

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

MEETING MINUTES

November 18, 2025, 12:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chairs Andrea Guerrero and Angela Sierra, and Members William Armaline, DJ Criner, Souley Diallo, Wade Forde, Darren Greene, LaWanda Hawkins, Lily Khadjavi, Manju Kulkarni, Ameenah Qazi, Jordan Rall, Rich Randolph, Chauncey Smith, and Sean Thuilliez

Board Members Absent: Members Chad Bianco, John Dobard, and Ronaldo Villeda

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Sierra called the meeting to order at 12:05 P.M.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Co-Chair Sierra introduced two new members of the RIPA Board (herein Board):

Jordan Rall was appointed to the Board by the California Attorney General, pursuant to the RIPA statute, as an individual between 16 and 24 years of age who is a representative of a community organization that specializes in civil or human rights and criminal justice. Member Rall lives in Eastvale, California and is a junior at Eleanor Roosevelt High School. She is a student leader affiliated with the Council of African American Parents. At age 16 years old, she is the youngest member ever appointed to the Board. Member Rall has consistently demonstrated leadership and advocacy for Black students through her roles in her high school's Black Student Union and Umoja programs. She has engaged directly with school leadership to address racial disparities, including the lack of meaningful Black History Month programming and the rise in racial slurs on campus. Her early activism reflects a deep understanding of systemic challenges and a strong sense of responsibility to speak out. She has also pursued legal education with intention and rigor, completing a mock trial course at UCLA, enrolling in Norco College's Administration of Justice course, and participating in the African American Leaders of Tomorrow Program hosted by the California Legislative Black Caucus.

Chief Sean Thuilliez is returning to the RIPA Board as a representative of the California Police Chiefs Association. Chief Thuilliez was appointed Chief of the Tustin Police Department in March 2025, after serving 18 years at the Beaumont Police Department and the last 9 years as their chief. Chief Thuilliez oversees all law enforcement services for the city of Tustin. He is a native Californian and grew up in the Inland Empire. He graduated from the University of Redlands, obtaining his master's degree in management. He is a graduate of the FBI National Academy class 245 and the California POST Command College class 55. Chief Thuilliez began his public service as a Police Explorer and later as a Reserve Police Officer with the Redlands Police Department. He was then sworn in as a Police Officer with the Redlands Police Department in May of 1999. His assignments there included Patrol, FTO, Narcotics, and Vice detective, SMASH-Gang unit, Special Response Team, and later Corporal. Chief Thuilliez lateraled to the Beaumont Police Department in 2007 to train and mentor the many new officers hired during Beaumont's rapid population expansion. He worked in Patrol, then community policing where he established the department's Quality of Life Team. Chief Thuilliez has worked command assignments as both a lieutenant and commander and has overseen Patrol, Internal Affairs, Community Policing, and Investigations. He is currently the first Vice President of the California Police Chiefs Association and will ascend to the President position in March 2026.

Co-Chair Sierra welcomed Members Rall and Thuilliez to the Board.

Next, each Board member in attendance introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 9, 2026 & OCTOBER 16, 2025 FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Sierra asked the Board to review the draft minutes from the October 9, 2025 and October 16, 2025 meetings of the full Board.

Member Forde moved to approve the October 9, 2025 minutes as drafted, and Member Greene seconded. California Department of Justice (DOJ) Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners assisted with the roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Randolph, and Smith
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Members Rall and Thuilliez

The October 9, 2025 meeting minutes were approved as drafted, with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions.

Member Diallo moved to approve the October 16, 2025 minutes as drafted, and Member Smith seconded. DAG Manners assisted with the roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Randolph, and Smith
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Members Rall and Thuilliez

The October 16, 2025, meeting minutes were approved as drafted, with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions.

4. UPDATES BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Co-Chair Sierra opened the floor for DOJ updates. DAG Manners welcomed Daniel Harmon, Research Supervisor over the RIPA team in the DOJ Research Services Branch, to provide an update on the data dashboard as requested at the last Board meeting.

Mr. Harmon informed the Board that Research Services intends to produce a RIPA dashboard by mid-to-late 2026. He noted, that in the interim, the public is encouraged to view various county- and city-level dashboards available from local law enforcement partners, such as the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, the San Mateo Sheriff's Department, and the Walnut Creek Police Department.

Member Randolph asked what would be featured on the dashboard. Mr. Harmon responded that, although it is a little too early in the development process to commit to specific features of the dashboard, the dashboard will include key measures for the general public to explore in a usable and easy to access manner.

Member Randolph stated that, on behalf of law enforcement agencies in the state, there is a lot of concern about the dashboard. He asked whether the dashboard will require the collection of additional data from law enforcement agencies or if the dashboard would reflect the data that is currently being collected by DOJ.

Mr. Harmon responded that the dashboard would not require the collection of additional data. The dashboard will only use existing RIPA data.

Co-Chair Guerrero requested an update on the data dashboard at every upcoming Board meeting. In particular, she expressed interest in understanding what the features of the dashboard will be, what will be included and omitted, and whether there will be cross tabs or filtering available to help the public navigate the data in a user-friendly way. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that providing updates as the dashboard is being developed will provide the Board and the public opportunities to give DOJ feedback. Co-Chair Guerrero requested a mockup on the dashboard at the next Board meeting, so that the Board can provide feedback as early as possible.

Mr. Harmon stated that Research Services plans to allow the general public to explore various ways to cross-tab the data or summarize it. While he cannot comment on specific cross-tabs at this time, Research Services will endeavor to present a mock-up of the dashboard to the Board as early as possible, with the understanding of the Board's need to weigh-in during its development along with the need to go through approvals and reviews before being made available for public use.

Member Khadjavi emphasized that it would be very useful for the Board to be not only engaged in updates, but to weigh in on and be actively engaged in the development of the dashboard as soon as possible.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked Mr. Harmon for his presentation and update on the dashboard.

Next, DOJ DAG Alex Simpson provided an update on legislation enacted within the last year that has an impact or affects the work of the RIPA Board in some way. This year, DOJ identified one bill that will be included in the Legislative Update section of the 2026 RIPA Report: Senate Bill (SB) 734. SB 734 does not specifically relate to racial and identity profiling in law enforcement, but it does relate to law enforcement accountability in that it prohibits officers from being disciplined if a court rules that their actions violated the Racial Justice Act (RJA) (for example, if a court rules that an officer demonstrated bias toward a criminal defendant such that the defendant's arrest or conviction should be set aside). SB 734 provides that POST cannot rely on the court's finding under the RJA setting aside the person's conviction as the basis for decertification under SB 2. DAG Simpson stated that, to be clear, SB 734 explicitly provides that officers can be disciplined and can be decertified based on the conduct underlying the court's determination of a violation of the RJA. However, SB 734 provides that POST cannot rely on the court's finding under the RJA in setting aside the person's conviction as the basis for decertification under SB 2.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

A member of the public stated that they would like to know about racial profiling, in terms of using artificial intelligence and geofencing software. She expressed concerns about the use of geofencing software as an AI tool used by local law enforcement in an abusive fashion, specifically targeting her and her son. She stated that their data location is open and that they are being harassed by local police and police helicopters. She also stated that the police should not be using the public's data in any way because it is harmful to the public. She stated that people are using 5G energy direct weapons against the public with artificial intelligence when they use any type of device. The member of the public stated that she is working with various individuals, including a crimes analyst who made a report last month. It follows that locally they are using these weapons. She stated that she has her eyes on the acoustic noise and radiation, 5G direct energy, EMF, and radio frequencies and receives reports every month. She recommended that local police stop using this technology, and she asked to work with the Board on this issue.

