CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)
https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/meetings

STOP DATA ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 5, 2025, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Subcommittee Members Present: Co-Chair Lily Khadjavi and Members LaWanda Hawkins, Darren Greene, Andrea Guerrero, and Chauncee Smith

Subcommittee Members Absent: Co-Chair Chad Bianco and Members Rich Randolph and John Dobard

1. **CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS**

Co-Chair Khadjavi called the meeting to order.

2. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

She introduced new member Chauncee Smith. Member Smith introduced himself and expressed excitement to work with the Subcommittee. Each Stop Data Subcommittee (herein Subcommittee) member introduced themselves.

3. **APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 3, 2024 MEETING MINUTES**

Member Guerrero moved to approve the minutes; Member Diallo seconded. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) proceeded with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Member Diallo, Member Greene, Member Guerrero, Member Hawkins, Co-Chair Khadjavi
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Smith

With five Ayes and one Abstain, the meeting minutes were approved.

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

DAG Simpson reported that the 2025 RIPA Report was published on January 1, 2025. The CARE Community Briefing occurred on January 21, 2025.

DAG Garrett Lindsey highlighted structural issues for the 2026 RIPA Report and new data elements they will gain in the 2024 data collection. There are two ways to think about structure in Stop Data: (1) Group-by-group analysis with an element of each stop—for example, looking at differences in search rates between all groups of interest, or (2) stop characteristics by characteristic analysis for different groups—for example, in racial identity, looking at racial analysis of stop characteristics for different groups.

In the 2025 Report, the Board looked at a stop-by-stop characteristic for youth and also a group-by-group analysis for each stop.

The advantages of the group-by-group analysis are that, because stop analysis is more complicated than group characteristics, it is easier to describe what happens during a search and impacts on groups they are looking at. That, in turn, focuses the reader on the different aspects of disparities within elements of a stop. The advantage of the stop characteristics-by-characteristic analysis for different groups is that, because they can easily track differences across different characteristics and how they impact more characteristics, down the line that may be less obvious in a group-by-group analysis. Furthermore, a reader may be more particularly interested in how one group is affected.

It is helpful to know if the Board is more interested to have the RIPA stop data reported as a group-by-group analysis or a stop characteristics-by-characteristic analysis for different groups. One is better for knowing what decisions an officer makes during a stop, and another is better to understand the impact of a characteristic of people within a stop.

New data elements are included in the RIPA stop data this year:

> (1) Type of stop. This is the position of the person in the world when they were stopped: Were they in a vehicle, a pedestrian, or on a bicycle? If they are on a bus or subway, that is reported as a pedestrian. Officers are now required to report this information.

> (2) Whether the person stopped is perceived to be unhoused.

Member Smith asked if these stops were being collected but not disaggregated. DAG Lindsey responded affirmatively. He stated that this information could have been inferred before; for example, if they were stopped for jaywalking, it would imply they were a pedestrian, or if they were stopped if they did not have a bicycle light, it would imply they were on a bicycle. However, there are other reasons to stop someone, and who is a pedestrian or in a car is not able to be determined.

> (3) If the stop was made during the course of responding to a call for service.

> (4) If the stop was made during the course of a wellness check or as part of an officer's community caretaking function. This new data element is mutually exclusive with a call for service, which would allow to distinguish between a call for service and community caretaking function.

> (5) Force-related vs. non-force related actions, disaggregated by amount. These new data values are more explicit in how they are accounted.

> (6) If the basis for search was verbal, written, or implied by conduct. If implied by conduct, the officer needs to use a field to explain what the conduct was that permitted the search.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked if this was for the consent basis. DAG Lindsey responded affirmatively.

> (7) The self-identified race of the officer that generated the RIPA report.

(8) If the officer gives a reason for stopping someone that is different than their actual reason, they collect the reason given for the stop, the actual reason, and the written explanation.

Member Smith asked for clarification of how that could be played out. DAG Lindsey gave the example of an officer stopping a person that matches the profile of someone suspected of abducting a child. The officer does not want to provide that reason to the stopped person in order to protect a child from imminent threat, so they could give the reason of reasonable suspicion for criminal activity.

Member Greene asked how much time it would take for officers to complete this work. Member Greene said it would take no more than thirty seconds to complete demographic data when he started. He asked if completing the documentation has taken away the number of contacts he is able to have during his shift. DAG Lindsey stated that the officer is only required to report this explanation if they gave a different reason, so it may be more of an exception than the rule. However, he stated that they could look at in the future.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that changing the stop data analysis was a multi-year process. Something that came up was if there is a way for the data to be filled out, so that you are not just seeing a long list but there are also subsections to make it more efficient to enter the data. She acknowledged the point Member Greene has raised is important and has been previously discussed.

