

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

STOP DATA ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 18, 2025, 10:03 a.m. – 11:57 a.m.

Subcommittee Members Present: Co-Chair Lily Khadjavi and Members Souley Diallo, John Dobard, Darren Greene, Andrea Guerrero, Rich Randolph, and Chauncey Smith

Subcommittee Members Absent: Co-Chair Chad Bianco and Member LaWanda Hawkins

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Khadjavi called the meeting to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each subcommittee member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF MAY 27, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Member Randolph moved to approve the minutes as written, and Member Greene seconded. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Yasmin Manners of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) proceeded with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Khadjavi and Members Dobard, Greene, Guerrero, Randolph, and Smith
- **NAY:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Diallo

With six “ayes” and one abstention, the meeting minutes were approved.

4. UPDATES BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Research Data Specialist Dr. Eric van Holm from DOJ Research Services gave a presentation about the stop data reported in 2024 under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA). Dr. van Holm explained that the presentation would provide a more in-depth look at the data that will be in the Stop Data chapter of the 2026 RIPA Report. There will be some overlap with the presentation shared with the Board on July 11, 2025, but today’s presentation will be more in-depth. There will be three principal sections of this presentation: (1) For each demographic group, Dr. van Holm will describe the number of stops taken, the most common actions taken, and the rate of various results of stops; (2) Dr. van Holm will review a few intersectional analyses with the interplay of language or housing status on issues of race; and (3) Dr. van Holm will give an introduction on the interstop co-occurrence analysis. He confirmed that the slide presentation would be uploaded to the Board’s webpage.

Dr. van Holm reported that in 2024, over five million stops were reported by 533 agencies across the state. With those stops, officers collect various demographics, which will be broken down throughout this presentation, specifically as to perceived race, gender, age, disability, English

fluency, sexual orientation, and housing status. Many of these demographic analyses do not differ from prior years.

Beginning with the average number of actions taken during a stop, Dr. van Holm reported that, considering all stops, individuals perceived to be Black have the most actions taken on average during a stop (with an average of 0.94 actions per stop), followed closely by individuals perceived as Native American (0.93 actions per stop). Both of those are above average across the data; the average is 0.63 actions taken per stop. At the other end of the distribution, individuals perceived as Asian and Middle Eastern/South Asian have the fewest actions taken during stops on average (0.21 and 0.26 actions taken per stop, respectively). However, Dr. van Holm noted that looking at all stops in the data impacts the way that this distribution looks. Looking only at stops that feature at least one action, the difference between perceived racial groups is somewhat muted, though still present. In stops with at least one action taken, individuals perceived as Black have 2.3 actions taken on average. On the other hand, individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian have 2.33 actions taken per stop on average, meaning the gap from the highest average number of actions per stop to the lowest shrinks from about 0.7 actions per stop, down to 0.5 actions per stop, thus there is still a difference present although it is somewhat less pronounced.

Looking at the specific actions taken during a stop by perceived race and ethnicity, Dr. van Holm noted that there are four types of actions listed: Asked parole status; detained; handcuffed; and searched. There are commonalities across perceived race. For instance, being asked for parole status is the least frequent of these four actions for each racial group. Individuals perceived as Black and Native American have the highest rates for each action, which is consistent with the earlier graphs and findings. For instance, in roughly 19 percent of stops individuals perceived as Black and Native American are searched. In contrast, searches occur in 3.61 percent of stops of individuals perceived as South Asian, so we do see significant larger differences in terms of the actions that are taken, along with their frequencies.

Dr. van Holm also reported that, looking at the results of stops across racial groups, warnings are distributed fairly evenly across each group, but there are wide differences in the likelihood of receiving a citation versus an arrest. While individuals perceived as Asian and Middle Eastern/South Asian are the most likely to receive a citation, they are the least likely to be arrested. In contrast, nearly one-quarter of stops of individuals perceived as Native American result in an arrest.

Turning to perceived gender of people stopped in 2024, Dr. van Holm reported that, considering all stops, the average number of actions taken during a stop is highest for individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys and transgender women/girls, with very similar figures (1.02 and 1.03 actions per stop, respectively). On average, at least one action is taken in a stop on an individual perceived as a transgender man/boy or transgender woman/girl. Individuals perceived to be cisgender men are also above the average, while perceived cisgender women have the lowest number of average actions taken during a stop. However, when looking only at stops with at least one action taken, people perceived as cisgender men are the only group with a total above the average for all groups. Perceived transgender men/boys have slightly more actions on