Co-Chair Sierra thanked this member of the public and stated that the Board takes in all public comments for consideration as the Board develops this year's Report. She encouraged this member of the public to continue engaging with the Board as it develops this year's Report.

Richard Hylton inquired whether California DOJ is directly involved with a company called Veritone in the development of the RIPA dashboard because he believes that Black people will be excluded, as always, in its development. Secondly, he asked the Board for clarification about what is or is not racial profiling, seeking a distinction from when ICE goes into a neighborhood to enforce immigration law that is predominantly of one race or ethnicity, from San Diego Police Department's patrol or enforcement efforts predominantly in neighborhoods of one race or ethnicity.

Michele Wittig suggested that the Board should consider including a narrative for the framework in responding to disparities found in stop rates. She explained that these disparities are a signal to be addressed and solved, rather than preemptively dismissed by attributing them to differences in violation rates or saying they are invalid due to imperfect benchmarks. Ms. Wittig stated that it would be helpful if this year's Report were to adopt a framework in which these differences are viewed as signals to be attended to and problems to be solved, rather than trying to partition the sources of the differences that are attributable to the violation rates versus those that may be attributable to bias or racial profiling.

6. BOARD DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE ANNUAL RIPA REPORT PUBLICATION DATE

Co-Chair Sierra opened the floor for the Board to discuss and vote on the annual RIPA Report publication date. She noted that the Board discussed, but did not vote on, this item at its last meeting and invited DOJ to provide an update.

DAG Manners stated that, at the last full-board meeting, DOJ asked the Board to consider the possibility of moving the report publication deadline. The RIPA statute allows the Board to move the report publication date to any date they choose, or to leave it at the current publication date of January 1st of each year. DOJ received questions from Board members asking whether it is possible to bifurcate the publication date by, for example, publishing the statutorily mandated data on a different date than annual RIPA Report. DAG Manners confirmed that the Board is able to do this if it chooses. DAG Manners asked the Board to discuss whether it would like to keep the current publication date of January 1st or whether they would like to move the date (and, if so, to what date).

Co-Chair Sierra opened the floor for Board discussion. She explained that there are several issues at play, including when the Board can be of most use to members of the Legislature and policymakers, when the Report will get the most attention from the public (for example, whether that is the beginning of January or later in the month), and allowing sufficient time for DOJ staff to complete the detailed and complex work that goes into the Report (including data analyses, drafting, and finalizing the Report).

Co-Chair Guerrero expressed support for establishing a January 1st publication deadline for the RIPA statutory tables and January 31st publication deadline for the RIPA Report. She stated that going any further into the year for publication makes it very difficult for the very people the Board seeks to direct the report to (i.e., the Legislature, policy bodies at the local level, etc.).

Co-Chair Sierra responded that she understands from DOJ that it would be possible to bifurcate the publication date in this way. DAG Manners confirmed that this is correct and added that an additional option to ensure that the Legislature and policymakers are informed about the Report and the Board's recommendations is to schedule a legislative briefing earlier in the year to discuss topics covered by the Report.

Co-Chair Guerrero clarified that her proposal is that the RIPA data files, not PDFs of the tables, are published to OpenJustice on January 1st so that researchers and legislators can access the data they need on an agency level. Then, the annual Report would be published on January 31st.

Co-Chair Sierra stated that this makes sense and clarified that the potential change in the publication date for the RIPA Report would not delay the publication of the RIPA data files.

Member Smith stated that he appreciated this issue being raised by DOJ and that he likes the proposal from Co-Chair Guerrero, as it strikes an appropriate balance between making the data available in a timely manner but also giving DOJ time to complete the production of the Report. Member Smith also expressed support for having legislative briefings.

Member Thuilliez stated that he would rather keep the report as a single publication. He stated that when tables or charts are released without context, they are interpretive. He expressed that it is best to release the Report in its entirety, and the Board should continue doing so. Member Thuilliez stated that legislators have ample time in their legislative session to draft bills as they see fit, but to bifurcate the publication date just to get a 30-day head start is not a sound practice in his experience of releasing reports.

Member Kulkarni stated that she agreed with Member Smith's statements. She expressed that it would be reasonable and appropriate to get the data out through the tables in early January then produce the Report at a time when it is readily accessible and people are more able to review and read it and do legislative hearings.

Member Khadjavi stated that she had reflected on this topic since the last Board meeting and believes that January 31st hits a sweet spot that affords more time to preparation of the Report without delaying things so much that it would throw off the cycle for what can be done with the Report. She stated that this date would not delay the annual posting of RIPA data to OpenJustice. By the beginning of January, everyone has already had a chance to work with the data, so making that data accessible through OpenJustice is distinct from publishing the Report and should not muddy what the Report's findings are or how to use that data. By having a January 1st deadline, the Board is aligning more with the current practice for the data release. Member Khadjavi stated that she would be in favor of having the Report release date be extended to the end of January instead of the beginning.

Co-Chair Sierra stated that these are two distinct processes: One is data being released by DOJ on OpenJustice. The Board does not release this data, and the suggestion is not that the Board releases additional tables or editorializes this data. DOJ would still issue what it does under its process, and the Board's work (i.e., whatever tables that are included in the Report) would come out together with the Report and any explanation or narrative on January 31st as suggested.

Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed that this is correct. The statutory data release is the agency-level data (i.e., the 5 million data points that are in OpenJustice). The proposal is to make that data available on January 1st. Any other analytic tables that are processed for the Report would stay in the Report and are not part of the January 1st data release. The January 1st release of statutory data would be the release of the raw data that is processed into a format for public and academic review every year. Co-Chair Guerrero stated, for the benefit of those who were not at the last full-board meeting, that what appears to be slowing down DOJ is the request for analyses of data by the Board—not the data itself, but analyses of data. That has taken a while and now we have a final Report that we will review today, but insofar as we can give DOJ extra time to make sure everything is correct for report publication, which is separate from those statutory data dumps, that is okay. Co-Chair Guerrero stated that, in a perfect world, she, like Member Thuilliez, would like everything to come out on January 1st, but she is cognizant of DOJ's concerns about the time crunch they are under, given the demands the Board has made. Co-Chair Guerrero suggested that, going forward, the Board should curb the things they are asking of DOJ so it is not such a heavy lift for the extra tables. But, as of right now, she believes that a January 31st deadline for the Report makes sense, given everything the Board has asked of DOJ.

Co-Chair Sierra asked Member Thuilliez if that clarification, that the proposal is not talking about changing the January 1st publication of the DOJ raw data, addressed his concerns.

