
SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Steven Bradford, Chair

2021 - 2022 Regular

Bill No: AB 1947 **Hearing Date:** June 21, 2022
Author: Ting
Version: May 19, 2022
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: AB

Subject: *Hate crimes: law enforcement policies*

HISTORY

Source: The Arc California ; Asian Law Alliance; California Asian Pacific American Bar Association; California Alliance for Retired Americans; California Association of Human Relations Organizations; California Council of Churches IMPACT; California Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP; California League of United Latin American Citizens; California Women’s Law Center; Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism, CSU San Bernardino; Feminist Majority Foundation; Hindu American Foundation; Japanese American Citizens League, NCWNP; Sikh Coalition; United Cerebral Palsy California

Prior Legislation: AB 57 (Gabriel), Ch. 691, Stats. of 2021
AB 2879 (Chu, 2020), not heard in Assembly Public Safety
SB 1165 (Jones, 2020), not heard in Senate Public Safety
AB 300 (Chu, 2019), held in Senate Appropriations
AB 301 (Chu, 2019), held in Assembly Appropriations
AB 1985 (Ting), Ch. 26, Stats. of 2018
AB 39 (Bocanegra, 2017), held in Assembly Appropriations

Support: American Jewish Committee; Asian Americans for Community Involvement; California Catholic Conference; California Church Impact; California Foundation for Independent Living Centers; California Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP; California Nurses Association; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights; Consumer Federation of California; Council on American-Islamic Relations California; County of Santa Clara; Equality California; Name, Oppose & Abolish Hate in Marin; PathPoint; Pioneer Congregational United Church of Christ, Sacramento; Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Stand With Asians; The Arc of Ventura; The Bar Association of San Francisco; The Salvador E. Alvarez Institute for Non-Violence; UDW/AFSCME Local 3930

Opposition: Anti-Defamation League; California Law Enforcement Association of Records Supervisors

Assembly Floor Vote: 74 - 0

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to require local law enforcement agencies to adopt a hate crimes policy, as specified, and require the Department of Justice to monitor compliance with this mandate. Additionally, this bill requires POST to develop a model hate crime policy, as specified.

Existing law defines “hate crime” as a criminal act committed in whole or in part because of one or more of the following actual or perceived characteristics of the victim:

- Disability;
- Gender;
- Nationality;
- Race or ethnicity;
- Religion;
- Sexual orientation; or
- Association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics. (Pen. Code, § 422.55, subd. (a) (1)-(7).)

Existing law provides that all state and local agencies shall use the definition of “hate crime” stated above except as other explicit provisions of state or federal law may require otherwise. (Pen. Code, § 422.9.)

Existing law specifies that “hate crimes” include, but are not limited to, violating or interfering with the exercise of civil rights, or knowingly defacing, destroying, or damaging property because of actual or perceived characteristics of the victim that fit the definition of hate crime. (Pen. Code, §§ 422.55, subd. (b). & 422.6., subd. (a) and (b).)

Existing law provides that any person convicted for violating or interfering with the civil rights of another on the basis of actual or perceived characteristics of the victim that fit the hate crime definition shall be punished by imprisonment in a county jail not to exceed one year, or by a fine not to exceed \$5000, or by both imprisonment and fine. The court shall also order community service, not to exceed 400 hours. (Pen. Code, §, 422.6 subd. (c).)

Existing law authorizes each state law enforcement agency to adopt a hate crime policy, and that when such a policy is adopted, it must include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the following:

- Definitions of hate crimes and associated terms;
- The content of the model policy framework developed by POST, as specified;
- Information regarding “bias motivation,” including disability-bias and religion bias, as specified;

- Information regarding the general underreporting of hate crimes and the more extreme underreporting of anti-disability and anti-gender hate crimes and a plan for the agency to remedy this underreporting;
- A protocol for reporting suspected hate crimes to the DOJ, as specified;
- A checklist of first responder responsibilities, including, but not limited to, being sensitive to effects of the crime on the victim, determining whether any additional resources are needed on the scene to assist the victim or whether to refer the victim to appropriate community and legal services, and giving the victims and any interested persons the agency's hate crimes brochure;
- A specific procedure for transmitting and periodically retransmitting the policy and any related orders to all officers, including a simple and immediate way for officers to access the policy in the field when needed;
- The title or titles of the officer or officers responsible for ensuring that the department has a hate crime brochure and ensuring that all officers are trained to distribute the brochure to all suspected hate crime victims and all other interested persons; and,
- A requirement that all officers be familiar with the policy and carry out the policy at all times unless directed by the chief, sheriff, director, or other chief executive of the law enforcement agency or other command-level officer to whom the chief executive officer formally delegates this responsibility. (Pen. Code, § 422.87, subd. (a).)

