spray and could not bring it in. He will come. She also noted one more thing they are being hit with. She stated that Senator Ron White, because she used to live in Oregon, is helping her. And Merkley, they are on the CIA Torture Act because they are using the Wi-Fi to hit them with this AI, hit them with this 5G direct energy weapons. Anybody and everybody can hit them with these weapons, and they are torturing her son to death, and he is barely able to breathe because of the transportation that is hitting them with these weapons. They know that a little bit of everybody is doing it, and she is asking the Board to please call the Governor, Attorney Bonta, to talk to the FAA because they are being profusely harassed by the helicopters, drones, and planes hitting them, and they are homeless because of this. Please, please. She is going to lose her son. They have some acoustic noise. She stated that her investigator's name is Amy Holm, and they are working with do weapons right now, but everybody is buying them, and they do not want to confess that they are using these weapons. This is genocide. She did a little writing for the Governor's office. She thinks it was one of the AG's assistants. It was a few months ago when they let her and her son make a public statement, and they did send a public statement about you guys when you were changing the police reform about genocide. If you guys find out about members, regimes or gangs within the police force, that they would be recommended. So, she and her son did make a public statement on this.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked Ms. Thomas for her comments.

DAG Manners thanked the public for their comments and reminded everyone, for their awareness, that the Board is here in a listening capacity and does not respond to individual comments. They really do appreciate the public attending the meeting today and sharing their comments. The Board can take that into consideration. She also acknowledged that at least one other person had their hand raised to provide comments, and she wanted to make sure there was time for them to share their perspective as well.

Public Comment #2:

A second speaker who identified themselves as Michelle Wittig provided public comment. With regard to the prior member of the public, she stated that she hoped the Board would direct her to

some of the entities that can address some of the concerns the prior speaker raised. One thing that sometimes happens is that people vent, and then they do not get directed to the proper place where their concerns can be addressed, so she hoped that will happen. Her comments were somewhat related to that and, of course, to the topic of today's meeting.

The first one had to do with due diligence when law enforcement agencies are hiring individuals who may have been peace officers in another jurisdiction. Ms. Wittig stated that she is not familiar with the Penal Code, so she was going to bring up some concerns that she had some firsthand knowledge of, which may fall through the cracks. For example, an individual may be hired without any disciplinary action being in their record at a prior agency, but might have been the subject of a lawsuit for which that person's place of employment actually paid out thousands or even millions of dollars, but then failed to put any indication of that settlement in that person's disciplinary record. So, when they apply to be a peace officer in a different agency or even in the same city in a different capacity, there is a certain blindness or lack of information about what has actually occurred. So, when you dig deeply enough that disciplinary action is not taken by the prior agency, even when litigation has resulted in a judgment or settlement against that person, that needs to be known by the new agency. She hoped that is covered by the Penal Code.

The other topic had to do with strengthening the complaint intake and adjudication procedures. Ms. Wittig wanted to mention a positive case study. The department that she is the most familiar with in Santa Monica was the subject of complaints about the complaint procedure. Fortunately, the city hired the Office of Independent Review, which is an entity in Marina del Rey, California, to investigate the complaint intake and adjudication procedures. And subsequently, the assistant chief and the chair of our local police oversight commission did a major overhaul of the procedure. Now, she could not say for sure that it is excellent, but it certainly has all the earmarks for being better than it was. So, if you are looking for a case study of how to do this, she thought Santa Monica might be a good example, at least on this one criterion.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked Ms. Wittig for sharing.

Public Comment #3:

A third speaker who identified themselves as The Jamaican provided public comment. He stated that he found interest in the former comment. The former speaker spoke of the situation where information exists about a police officer who misbehaved in some former position who now gets hired because, today, this very morning, there was an article that appeared. He did not remember where, but he just posted a link to the chat that essentially said that police departments have information upon which to act, but most choose not to. He thought that is true. He thought that is true, particularly with regard to this Board. From time to time, he says similar things as he has just repeated or regurgitated from others, and he sees nothing happen to it. Not many minutes ago, the sheriff who would be governor was mentioned. He brought that up merely because the sheriff who would be governor has served a useful purpose, useful in his opinion, because the sheriff mentioned, together with one other member of the Board who sits here today, that RIPA data is so poor that the public would not stand for it if the public knew about the data quality. They speak of Chad Bianco. That is what he said. What he said was true. So, he is like a broken clock. At least he was right once. His department has been a warning signal to this Board and has

been so for a long time. It was either last year or the year before that his department had a 7,000% increase in complaints made against them.

The speaker's question to this Board was: How is it possible that some entity could have a 7,000% increase in complaints without that being mentioned and dealt with? He thought that the sheriff is in a retributive place because his department has been subject to investigations by the DOJ and that may be part of what motivates him.

The speaker stated that this is related, but not directly. He had a complaint to the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ. It is not a direct RIPA matter, but it is a complaint about police stops at the MTS of San Diego County. It has been with the DOJ's Civil Rights Division for more than a year, and it has been ignored. When he said it here, he said it because he expected someone in the Civil Rights division of the DOJ to hear the Jamaican's mention of the complaint and to have it removed from the place where it has sat, unacted upon, for more than a year. He asked how is it possible for something like that to happen.

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked this member of the public for sharing and asked if there were any other public comments. Hearing none, she again thanked the public for their comments and moved to the next agenda item.

7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Before the meeting concluded, Co-Chair Hawkins asked the DOJ if there were any questions or comments regarding the next steps. DAGs Gomez and Fretz stated that they did not have any questions. Co-Chair Hawkins thanked DAGs Gomez and Fretz for their magnificent report.

DAG Manners thanked all Board Members and members of the public for attending the meeting and reminded the Board of the opportunity flagged in the DOJ Update by DAGs Fretz and Gomez, who mentioned that the Subcommittee will need a new Co-Chair. She encouraged the Subcommittee members, if they are interested in this position or have any questions, to please feel free to reach out to the DOJ team and they will be happy to talk with the Members about what that would entail. DAG Manners asked members to be prepared to nominate and vote for a new Co-Chair at the next Subcommittee meeting and noted that the DOJ will hopefully have an initial draft ready for the Board by then.

8. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Hawkins thanked the Subcommittee and adjourned the meeting.