Member Thuilliez responded that he is sensitive to whatever the requests to DOJ were and to give DOJ more time if needed. This is what they do for a living full-time, and if they are saying they need more time, Member Thuilliez is sensitive to and okay with that. He stated that he does not think the Board should release anything in increments if DOJ needs more time and suggested giving DOJ time to release everything at once rather than releasing charts, tables, or images that don't have context since those can often be misleading.

Co-Chair Guerrero clarified that they are not talking about anything you would see in the Report. None of those charts would be released on January 1st. Those are all second-level analyses that are done for purposes of the Report, based on the Board's requests. What gets released at the beginning of the year, separate from the report, is a massive file called "Statutorily Mandated Tables." This file is available on the website and is constant — it is all the data given by reporting agencies.

Member Thuilliez clarified his understanding that this data is put into an Excel file, and Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed that this is correct.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that releasing that raw data allows academics, legislators, agencies, policymakers, and anyone who wants to see the data to view the aggregate data. This is a giant Excel sheet and does not include charts or all the fun things.

Member Thuilliez expressed his understanding and stated that he would be in support of a motion if one were on the table.

Co-Chair Sierra asked if any Board members had additional comments, questions, or ideas.

Co-Chair Guerrero moved to release the statutorily mandated tables and data through OpenJustice on January 1st and the RIPA Report with its narrative, analysis, charts, and pictures on January 31st. Member Smith seconded the motion.

DAG Manners assisted with the roll-call vote to publish the statutorily mandated data and tables on January 1st and publish the RIPA Report, containing narrative analysis, on January 31st.

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Criner (no vote)

The motion carried with 14 ayes, 0 nays, and one abstention (no vote).

7. BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE 2026 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for discussion of 2026 Board Report. She reminded Board members that they had the opportunity to have a lengthy discussion about the different sections of the Report and provide additional input at the last full-board meeting, and they have one more opportunity in today's meeting to provide any additional input to the Report. Because the Board will need to vote on the Report and the recommendations contained therein, she suggested going through the Report section by section, beginning with the Introduction.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the Introduction is a summary of the sections, and it provides an overarching introduction to the Report, what the Board does, then goes through the sections (i.e., Stop Data, Civilian Complaints, State and Local Racial and Identity Profiling, POST Training and Recruitment, and Accountability), and ends with a reflection on the continuing need for RIPA in 2026. She invited Board members to review the Introduction and invited any final comments from Board members on this section of the Report.

Member Randolph stated that the Introduction is the most important part of the Report because it is the first thing the Legislature, law enforcement, and the public see. In this year's Report, the Board speaks about federal immigration enforcement agents' use of racial profiling. Member Randolph stated that lumping in law enforcement who are the only officers in California required to fill out RIPA forms with federal officers is unfair and misleading. He feels strongly that anything related to immigration enforcement should be removed from this Report. He stated that local law enforcement is barred under California law from participating in immigration enforcement actions, and law enforcement goes by that. Member Randolph expressed that this conflation is unnecessary and harmful to California's peace officers who proudly live, work, and serve in our communities, particularly the last section of the Introduction which claims that last year the RIPA Board examined RIPA data in depth "to identify trends and recommendations to address concerns about state and local law enforcement responses to federal immigration enforcement policies." Member Randolph stated that this is a gross overreach of the Board's scope. RIPA does not collect data on immigration enforcement; the Board is tasked with examining the state of racial profiling in the state of California, not federal immigration actions. Member Randolph made a motion to remove this from the Report.

Co-Chair Guerrero shared that, since Member Randolph was not at the Board's October 9, 2025 meeting dedicated to this topic, this section is reflective of that meeting. Attorney General Bonta attended that meeting, in which the Board discussed that the data RIPA does collect and analyze on when local law enforcement engage with federal law enforcement. Co-Chair Guerrero acknowledged that while this data is very limited as Member Randolph points out, it is nonetheless a data point collected by RIPA. She noted that the duty to intervene under state law was also covered in that meeting. Co-Chair Guerrero reiterated that the language in the Introduction is reflective of that meeting.

Member Khadjavi suggested providing an Executive Summary, separate from the Introduction. She noted that, in past years, the Board has had some kind of handout or limited, one-to-two page graphical displays or Executive Summary handout, and suggested that the Board could circle back to that this year.

Member Thuilliez stated that he was also not at the October 9, 2025 special meeting. He stated that the strength of SB 54 (the California Values Act) supersedes the need to say RIPA should continue because of the federal incursion into local communities because, reading this for the first time as a layperson, that reads as saying that local law enforcement is not abiding by SB 54. Member Thuilliez stated that this portion of the Introduction is saying SB 54 does not go far enough, therefore RIPA needs to take over and continue its work. Member Thuilliez stated that he thinks that is not the reason RIPA was formed through legislation, and we should rely on SB 54. He stated that he would go back to the fact and say that we do not need SB 54 because law enforcement never wanted to do that job in our communities. He stated that none of law enforcement wanted to get into that realm. However, SB 54 is there, it is the law, they do abide by it, and it is good enough on its own.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited everyone who was not able to attend the October 9, 2025 Board meeting on the interaction of racial profiling and federal law enforcement to review the video and slides that were presented there. She stated that the focus of that meeting was on the duty to intervene, and it was an opportunity to educate the public on the current state of racial profiling at the federal level because the rules operate differently at the federal level than they do in the State of California. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the meeting was held days after the U.S. Supreme Court let racial profiling to stand in California. The conversation at that meeting, which is reflected in the summary, was about what state and local law enforcement officers can and cannot do vis-a-vis racial profiling that they may be witness to or observing and, specifically, the duty to intervene that officers have. Co-Chair Guerrero expressed that the language in the summary is a fair representation of that meeting and what the Board wanted to do earlier in the year.

Co-Chair Guerrero reminded the Board that there is a motion on the table, which Board members have the ability to act on if they would like to.

Member Forde asked for clarification in response to Member Randolph's statements. Member Forde stated that SB 54 is creating a particular guideline, directive, and law, but ICE federal enforcement is not held to California legislation. He asked whether that means California law enforcement is being held responsible for offense by federal agencies and whether the data is then skewed because of federal agencies who are not, per se, complying with California state legislation.

Co-Chair Guerrero responded that state and local law enforcement have a role to play in the state and keeping the public safe. The Board does collect data on what are called pass-offs between state and local law enforcement and federal agencies, so they are able to see when there are pass-offs. There are limited allowances for those pass-offs, and that is in the Board's data. But, the focus of the October 9, 2025 Board meeting was about the role of state and local law enforcement officers to protect the public when they are witness to racial profiling that may lead to excessive force and other abuse of power. Under state law, state and local law enforcement have a duty to intervene. That is what the Board covered. They did not cover what federal agencies have the power to do apart from distinguishing that from what state and local law enforcement have the power to do. The focus was on the role that state and local law enforcement have. A retired local chief who shared his wisdom with the Board, and there was an opportunity for Board members and the public to engage with this topic. The Introduction summary here is a reflection of that and the Board's decision at the last meeting that they wanted to acknowledge it in a summary fashion as part of their year's work.

Member Forde stated that he understands. He clarified that he was at the October 9, 2025 Board meeting, and his question was directed to understanding what Member Randolph's concern was.