Member Diallo asked about the new category regarding the actual reason of the stop not given. He asked if that included legitimate pre-textual stops. DAG Lindsey stated that the primary reason for the stop may be different, and what Member Diallo stated may not be captured by the reporting. This new requirement does not change an officer's requirement to report the primary reason for a stop, only what they communicated to the subject of the stop.

DAG Lindsey stated that another topic discussed last year that may be interesting to think about this year, is geographic differences in policing practices. He stated it may be helpful to contextualize policing accountability in a geographic discussion. DAG Lindsey stated that they are able to precisely map the California Highway Patrol stops to the California Department of Transportation, where the California Department of Transportation was an appealing break down for the Subcommittee. He said that if there should be a more Northern-Southern California distinction, then San Bernadino to San Luis Obispo is thought of as Southern California.

5. BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2026 REPORT

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the 2023 data is posted on Open Justice.

Member Guerrero stated that it would be good to look at disparity hotspots geographically to better understand where there re patterns and trends. Looking at data points, there are consistently problems not only in one police department, but a constellation of police departments in a geographic regions. She stated that a county-by-county look of disparities would be helpful, furthermore helpful to the Policies Subcommittee.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that there was discussion about separating agencies because those data dominate as overall trends. She stated that DAG Lindsey suggested to break down by statewide regional analyses and he talked about mapping to California Department of Transportation regions. However, this would be narrowing even more to hotspots. She asked DAG Lindsey if approaching geographic hotspots would be possible.

DAG Lindsey stated that even within a county, since they are large, geographic hotspots would be even narrower than that. In some cases, the reported locations are not as precise as they would hope. For example, in some cases the cross-street ends up reported as a street, which can be miles long. Furthermore, when talking about disparities, there needs to be assumptions of who is moving in and out geographically. DAG Lindsey stated that someone in Los Angeles County may not be moving in and out of the county. However, for smaller counties, people may be traveling in and out for work.

Member Guerrero stated that her interest is looking at the agency level to understand how an agency is conducting searches relative to the rest of the state agencies. For example, medians of consent searches or handcuffing or use of force – which of the agencies are above and below that median? For the data analyzing consent searches, there are agencies that most of their searches are consent searches. That is alarming that they are not using evidence-based grounds for searches. When sorting by county, they are in the same areas. She wants to understand what is going on in that county in those agencies. The other way to look at it is relative to all the other agencies – they are using certain tools at a higher frequency than others. Why? How does that impact community trust? At a minimum, that should be at the county and agency level. A Northern and Southern California split is not valuable. If county and agency level is too arduous, then they could look at the top ten counties.

DAG Lindsey stated that they could create a heat map of particular data elements that are of high salience. However, there is an issue that sheriffs departments and California Highway Patrol expand beyond those areas. Very small departments can end up below or above the medians because small datasets get skewed. However, with regional differences, heat maps provide area size differences.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that hotspots are about areas of interest, but do not have to go down to the specific street. She stated trends are not just about who is stopped, but also once a stop has happened, what occurred during the stop. They will swing back and forth between consent, what occurred at the agency level, and practices varying so much that those are highly discretionary searches. It is narrower about particular actions taken during a stop.

Dr. Eric van Holm of the DOJ Research Services stated that region is interesting to look at, but law enforcement agencies are not at the regional or agency level, so there is no policy lever there to affect all law enforcement agencies. An interesting line of research would be an agency level analysis that looks at region as one element, but also other interesting things that can predict differences within stop outcomes are at the regional level, such as city population, county population, county demographics. These influence the way individuals interact with police. Other elements can include type of agency. He thinks there is an interesting agency-level

analysis that also captures the regional differences and also expands to look at predictors of what drives outcomes of stops that would be of interest to the Board.

Member Sierra asked about moving away from demographics of the region as a benchmark but among those stops—what happens to them? In the data, putting population aside, among those stopped, disproportionate of Black and brown women who are handcuffed, curbed, put in the back of a police car, asked for consent to search, subject to field interview cards, etc. Let us take the population benchmark out and look at those stopped then what happens. Member Sierra expressed interest in continuing a deeper level of analysis started last year, but in the aggregate.

Member Smith agreed. He stated that there is a significant mobility justice movement in California. The common framework for racial profiling is driving in a car. However, having the additional ability to look at the data at a granular level is helpful, especially in areas of the state that are more diverse in how they go about in their daily lives. In urban areas, he supposes they would have more people riding bicycles or taking public transit. He stated that there are concerns for racial and identity biases for people who are cyclists, using public transportation, or going about daily life without a car.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated it is important to take into account the separation of pedestrians and bicyclist stops. She stated that frisk and search rates were disproportionately high for pedestrians looking historically at LAPD data.