Existing law permits any local law enforcement agency that updates an existing hate crimes policy or adopts a new hate crimes policy to include any of the provisions of a model hate crime policy and other relevant documents developed by the International Association of Police Chiefs that are relevant to California and consistent with specified existing law. (Pen. Code, § 422.87, subd. (b).)

Existing law requires local law enforcement agencies, upon adequate funding, to report to the DOJ in a timely manner prescribed by the Attorney General any information relative to hate crimes. (Pen. Code, § 13023, subd. (a).)

Existing law requires DOJ, on or before July 1 of each year, to update the OpenJustice Web portal with information obtained from local law enforcement agencies regarding hate crimes. (Pen. Code, § 13023, subd. (b).)

Existing law requires POST, in consultation with subject-matter experts including, but not limited to, law enforcement agencies, civil rights groups, academic experts, and the DOJ, to develop guidelines and a course of instruction and training for law enforcement officers who are employed as peace officers, or who are not yet employed as a peace officer but are enrolled in a training academy for law enforcement officers, addressing hate crimes. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subd. (a).)

Existing law requires the POST course on hate crimes to include instruction in each of the following:

- Indicators of hate crimes;
- The impact of these crimes on the victim, the victim’s family, and the community, and the assistance and compensation available to victims;
- Knowledge of the laws dealing with hate crimes and the legal rights of, and the remedies available to, victims of hate crimes;
- Law enforcement procedures, reporting, and documentation of hate crimes;
- Techniques and methods to handle incidents of hate crimes in a non-combative manner;
- Multimission criminal extremism, which means the nexus of certain hate crimes, antigovernment extremist crimes, anti-reproductive-rights crimes, and crimes committed in whole or in part because of the victims’ actual or perceived homelessness;
- The special problems inherent in some categories of hate crimes, including gender-bias crimes, disability-bias crimes, including those committed against homeless persons with disabilities, anti-immigrant crimes, and anti-Arab and anti-Islamic crimes, and techniques and methods to handle these special problems; and
- Preparation for, and response to, possible future anti-Arab/Middle Eastern and anti-Islamic hate crime waves, and any other future hate crime waves that the AG determines are likely. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subd. (b).)

Existing law requires POST guidelines to include a framework and possible content of a general order or other formal policy on hate crimes that all state law enforcement agencies shall adopt and the commission shall encourage all local law enforcement agencies to adopt. (Pen. Code, § 13519.6, subd. (c).)

Existing law defines “anti-reproductive rights crime” and “subject matter experts” for purposes of POST training. (Pen. Code, § 13776.)

This bill requires, rather than simply authorizes, all state and local law enforcement agencies to adopt a hate crimes policy that includes all of the following:

- The definition of “hate crime,” and other terms that are pertinent to the recognition and investigation of hate crimes;
- The content and framework of the model policy develop by POST, as specified;
- Information regarding bias motivation, as defined;
- Instruction on the recognition of suspected religion-bias and disability-bias hate crimes, as specified;
- Instruction that officers consider whether the crimes occurred on a day of actual or perceived significance to, or concerning, the victim or victims or to persons of the same actual or perceived protected characteristic as the victim or victims (e.g., Lunar New

Year, Cinco de Mayo, Easter, Martin Luther King Day, and Yom Kippur).