Member Qazi noted that Footnote 8 does link to the prior meeting materials and suggested that, instead of having a footnote, this could be called out more for further information or access to the prior meetings. Member Qazi stated that it is helpful to know some reactions. She also thought that this was a little too summarized, but having been at the October 9, 2025 meeting and the July meeting, she knew that there was a lot more discussion. Member Qazi suggested that perhaps calling this out a little more and linking the prior meeting materials would save a lot of confusion with future readers.

Member Khadjavi noted that there is a part of the Introduction titled, "The Continuing Need for RIPA." What Member Khadjavi heard in the concerns that were raised is somehow distinguishing, at some level, state and federal activities. She wondered if, instead, the paragraph which well summarized and captured the October 9th meeting could have a title that refers specifically to that, then the "Continuing Need" title could go with the last paragraph to ease some of this tension.

Member Smith stated that he supports the introductory statement as is, and he is also okay with the suggestion offered by Member Khadjavi.

Following up on some of these comments, Co-Chair Sierra suggested bridging this a bit. For example, on page 1, the Introduction talks about how, although it is not clear how the courts will limit racial profiling in federal law enforcement, the comments and actions we have been discussing and that were discussed at the October 9th meeting demonstrate the vital need for the Board to find ways to reduce or eliminate profiling in our state's law enforcement agencies. Co-Chair Sierra noted that Member Randolph mentioned how it may be interpreted as suggesting that the Board believes agencies are not following the California Values Act. She suggested that maybe a way to make this a little bit more nuanced is to say that the Board knows and has strong reason to believe that our residents of California are being subject to racial profiling by federal law enforcement because of the positions they have taken. The California Values Act does not

cover what they do, but because of that and because of the experiences of California residents, that underscores the need to do whatever the Board can to continue their work with California law enforcement agencies because our residents are feeling an even more heightened burden in this era. Co-Chair Sierra stated that this is how she read the Introduction, but she could see how others could read it differently and maybe the Board does need to weave in the fact that we have a Values Act in California and RIPA, so there are rules for our state and local law enforcement. Those are different than federal laws, and despite that though is a heightened need for what the Board does. Co-Chair Sierra asked if that would address the concern Member Randolph raised.

Member Randolph thanked everyone for thinking outside of the box and stated that Member Khadjavi knocked it out of the park by suggesting a subsection identifying this. Member Randolph stated that he talks to legislators every week, and when they look at the RIPA Report, the first thing they start doing is reading the first few pages. In layman's terms, this looks like California law enforcement is cooperating with federal immigration, and that is not the case. Member Randolph would like to make that clarification. He thanked Co-Chair Sierra for bringing this up as well.

Co-Chair Guerrero noted that there is still a motion on the floor that has not been seconded and asked Member Randolph if he would like to withdraw or amend the motion. Member Randolph withdrew the motion and asked Member Khadjavi to restate the language she proposed. Member Khadjavi stated that she had proposed that the headings in the Introduction be modified, but Co-Chair Sierra laid out some greater distinction. Member Randolph moved to modify the headings in the Introduction and to add a side note about the California Values Act as suggested by Co-Chair Sierra. Member Smith seconded the motion.

DAG Alex Simpson assisted with the vote to modify heading on page five of the Introduction from "The Continuing Need for RIPA in 2026" to "The Board's Meeting on October 9, 2026," to add the title "The Continuing Need for RIPA in 2026" to the following paragraph, and to include a side note in last paragraph on page one of the Introduction explaining that, "The Board understands that our residents are subject to racial profiling by federal law enforcement. The Values Act does not cover what federal law enforcement does. That absence highlights the need to reduce or eliminate racial profiling in state and local government."

DAG Simpson assisted with the roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Criner (no vote)

The motion carried, with 14 ayes, 0 nays, and 1 abstention (no vote).

Stop Data Analysis

Next Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for a discussion of the Stop Data section. She noted that this section does not have any recommendations; it is just data analysis with attached charts. Co-Chair Guerrero noted that the Board has probably taken a look at the data more than anything else, and this is not new, but they have been making recommendations along the way to clean up and clarify the language and tables. She expressed appreciation for the work DOJ has done to be responsive to the Board's interest in understandable charts and figures, and once the Board approves the Report, the last work that DOJ will do is vet the Report to make sure it is ADA compliant regarding colors and visuals.

Member Khadjavi flagged for DOJ that there is a series of tables beginning on page 91 onward that are really for the Appendix. Additionally, she acknowledged that the Board received a brief

but positive announcement about the RIPA data dashboard. She noted that the Board previously talked about elevating this to a recommendation in the Stop Data section. Currently, in the Introduction of the Stop Data section, the last sentence that was coming from a previous draft is still there. Member Khadjavi asked the Board if they should strengthen the call for a data dashboard. She noted that, on one hand, there is now a plan with a rough timeline attached for next year but, on the other hand, this has been a continuing theme and call.

Co-Chair Guerrero responded that this could take the form of a motion, which is something for Member Khadjavi to think about as the Board continues to move through comments.

Co-Chair Sierra noted that this chapter talks a lot about *Terry* stops but does not fully define them in the body of the text until much later in the chapter on page 72. Co-Chair Sierra suggested that this definition be brought up sooner in the chapter, when it first begins taking about *Terry* stops. Additionally, since the chapter references those types of stops so often, the definition should be included in the body of the page and not just in a footnote.

Member Thuilliez concurred with Co-Chair Sierra on that point. He also expressed concern about accessibility on page 56 of the chapter. He stated that it looks as though that page was scanned in and is very difficult to read in the color schemes and font.

Member Khadjavi clarified whether Member Thuilliez was referring to the co-occurrence table. Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed that it was.

Co-Chair Guerrero reiterated comments from Board members so far, including drops the extra pages beginning on page 91 which appear to have been included in error; to define *Terry* stop sooner; to include a recommendation around the data dashboard; and to make sure that the charts and figures are accessible in terms of the font, color, visualization, clarity, etc. She stated that if Board members feel the same about these items, they would need to be put into a motion. She also noted that Member Khadjavi was considering making a motion, and that there may be a motion to approve this section with the changes suggested above to *Terry* stops, accessibility, and dropping pages 91 onward.

Member Khadjavi asked to hear Board members' thoughts on leaving language in the Introduction stating that the Board encourages the implementation of a public data dashboard that and adding this as a recommendation at the end of the section. She stated that this would be in parallel with many of the other sections of the Report, and it does reflect the discussion, public comment, and other interests expressed throughout the year. That said, Member Khadjavi acknowledged that the Board now knows that a dashboard is coming. She asked if there are any objections to including this recommendation and, if not, what the easiest way to craft one and put it to a vote would be.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that she does not know if the Board has made a recommendation to DOJ in the past, but the Board is its own body and came make a recommendation to DOJ. However, that would need to come from the Board, not DOJ staff. She stated that she would be supportive of a motion that clarified a recommendation from the Board to DOJ to move with great haste to develop and implement a data dashboard, to ensure the Board's underscoring of the issue at the last several meetings is solidified and formalized.