average than perceived transgender women/girls, and individuals perceived as cisgender women have the fewest actions during stops with at least one action (2.41 actions during a stop, among stops where at least one action is taken). Looking at the type of actions taken, individuals perceived as transgender men/boys and transgender women/girls are more likely to have all four actions taken during a stop (i.e., asked parole status, detained, handcuffed, or searched and Terry frisked). Individuals perceived as transgender women/girls are more likely to be detained and handcuffed, while perceived transgender men/boys have higher rates of parole requests and searches. We observe three steps here, with perceived cisgender women being the least likely to have actions taken; perceived cisgender men and non-binary individuals having similar rates of each type of action; and a higher level for perceived transgender men/boys and transgender women/girls. Finally, reviewing the results of stops by perceived gender, Dr. van Holm reported that 9.88 percent of stops result in an arrest for individuals perceived as cisgender women. That figure grows to 13.34 percent and 14.08 percent for perceived cisgender men and non-binary people and increases further to nearly one-quarter of stops of perceived transgender men/boys and transgender women/girls. There is a reverse pattern across citations, with individuals perceived as cisgender women having the highest rates of citation and, at the other end of the distribution, individuals perceived as transgender men/boys and transgender women/girls are the least likely to receive a citation. Warnings are less uniformly distributed, though perceived transgender women/girls and transgender men/boys have the highest rates.

Shifting to perceived age, Dr. van Holm reported that there are large differences across different age bands. Young individuals, specifically those perceived to be between 10 and 17 years old, have the highest average number of stops when looking at all stops. Those perceived to be between 25 and 44 also have a higher number than average. However, few stops occur for those perceived to be under 18. Individuals perceived as 65 or older have the fewest actions taken when considering all stops. Looking instead at stops with at least one action is taken, we see that individuals perceived to be between 25 and 44 have the highest average for actions taken (approximately 2.76 and 2.8 actions per stop). Those perceived as younger than 8 have the lowest average number of actions taken (2 actions per stop), even when considering only stops with at least one action. Looking at the results of stops, youth perceived to be between 10 and 17 stand apart from the other age categories. When a stop is of a minor perceived to be over the age of 10, there is a greater chance that the stop will end in detainment, handcuffing, or search. Those percentages tend to be double for adults. There are not great differences among perceived adults, although there is a small rise in mid-adulthood, then a slow decline past the age of 45. Those perceived to be over 65 have the lowest rates amongst all age groups. Finally, looking at the results of stops by perceived age group, if we focus on arrests, the path across age groups matches actions fairly closely, with a rise between 25 and 44 then a decline into adulthood. Dr. van Holm reported that arrest follows actions fairly closely here.

Next, Dr. van Holm reported on perceived disability status, starting with the average number of actions taken across all stops and those where at least one action was taken. Individuals perceived as having a disability are far more likely to have an action taken as part of a stop, as indicated by the average which is nearly three times as high across all groups, though when considering stops within an action, the average is the same. This indicates that those who are

perceived as disabled are far more likely to have actions taken during a stop, though within a stop with at least one action taken, there is less of a difference. Individuals perceived as not disabled are less likely to have a stop with actions taken. Actions taken happen at a much higher rate for those perceived to have a disability. Being detained, handcuffed, and searched occurs in more than three times as many stops, so being perceived as disabled indicates that there is a greater chance of having actions taken. Finally, while those perceived as being disabled have warnings issued at a far lower frequency, they are arrested more than twice as much — nearly one-third (29.03%) of stops of individuals perceived as disabled result in arrest.

Turning to perceived sexual orientation, Dr. van Holm reported that while those perceived to be part of the LGB+¹ community have a higher average number of actions taken across all stops.

Member Randolph asked Dr. van Holm to clarify what he meant by “actions” in this report. Dr. van Holm responded that there are approximately 25 actions that can be reported under RIPA, but the analyses being presented are focused on a subset of those actions (i.e., whether the stopped person is asked about their parole status, detained, handcuffed, or searched).

Member Randolph asked whether perceived disability could include anyone who says they have a disability or ADHD. He stated that law enforcement won’t ask a motorist if they have a disability, although they would document their perceptions of a visible disability. Member Randolph expressed concern that demographics such as disability status and sexual orientation should only refer to the characteristics perceived by the officer. Dr. van Holm responded that all of the demographics in this presentation and in the RIPA Report are based on the reporting officer’s perception. There are different ways for an officer to ascertain whether a person is disabled; for example, some disabilities are visible, while others are more hidden. All of the RIPA demographic data is based on perception, including whether an officer perceived someone to be White versus Black; whether they are part of the LGB+ community; whether they have a disability, including mental or physical conditions; and whether they are unhoused. The data is a reflection of how the officer’s perceptions may impact a stop, although we hope that reflects the status of the stopped individual in some way.

