

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

MEETING MINUTES

March 13, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Angela Sierra and Andrea Guerrero, and Members D.J. Criner, Souley Diallo, John Dobard, Darren Greene, LaWanda Hawkins, Brian Kennedy, Lily Khadjavi, Manju Kulkarni, Chauncey Smith, Rich Randolph, and Cha Vang

Board Members Absent: Members William Armaline, Chad Bianco, Ameena Qazi, Sean Thuilliez, and Ronaldo Villeda

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Sierra called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each RIPA Board (herein Board) member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 19, 2024, FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Sierra asked the Board to review the draft meeting minutes from the November 19, 2024, full Board Meeting. Member Criner moved to approve the minutes, and Member Khadjavi seconded.

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

- **AYE:** Members Criner, Diallo, Dobard, Greene, Guerrero, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Sierra, and Smith
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Vang

The meeting minutes were approved as presented, with ten ayes and one abstention.

4. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Stop Data Analysis

Member Khadjavi reported that the Stop Data Analysis subcommittee met recently, on March 5, 2025, Stop Data Analysis subcommittee meeting. The subcommittee was pleased to welcome Member Chauncey Smith to the subcommittee.

Member Khadjavi reported that the primary focus of the subcommittee meeting was a rich discussion of the topics to be included the 2026 RIPA Report. As a backdrop to that discussion, several new elements were collected in the 2024 RIPA stop data, such as the type of stop (e.g., distinguishing between vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian stops).

The Stop Data subcommittee created a list of topics for potential exploration in the upcoming report, including:

- Looking at RIPA stop data by region and agency, with the goal of identifying hotspots of police activity to better understand the nature and impact of agencies' policies and training. This would not mean focusing a specific location like the intersection of streets, but rather an agency or

region as a hotspot. This analysis may focus on uses of force, handcuffing, searches, uses of consent searches, field interview cards, and more;

- Analyzing stops that do not involve the use of a car to better understand police practices. For example, bicyclist and pedestrian stops can now be disaggregated within the stop data. Historically, in areas such as Los Angeles, pedestrians were more likely to be subjected to a search or frisk at higher than national rates. Accordingly, it would be very important to distinguish stops that do not involve a car;
- Analyzing the newly-reported stop data in light of use of consent searches by agency, to observe if there have been effective policy changes in agencies. The data will now reflect the ways in which consent is demonstrated (i.e., verbal, written, or implicit consent). This will give a window in the practices of particular agencies;
- Analyzing the newly-reported data regarding officers' self-identified race;
- Continuing to focus on pretext stops;
- Analyzing the resulting harms of profiling, particularly in policies surrounding vehicle pursuits that result in car crashes;
- Analyzing the duration of a stop to understand the impact and lifecycle of a stop;
- Conducting a longitudinal analysis of Wave 1 agencies (which are the largest law enforcement agencies in California, such as CHP and LAPD). Since there is data for many years, the subcommittee could look longitudinally to see if things have changed since the enactment of RIPA; and
- Analyzing stops that stem from a call for service in contrast to discretionary stops by law enforcement.

Member Khadjavi stated that the DOJ will look into the feasibility of the list provided and report back at the next Stop Data subcommittee meeting.

Member Khadjavi lastly reported on two more global issues discussed during the Stop Data subcommittee meeting:

- The DOJ is looking into vendors for the statewide RIPA data dashboard; and
- As a companion to that, the Stop Data subcommittee would like public input on ways in which the Stop Data section of the annual RIPA Report and the data dashboard can be more useful for members of the public. The subcommittee acknowledged that members of public should not need special resources, such as special software, to have an eye on the RIPA data – the data should be available in a digestible form, which is vital for transparency and building public trust. The RIPA Board could consider convening a group outside of the full Board or subcommittee meetings to get more targeted public input.

State and Local Racial and Identity Policies

Member Dobard reported that the State and Local Racial and Identity Policies subcommittee met on February 26, 2025. The subcommittee discussed several potential topics for the 2026 RIPA Report, including:

- Examining the negative consequences of policing, including their impacts on Black and brown communities;

- Analyzing hotspot policing data across the state and its relationship to racial and identity profiling;
- Examining the impact of policy changes related to pretext stops;
- Analyzing stop data to understand the trajectory of individual stops;
- Examining the allocation of police resources; and
- Conducting a deeper dive on disparities based on language proficiency.

The Policies subcommittee decided it would like to focus on ways to increase public safety, particularly in Black and brown communities, as their theme. Member Dobard reported that the subcommittee would like to analyze different elements of this theme, such as the factors that contribute to communities being and feeling safe; the relationship between those factors and negative police interactions; the drivers in the evolution of racial and identity profiling over time; and the consequences of over-policing and hotspot policing. This may include potential data analyses of geographic trends in racial and identity profiling across the state; the impact of changes to pretext stop policies by San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD); and trends in stop data for each individual stop (e.g., trends in stops of perceived demographics, including language profiling).

Member Dobard reported that the DOJ is looking into the possibility of conducting these data analyses and will report back at the next Policies subcommittee meeting, including a report back on whether analysis of the LAPD or SFPD policies should be included in the annual RIPA Report or released in another form.