- Instruction that officers consider whether the victim or victims of the crimes were one or more persons or properties with a particular actual or perceived protected characteristic when other, at least equally available and vulnerable potential victims were not targeted. Examples of such discriminatory selection may include, but are not limited to:
 - A series of sexual assaults of women and girls;
 - A series of crimes against actual or perceived transgender women, against actual or perceived noncitizens, or against persons demonstrating on behalf of a particular race or ethnicity and any observers or bystanders;
 - A series of attacks on one or more places of worship of a particular religion; and,
 - A series of attacks on one or more businesses, community centers, or other gathering places operated, staffed, or frequented by a person or persons with a particular known, evident, or perceived protected characteristic.
- Instruction that officers consider whether the victim is either:
 - A person with an actual or perceived disability that is known or evident to the perpetrator; or
 - A person with any other actual or perceived protected characteristic that is known or evident to the perpetrator and that, under the existing facts and circumstances, is likely to make the victim the target of a hate crime.
- Instruction that officers, when recognizing a suspected anti-immigrant or anti-race hate crime, to consider whether persons who are part of the victim's community in the victim's actual or perceived country of origin are commonly subject to hate or other bias there because of one or more of the protected characteristics and whether the perpetrator may have been motivated by such bias.
- Instruction that officers include statements by a crime victim or witness about their belief that the crime was a hate crime or motivated by bias against an actual or perceived protected characteristic in any report generated as a result of the incident.
- Instruction that officers not argue with the victim or witness who believes it was a hate crime, regardless of the initial opinion of the officer.
- Instruction that supervising officers who review reports of incidents in which the victim believed the crime was a hate crime to carefully consider whether additional investigation is necessary.
- Information regarding the general underreporting of hate crimes to, and by, law enforcement and the more extreme underreporting of anti-disability and anti-gender hate crimes and a plan for the agency to remedy this underreporting.

- A protocol for reporting suspected hate crimes to the DOJ.
- A checklist of first responder responsibilities, as specified.
- A specific procedure for transmitting and periodically retransmitting the policy and related orders to all officers, as specified.
- The title or titles of the officer or officers responsible for ensuring that the department has a hate crime brochure, as required, and ensuring that all officers are trained to distribute the brochure to all suspected hate crime victims, regardless of whether they specifically request it, and to all other interested person upon request.
- A requirement that all officers be familiar with the policy and carry out the policy at all times unless directed by specified individuals.
- A supplemental suspected hate crime report form providing the information necessary for the law enforcement agency or the prosecuting agency to determine whether a hate crime has occurred or whether to conduct a further investigation to make that determination.
- Instruction that responding officers must complete the form when they have a reasonable belief based upon the available evidence and information that a hate crime may have been committed.
- A schedule for providing the hate crime training, including, but not limited to, that required by statute and any other hate crime training certified by POST that the law enforcement agency selects.
- A requirement that, when an officer suspects multission criminal extremism, they report it to their agency's terrorism liaison officers.
- A requirement that each state and local law enforcement agency shall seek to incorporate examples of terminology that is specific to the communities they serve. For example, given the nationwide surge of anti-Asian American and Pacific Islander hate crimes beginning in 2020 and resulting from rhetoric blaming China for COVID-19, agencies that serve Asian American and Pacific Islander communities may include terminology and slurs relating to the coronavirus as part of a hate crime investigation.

This bill provides that a law enforcement agency shall be deemed in compliance with the above requirement if it does all of the following:

- Adopts, by no later than July 1, 2023, a policy including, but not limited to, all the provisions of the POST existing model hate crime policy framework including the supplemental suspected hate crime report form, called the "hate crime checklist."
- By no later than April 1, 2026, updates its policy to conform to POST's 2025 update of the model policy framework.

- Updates its policy within six months after each time POST updates the model policy framework or, if the agency has a regular policy review cycle, during the next policy review cycle.

This bill specifies that the above provisions regarding the hate crimes policy requirement and compliance are intended to establish statewide minimum practices, and shall not be construed to restrict a law enforcement agency from implementing more precise or more stringent policies.

This bill provides that, except as other provisions of state or federal law require, every law enforcement agency and each state and local agency shall exclusively use the Penal Code definitions of “hate crime,” “characteristics” and “protected characteristics,” and shall not use misleading terms such as “protected classes” or “protected groups.”

This bill requires, subject to the availability of adequate funding, the Attorney General (AG), in consultation with subject matter experts, as defined, to direct law enforcement agencies to report to the DOJ, in a manner to be prescribed by the AG, any information that may be required relative to hate crimes.