Member Randolph thanked Dr. van Holm and clarified that the presentation should note that it involves perceived disabilities. Dr. van Holm noted that this could be added to every slide in the presentation, and Member Guerrero suggested that it be added into the title of each slide because this is a constant source of confusion. Member Guerrero also expressed caution as to whether the officer’s perception aligns with the actual demographics of the person stopped, since that is not the RIPA Board’s mandate.

Member Guerrero asked Dr. van Holm to explain the search and *Terry* frisk category from the prior discussion because it could mean a lot of things, since the Board tracks a lot of things such as consent searches. Dr. van Holm responded that “search” includes any type of search that occurs; all of them are bundled together. Member Guerrero noted that the Board has spent a lot of time in the past thinking about consent searches versus other kinds of searches, such as

¹ “LGB+” is an acronym that refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual and all other sexual orientations other than heterosexual. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, sub. (a)(7)(1).)

evidence- or intelligence-based searches, and that it would be helpful to disaggregate consent-based searches because they are discretionary, while other things may not be. Additionally, consent search data should be disaggregated somewhere in the Report because the Board has spent a lot of time on it as a body, has made recommendations about it, and lawmakers ask about it. Dr. van Holm responded that the DOJ Research Services team can further break out these graphs at a future meeting and noted that the Report does talk about discretionary versus non-discretionary searches.

Co-Chair Khadjavi summarized the conversation between the Subcommittee members and Dr. van Holm, noting that all of the demographic categorizations discussed in this presentation are based on officer perception, and although it might feel wordy, “perceived” is technically correct and should be added into the title of the graphs so that everyone can know how to interpret them. Additionally, Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the Report includes a footnote describing what “actions taken” can mean. Some of the possible actions may be more frequent than others, and the point raised by Member Randolph may mean that, within the Report, even though the Report is very explicit, we may want to think about ways to make very clear what the graphs refer to. For example, the Board could choose a couple of findings to illuminate the term “action taken.” Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that, on page 3 of the draft, there is a companion to the footnote that says which of the actions taken are by far the most common (i.e., searches, *Terry* frisks, handcuffing, detention, and asking about parole status). Co-Chair Khadjavi suggested that DOJ find ways to make it as clear as possible, so that readers know which actions are most common. Co-Chair Khadjavi also reiterated that the search category includes everything from *Terry* frisks and other discretionary searches, like consent searches, but the Board needs to know both the overall number of searches, as well as a focus on consent searches. Lastly, Co-Chair Khadjavi asked that “perceived” be added into the version of today’s slide presentation that will be posted on the RIPA website.

Dr. van Holm continued his presentation, reporting that, when looking at perceived sexual orientation, being perceived as part of the LGB+ community leads to having a higher number of actions across all stops. But, when looking only at stops where at least one action is taken, the figure is nearly identical. Individuals perceived to be part of the LGB+ community are 1.5 percent more likely to be asked their parole status as part of the stop, and are roughly 8 percent more likely to be detained, handcuffed, and searched. There is a consistent gap across those different actions of roughly 8 percentage points. Looking at the rates of various results of stops across perceived sexual orientation, we see that those perceived as being LGB+ are arrested nearly twice as often as part of a stop, while they have lower rates of citations and warnings as a result of stop than individuals perceived as heterosexual.

Shifting to perceived housing status, Dr. van Holm noted that the RIPA data collection forms were amended this year to add the officer’s perception of whether a stopped individual is housed or not. In 2024, 3.58 percent of stops were reported to involve an individual perceived to be unhoused, in contrast to 96.42 percent of stops in which people were perceived as housed. Perceived housing status can be compared to perceived English fluency. As shown, individuals perceived as unhoused are far more likely to have actions taken as part of a stop. Among all stops, those perceived as unhoused have nearly four times as many actions taken, compared to all

stops. The difference that perceived language fluency makes is far smaller (only 0.12% higher). When we look at only stops where at least one action is taken, the unhoused difference shrinks. Individuals perceived as unhoused are still more likely to have actions taken on average (2.77 actions per stop, among stops where at least one action is taken), although those perceived as having limited English fluency have a higher number of actions taken in stops where there is at least one action (2.81 actions per stop, among stops where at least one action is taken).

Member Guerrero asked whether perceived housing status is captured by reporting officers or if it is determined in some other way. Dr. van Holm responded that perceived housing status is a data element as of 2024, meaning officers report their perception of the stopped person's housing status.

Looking at the actions taken during stops by perceived housing status, Dr. van Holm reiterated that individuals perceived as unhoused are more likely to have actions taken during a stop. This is reflected in all four of the most common actions taken (i.e., asked parole status, detained, handcuffed, and searched/*Terry* frisked), as each of these actions occurs at roughly four times the rate for the perceived unhoused community. Nearly half of stops of individuals perceived as unhoused end in detainment, and 43 percent feature a search. Further, looking at the outcome of stops, stops of perceived unhoused persons very often end in arrest. While 11.3 percent of stops of individuals perceived as housed end in arrest, 47.32 percent of stops of perceived unhoused persons end in arrest. Further, while nearly half of stops of perceived housed persons result in a citation, only 7.32 percent do for persons perceived as unhoused. Dr. van Holm noted that there are significant differences in the result of stops based on perceived housing status.