Member Smith stated that there is significant categorization of people who appear to be unhoused. He stated that the criminalization of people unhoused in Los Angeles is happening at a high rate. The criminalization of poverty can be a proxy for the criminalization of people of color when looking at disparities within local economic strands. It is an extremely public policy issue, given the housing crisis. Member Smith stated that there is a ripple effect, where people filling local jails are people who are unhoused and dealing with other life challenges. He stated taking a closer look at those indicators could also have significant volume.

Member Greene asked if calls for service has been the denominator for law enforcement contracts. The California Highway Patrol contracted with California Policy Lab and they looked at their data extremely deep. One of the denominators they used was call for services in certain areas. Crashes, tires that have broken down, etc. have been compared to their stops. Member Greene asked if this has been done in the past and if this is feasible for local police departments.

Member Greene stated that using consent searches to start an investigation is lazy policing. He stated that the human element needs to be included with the data. He gave the example of the opioid and fentanyl epidemic. Oftentimes training lags well behind trends. The one tool in a police officer's bag is pretextual stops and consent searches. Members of the community demand law enforcement to stymie opioids and fentanyl, and law enforcement officers are touched when they go to town halls or a briefing the next day or their family member is also impacted. The officers become hot and heavy and disregard the training. He states that before collecting more data, it is essential to establish the why – what are we going to do with data at the end of day? How do we apply it? How do we give education for law enforcement and the public, before adding more training. Officers perceive training as one more thing added to their day without having the context of where it came from.

Member Diallo stated that analysis of data at agency and regional level will illustrate what agencies are doing with training. He is interested, at a policy level, the policies that come out of departments and affect officers on street. Member Diallo believes this would affect disparities on stop data at the agency and regional level, not just individual officer level disparities. He stated this is encouraging to explore.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that with knowing consent as a basis for search data element, they would know if the agencies who proposed changes in their policies is borne out in the data. They should also separate agency and agency policy. For example, the Los Angeles Police Department and San Francisco Police Department may talk about pretextual stops differently from other agencies. This is the year to collect policies of department and see how they are borne out.

About consent being used, there are many questions to ask. Who is asked to consent to begin with? If consent was a basis, was the search conducted? Was that the only basis for a search? Consent being the only basis for search implies a much more discretionary search compared to a search with other bases. As a policing tool, the officer is also asking for consent. Co-Chair Khadjavi wanted to circle to how consent is granted. She is surprised to see implied consent is a data element. She wants to see what is happening, at least in terms of an officer filling the data out, if they are promoting use of consent to buttress what they were sharing.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that regarding Member Greene's comment about calls for service is true in how discretionary stop begins is different than officer initiated. She appreciates separating them out.

Member Guerrero stated that she would like to see a consent-only data point in the Report. She stated that it could be gleaned by downloading the five million data points, but that is not accessible to the general public unless they have special software. The consent-only data point should be crunched into tabs by agency – it would be nice to see the state doing that.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that a data dashboard would also be helpful to have.

Member Smith stated that he liked the consent search indicator and the data dashboard. He said that it speaks to the data and work of the Board more accessible to the public. People may be impacted by racial profiling from a variety of circumstances. The more transparent and accessible in sharing the information, the better. In addition, he wanted to offer an idea of looking at the harms and consequences that arise from racial profiling, specifically stops that are pretextual. As a result of that initial decision to stop the person, it can lead towards troubling and traumatic circumstances. He is speaking about fatal police car chases which are a significant problem throughout the nation and often arise from relatively minor stop reasons. An officer sees someone in a particular neighborhood, and there is some implicit and unconscious bias at play, and they identify a minor issue as the basis for the stop. Recent reports have shown, specifically an in-depth investigative piece by the San Francisco Chronicle, where these scenarios lead to a police car chase where someone dies. The person who dies could be the officer involved, driver, or bystanders – 36% of people who die from fatal police chases are bystanders. He stated that this understates the severity of these types of stops. He stated available data show Black people are four times more likely to die from fatal police chases than white people, and

disproportionately occur in neighborhoods with Black people. He stated that the Board should look into this in California, maybe not through RIPA, but other data is out there, to tease out racially biased stops. There is a general trend in the nation to address this particular topic. In 2023, the U.S. Department of Justice issued recommendations saying law enforcement agencies should limit the use of car chases, particularly in incidents where the dangers posed are extreme and there is also an opportunity to apprehend the suspect later. The Police Executive Research Forum was a co-author of that report.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that this ties to a recommendation of having something that illustrates different policies of agencies, including car chase policies. She understands that some agencies in California have prohibited police chases where there is no imminent danger. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that even if these types of stops are not reflected in large datasets, this could be important to illuminate.

Member Guerrero stated police pursuits are a use of force and is the number one cause of fatalities with federal Department of Homeland Security agents in the country. She states it is seen in neighborhoods on the rise. Fatal police car chases as an outcome of initial stops, with the throughline of what is happening, who has vehicle pursuit policies, and if they align with best practices to limit this as a use-of-force tool to that which is proportionate.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that there is an interest in longitudinal change. In the larger agencies, there are now data collected over several years that was not available in past reports. She asked if there was an interest in a longitudinal analysis to see a change over time.