POST Training and Recruitment

Member Kulkarni reported that the POST Training and Recruitment subcommittee met on March 10, 2025. The meeting covered three main areas: (1) discussion of the 2025 RIPA Report; (2) plans for the 2026 Report; and (3) the Board's ongoing relationship with POST.

(1) Discussion of 2025 Report

Member Kulkarni reminded the Board that AB 953 requires the RIPA Board to analyze the POST Commission profiling courses and include its findings in the annual RIPA Report. AB 953 requires POST to develop courses of instructions and guidelines to ensure that law enforcement agencies comply with training objectives required under California and federal law. Upon RIPA's enactment, POST identified eight courses that met AB 953's requirements. Over the past seven years, the RIPA Board (in particular, the POST subcommittee) has reviewed most of the racial and identity profiling training courses identified by POST. Last year, in the 2025 RIPA Report, the Board paused its review of the identified courses to participate in POST workshops to develop guidelines for racial and identity profiling courses and policies. The remaining course for the Board's review is Field Training, which the subcommittee will review this year and next year.

Member Kulkarni reported that the POST subcommittee discussed a summary of the POST section during its March 10, 2025 meeting. With respect to the POST guidelines, the subcommittee relayed its concerns to POST about outdated legal standards and the need for guidelines to apply to all existing and future POST-certified racial and identity profiling courses. The subcommittee will invite POST to speak at the next subcommittee meeting to discuss the guidelines and POST's response to the recommendations in the 2025 RIPA Report.

(2) Plans for 2026 Report

For the 2026 Report, the POST subcommittee will focus on evaluating POST's Field Training Program in the 2026 RIPA Report.

Field Training is a continuation of the basic academy and facilitates a peace officer's transition from an academic setting to the performance of general law enforcement duties of the employing department.

Newly assigned officers and deputies must receive additional training in the field on actual calls for service, where they can learn from officers who already have practical patrol experience. New officers are assigned to a Field Training Officer, who is an experienced officer selected and trained to conduct this type of training.

The POST subcommittee will review the Field Training Program over the next two years. The 2026 RIPA Report will include: 1) A review of the published POST guidelines; 2) an analysis of POST's response to the 2025 Report recommendations; 3) Part One of the Field Training Program review; and 4) recommendations to the Legislature and POST.

(3) Ongoing relationship with POST

Member Kulkarni reported that RIPA Co-Chair Sierra provided the POST Subcommittee with an update on efforts by the Board co-chairs to improve communication and effectiveness of the Board's relationship with POST.

Accountability and Civilian Complaints

Member Hawkins reported that the Accountability and Civilian Complaints subcommittee met on February 12, 2025. All subcommittee members were in attendance.

Member Hawkins stated that the subcommittee discussed the following recommendations regarding youth, which were tabled in the development of the 2025 RIPA Report:

- POST modify the SB 2 complaint form to indicate whether an incident involves a person 17 or younger or between the ages of 18 to 24;
- The Legislature amend Penal Code section 13510.8 to require consideration of the complainant's age in determining if a peace officer's conduct rises to the level of serious misconduct and warrants decertification. Member Hawkins stated that this recommendation relates to the prior recommendation of identifying complaints involving youth, and that it is crucial to understand the contact youth have with law enforcement because having a first contact with law enforcement at a young age can determine how individuals react and interact with law enforcement as an adult;
- POST amend Regulation 1205 to require consideration of the complainant's age in determining if a peace officer's conduct rises to the level of serious misconduct that warrants decertification. Member Hawkins stated that there is no prior data, and there needs to be legislation to ensure that this data is provided;
- The Legislature consult with POST, law enforcement agencies, experts, researchers, and community groups about harmful conduct of officers that may not fit within the nine categories of serious misconduct. Member Hawkins stated that Board members have heard there are things outside the nine categories that people are being stopped for, so the subcommittee needs to hear from the community about other categories that may not be included in the current definition of serious misconduct;
- The Legislature amend Penal Code section 13510.8, subdivision (d) to expand the authority of POST Executive Director to continue an immediate temporary suspension of an officer where the circumstances indicate that the officer continues to pose a danger to the public, even when one of the statutory grounds for imposing an immediate temporary suspension has been resolved. Member Hawkins stated that there may be times when an officer can go through the procedure, but they are still a danger to public safety and the chief of police is not allowed to fire them. If POST had the power to step in, then officers should be let go if they pose a danger to the public.

Member Hawkins reported that the subcommittee discussed the following topics for inclusion in the 2026 RIPA Report:

- Continuing to analyze SB 2 decertification data;
- Continuing to monitor the *L.A. Protective League* case and its effects on deterrent language on the complaint forms. Member Hawkins stated that smaller police departments will follow LAPD's example, therefore the Accountability and Complaints subcommittee needs to see if that language can deter people from filing a complaint;
- Civilian oversight bodies;
- The evolution of how racial profiling occurs; and
- The consequences of pretext stops.

The subcommittee felt some of the topics discussed would be better housed in the Policies or Stop Data subcommittees. Ultimately, the subcommittee decided to continue analyzing SB 2 data and develop best practice for civilian oversight bodies in the Accountability section of this year's Report, and to continue monitoring the use of deterrent language in complaint forms in the Complaints section of the Report.

Member Hawkins also reported that the Subcommittee asked someone from POST to attend their next upcoming subcommittee meetings to provide additional information on the recommendations discussed above.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked the subcommittees for their work and encouraged members of the Board to attend the subcommittee meetings and stay in close contact with DOJ regarding their availability, as the meetings cannot proceed if a quorum is not reached.

5. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND BOARD DISCUSSION

DAG Alexander Simpson provided updates on Board work: (1) The 2025 RIPA Report was posted to the DOJ website on January 1, 2025; and (2) the DOJ Office of Community Awareness Response and Engagement (CARE) hosted a community briefing on the 2025 RIPA Report on January 21, 2025, which Board members Smith and Qazi participated in. DAG Simpson encouraged members of the public to review the report and recording of the CARE Community Briefing.

DAG Simpson next gave a presentation summarizing the Board's work, responsibilities under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, and proper procedures for Board meetings.

The RIPA Board is responsible for eliminating racial and identity profiling under Penal Code section 13519.4. Procedurally, this happens through Board meetings. There are four full Board meetings per year. The Board subdivided its work into four subcommittees: Accountability and Complaints; Policies; Stop Data; and Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). Each subcommittee meets three times per year. All of these meetings are governed by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

The Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act promotes open consensus building and ensures that the public has the right to access information about the State's public business. The goal of Bagley-Keene is to ensure that the actions of state bodies are transparent, and that the public can observe and participate in decision-making. Bagley-Keene applies to state bodies, including the RIPA Board.

There are certain requirements for remote meetings under Bagley-Keene. The RIPA Board is permitted to hold open and noticed meetings remotely through January 1, 2026. RIPA Board members are responsible for attending meetings, and are required to keep cameras on for the duration of the meeting unless it is technologically impracticable. Members may turn off their camera only after announcing the reasoning for their nonappearance.

Board members also have responsibilities under Bagley-Keene outside of meetings. Under Bagley-Keene, a meeting occurs when a majority (or quorum) of members convene to hear, discuss, deliberate,

or decide on matters of the state body. Board members should avoid scenarios where a majority of members spontaneously discuss Board business outside of a properly noticed public meeting. Sometimes this occurs in what is called a “serial” communication.

Board members must recognize and prevent scenarios that violate Bagley-Keene. Serial communications are prohibited under Bagley-Keene. Serial communications occur when a Board member discusses (directly or through an intermediary) any board business outside of a meeting with another Board member, and that communication circulates through to a majority of the state body’s members. This applies to all forms of communication (e.g., in-person meeting, email chain, virtually, or any time Board members discuss Board business outside of a public, noticed meeting).

An example of serial communication is a chain of emails by a majority of Board members to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business, even if the emailers were intermediaries of the Board. A serial communication can also occur if, when taken as a whole, the series of communications involves a majority of members about Board business.

Some outside communications are not prohibited under Bagley-Keene. Board members can:

- Communicate with staff members to ask questions or obtain information;
- Review written legal advice received by a majority of a state body; and
- Attend a conference or a similar gathering with other Board members (including purely social or ceremonial events, local public meetings, and open and public meetings of another state body), provided that members do not discuss Board matters amongst themselves.

DAG Simpson next presented on proper parliamentary procedures in Board meetings. The parliamentary procedures for the RIPA Board are governed by Robert’s Rules of Order. The rules govern how meetings should be conducted through the use of formal motions, which allows for structured conversation and collaboration. The Robert’s Rules of Order apply to both meetings of the full RIPA Board and to subcommittee meetings.

To make a motion, a Board member must introduce an action item or proposal for consideration. The co-chair conducting the meeting will restate the motion and ask for a second. Another Board member must second the motion. If the motion is not seconded, the motion fails and will not be discussed. If the motion is seconded, the co-chair will restate the motion again and ask whether there is any additional discussion or debate on the motion.

For purposes of discussion and debate of the motion, the Board member making the motion is entitled speak first. In an ideal scenario, the discussion would then allow an opportunity for all members to speak before a member is recognized to speak again. The goal is to ensure that all members who want to speak on the motion have an opportunity to do so before another Board member gives a response. The discussion continues until the co-chair determines there will be no further discussion, or if a member moves to close discussion. A motion to close discussion requires another member to second and a two-thirds majority vote.

Some motions can be amended. Procedurally, a Board member moves to amend the motion, the co-chair will call for a second and, if seconded, call for discussion on the amendment. The amendment will then be discussed and voted on. If the amendment passes, the co-chair will return to the main motion as amended for further discussion. If the motion to amend fails, the discussion will return to the original motion.

Once the discussion has ended, the co-chair conducting the meeting will direct DOJ staff to perform a roll-call vote. The DOJ staff member will repeat the motion before calling on Board members to vote. Board members vote Aye, Nay, or Abstain. The DOJ staff member will then announce the number of Ayes, Nays, or Abstentions, and the co-chair will then announce the number of votes and whether the motion passes or fails.

Some motions do not require a formal process, such as minor matters and matters where no opposition is expected (e.g., ending a meeting). Board members may call for a unanimous vote for these matters. The co-chair conducting the meeting will repeat the request, and upon hearing no objections, the motion will pass.

The DOJ has prepared a chart of proper board procedures by motion type, which is available on the DOJ website.

To summarize, when the Board meets to gather information, deliberate, or make a decision, the Bagley-Keene Act requires that the public have a seat at the table in most instances. Serial meetings conducted outside of a noticed public meeting that ultimately involve a majority of Board frustrate the Act's goals of transparency and violate the law.