Shifting to perceived English fluency, Dr. van Holm reported that there are differences in the four most common actions taken during stops, however those differences are smaller than we observe based on perceived housing status. Individuals perceived to have limited or no English fluency have higher rates, ranging from 0.07 percentage points for asking parole status to 2 percentage points for handcuffing. Stops also have different results based on perceived English fluency. Individuals perceived as having limited or no English fluency have a slightly higher rate of receiving a warning and arrest (roughly 2% in each case). On the other hand, their stops result in a citation roughly 0.5 percentage points more often.

Next, Dr. van Holm presented two intersectional analyses regarding: (1) the percentage of stops for each perceived race and ethnicity that involved individuals perceived to be unhoused; and (2) the percentage of stops for each perceived race and ethnicity that involved individuals perceived to have limited English fluency.

Within each perceived race and ethnicity group, the highest rate of stops for those perceived to be unhoused was for individuals perceived to be Black (5.42% of stops of individuals perceived as Black also involved perceptions of being unhoused), while 4.99 percent of stops of individuals perceived as White were also perceived as being unhoused. At the other end of the spectrum, only 0.72 percent of stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian were perceived as unhoused. Dr. van Holm reported that there is some distribution of the perceived race of those perceived to be unhoused.

Member Guerrero asked to add average lines into the graphs throughout the presentation.

Turning to the second intersectional analysis regarding the percentage of stops from each perceived race or ethnicity group that were perceived as having limited or no English fluency, Dr. van Holm reported that 11 percent of individuals perceived Hispanic/Latine(x) also perceived as having limited English fluency, representing the highest rate among perceived race and ethnicity groups. Individuals perceived as Asian and Middle Eastern/South Asian were second most likely to be perceived as having limited or no English fluency, and at the other end of the distribution, 1.52 percent of individuals perceived to be Black were perceived as having limited or no English fluency.

Lastly, Dr. van Holm presented on co-occurrence analyses that were requested by the Board to understand the relationship between different actions and the progression of stops from beginning to end. Dr. van Holm noted that, unfortunately, we do not know the order of actions taken within a stop (i.e., which action occurs first); we simply know that some number of actions occurred. Nevertheless, we can divide a stop into three sections: the beginning of a stop, actions taken, and the result of the stop. Due to time constraints, Dr. van Holm will cover a portion of the findings at this meeting and can cover more at a future meeting if the Board would like.

Beginning with the relationship between different actions taken, Dr. van Holm presented a graph showing the correlations between different actions, with the strength and directions indicated by color. The names of different actions are shown on the top and side of the graph. Where those names meet represents the correlation between those two variables. The dark blue, horizontal stripe through the middle of the chart represents a correlation of one (i.e., where the same action on the top meets the same action on the side of the graph). All actions were included in the graph, though some were collapsed into bundles to reduce the noise of the graph. For instance, asking for consent includes different types of searches an officer could ask about. Many of the correlations are logical. For instance, there is a strong positive correlation between asking for consent and receiving consent. Of perhaps more interest, there is a moderate positive correlation between force and search, meaning that, in stops with actions, if force is used, there is a greater chance that a search will also occur. This does not predict in what order they occur, just that the two tend to co-occur together within a stop.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked to clarify whether actions that are less likely to happen during the same stop are fainter in the graph. Dr. van Holm confirmed that they are. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that there is something a little funny about shading both positive and negative correlations in the same coloring, although, on the other hand, if two things are close to zero, they are close to being unrelated. Co-Chair Khadjavi invited Board members to look back at this graph, either at this meeting or later, to think about ways to visually represent what this graph is capturing and whether the color coding is allowing us to see the things that are most important. Dr. van Holm noted that the single color was chosen, in part, for ADA compliance.

Board Member Guerrero asked whether the category of “Searched or Frisked” should be disaggregated. Member Guerrero noted, regarding the intersection of “Asked for Consent” and “Consented,” that virtually everybody is consenting. This is consistent with what we know from past Reports. But, looking at the graph, the intersection of “Consent” horizontally with “Searched or Frisked,” it is not a strong one, which raises questions. If virtually everybody

consented to a search, does that mean even though they consented, some people are not being searched? Or is the lightest blue a function of the aggregation of “Searched or Frisked”? If that is the case, we should disaggregate those since this is an issue of particular concern to the Board. Dr. van Holm responded that, likely, few people are asked for consent and are not search, but there are people that are searched without consent, which partially gets at the concern raised by Member Guerrero. Dr. van Holm further explained that there may be ways to break out some of this data more finely and add a few more rows and boxes to capture those specific relationships.