Member Khadjavi proposed that the Stop Data section end with a recommendation that is reflective of Board deliberations, public comments, and past reports that the Board urges DOJ to move with great haste. Member Khadjavi asked Co-Chair Guerrero to reiterate her proposed language, and Co-Chair Guerrero responded that she heard Member Khadjavi making a motion to recommend to DOJ that they develop and implement a data dashboard with great haste. Member Khadjavi stated that this captures her proposal. She expressed appreciation for Co-Chair Guerrero's statement that, procedurally, this is different than making a recommendation to the Legislature, but that this is consistent with the Stop Data section and the Board's past discussion.

Member Kulkarni seconded the motion.

DAG Simpson clarified if the motion is to include a recommendation at the conclusion of the Stop Data section that states specifically, “The Board recommends that the DOJ develop and implement a data dashboard with great haste.” Co-Chair Guerrero affirmed that it is.

Co-Chair Sierra expressed hesitation about the phrase “with great haste.” She stated that, on behalf of DOJ, we are going to do this as quickly as we can, but we have to be sure that all appropriate protocols are being followed. With respect to the Board’s request that tables or a presentation is given at the next meeting, DOJ will do what it can to give updates but it can’t necessarily make promises at this point as to the timing. Co-Chair Sierra noted that the term “with great haste” could mean different things to different people, and suggested having the recommendation state instead that DOJ should create the RIPA data dashboard and add that it be accessible to the public and clear.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked whether this would be a friendly amendment to the motion. Co-Chair Sierra affirmed that it would be a friendly amendment to read that, “The DOJ should create a RIPA data dashboard that is accessible to the public.”

Member Khadjavi clarified that removing the language “with great haste” does not mean without great haste, but that the amendment would add that the dashboard must be publicly accessible.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked if this amendment is acceptable to Member Khadjavi, and Member Khadjavi confirmed that it is. Co-Chair Guerrero also asked Member Kulkarni if the amendment is acceptable to her, and she confirmed that it is.

DAG Simpson assisted with the roll-call vote on the motion to include a recommendation in the Stop Data section stating that, “The Board recommends that the Department of Justice should create a RIPA data dashboard that is accessible to the public”:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Thuilliez Randolph and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried with 13 ayes, 2 nays, and 0 abstentions.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited a motion to approve the Stop Data section with three amendments: (1) moving the definition of *Terry* stops sooner; (2) dropping pages 91 on from the Report; and (3) ensuring that the visualizations are fully accessible. Member Diallo so moved. Member Thuilliez clarified whether they are voting on the cleanup of the sections, not the entirety of the Report. Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed that the motion is to accept the Stop Data section with the three changes noted above. Member Kulkarni seconded the motion.

Next DAG Simpson assisted a roll-call vote on the motion to approve and accept the Stop Data section with the following amendments: (1) On page one, the definition of *Terry* stop is going to be inserted into the body of the report, not the footnote; (2) the tables from page 91 onwards will be deleted; and (3) on page 56, DOJ will ensure that the chart and all subsequent charts in this section will be ADA compliant:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried unanimously.

Civilian Complaints

Co-Chair Guerrero opened discussion on the Civilian Complaints section. She noted that this section is a shorter, 12-page section and asked Board members to review for clarity or any other input they would like to provide.

Co-Chair Guerrero flagged that, on page 11, there is an update on a prior Board recommendation to amend Penal Code section 148.6 regarding complaint language. On November 10, 2025, the California Supreme Court finally ruled on the case, *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles*, to settle the question and determine that the requirement that complainants read and write and sign a written advisory when filing a complaint is not enforceable. She noted that this section of the Report contains a sentence that, “The Board will continue to examine this issue in a future report.” Co-Chair Guerrero clarified that this is not a new recommendation; it is just an update.

Member Kulkarni stated that on page 3, it is hard to see the difference between red and orange and asked that a different color could be used so that it is easier to know which numbers they are referring to between “sustained” and “not sustained.” She also suggested that, starting on page 5, the colors in those graphs not be so monochromatic, but use multiple colors so that it would be easier to see the difference in years.

Co-Chair Guerrero thanked Member Kulkarni and noted that this goes to the accessibility issue of ADA compliance that the Board raised in its discussion of the Stop Data section.

Member Thuilliez concurred with Member Kulkarni.

Co-Chair Guerrero stated that the figures that start on page 5 onward do not have values for the bars, so we don’t know what those numbers are unlike in prior sections and figures. She stated that it would be great to see those numbers.

Co-Chair Guerrero asked Board members if they have any other thoughts about this section and, if not, invited a motion to accept this section with the suggestions for ensuring that the visuals are accessible and complete with data values. Member Kulkarni moved as such, and Member Khadjavi seconded. Co-Chair Guerrero asked Board members if there were any points for discussion and, hearing none, asked DOJ to call a vote.

DAG Simpson assisted with the roll-call vote to approve the Civilian Complaints section, with DOJ looking into ADA compliance regarding the charts and to make sure that data values are reflected in the draft:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried unanimously.

State & Local Policies

Co-Chair Guerrero invited the Board to review the Policies section prior to Board discussion. She provided an overview of the section by informing the Board that the section focuses on law enforcement practices such as oversaturation, concentration of law enforcement presence in communities and how they affect the sense of public safety within the community. She explained further, how limiting or prohibiting such practices could reduce racial and identity profiling and improve public safety. She also stated that the section looked at alternative enforcement

technologies such as the use of face recognition technology, gunshot detection, and predictive policing, and explored the question of whether those exacerbate the effects or the practices of oversaturation. Co-Chair Guerrero also noted that this section also revisited the issue of pretextual stops, and looked at how several jurisdictions in California have taken steps to improve public safety with local ordinances related to pretextual stops.

Member Diallo expressed that he was pleased with the language changes in recommendation two on pg. 55, relating to the use of alternative enforcement technologies, and that he believed these changes were reflective of the discussion in the subcommittee and that the recommendation was more clear that the Board believed alternative enforcement technologies needed further study. Co-Chair Sierra provided technical recommendations regarding the language of recommendation two, suggesting deletion of the word “governor” in the recommendation, as the governor would not be enacting the legislation. Co-Chair Sierra also requested to add the phrase that legislature should enact legislation to allocate resources to an entity with the needed capacity or expertise, such as a state commission or research institution, to study the effects of alternative enforcement technologies. Co-Chair Sierra also provided a more general comment with respect to the recommendations relating to oversaturation. Specifically, Co-Chair Sierra expressed that the report did a great job of describing the dangers of oversaturation, such as the disproportionate concentration of law enforcement officers in certain communities. However, Co-Chair Sierra discussed the necessity of the Board to come up with a guide or working definition for “oversaturation” in more general terms, as policymakers need to come up with a test to be used for agencies to determine whether the agency is engaging in such practices. Policymakers also need to know what are the factors to be considered when assessing oversaturation. Co-Chair Sierra also expressed the Board should consider what are the other possible solutions to the issue, what the needs of may be of a community that is subject to oversaturation, and what remedies the Board should propose. Co-Chair Sierra followed up with another recommendation relative to the issue of oversaturation policing—specifically, that local law enforcement agencies should make publicly available data and information related to their geographic deployment in different parts of the community. Co-Chair Sierra expressed that these recommendations were in alignment with public comment.