This bill provides that by no later than July 1, 2023, again after October 1, 2025, but by no later than April 1, 2026, and thereafter whenever changes in law or POST’s model policy framework require it, or whenever the Attorney General in consultation with subject matter experts deem it prudent, each law enforcement agency shall submit to the DOJ in a manner prescribed by the AG, the agency’s hate crime policy and hate crime brochure.

This bill requires agencies to include in their reports to the DOJ any hate crimes policies, brochures or other relevant information that the department finds the agency has failed to submit in any previous year.

This bill requires DOJ to publish on its website the names of agencies that have complied with hate crime reporting requirements and the names of any agencies that have failed to comply with those requirements.

This bill provides that the DOJ shall publish on its OpenJustice Web portal, on or before July 1, 2025, again by no later than July 1, 2028, and thereafter whenever all law enforcement agencies are required to submit their hate crime policies and brochures to the DOJ, the names of agencies that have and have not complied with the requirement, and submit an analysis of this information to the Legislature.

This bill requires POST to consult with subject matter experts, as defined, to develop its course of instruction in hate crimes, a change from the previous requirement that POST consult with law enforcement agencies, civil rights groups, academic experts, and the DOJ.

This bill requires POST to include in its course on hate crimes instruction regarding the preparation for, and response to, possible future anti-Asian, anti-Hindu, anti-Sikh, anti-Arab/Middle Eastern, anti-Semitic, and anti-Islamic hate crime waves, and any other future hate crime waves that the Attorney General, in consultation with subject matter experts, determines are likely and for which the Attorney General has notified law enforcement agencies.

This bill requires POST to develop a model hate crimes policy framework, which must include, among other specified items, all of the items that local law enforcement agencies must include in their hate crime policies under this bill.

This bill provides that POST shall, by no later than October 1, 2025, adopt and promulgate an updated hate crime model policy framework in consultation with subject matter experts and with the concurrence of the Attorney General, and shall adopt significant updates or additions to the framework only in consultation with subject matter experts and with the concurrence of the Attorney General.

This bill specifies that that the framework and model policy are not regulations, as defined.

This bill defines “subject matter experts” to include, but not be limited to, representatives of communities most victimized by hate crimes, academic experts, and law enforcement agencies.

COMMENTS

1. Need for This Bill

According to the Author:

Existing law does not require law enforcement agencies to adopt hate crimes policies, which has the effect of treating hate crimes different across jurisdictions. As we see the Asian Pacific Islander American community facing a major surge in violence and harassment solely based on their race, we must have consistent enforcement of hate crime laws and accurate data collection. AB 1947 would resolve this issue by requiring all California law enforcement agencies to adopt an updated hate crimes policy. The protocols will include how authorities recognize, report and respond to hate crimes, bringing consistency to responses victims receive and the information being collected.

2. DOJ Hate Crime Data and Reporting

In 1995, the DOJ began collecting and annually reporting data regarding hate crimes in California, and beginning in 2017, the DOJ was further required to publish that data on its OpenJustice Web Portal.¹ The most recent DOJ hate crimes report, presenting data collected from local law enforcement agencies in 2020, revealed some disturbing trends. Although the number of hate crime vents has fluctuated over the last decade, overall, hate crime events have increased by 25.5 percent, with 1,060 reported in 2011 and 1,330 reported in 2020.² Since the prior year (2019), hate crime events had increased by 31 percent and the number of victims of reported hate crimes increased 23.2 percent.³ Additionally, the 2020 report found that anti-Black hate crime events were the most prevalent that year, and anti-Asian hate crime events saw the greatest overall increase, up 107 percent from the prior year.⁴

¹ AB 2524 (Irwin), Ch. 418, Stats. of 2016, the OpenJustice Data Act of 2016.

² “Hate Crime in California 2020.” *California Department of Justice*. Published June 30, 2021. <https://data-openjustice.doj.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-06/Hate%20Crime%20In%20CA%202020.pdf>

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* Anti-Black hate crime events increased 87%, from 243 in 2019 to 456 in 2020.