Member Guerrero asked DOJ Research Services to check on the data because she does not know how the intersection of “Consented” and “Searched” is anything other than the strongest blue. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that she suspects that, if there was a variable of consent-only based searches, we would see very strong relationships. Separately, “Searched or Frisked” might include searches where maybe probable cause was checked off but consent wasn’t sought. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that we might see, for example in the Policies section, that there are some agencies that are using consent as a matter of course and often asking for consent, when in fact there might have been some other basis for search, imposing a sort of Fourth Amendment waiver in stops. However, other agencies may not be doing this, and it might be muddied by having a mega “Searched or Frisk” category. Member Guerrero stated that that is all true, but given that we have a data line for “Consented” and “Asked for Consent,” whether there is an additional factor, what we do know from this and other data is that people who are asked for consent give consent and, unless there is something showing otherwise, they are always searched. Given this, Member Guerrero suggested that DOJ Research Services cross-check the data to make sure this is showing up and, as a test, ask the data why there is a significantly less strong intersection of consent and search, given what we know.

Dr. van Holm responded that there is a moderate correlation between search and consent and, in part, this is because we don’t have the ordering of the variables. Although you can assume that people that are asked for consent to search are searched at a high rate, not all searches will occur with consent. People are frisked without consent, which weakens the correlation. Then, there are cases of people that do not consent but are searched, which also weaken the correlation to what you see in this graph as moderate and positive. This is why the correlation in the graph is not as strongly blue as some other cases, and it goes to the fact that we don’t know the ordering of the actions. Dr. van Holm explained that one can assume that consent would be asked first, but when that’s not present, searches can still occur from various mechanisms, but that goes to the greater point of how and when the analysis should break out consent-based searches and non-consent-based searches.

Member Smith asked Dr. van Holm to clarify what “No Force Action” and “No Non-Force Action” in the graph mean. Dr. van Holm responded that “No Force Action” means that there was not any action taken with force, which is why there is a negative correlation in the row with “Force.” If there is “No Force Action Taken,” there will not be “Force.” “No Force” means, for example, asking for parole status or identifying a passenger. “No Force” actions relate to handcuffing, detention, so “No Non-Force Action” means that none of these non-force actions occurred. Member Smith thanked Dr. van Holm and asked for clarification about the arrow next to “Force,” showing a negative correlation with “No Force Action” taken. Dr. van Holm

responded that this is essentially an inverse. We group variables into “Force Actions” and “Non-Force Actions,” and if a force action occurred such as handcuffing, the idea that there was no force action taken becomes negative by the rule that if you commit a force action, you cannot commit no force actions. “No Non-Force Actions” just means that no actions that take force occurred. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that, looking forward, maybe the Report should provide more narrative explanations of these bins or categorizations.

Dr. van Holm continued the presentation on co-occurrence analysis, explaining that, beyond understanding what actions are more likely to co-occur, there were other questions embedded into the analysis. The first step was to understand how the perceived demographics of the person stopped and the initiation of stops change the odds of those actions being taken. In other words, not just which actions occur, but how do the way a stop begins and the demographics of an individual impact those actions? There were five separate actions tested as outcomes in this analysis: Handcuffing, search, being asked to search, force (as a group category of different actions), and detainment.

Dr. van Holm presented a graph showing independent variables on the left, to help understand what type of person and stop are more or less likely to have the outcome being studied (in this case, force during a stop). Each of the variables in this list has something it is being compared to. In the case of age, all of the age brackets are compared to the omitted category which is people perceived to be between 10 and 14 years old. At the bottom, reason for stop is compared to stops for reasonable suspicion. In terms of race, all of the perceived racial groups listed are compared to people perceived as White. What regression allows us to do is look at one variable at a time and compare how a stop that is, for example, officer-initiated changes the odds of an outcome, holding all else constant. In the case of race, what this allows us to do is, for example, when we have a result for an individual perceived as Asian, what we’re comparing is an Asian individual to a White individual because White is the omitted category. All of the other categories, such as age, housing status, or reason for stop, are the same, so we can find people that match and change one little thing at a time to see if that changes the odds of whatever outcome we’re looking at. For now, the outcome we are looking at is the use of force. The bars on the graph shown by Dr. van Holm show the relative likelihood of force being used during a stop when changing only that thing (e.g., age category, race, etc.). For today’s presentation, due to time constraints, we are only looking at the changes of force being used as a first set for this regression.