Member Thuilliez expressed that he supported most of Co-Chair Sierra’s comments. Member Thuilliez stated that law enforcement officers go where they are called, and that a big component of RIPA is the what’s missed by RIPA is the issue of victim’s and victim’s rights, and that cannot be forgotten about in the discussion of oversaturation policing. He explained that it’s often lost that partnering with community is a big part of law enforcement strategy, and through town hall meetings or other venues, law enforcement officers are responsive to requests for help. Member Hawkins expressed appreciation for law enforcement as an advocate for victim’s rights, stating that they are the only ones there when things go wrong.

Member Kulkarni inquired whether there was a definition for oversaturation policing in the Report and requested DOJ to include the definition in the text of the report. DAG Simpson pointed the Board to footnote 31 of the draft Report that discuss the definition of oversaturation policing, and that DOJ could put that definition in the text if it was the Board’s preference.

Member Randolph thanked the Board and expressed that he was glad the Board was having the conversation. Member Randolph pointed the Board to the text of Penal Code section 13519.4, subdivision (e), which outlines all the parameters on racial profiling and what the Board stands for. Member Randolph explained that he was excited that the Board was still working on this issue. However, he pointed out that when the Board discusses technology and oversaturation and modifying deployments for law enforcement agencies the Board is overreaching, and that is a concern on behalf of law enforcement, and a concern expressed by law enforcement at the assembly as well.

Member Diallo stated that he believed Co-Chair Siera's recommendation to include a definition was helpful. The concept of oversaturation could be seen as a policy recommendation made at the department level in terms of deployment of resources, or it could be looked at from the bottom up, where deployments are being resources. Member Diallo recognized Member Thuilliez's concern, because data collection would be important both at the department level and at the officer level for collecting data. As to recommendation two, relating to alternative enforcement technologies, Member Diallo expressed that he was not sure whether the Board was ready to make specific recommendations, and would be open to amendments as to this recommendation—instead of prohibiting the use of such technologies, he would be open to limiting the recommendation to studying these technologies to determine their effects. Member Diallo acknowledged the research that had been presented in the draft.

Member Smith informed the Board of a definition of oversaturated policing found on page six of the Policies draft. Additionally, he noted that oversaturation policing is not a new topic in the public discourse. He explained that communities of color and low-income communities have long been subjugated to over policing and disproportionately harmed because of oversaturation. Further he stated that for a lot of folks on the ground this is something they repeatedly deal with in their everyday lives. He noted that there is no need for further study regarding advocacy for legislation to prohibit or limit oversaturation tactics, given the research that the subcommittee provided prior to the full board meeting is sufficient for purposes of moving forward today.

Member Thuilliez stated that he agreed with Member Smith's comments. He also acknowledged Member Diallo's comments regarding oversaturation, and what the philosophy of a particular law enforcement agency might be—i.e., whether it has a policing philosophy or partnership philosophy. Member Thuilliez related that at his agency, stakeholders ask the police department to come to various communities. Member Thuilliez explained that it was difficult to create a policy around philosophies. He motioned to table recommendation one.

Member Qazi commented that she agrees with Member Smith, stating that the need for legislation to address this issue is long overdue and that the working definition of saturated policing can be found on page six of the draft, and that this has been cited in the studies provided in the report, and that to ask for additional time to look at the issue is a disservice to the community. Further in light of concerns surrounding recommendation one and oversaturated policing, Member Qazi moved to approve recommendation one of the policy section.

Co-Chair Guerrero then opened the floor to discussion on Member Thuilliez's motion to table recommendation one. Member Thuilliez asked for clarification of the motion and whether the motions needed to be discussed one by one, as he did not want to give the impression he was in support of recommendation two or three. Co-Chair Guerrero gave the clarification that the motion on the table was Member Thuilliez's motion to table recommendation one.

Member Diallo asked whether anyone could help to wordsmith recommendation one in light of Member Qazi's comments, and expressed that he would be open to amendments. Member Diallo expressed that the report outlines the effects of over policing and oversaturation, but would like to see a specific usable definition of oversaturation that includes the understanding that it is directed by bias. Member Diallo explained that a prohibition on oversaturation could include a range of actions that could be subject to interpretation, and without that clarity, the recommendation could be interpreted in a way that the Board did not want.

Co-Chair Sierra suggested tabling recommendation one with further development from the Board. Co-Chair Sierra noted that the Board had done a good job relating the recommendation to the concerns that the practice perpetuates or has roots in racial profiling and bias. Acknowledging the definition of oversaturation on page 6, Co-Chair Sierra noted that what the Board really meant with the recommendation relates to the disproportionate concentration of law enforcement presence in marginalized communities. She noted that, whatever the motive—

whether the motive is explicit bias, implicit bias, or not bias—this practice is still problematic. However, the definition of oversaturation as stated is very hard to implement for an agency.

Co-Chair Sierra offered the friendly amendment to Member Thuilliez’s motion to table recommendation one for further development by the Board. Member Thuilliez accepted the friendly amendment to his motion. The motion was not seconded.

Member Diallo asked for clarification about what a motion to table meant, and whether it meant the recommendation would not be included in the report. Co-Chair Guerrero confirmed that was what the term meant.

Member Qazi made a motion to use the following substitute language for recommendation one: The legislature and local policymakers should enact legislation to prohibit or limit police agencies from relying on oversaturated policing as defined in section three above in marginalized communities due to the negative effects of those practices on those communities. Member Smith seconded Member Qazi’s motion.

Member Randolph asked to second Member Thuilliez’s motion. Co-Chair Guerrero explained that Member Thuilliez’s motion was not seconded. Member Thuilliez asked for a point of order, and explained that his motion was first, not Member Qazi’s motion. Co-Chair Guerrero explained that his prior motion was not seconded, and Member Qazi’s motion had been seconded, so Member Qazi’s motion was ripe for a vote.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated that motion reads as follows: The legislature and local policymakers should enact legislation to prohibit or limit police agencies from relying on oversaturated policing as defined in section three above in marginalized communities due to the negative effects of those practices on those communities. DAG Simpson then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Guerrero and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Randolph, Greene, and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:** Co-Chair Angela Sierra

The motion carried on a vote of 10 ayes, 3 nays, and 1 abstention.

Member Thuilliez moved to table recommendation one addressing oversaturated policing with Member Randolph seconding the motion.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated the motion is to table recommendation one in the Policies section. DAG Simpson then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Sierra and Members Greene, Hawkins, Randolph, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:** Co-Chair Guerrero and Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, and Smith
- **ABSTAIN:** Members Criner and Rall

The motion failed with a vote of 5 ayes, 8 nays, and 2 abstentions.

The Board then moved on to recommendation two of the Policies section. Co-Chair Guerrero reminded the Board that Co-Chair Sierra had suggested that the recommendation not include language directed towards the Governor. Co-Chair Guerrero explained, however, that recommendation two was originally conceived mainly as a budget item and therefore both the legislature and the Governor would have a role to play in that.