There are some exceptions to communications about Board business outside of a public, noticed meeting. For example, a member may contact Board staff to ask questions or gather information about an upcoming item, so long as the member and staff do not share these conversations with other members outside of a properly noticed meeting. The rule of thumb is that, when a member receives information from staff, do not communicate with other members about this information. If information is sent to all Board members, do not reply all. However, Board members may communicate individually with members of the public to share the work of Board, provided that Board members indicate whether the views expressed are those of Board or their own. Board members are encouraged to have conversations with members of the public and listen to comments that the public may have.

Co-Chair Sierra asked DAG Simpson to provide Board members with the slide containing proper procedures by motion type, and asked Board members if they had any comments, observations, or questions regarding the presentation, 2025 RIPA Report, or the January 21, 2025 CARE Community Briefing. Member Smith thanked DAG Simpson for his presentation.

6. BREAK

The Board adjourned for a twenty-minute break and reconvened at approximately 11:25 a.m.

7. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2026 REPORT

Co-Chair Guerrero opened discussion of the 2026 RIPA Report by asking the Board for their thoughts on how to pull all the ideas reported by the subcommittees together into a single theme. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that she heard a lot about hotspot policing and its impact on Black and brown communities, including the anatomy of hotspot policing, its effect on public trust, and other issues.

Co-Chair Sierra stated that she likes the idea of continuing from last year's report and working toward a theme. Co-Chair Sierra stated that last year's theme of racial profiling and youth made the report focused and impactful, and she is in favor of having a theme for this year's Report, to the extent possible among the different sections of the report. Co-Chair Sierra stated that she is intrigued by the topic of hotspot policing, as the Board has previously discussed looking at potential systemic issues that lead to racial and identity profiling, including the impact of those policies and their relationship to profiling. She stated that hotspot policing is a broad, but focused issue and could be supported by the new data points mentioned by the Stop Data subcommittee. If the Board looks at the anatomy of hotspot policing, the Board can bring in speakers to talk about why law enforcement has policies related to hotspot policing and look at the pros and cons, in addition to its relationship to racial profiling. Co-Chair Sierra stated that hotspot policing could be a good topic to bring together the work the subcommittees are doing, and asked the Stop Data subcommittee if there is some additional data that would be helpful in this regard.

Member Khadjavi stated that last year's report was strengthened by having a focus on youth and that it is ideal to have a theme. However, this year, it may be challenging to think of a single focus if subcommittees are thinking of different sub-themes within the overarching theme of public safety. Member Khadjavi noted that the term "hotspot" is sometimes used in different ways—police agencies

may state that they have identified a hotspot in a community, while the Stop Data subcommittee has been looking at it as agency or regional practices within the state where policing practices are different. Member Khadjavi wondered if the Board would find a term of art that would be a good umbrella for the term “hotspot” policing.

Member Diallo stated that, to the extent there is an overarching theme, he is interested in a broader concept that, when drilled down, can relate to things like hotspot policing. Member Diallo stated that issues related to public responsiveness and public trust exist at both the department and community level in terms of addressing community concerns public safety. To the extent those concerns are not adequately reflected in department responsiveness through explicit policies and training, and to the extent departments implement policies and training in different ways, this can undermine public confidence and trust and result in disparities in things like hotspot policing. At a departmental level, hotspot policing can be argued to result from community response to public safety. There can be a tension between needing to be responsive and undermining public trust because, to the extent racial and identity profiling is embedded in those policies, they undermine public trust and confidence. Member Diallo stated that there is a false choice between responding to public safety and unbiased, trustful policing in the community. This is especially pertinent right now as there is a focus of public trust in public safety issues.

Member Dobard stated that the broad theme of the Policies subcommittee – how to foster public safety, particularly in Black and brown communities, and understanding the environmental and other contextual factors that undermine being and feeling safe – captures this discussion. The topics the Board just discussed can fall under this broad theme, including hotspot policing, the ways in which it undermines feelings of safety, how to address it, and what public responsiveness looks like in practice and whether it fosters or undermines a sense of public safety in those communities. Member Dobard proposed that the Board consider this broader theme, under which the other topics could be explored.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that this resonates with her and asked Board members for their thoughts.

Member Smith stated that the broad category of thinking about the relationship between policing practices and safety is good and particularly timely, given that there are significant public concerns about safety and how to address it. Proposition 36 passed in California, which gives rise to many implications. More generally, there is probably a presumption for some folks that policing practices are inherently connected to driving safety. However, the research undermines that to a significant extent. Given this context, the broad theme makes sense, and the scope is sufficient to allow for more nuanced topics within it in a way that is cohesive. Member Smith stated that he liked the idea for a geographic focus on parts of the analysis, and agreed with the idea from Member Khadjavi to define what the Board means by hotspot policing so there is general understanding among Board members to communicate it in a way that does not unintentionally replicate connotations of hotspot that may not be what the Board intends to aim for.

Member Kulkarni agreed with Members Smith, Khadjavi, and Dobard.