Dr. van Holm reported that for individuals perceived as Black or Hispanic/Latine(x), holding all else constant and only changing one variable at a time, we see that force is more likely to be used than for an individual perceived as White; for a person of the same age, same sexual orientation, same language fluency, in a stop that begins the same way, it is more likely that force will be used if they are perceived as Black or Hispanic/Latine(x) instead of White. Looking at gender, being perceived as a cisgender female makes force less likely to be used than if you are perceived as a cisgender male, holding all else constant. And, similarly, being perceived as non-cisgender makes force less likely to be used than if you are perceived as male. Looking at perceived disability and housing status, if you are perceived as having no disability, you are less likely to see force used. If you are perceived as unhoused, you are more likely to see force used,

holding all else constant. For this outcome of force during a stop and action, we are looking at how initiation of a stop and perceived demographics affect the actions taken during a stop. We can keep looking further within a stop by, for example, looking how the initiation of a stop and perceived demographics impact the result of a stop — specifically, the odds of being arrested. Dr. van Holm stated that, generally, things are fairly consistent. The things that affect likelihood of being arrested are the same things that affect the likelihood of having force used. Individuals perceived as Black or Hispanic/Latine(x) are more likely to be arrested in the same way that they are more likely to have force used, holding all else constant. We do see a small change in terms of gender — individuals perceived as cisgender women and girls are less likely than cisgender men to be arrested during a stop. There is no change among individuals perceived as non-cisgender; they have an equal chance of being arrested as individuals perceived to be cisgender males, in contrast to individuals perceived as cisgender women who have a lower chance. Finally, looking at perceived disability among those perceived as unhoused, we see that those perceived to not have a disability are less likely to have force used and are more likely to be arrested during a stop, while those perceived as being unhoused, who are more likely to have force used during a stop, are also more likely to be arrested. We see that the relationship of disability changing direction when looking at different outcomes.

Member Guerrero suggested that the graph be amended to state “Disability” instead of “No Disability” because we are thinking about whether perceived disability has an impact or not. Dr. van Holm stated that this change can be made in the Report.

Member Guerrero also asked whether “Reason for Stop: Traffic” is being compared to “Reason for Stop: Non-Traffic.” Dr. van Holm affirmed that this is correct. Member Guerrero expressed that the Board has been very concerned about the difference between calls for service, which are mandatory responses, and discretionary stops, which could be traffic or non-traffic related. Member Guerrero stated that it would be important to have a category for calls for services, versus non-calls for service. Dr. van Holm stated that this would be really valuable; the issue for today’s presentation was how much time and depth the presentation would allow, however Dr. van Holm would love to come to a future Board meeting to discuss this more. Further, Dr. van Holm noted that calls for service are contrasted with “Officer-Initiated” in this graph. We can see in the graph that if a stop is officer-initiated, it is much less likely to end in an arrest. If we flip that and instead include call for service (omitting “Officer-Initiated” as the category), Research Services would see that call for service increases the odds of being arrested during a stop. Member Guerrero stated that maybe this speaks to the need for a descriptor, if it’s not already there, of what each of these categories is being compared against. Dr. van Holm noted that there is much greater depth in the written report, including descriptions and construction of each variable.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that in past reports, if there is some narrative discussion fleshing this out, there has been a bubble or breakout within the narrative to highlight particular points.

Dr. van Holm reported that the final regression looks at all three steps together — how do initiation and demographics influence actions during a stop and end up in the result of a stop (in this case, being arrested)? The actions of “Detention,” “Handcuffed,” and “Searched or Frisked”

were added to the analysis. However, force itself was not added because those actions are the most common uses of force. The effect of being perceived as Black, taking into account all of these other factors of a stop, is now negative on the likelihood of being arrested. However, we know that individuals perceived as Black are more likely to have force used, to have force used, or be handcuffed. All of the actions occur at a higher rate for individuals perceived as Black and, overall, being perceived as Black does mean the stopped person is more likely to be arrested, though much of that effect goes through these actions taken during a stop. These actions occur at such a high rate for individuals perceived as Black that it soaks up a lot of the effect of perceived race. When we include those together, the effect actually turns negative for being perceived as Black. It is said to sort of mediate the effect of perceived race in this case and turn the variable negative, but, overall, being perceived as Black means that the person stopped is more likely to be arrested.

For perceived gender, Dr. van Holm reported that the likelihood of people perceived as cisgender women being arrested is essentially no different from perceived cisgender men, taking into account all of the actions that occur during a stop and all of the perceived demographics. While people perceived as non-cisgender (i.e., a combined category including people perceived as transgender men, transgender women, and people perceived as non-binary) are more likely to be arrested during a stop than perceived cisgender men, taking everything into account. Finally, looking at perceived disability and housing status, individuals perceived as not having a disability are more likely to be arrested, despite being less likely to have force used. Holding all demographics and actions constant, individuals perceived as unhoused are more likely to be arrested, which was consistent across all of the different results.