Co-Chair Sierra made a motion to amend the language in recommendation two to the following: the legislature should enact legislation to allocate resources to an entity with the needed capacity or expertise, such as a state commission or research institution, to study and make further recommendations on whether alternative enforcement technologies such as face recognition, gunshot detection, and predictive policing technology exacerbate existing bias or are deployed in ways that lead to oversaturation policing. Member Qazi seconded the motion.

Member Randolph urged the Board to do a deep dive into Penal Code section 13519.4, and that he believed the Board was engaging in gross overreach recommending to law enforcement practices that involve alternative enforcement technologies, or prior conversations relating to monies that law enforcement agencies have used for those technologies. Member Randolph cautioned that if the Board continued down this path, the Board would probably see law enforcement agencies doing a spot check on how much money they have used to obtain or collect RIPA data, including technology, computer systems, software systems, and staff.

Member Qazi seconded Co-Chair Sierra's motion to amend the language in recommendation two. DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by reading the motion which states: The legislature should enact legislation to allocate resources to an entity with the needed capacity or expertise, such as the state commission or research institution to study and make further recommendations on whether alternative enforcement technology such as face recognition, gunshot detection, and predictive policing technology exacerbate existing bias or are deployed in ways that lead to oversaturation policing. DAG Simpson then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Diallo, Forde, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Criner, Greene, Hawkins, Randolph, and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Armaline

The motion carried with 9 ayes, 5 nays, and one abstention.

Co-Chair Guerrero then moved to the next recommendation in the Policies section. Co-Chair Sierra made a motion to approve recommendation number three in the section to read as follows: The legislature and local policy makers should enact legislation or policies like those in place in North Carolina, San Francisco, West Hollywood, Los Angeles, and Virginia to limit pretextual stops consistent with public safety. Co-Chair Sierra explained that this proposed amendment was based on the fact that these policies do various different things, but what they each have in common is limiting pretextual stops, rather than prohibiting such stops. Co-Chair Sierra explained that the amendment characterizes more closely what those policies are doing. Member Diallo seconded the motion.

Member Thuilliez objected to the motion, stating that law enforcement officers solve crime, rescue people that are victims of human trafficking, and interdict fentanyl and guns. This is accomplished through analyzing tips, trends, and certain criminal enterprises. Member Thuilliez explained that stopping a vehicle based only on a bona fide California Vehicle Code violation would not be in the best interests of bringing justice to victims and safeguarding the Constitution. Member Thuilliez explained that officers take an oath and do things lawfully and legally. He stated further that we bring justice to victims, to rescue victims, and so, he stated the need to speak out against policies that he believed infringe on that ability of law enforcement to do their jobs on behalf of victims.

Member Diallo acknowledged Member Thuilliez's concerns, and explained that this was why he seconded Co-Chair Sierra's amendment. Member Diallo stated that he believed the amendment balanced the issues regarding public safety and bias, and that the Board could find a middle ground in instituting policies that both serve public safety and do not institute bias. To the extent that recommendation two includes the caveat to limit, and not prohibit, such stops, Member

Diallo expressed his belief that this was consistent with public safety versus an outright prohibition, especially in light of the report showing data, studies, and other legislation recognizing some of the problems of pretextual stops. Member Diallo reiterated that in his view, the amendment balances both of those concerns and asks the legislature to just take a careful eye in directing law enforcement to both serve public safety and eliminate bias.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion: The legislature and local policy makers should enact legislation or policies, similar to those in place in North Carolina, San Francisco, West Hollywood, Los Angeles, and Virginia to limit pretextual stops consistent with public safety. DAG Simpson then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Greene, Hawkins, Randolph, and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Criner

The motion carried with 10 ayes, 4 nays, and one abstention.

Next Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for the Board to vote on accepting the State and Local Policies Section into the 2026 Report. Member Khadjavi made a motion to accept the Policies section, seconded by Member Armaline.

DAG Simpson restated the motion to approve the 2026 Policies section of the report. He then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Randolph and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Greene

The motion carried with 12 ayes, 2 nays, and one abstention.

POST

Co-Chair Guerrero invited the Board to review the POST section prior to Board discussion. She informed the Board that there are no recommendations but rather a discussion of the work of the section. She stated that the section reflects the Board's continued work with POST to identify ways to improve law enforcement training related to racial identity profiling to train officers not just on prohibitions against profiling, but on how profiling can decrease the safety of both the officer in the community and the individuals they serve within that community. Co-Chair Guerrero pointed out that the Board will begin a 2-year review of the field training program. So that is the work ahead.

Co-Chair Sierra pointed out that, on page 19, she would like it to be changed to reflect that she answered questions and received input from the POST Commissioners. Co-Chair Sierra also asked that the sentence discussing the Board's aim to strengthen its partnership "by working more collaboratively in the future" to be amended to state "by working even more collaboratively in the future."

Member Randolph asked for clarification regarding the discussion on SB 2 and whether these related to Wave

Member Kulkarni moved to accept the POST section, seconded by Member Armaline to adopt the post draft chapter for our report with the following modifications. Member Sierra provided the language: That the wording regarding the RIPA board continuing to work with POST to

measure its course effectiveness will no longer be stated as a recommendation. It will be worded to the effect that the RIPA board looks forward to continuing to work with post to explore ways to measure its course effectiveness. She also noted the following changes on page 19 of the POST section in the second paragraph under vision for future reports would state that Co-Chair Sierra also answered questions and received input from commissioners and that the presentation highlighted the fact that the board and the commission aim to strengthen their partnership by working even more collaboratively in the future.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited a vote on the motion to accept the POST section. DAG Simpson restated the motion. Motion to approve the post section of the 2026 report with the changes that co-chair Sierra recommended. DAG Simpson took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Randolph and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried with 13 ayes and 2 nays.

Accountability

Co-Chair Guerrero invited the Board to review the Accountability section prior to Board discussion. She explained that the section explores the impact of civilian oversight agencies, and also talks about SB 2 decertification. She further informed the Board that there are five recommendations regarding recommendations to civilian oversight agencies that are on page 21. The section also includes tables of agencies with a listing by checklist of what kind of civilian oversight they have. Further, she explained that that the first set of agencies are wave 1 and wave two agencies.

Co-Chair Sierra suggested the following modifications to the third recommendation. She recommended that the word contemporaneous should be replaced with the word timely. Additionally, she recommended that the words in recommendation three, “reported data” will be replaced with the phrase “matter being reviewed, with all appropriate confidentiality protections in place.” Co-Chair Guerrero clarified for the Board that the motion would be to adopt the five recommendations in the accountability section as written except with the following modifications to the third recommendation.