Generally, the DOJ's annual hate crime reports are accompanied by updated guidance for local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors on various topics related to hate crimes, including relevant state laws and best practices for hate crime investigation, training and reporting.⁵ The latest law enforcement bulletin issued by the DOJ included the following best practices for hate crime data reporting:

- Ensure that hate crimes are properly investigated, documented, and reported to the California Department of Justice, pursuant to Penal Code section 13023, so that they may be reported by the State to the federal government.
- When documenting incidents, ensure hate crimes are clearly flagged to allow for required reporting. This can be indicated by the title/penal code section identifying the report as a hate crime.
- The agency head or their designee should make a final determination as to whether the incident should be classified as a hate crime by the agency.
- Agencies shall develop procedures to preserve hate crime reports, ensure timely communication of crimes to prosecutors' offices, and comply with legally mandated reporting.⁶

3. Deficiencies in Hate Crime Reporting and Response

California has experienced challenges regarding hate crime reporting by local law enforcement agencies. The DOJ requires law enforcement agencies (including police, sheriffs, CHP, and prosecutorial agencies) to submit information on all hate crimes occurring in their jurisdictions on a monthly basis, then transmits these data to the FBI and creates its annual report to the Legislature. However, a report published by the California State Auditor in 2018 found that several agencies had failed to report some hate crimes to the DOJ.⁷ Additionally, the audit found that although DOJ guidance requires agencies to submit information on a monthly basis, the DOJ had made no recent effort to ensure that all agencies complied with this requirement. According to the report:

When we asked DOJ to provide us with a list of agencies that it requires to report information to its hate crimes database, we found that it did not maintain a complete or accurate listing of all law enforcement agencies in the State. Specifically, a number of law enforcement agencies were not present on the list, and much of the contact information on the list was incorrect. Moreover, DOJ does not verify that all law enforcement agencies it requires to report do so, nor does it review the data that the agencies submit to ensure its accuracy. DOJ's lack of proactive guidance and oversight of law enforcement agencies is contributing to the underreporting of hate crime information that it provides to the public, the Legislature, and the FBI.⁸

⁵ The law enforcement bulletin can be found here: <https://www.oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/2021-dle-05.pdf>; the guidance for prosecutors can be found here: <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/hc-prosecutor-guidance.pdf>

⁶ "Information Bulletin: California Laws That Prohibit Hate Crimes and/or Provide Enhanced Penalties for Specific Hate Related Acts." Bulletin 2021-DLE-05. Published 30 June 2021. Page 13.

⁷ "Hate Crimes in California: Law Enforcement Has Not Adequately Identified, Reported or Responded to Hate Crimes." Report 2017-131. *California State Auditor*. Published May 2018. <https://www.auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2017-131.pdf>, page. 26.

⁸ *Ibid* at 3; it is unclear whether DOJ has taken steps since the publication of this audit to improve its data collection processes with regard to hate crimes.

The audit also found that local law enforcement agencies lacked the tools and training to identify hate crimes appropriately. The audit states:

Officers at...law enforcement agencies might have been better equipped to identify hate crimes if their agencies had implement better methods for doing so and provided periodic training. [...] At local law enforcement agencies we reviewed, a lack of hate crime training and protocols, in addition to little proactive guidance and oversight from DOJ, have contributed to the underreporting of hate crimes.” [...] “Law enforcement agencies need to improve their response to hate crimes by providing outreach that encourages individuals to report hate crimes.⁹

Existing law authorizes, but does not require, local law enforcement agencies to adopt a hate crimes policy. If a law enforcement agency does elect to adopt a hate crimes policy, existing law requires the policy to include a host of specific elements, including existing statutory hate crime-related definitions, POST’s model policy framework, information regarding bias motivation, a checklist of first responder responsibilities, and a protocol for reporting hate crimes to the DOJ, among others. This bill instead requires every local law enforcement agency to adopt a hate crimes policy, and adds several new mandatory elements, including the following:

- Additional instruction on bias motivation with a focus on the actual or perceived characteristics of victims.
- A supplemental suspected hate crime report form providing necessary information for the police or prosecuting agency to determine whether a hate crime has occurred or whether further investigation is necessary.
- A schedule for providing specified hate crime training.
- A requirement that officers report ‘multimission criminal extremism’ to their agencies terrorism liaison officers when they suspect it.¹⁰
- A requirement that in adopting a hate crimes policy, agencies seek to incorporate examples of terminology that is specific to the communities they serve.