Member Guerrero proposed that, given that Californians perceived to be Black are consistently taking the brunt of the profiling here in the state, the Report should have a dedicated chart of co-occurrences for Californians perceived to be Black against all of these categories. Member Guerrero stated that this would help us understand in a more granular way the impact of profiling on this highly vulnerable community. Dr. van Holm responded that the above finding regarding co-occurrences for individuals perceived as Black is a bit odd and contrary to what was expected. There are different ways to go into depth in the Report to elucidate the effect. At its core, statistically in the analysis, individuals perceived as Black are more likely to be arrested, but it becomes a discussion of direct and indirect effects and the role of the actions taken have on individuals perceived as Black and their likelihood of being arrested. Member Guerrero asked if DOJ Research Services could create a regression analysis graph for individuals perceived as Black, plus these other demographics, against individuals perceived as White. For example, this could be a regression analysis of perceived Black individuals between 1-9 years old, compared to perceived White individuals 1-9 years old. Dr. van Holm stated that DOJ Research Services would continue to consider ways to best explain the regression analysis results.

Member Smith asked if there is a simpler way to convey the main points here, such as a different form of a visual, considering the viewpoint of the general public. As someone who works at an organization rooted in data analysis, this comes off as a visual that will lead to a misunderstanding. Dr. van Holm responded that this is something DOJ Research Service has wrestled with, and there are limitations to making the analysis visually digestible. There are ways

to create infographics that may break things down by different demographics and show the likelihood of different actions taken and the way those actions lead to results of stops, but that is a further step that Research Services can consider now that they have completed the analysis. Until now, Research Services has been doing the analysis and now has time to think about how to best display and explain the results in a way that is both digestible, accurate, informative, and is not misleading. Dr. van Holm stated that Research Services is thinking of ways to make this more understandable for the public.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that, if you slice by age, in general, people age out of the impact of law enforcement. But, nationally, in particular for Black drivers and pedestrians, policing is still heavier into middle age and beyond. Given this, Co-Chair Khadjavi asked if this is an artifact of the age groups not being proportionate; for example, are 55 and 64 year olds who are stopped disproportionately perceived as Black men? In other words, is there a stronger weighting that is a piece of the puzzle? Dr. van Holm responded that Research Services has not looked at the effect of each variable on individuals perceived as Black. The key story is that, when we don't include the actions taken during a stop, the relationship of individuals perceived as Black being arrested is positive and they are more likely to be arrested. The change of variables comes when we include all of those actions, so being handcuffed has a different effect on individuals perceived as Black than other racial groups. Being searched has another effect, and there are ways to statistically tease that out. The issue there is the level of complication in explaining it. Research Services is trying to tease out how to keep this result as digestible as possible, while explaining the result. There are additional analyses we can include which could go into appendices that further test this out and help elucidate that individuals perceived as Black are more likely to be arrested and what really affects that is the actions being taken because individuals perceived as Black are handcuffed so much more often than other individuals, ultimately soaking up a lot of the effect because being handcuffed is highly correlated with being arrested. That is why those two analyses separately look so similar. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the representation shown in the graph is inadvertently distorting how people can understand the impact of perceived race and identity, relative to how we experience policing. Dr. van Holm responded that this is a concern that Research Services is still trying to figure out how best to clarify.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that she appreciates the idea of this model that is now going to look at the shorthand of co-occurrences, but we don't want it to be at the expense of clarity or what the actual experience of Californians is.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked DOJ to explain how the Policies section of this year's Report has rich interaction with other data analysis, that some Board members have expressed interest in looking at, for example, how consent is used, and to mention some of the topics that might be in the Policies section that might influence the Stop Data Subcommittee's discussion today. DAG Manners stated that the Policies draft, which has been circulated to members of that Subcommittee and will be publicly posted within the next day, does contain analyses of the stop data. Overall, the Policies section is focusing on how disparities in the 2024 stop data may inform policies that could impact racial and identity profiling, as well as public safety. Specifically, the draft includes stop data analyses related to disparities in perceived characteristics in Terry stops and frisks; comparison of stop duration, actions taken by officers

during stops, and results of stops across perceived characteristics; and disparities in stop outcomes by agency and by region.