Member Khadjavi stated that a theme of public safety is broad in a way that could serve the Board well for many of the topics that have come up. Additionally, Member Khadjavi recalled that, last year, the Board raised the idea of looking at recommendations the Board made to the Legislature and their status.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the topic of how to foster public safety could be a thread to connect the issues that were mentioned, and that there may be some refining of what those things are to streamline the report. Co-Chair Guerrero called the Board’s attention to the 2026 RIPA Report Outline, which was generated from discussions had during the subcommittee meetings. She asked Board members for their thoughts about whether this theme informs what the different sections of the report could focus on.

Co-Chair Guerrero also asked Member Dobard to help the Board think about the Policies section, including whether the outline reflects what Member Dobard reported at the beginning of the meeting and whether there’s anything the Board wants to add or subtract. Member Dobard stated that the outline does generally reflect what he stated verbally, including the theme of increasing public safety in Black and brown communities, elements of a healthy and thriving community (which could be more specifically

about what the research tells us that leads to communities being and feeling safe), and the evolution of racial profiling (which starts to go into things that undermine public safety). Member Dobard stated that DOJ will report back about the longitudinal analysis, and it may not be included in the report. Member Dobard asked Board members to think about elements that help elaborate on the general theme of increasing public safety.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked Member Khadjavi if the outline reflects the Stop Data subcommittee report out. Member Khadjavi noted that other Board members from the Policies subcommittee had their hands raised and asked if they wanted to comment beforehand.

Member Kulkarni asked to add history and analysis to the section on broken windows policies in the past. Even now, there continues to be misinformation about perceived successes of broken window policies, for example in New York. Before the Board talks about it in California, it would be good to provide an accurate historical analysis of whether it worked or not, and what the consequences and impacts were. Member Kulkarni stated that, in past reports, the Board has shared historical information from other regions of the country and that it might be useful here as well.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the RIPA Reports have provided historical analysis of broken windows policing in the past. The Board could uplift or update it.

Member Smith stated that he would like to highlight a couple of topics that fit within the theme of public safety in communities of color. First, the civilian oversight topic in the Accountability section of the outline also dovetails nicely into the Policies section. There are many civilian oversight entities for local law enforcement agencies at the local level throughout California. The policies and practices that apply may vary across jurisdictions. As a result, there are varying levels of efficacy in terms of accountability depending on where a person resides, which leads to significant inequities of individual community members' ability to have their concerns addressed and ensure that safety is carried out equitably throughout the state. Member Smith stated it would be helpful to have a landscape analysis of civilian oversight entities throughout the state so that the Board can develop some form of best practices for the Legislature and local jurisdictions to consider as they go about the process of establishing civilian oversight entities or refining the protocols in place. This fits within the overall theme of safety and advancing safety.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that one RIPA past report did a landscape of the kinds of oversight bodies that exist in California. It was expansive and a focus of the report. Co-Chair Guerrero suggested that the Board could refer to that report and think about what would be additive to previous information. She stated it would be good to have a chart of what each report focused on, as it is difficult to remember.

Member Khadjavi agreed with Co-Chair Guerrero's earlier statement that the Stop Data section is in service to the other sections of the report and the goals of the Board overall. Member Khadjavi advocated for a focus on data analysis that captures attention, but also recognizes changes that have already happened and points to policy changes that can be made. She stated that the DOJ is going to look into the feasibility of the following proposed topics, which fall under the theme of public safety broadly:

- (1) Identifying regions and agencies with heavy police practices (in other words, places where searches are happening at a much higher rate or consent is the only basis for searches);
- (2) Analyzing the new data elements that separate out vehicle, pedestrian, and cyclist stops. In particular, in Southern California, some news agencies did analyses and found that cyclists are cited at highly disparate rates, so it will be important for the Board to see if the experience of those driving vehicles, those on bicycles, and pedestrians are very different;
- (3) Analyzing the use of consent. The Board has looked at this in the past, but it needs to continue to be a throughline. There continue to be very disparate practices, and officers have a lot of discretion at their disposal. In past meetings, the Board has focused on areas where officers have a good deal of discretion, so this might be an area where the Board can make more change.

Additionally, there is a new data element indicates how consent is demonstrated (i.e., verbal, written, or implicit). Member Khadjavi stated that she is not sure where consent would lie in the outline, but it needs to have a focus.

Member Khadjavi stated that another topic raised by Member Dobard – fatalities resulting from vehicle pursuits – ties very directly to public safety. Member Khadjavi could see that topic, which was raised by a number of subcommittees, fitting into the Stop Data or Policies section of the report even though it may not be explicit in the data that's collected by RIPA. Member Khadjavi also referred to the longitudinal analysis of pretext stops by LAPD and SFPD included in the outline and suggested that the Board may also want to look at data for California Highway Patrol.

Member Smith agreed with the topics elevated by Member Khadjavi. Additionally, Member Smith stated that there was some energy around the topic of fatal police car chases in the Stop Data and Accountability subcommittees, which would fit within the overall theme of increasing public safety particularly in Black and brown communities, but was not included in the outline due to procedural nuances. Member Smith stated that, all too often, high-speed pursuits result in someone dying, whether it's the driver of the car the officer is trying to stop, a passenger, the officer involved or their partner, or a bystander who is going about their everyday life and is not involved in the stop. There have been recent reports throughout the nation that show fatal police car chases too often arise from stops for relatively minor traffic violations. There is a significantly racially disproportionate impact – specifically, national data shows that Black people are four times more likely to be killed in police car crashes than white people. Additionally, bystanders represent one-third of people killed in fatal police car chases. Member Smith stated that the consequences for public safety are significant because deaths are resulting from relatively minor things. Member Smith has taken a quick look at the landscape of this topic, and it seems the general thrust in the landscape is to try to address this at the state level, if possible. For example, Washington state recently passed a law that significantly curtailed the ability for police car chases to occur when they arise from relatively minor traffic situations. Additionally, both the federal Department of Justice and the Police Executive Research Forum have issued a report with recommendations trying to address this topic. This topic was discussed in greater detail in a couple of subcommittees. Member Smith asked for this topic to be added to the outline within the context of the overall discourse about public safety in Black and brown communities.