Rather than requiring agencies to develop each of these new elements individually, this bill requires POST to add the new elements into the model hate crime policy framework it is already required to have developed under existing law, and requires agencies to adopt this model policy no later than July 1, 2023. The bill additionally requires POST to update this framework again in 2025, and requires agencies to update their policies accordingly by April 1, 2026. Law enforcement agency compliance with this bill is contingent upon regular updates to their hate crime policy following updates to POST’s model policy as well as regular reporting to DOJ.

4. Implementation Timeline

As discussed above, law enforcement agencies’ compliance with this bill’s requirements is dependent upon the implementation of regular updates to their hate crime policies based on POST’s updates to its model policy. Under the bill, this process begins with a requirement that

⁹ *Id.* at 2, 9-10, 27.

¹⁰ “Multimission criminal extremism” is defined elsewhere in existing law as “the nexus of certain hate crimes, antigovernment extremist crimes, anti-reproductive rights crimes, and crimes committed in whole or in part because of the victim’s actual or perceived homelessness.” See Penal Code 13519.6(b)(6).

POST include several new, highly specific elements in its model policy, however no date is established for the completion of that task. It is possible that such a change to POST's model policy may be relatively pro forma, but the bill further requires law enforcement agencies to adopt POST's model policy and submit the policy to the DOJ, in a manner prescribed by the Attorney General, no later than July 1, 2023, a mere 6 months after the effective date of the bill. The Author and Committee may wish to consider whether this relatively truncated timeline is sufficient for the optimal implementation of this bill's numerous requirements.

5. Overly Prescriptive?

Existing law requires POST to develop a model hate crime policy framework for law enforcement agencies that elect to adopt one, and requires the inclusion of various elements in that model policy, including references to existing hate crimes-related statutes, a message from the agency's chief regarding the importance of hate crimes laws, and a title-by-title specific protocol that agency personnel are required to follow.¹¹ This bill seeks to add several additional elements to that policy (described above), including considerable additional instruction in topics related to bias motivation. Under the bill, law enforcement agencies statewide would have to adopt the same stringent and highly detailed instruction requirements. In many cases, the language of these additional requirements may be overly prescriptive. According to the Anti-Defamation League, the only group writing in opposition to the bill:

As written, AB 1947 mandates codification of overly specific requirements that sends a misleading message to communities about what is and is not a hate crime and may undermine law enforcement agencies' ability to effectively recognize and respond to hate crimes. We recognize the earnest intention for providing numerous specific bias indicator examples for some targeted groups, such as listing days of significance to particular communities – especially ones that are disparately impacted by hate crimes or for whom they are underreported.

Codifying these many examples risks giving more weight to the groups and examples than to those that are not. Moreover, bias indicators, such as slurs and slogans change overtime. Although most hate crime policies will have much in common, AB 1947 will freeze them in time and substance. Individual agencies must retain the ability to create living documents that reflect evolving community needs, response strategies, and the nature of hate itself.

Finally, enshrining a specific hate crime policy into law will create significant logistical hurdles for legislators. What is written into law can only be amended by more law. AB 1947's one-size-fits-all approach as drafted by legislators will force lawmakers to revisit the content on a frequent basis to ensure it accurately reflects current trends, circumstances, and language.

The Author and Committee may wish to consider whether various elements of the bill, particularly its additions to required instruction on bias motivation, are overly prescriptive.

¹¹ Penal Code 13519.6(c).

6. Argument in Support

According to the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association:

According to its latest statistics, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) reported that hate crimes have surged to their highest number in the past twelve years, including 56% of victims of race-based crimes being targeted due to anti-Black and anti-Asian bias. Stop AAPI Hate has documented over 3,500 alleged hate incidents in California since March 2020. Unfortunately, the California State Auditor has found that law enforcement has not adequately identified, reported, or responded to hate crimes and has made recommendations to remedy these failures.

The increasing number of acts of hate demonstrates the need for state and local governments to take steps to address hate crimes, build community trust, and ensure that the experiences of victims of acts of hate and bias are documented. The solutions offered in AB 1947 represent a needed step forward to support the ability of law enforcement to respond to and investigate acts of hate and bias.”

7. Argument in Opposition

The only organization opposed to this bill is the Anti-Defamation League – their primary argument in opposition is highlighted in Comment 5, above.

-- END --