Member Smith stated that this would be a way to evaluate the evolution of racial profiling over time. He stated no other public policy issue stays static. Member Smith stated that is the benefit of having RIPA in place for several years, it would be beneficial to see how things are playing out in a bird's eye view. There is tremendous value in seeing where things are now and where things were in the past. Are things getting better on particular subtopics? Which things are staying the same?

Member Guerrero stated that a longitudinal analysis would be helpful and asked if it could be embedded into the suggestions that they are making. She stated there is only full data for two years, as the agencies have been brought on in waves. Since Wave 1 agencies have been on the lightest, they could limit their analysis to Wave 1 agencies, which would also lighten the workload.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated duration of stop was not looked at in the past. The duration of a stop impacts the experience of a stop. Furthermore, the life cycle of a stop can impact the different actions that can be taken.

Member Smith stated that the research shows people of color are subject to longer stops. It is not just the time itself, but also the experience they need to endure for longer stops. It could amount to intimidation and harassment.

Member Guerrero stated that RIPA Board Reports have looked at duration of stops, but they should continue to track that issue. It is only through an analysis of that data that they are able to see that significant duration of stop is alarming.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that some people consent because they do not want to get held up longer. She stated that all the outcomes need to continue to be tracked. For those that are impacted, the research shows that the denigration and humiliation are there. Not all yields in a result of discovery for contraband. She is concerned that there is a pattern of stops that are racially motivated, leading to microaggressions, macroaggressions, and uses of force. Board member Guerrero stated the former California Highway Patrol Commissioner stated that it is in discretion that bias blooms. She asked they should see where discretion is operating and limit it. Member Greene stated that it is lazy policing; Member Guerrero agrees. She stated they need to continue tracking outcome data.

Co-Chair Khadjavi encouraged the Subcommittee to think about what can be borne from the new element perceived race of officer element. She understands from older studies that a diverse police force does not necessarily change the disparities. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that if the perceived race of officer and perceived race of person stopped are the same, there are different search rates and practices than if they were different. There are a number of variables present that were not available in the past.

Member Greene stated that race of officer is a good starting point. He stated that a lot of times it is not the race of officer but the background of an officer. Member Greene stated that the background is as important or even more important than the race of an officer. The race of an officer can feed into the bias they are looking for. He stated that the human element will not be able to be quantified, but asked to look further than race and remember each officer has their own background.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Richard Hylton of San Diego asked what became of the data dashboard. He thanked Member Greene for making the observation he did: he believes they have enough data and should recognize the data already there. He thinks the only new data that is different is the information provided to the person stopped as the reason being stopped. Everyone already exists in the data and could and should be used. He stated that they need to be more familiar with the data they have, and they should have someone from CJIS to provide them with information and guidance. The new use of force and lack of use of force of fields have created for him an issue of maintaining legacy values with new values that existed before. When he tried to determine uses of force, he learned that from DOJ. He finds the new change unnecessary. As for pretext stops, Mr. Hylton stated that recently, trying to get pretext information from San Francisco, they increased their reported stops by more than 100% in 2024 as compared to 2023. He cannot say anything positive about the pretext stop bags that he did not get. They were important to him and, he suspects, others. He calls to do something about that.

Aldon Thomas Stiles posted his public comment in the MS Teams Chat Log. Co-Chair Khadjavi read his public comment:

"I have contacted several law enforcement agencies for comment regarding racial disparities in police stops as represented in the RIPA report and a vast majority of these agencies have refused to respond to my inquiries. What do you say to law enforcement agencies that do not respond to the public?"

7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the previous data dashboard had questions about data security, that led to it being taken down. She understands the DOJ has acquired grant funding for a new data dashboard. She asked DOJ for an update regarding the data dashboard.

DAG Simpson stated that the DOJ is looking into vendors and funding options regarding the data dashboard. They are making every effort to select those vendors and revive it as soon as possible.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the data dashboard does not need to look like the previous one. Many law enforcement agencies have provided their own data dashboard. She is pleased to hear that it is at least in the proposal stage.

Member Guerrero stated that the topics they covered feed into the themes on the Policies Subcommittee about hotspot disparities and longitudinal understandings of data outcomes. Member John Dobard will present the themes of the Policies Subcommittee at the full RIPA Board meeting. She added that neither the data nor the report is digestible to the average person in California. She stated that a data person may not see how inaccessible it is. She stated it would be helpful to convene a meeting to get the public's input on what would make it more accessible. It could be outside of the Subcommittee in the community with lay and data people to understand what information could be digested. A special focus meeting has been done before.

8. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Khadjavi adjourned the meeting.