Member Khadjavi stated that, when looking at regions with high disparities, based on the subcommittee's discussion, this isn't so much about stops, but what happens when a stop is initiated (e.g., search practices and other impacts of policing). Additionally, the lifecycle of a stop could be useful framing within some sections.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked for members of the Accountability and Civilian Complaints subcommittee to give their feedback, including whether the outline includes what was discussed in the report out.

Member Hawkins emphasized that the Board should make sure there is a clear understanding of their recommendation regarding stops of youth. Member Hawkins stated that the Board should ensure that the SB 2 complaint forms captures the age of the complainant, especially minors. This is important because the Board needs data to understand if youth having encounters with law enforcement is good or bad, or how often it is happening. Member Hawkins stated that amending Penal Code section 13051.8 is very important because collecting data makes it safer for all. If a youth has a bad encounter with law enforcement, the Board needs to know about the encounter, and the involved youth needs to know who they can contact and that they have a right. Member Hawkins stated that this needs to be put into legislation, and POST needs to assist in putting it into their requirements. Additionally, Member Hawkins stated that POST needs to look beyond the nine categories they use to define "serious misconduct," and the community should have input on those categories. For example, the car chases discussed by Member Smith is not included in the nine categories, but should be. Member Hawkins also emphasized that not all police interactions with youth are negative, but that the Board needs to know about the contact police have with youth.

Member Kulkarni stated that section VI.B of the POST section of the RIPA 2026 Outline, titled “Topics to be decided at March 10th subcommittee meeting,” these are the topics Member Kulkarni mentioned in her report-out:

- (1) Review of published POST guidelines;
- (2) Analysis of POST’s response to the RIPA Report;
- (3) Part One of Field Training review; and
- (4) Recommendations to the Legislature and to POST.

Member Randolph thanked Member Hawkins for stating that not all youth contact with law enforcement is negative. Member Randolph stated that the RIPA Board should focus on that because all he’s hearing is that it’s all negative, which is why Member Randolph will probably be more quiet and not voicing what he’s really thinking about. Member Randolph stated that he was glad Member Smith highlighted the issue of people dying in police pursuits. Member Smith stated he has been involved in police pursuits, and it is a national issue. The state of California has advanced pursuit policies. Member Randolph stated that, when he is preparing to pull someone over, he does not know the ethnicity of the driver 50-60% of the time. Furthermore, California is the pioneer with juvenile law. Juveniles have a lot of protections in California through SB 203 and SB 439, which prohibit questioning of youth in schools or on the streets without having a lawyer or parents present. Member Randolph stated that as a leader of a K-12 department, he is pushing his agency to have positive contacts with youth. He stated that he has recommended in past Board meetings that positive contacts should be documented, but it fell on deaf ears. Member Randolph stated positive contacts with youth, such as asking about becoming a police officer or learning how to get her driver’s permit, are phenomenal. Member Randolph also stated that the DOJ has called law enforcement agencies to inquire with their chiefs to inquire about their stats, data, and why their numbers are down. He stated the agencies are usually 50 below and he is ready to do a statewide query on it through PORAC of agencies inquiring about why their numbers are down. There are a lot of anomalies forced with some chiefs, and it is circulating with the state. He is planning to have a deeper conversation with the DOJ.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that analyzing the data over trend lines is going to be really important because numbers rise and fall due to external factors that have affected the data, such as the pandemic. It is important to contextualize and understand what is going on. She stated that is important for the DOJ to engage with law enforcement to understand what is going on with the data as there have been big swings in data over time, and the only way to understand that is to talk to the data collectors.

Member Greene stated that if the Board looks at stops and contacts for bicycle and pedestrian stops, they should also look at corresponding crashes in that area. In the California Highway Patrol, when there is a big uptake in pedestrian and bicycle fatalities, what follows is further enforcement. Member Greene stated that if the Board looks at one, it should look at both.

Member Smith asked if, within the disaggregation of vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian stops, pedestrians include people riding on public transportation. Member Khadjavi stated that she understands pedestrian to be a category that means not a vehicle, not a bicycle. Member Smith asked if public transportation would be a vehicle. Member Khadjavi stated that a vehicle means a vehicle that the person stopped was driving.