Member Armaline made a motion to approve the Accountability section of the 2026 report with the modifications stated by Co-Chair Sierra. Member Khadjavi seconded the motion.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated that the motion on the floor is to approve the 2026 accountability section of the report. He then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, and Smith
- **NAY:** Members Randolph and Thuilliez
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried with 13 ayes and 2 nays.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited the Board to address a procedural matter by way of a motion, to authorize Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra to sign off on the final report prior to publication. Member Armaline moved, and Member Greene seconded to authorize the Co-Chairs to sign off on the final report prior to publication.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated that the motion on the floor is to authorize the Co-Chairs to sign off on the final report prior to publication. He then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Criner, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:**

The motion carried unanimously.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Mr. Hylton expressed concerns with the RIPA data's integrity. He inquired why have an end of January deadline if the body is approving of the report today. Additionally, he expressed frustration, noting that the Board continues to struggle with addressing the issues previously raised by the public. He stated that having three complaints for racial profiling being sustained out of 1,500 being filed is a serious problem that he will continue to raise before the Board. He stated that the RIPA report drafts make no mention on its efforts to ensure the data used is accurate and validated. He continued by addressing law enforcement concerns regarding the difficulty of collecting stop data by stating that it should not be difficult to collect using technology.

9. BREAK

The Board adjourned for a five-minute break at 3:22 p.m. and reconvened at 3:27 p.m. Once a quorum was re-established, Co-Chair Guerrero moved on to the next agenda item.

10. BOARD DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL THEMES FOR THE 2027 RIPA REPORT AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Co-Chair Guerrero opened the floor for Board discussion on potential themes for the 2027 RIPA Report and discussion of public engagement. She stated that this is an opportunity for the Board to take a few minutes to think about potential themes for next year's report and also to think about how to expand public engagement with the RIPA proceedings.

Member Kulkarni stated that she would like to see follow-up and further discussion regarding immigration enforcement and the impact of unconstitutional actions in the enforcement efforts, is having on the lives of everyday Californians. Member Smith agreed with Member Kulkarni, stating that recent board meetings were quite helpful, but that they were a starting point. He expressed that when it comes to issues of law enforcement throughout California, this year, the immigration raids, and attacks on undocumented people was probably the highest of all things of public importance that we were seeing. He explained further that people were in the streets protesting, families were being torn apart and it was extremely devastating. He noted that these elements are rooted in racism and xenophobia and that goes to the heart of the overall purpose of the RIPA board which is to prevent communities from being harmed based on their race or other aspects of their identity. Member Smith stated that he believes it is extremely important to continue the conversation regarding the impact of federal immigration enforcement on the lives of Californians and how RIPA can be helpful.

Co-Chair Guerrero agreed with Members Kulkarni and Smith in stating that the conversation in October served as a starting point in the conversation around federal immigration enforcement and helped the Board to better understand the nexus to the work on the RIPA board which is the

role of local and state law enforcement in addressing issues of bias. She informed the Board that engagement between local and state law enforcement and federal law enforcement on some of these incidents are becoming more frequent, and that clarifying what community members can expect from local and state law enforcement is going to be important and understanding what the data available data tells us. Co-Chair Sierra noted that there was discussion about civilian oversight agencies in this report talking about how they can use the RIPA data. She stated that she did not know whether the Board has explored how local law enforcement agencies may benefit from having guidance and assistance on how they can use the RIPA data, especially for the smaller agencies. She explained that it could be helpful to explore having all this data and how they could be of use to the actual entity that is providing the data, and how to make it actionable for those local agencies. Member Randolph stated that he and other law enforcement officials throughout the state would like to see greater engagement from the RIPA board with law enforcement agencies and academics, believing that it leads to greater dialogue and collaboration between RIPA and civil rights advocates and California Peace Officers.

Member Thuilliez expressed RIPA jurisdictional concerns, noting that the RIPA board is not charged with addressing federal immigration matters. Co-Chair Guerrero explained that the interest in following up on the discussion from the October meeting addressing federal immigration actions focused on state and local law enforcement's duty to intervene when federal law enforcement is engaging in abusive power. Member Smith in response to Member Thuilliez explained that there's no intention for finger pointing of local law enforcement. He explained that federal immigration enforcement is a topic of interest for the Board because it's a significant issue of public concern and it relates to race and racism, and the reality for the Board is that it is about being responsive to the concerns and needs of the public and really trying to meet the existing moment.

Member Diallo explained that the October 9, 2025 meeting was not so much as pointing a finger at local law enforcement, but attempting to better understand the environment in which local law enforcement is operating based upon what's going on in the federal level. He explained discussions focused on what policy recommendations may be helpful in assisting local law enforcement to remain consistent with our state values, specifically in those incidents leading to federal interactions that cause complications for local law enforcement. He further informed the Board that the meeting was an attempt at being engaged with the public, acknowledging the environment is complicating in a lot of ways. He stated a point of emphasis is to separate federal immigration efforts from the operations of local law enforcement and to the extent that's complicated by the federal government, what policy recommendations can the Board develop that would increase transparency at the local level and assist local law enforcement in these interactions with federal immigration enforcement.

Member Armaline inquired about interview protocols and whether the Board has established a process, or a point person, when the media seeks an interview from a Board member about the RIPA Report. DAG Simpson explained that because the RIPA Board is a state body and because the requests are to individual board members, board members are required to speak only in their individual capacity so that they don't speak on behalf of the board about statements or comments or positions that the board may take without a vote. Further, he explained that the distinction is that if the board wants to take a position on a particular issue or matter, and the report is a reflection of the positions that the board as a whole is taking, then that's appropriate, because the board has taken a vote on it, but if members receive questions from reporters, the answer is you can answer those questions but only in my individual capacity and not on behalf of the Board.

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 Sierra raised the importance of the Board's engagement with the legislature prior to publication of the Report, stating that the legislature desires to hear from the RIPA Board in December and January before publication. She then moved for the board to approve Co-Chairs Andrea Guerrero and Angela Sierra to meet with legislative bodies such as legislative caucuses to present the recommendations and legislative briefing before the actual Report comes out. Member Diallo seconded the motion.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated that the motion on the floor is to approve Co-Chairs Andrea Guerrero and Angela Sierra to meet with legislative bodies such as legislative caucuses to present a legislative briefing and recommendations before the actual Report comes out. He then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra, and Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Members Criner (no vote) and Randolph (no vote)

The motion carried with 13 ayes and 2 abstentions.

Co-Chair Guerrero invited the Board to transition to the next agenda item of the nomination of co-chairs for 2026. She opened the nomination process by requesting the nomination of candidates. Member Kulkarni moved to nominate Co-Chair Guerrero, which she accepted, and the nomination was seconded by Member Khadjavi. Co-Chair Guerrero nominated Co-Chair Sierra, which she accepted, and the nomination was seconded by Member Kulkarni.

DAG Simpson assisted with the vote by restating the motion. He stated the motion on the floor is to nominate Co-Chairs Guerrero and Sierra as Co-Chairs for 2026. He then took a roll-call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Guerrero and Sierra, Members Armaline, Diallo, Forde, Greene, Hawkins, Khadjavi, Kulkarni, Qazi, Rall, Randolph, Smith, and Thuilliez
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Criner (no vote)

The motion carried with 14 ayes and 1 abstention.

13. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Guerrero congratulated Co-Chair Sierra for her nomination for another year, and thanked the body for entrusting them to lead the Board for 2026 and thanked the members of the public for their participation and engagement. Member Armaline thanked the Co-Chair's Guerrero and Sierra for their time, effort, and sacrifice for taking on the leadership position with the Board. Co-Chair Guerrero thanked everyone for their attendance and adjourned the meeting.