Member Smith asked DOJ if public transportation is captured and could also be disaggregated as a pedestrian or something on its own. He stated that in Los Angeles and other areas that have a significant amount of public transportation, there are a lot of reports about racially disparate stops occurring within those spaces. However, if they are aggregated within the context of another type of stop, whether they are labeled as pedestrian or vehicle because they’re technically on a train or bus, it would be good to have that level of analysis also.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that one of the challenges is that transit officers, such as Municipal Transit in San Diego, are not peace officers subject to RIPA law. They do not do stop data collection because they

are not classified. Member Smith stated he meant police officers, as opposed to transit officers. He stated that in Los Angeles, L.A. Metro has a contract with three law enforcement agencies – Los Angeles Police Department, Long Beach Police Department, Sheriff’s Department – to do stops, and they ride on public transportation to do stops.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked DOJ to answer Member Smith’s question. DAG Manners stated that public transit are included in pedestrian stops of the stop data elements. Member Smith asked if it is possible to disaggregate it. DAG Manners stated that she is unsure but would raise it with DOJ Research Services and bring the answer to the Stop Data subcommittee.

Member Randolph stated that out of the 110 transportation systems in California, not all of them have law enforcement or interactions the way three agencies in Los Angeles do. It would not be appropriate numbers to compare; it is apples to oranges.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked Board members for any further comments regarding the draft report and, hearing none, moved to the next agenda item.

8. DISCUSSION REGARDING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Co-Chair Guerrero opened discussion regarding how the Board can increase public engagement. As part of that, Co-Chair Guerrero asked if the RIPA Board should have in-person meetings, or if there are other suggestions for how to increase public engagement. She stated that the Board had more public engagement in the past when they had in-person meetings, especially before the pandemic. She invited ideas to increase public engagement.

Member Kulkarni asked how in-person meetings occurred (i.e., did people come to the individual public locations and how did the attendance numbers compare to the present). Co-Chair Guerrero stated the Board and members of the public traveled to one location. The location rotated geographically. There were regularly at least 50 people, or upwards to 100 depending on the topic and location.

Member Hawkins stated that the people she associates with work Monday through Friday from 9 to 5, so they are not able to participate or listen in to any of the meetings. She suggested that the Board hold community meetings on the weekend so that they can be involved and hear what’s going on. If the Board could hold a few community meetings throughout the year in the evening or weekends, it would allow different people with different perspectives to have input.

Member Smith stated that last year, there were public comments from members of the public (specifically, Cephus Johnson) talking about how RIPA Board meetings used to be in person and, as a result of going completely virtual, it has decreased opportunities for members of the public to meaningfully engage with the Board. Member Smith stated that this comment is valuable for the Board to consider since it was from a community member who was interested and wanted to be more participatory. Since the RIPA Board are a public body, they should lean towards transparency and increasing political participation, particularly when it comes to issues of racial equity and racial profiling. Member Smith stated that Member Hawkin’s suggestion of alternative times or days to make the Board’s work more open and accessible to the public is a good idea. Additionally, perhaps the Board can revisit the idea of meeting in person now that we’re somewhat removed from the peak of the pandemic. Member Smith also stated that the structure of the meetings could have more than one opportunity for public comment, such as the start and end of the meeting. This is particularly helpful for meetings such as this that are long. It may not fit within a member of the public’s schedule to step away from their work for a 10-minute public comment period, so they are not able to voice whatever they think. The more opportunities for public engagement and decreasing barriers for participation would go a long way in making sure that the Board is living up to the spirit of what gave rise to this, and will help the Board develop solutions that are responsive to what community members want to see happen.

Member Vang asked what the public attendance was for an in-person meeting in Los Angeles two years ago, after the pandemic. If there was an increase in attendance, then it could strengthen the argument for

in-person meetings. That being said, Member Vang acknowledged Member Smith's point that long meetings can be a barrier for how much commitment members of the public can offer. She asked what options the Board could consider when thinking about timing and duration of the meetings, so that the public does not think it is a large commitment to attend the entire meeting just to understand what's being discussed and how they can actually engage and make public comments. Additionally, the DOJ and Member Smith made a presentation for the RIPA Report in January. What are other opportunities outside of meetings for the public to see what the Board does and what is in the RIPA Report? Because it is a very long report, most individuals will not be able read through everything. There is also not a lot of knowledge in the RIPA Board, even among friends who are engaged in policy spaces, so what are some ways that the RIPA Board can be more visible?

Member Criner stated that going back to in-person meetings will be a struggle, as people are accustomed to being online. Offering a mixture of both online and in-person meetings is a great opportunity to slowly migrate and pull people back in. Instead of having in-person meetings for all four full Board meetings, two could be in-person and two could be online. It is a struggle to even get people to leave their homes. However, when the meetings are online, there are many distractions and other things to do. Being in-person, the focus is on that gathering and the focus is on that, so it is vital and important to get people to come back together in person. However, the Board should be prepared that they may not see as many attendees as they'd like when they return to in-person meetings. The Board can slowly build on the numbers of attendance by getting the word out, explaining what RIPA is about, maybe spending a little bit on snail mail, and emailing. The Board could also alternate between in-person and online meetings to help build up engagement. Additionally, the Board should show a level of engagement and operate as a group that wants to come together, to let the community know that the Board is operating as a team even though they may have different avenues of getting to success.

Member Diallo stated he has served on many boards struggling with the concept of meeting in-person versus online. Whatever system the Board comes up with that allows the most people to participate would be apt in different forums. Some people are more comfortable meeting online because it is more convenient for them and allows participation from all over the state, but others experience technological difficulties or discomfort with the forum. There is a stifling quality to conversation online, whereas an in-person meeting can increase willingness to engage and participate. Member Diallo expressed support for hybrid meetings, with some online and some in person with geographic diversity and staggered times with some meetings on weekends and others during the week so that different people are able to participate and give their input on the Report. However, the Board should think broadly and not get locked into one medium because, for any one form, people may be unintentionally excluded.

Member Kulkarni stated she agreed with Member Diallo. She is of the Los Angeles City Ethics Commission, which allows people to join in-person or by phone. Making it accessible in both forms has allowed for the most public engagement.

Member Khadjavi stated that an in-person meeting can be more potent. However, California is a large state and being online creates an opportunity to be accessible that is not available otherwise. Member Khadjavi referred to two previously raised points: (1) creating a better space within meetings for public comment and meaningful engagement, and (2) getting the word out. Board meetings are publicly noticed, but are there ways Board members can think about to connect more? Member Khadjavi stated that Board members could think constructively and consciously about reaching out to make sure that organizations and people know about the meetings. Member Khadjavi also heard the idea of having themes for meetings, meaning the Board could theme meetings in ways to engage particular constituencies and community members. The Board could make meetings more targeted. This may mean a listening session for cultivating public engagement of particular topics.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that Member Khadjavi's idea reminded her of meetings where the Board has had presentations by experts, which were better attended than others. Co-Chair Guerrero also suggested considering:

- Having a pre-meeting held in an open-capacity building for the community to be prepared to be involved in the conversation and prepare them on what will happen in the meeting;
- Community presentations on the work of RIPA and the data in the reports in digestible way; and
- Interpretation services. Co-Chair Guerrero's organization works with non-English speakers who could be involved. RIPA is not set up for interpretation. This could be a regional thing to think about, if the Board moves their meetings around the state.

Member Kulkarni agreed with Co-Chair Guerrero's statement that translation would be really important. Member Kulkarni also asked if public comment could be moved to the beginning of the meeting so the public would not have to wait for hours. In the other commission Member Kulkarni sits on, public comment is made immediately after approval of the minutes so that people can make their comments and not have to stay for the entire meeting.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Karen L., a data analyst for a community organization, stated that she is happy to hear that the RIPA Board is in the process of developing a stop data dashboard and reiterated the importance of this endeavor. As it stands, the data formats made available can be challenging for the average of the public to navigate. She thinks a dashboard will go a long way to make the vast amount of stop data more accessible for all. If it is helpful to the Board, she will include links in the chat to existing dashboards by the California Department of Education, California Department of Finance, California Department of Health and Human Services, that could serve as a starting point for what a data dashboard might look like.

Richard Hylton of San Diego is entertained, but not amused. He stated that if members of the Board may assert that the data is so bad that the public would not stand for it if the public knew about, he sees no purpose in engaging with the public in dealing with data that members of the Board and DOJ knows to be highly faulty. He stated they are indulging in a form of self-delusion that they ought to have remedied. With respect to the data on pretext stops, in the last meeting, he sought the help of the Board, specifically the DOJ, in obtaining data on pretext stops for San Francisco. He has been seeking that data for more than sixty days and has not been able to get that data. It seems to him that because of his own illness, he has a feeling that the heavy hand of the DOJ is behind his inability to get pretext stop data. There is no legal basis for the DOJ to not provide the data or delay it. He states that this is not new, and accused the DOJ of delaying and concealing data. They may be wasting his time and their time doing these things. Many can see through the claims of transparency, which he feels are deceitful.

10. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON ACTION ITEMS

Co-Chair Guerrero asked the DOJ what they need to take action on. DAG Manners stated that there are no action items on the table. She asked the Board to confirm the direction for this year's report. As DOJ understands it, the theme decided by the Board is looking at ways to increase public safety, with hotspot policing and the other topics included in the outline as subtopics under that theme. She also asked if the Board would like to take any steps in the meantime regarding public engagement. Currently, the standard for remote RIPA meetings is set to expire at the end of the year, so as of January 1, 2026, the meetings would return to in-person. However, there is a chance the Legislature may extend the current rules, so RIPA Board may continue online.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the theme is how to foster public safety, bringing in all of the issues raised as components of the broader theme. She asked the DOJ to do work to structure that by refining the outline based on this discussion.

Co-Chair thanked DAG Manners for giving them notice that things may change based on Legislative rules. She asked if the Board could consider doing in-person meetings even if remote meetings are allowed. DAG Manners answered affirmatively.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked the DOJ to digest the Board's suggestions for public engagement and, if any of them make sense for the current year, consider to implement them. When they re-converge, the DOJ could share thoughts and requests to the Board for public engagement. DAG Manners stated that they could include in the next Full Board meeting an agenda item for continued discussion of public engagement.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked the DOJ to update them at the next meeting about the data dashboard. DAG Manners stated the DOJ will include this in their update at the next Board meeting.

11. NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Sierra thanked the Board and members of the public for their attendance.

Member Randolph stated that the California Chiefs and California Sheriffs are not represented in the outline that is laid for the rest of the year. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the outline was drawn from the subcommittee meetings, where law enforcement was involved. Any Board member or member of the public is welcome to share comments with the DOJ, which is shared with the Board between meetings and/or incorporated into the draft.

Co-Chair Sierra encouraged Board members to attend subcommittee meetings to hear all perspectives on the Board's work. Additionally, the outline is a living document and will stem from the data.

12. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Guerrero adjourned the meeting.