Co-Chair Khadjavi responded that, ideally, the Board's whole enterprise is to inform, change, or improve policy and law enforcement practice, so because there are many topics that come up in both the Stop Data and Policies subcommittees, especially the way consent is used and how that might vary across the state, the Policies section might look in particular at consent, regional distinctions, and perhaps longitudinal analyses of the RIPA data over time since RIPA data has been collected for many years especially for larger law enforcement agencies. Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted that, in Section A of the Stop Data draft, there is a reference to the fact that the elements of a stop include not only what initiates a stop, such as a call for service versus an officer-initiated stop, but also items like duration of stop which may come up in the Policies section. Co-Chair Khadjavi recommended that the introduction to the Stop Data Analysis section of the Report include language pointing readers to the Policies section of the Report as well.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Co-Chair Khadjavi moved to the next agenda item.

5. BOARD DISCUSSION OF THE 2026 REPORT DRAFT

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked Subcommittee members to share any comments or reflections based on today's presentation and the draft Report.

Co-Chair Khadjavi recommended the addition of text boxes or bubbles in several places in the draft Report to highlight a particular note or findings that may point to policy recommendations. For example, the search and *Terry* frisk category is very large and could be described not only in the narrative, but in some kind of breakout in the draft.

Member Guerrero agreed with Co-Chair Khadjavi and underscored the importance of disaggregating information about consent-based searches and the "Search and *Terry* Frisk" category. Member Guerrero also stated that it may be helpful to have a breakout box in the Report, maybe with two columns showing what the regression analysis is comparing against. Member Guerrero agreed with Member Smith that regression analysis is not something that the public commonly understands, so if there is an alternative way to explain it, such as a breakout box in plain terms, that would be great.

Co-Chair Khadjavi reiterated that the breakout boxes do not have to summarize everything, but, within a particular regression, there may be a place to use a breakout box with a key finding or observation. Data analyses separating discretionary and non-discretionary stops could also be included in a breakout bubble, as a way to focus the reader's eye.

Member Greene suggested that the topics discussed in the Policies section could be included in a breakout bubble, to identify where readers can find a deeper dive into that data (e.g., analyses of demographic disparities in *Terry* stops and comparison of stop durations). Co-Chair Khadjavi supported this idea as a way to invite the reader to see the interplay between the different sections of the Report.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked that, in advance of the Board meeting, the Subcommittee members consider which findings or items from the Stop Data section should be highlighted in the

Executive Summary and Quick Facts documents that will accompany the Report. Member Greene recommended including information in these documents referring readers to resources for region-specific and agency-specific findings. Member Diallo recommended that the Executive Summary focus on a high-level comparison of discretionary actions with non-discretionary actions. He stated that synthesizing this data should be a key focus and would connect well with issues discussed in the Policies section of the Report. Co-Chair Khadjavi suggested that a way to do this could be picking out particular discretionary and non-discretionary actions.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that a stop data dashboard is necessary to provide transparency and make the data accessible to the public, and asked if DOJ staff could provide an update on the development of a data dashboard. Dr. van Holm stated that the DOJ was selecting a vendor and would continue the process to produce a public data dashboard. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that it is a priority for the Board to understand what is happening with the development of the dashboard and have a realistic timeline for the creation of the data dashboard. Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked DOJ staff for working on the development of the dashboard and noted that it has become more and more urgent as time goes on.

Hearing no further comments from the Subcommittee, Co-Chair Khadjavi moved to the next agenda item.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-Chair Khadjavi opened the floor for public comment. No members of the public provided comments.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that this is the first Board meeting she has attended where there have been no public comments. She emphasized that, as a Board member, it has been a very significant part of her experience on the Board to hear from people who are directly engaged in working on these issues and can share their personal experiences. She expressed hope that there will be public participation at future meetings.

7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Khadjavi moved to the next agenda item, beginning with a discussion of plans for next year's RIPA Report. She reiterated that it is a priority for the Subcommittee to receive updates on the data dashboard. She expressed a strong call for the need for a data dashboard, so that the public can access the RIPA data without specialized statistical software expertise or public records requests. She also noted that law enforcement goes to great efforts to collect this information, so it needs to be as accessible as possible.

Member Guerrero also underscored the importance of a data dashboard. She noted that, earlier this year, there was a special meeting to talk about that and receive input about the data dashboard, and it would be very meaningful and responsive to the public's call for accessible data that can help them understand what we're looking and what is actionable for them. As part of the Board's mandate, the Board not only needs to review the data and make it available, but to make it accessible.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted that a data dashboard could help address the Subcommittee's call to tease out discretionary versus non-discretionary stops or to look at the data by region.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also reiterated that the use of consent and how it may vary by agency has come up at many Board meetings, and the way consent is used is clearly of great interest. This is an area where officers have a great deal of discretion and where policy recommendations flow from the data. Consent as an overall umbrella evokes a lot of questions, including whether there are agencies that have changed practices and whether that is captured in the data in any way. While some of this analysis is happening or has already happened, Co-Chair Khadjavi suggested that it continue to be a part of next year's RIPA Report. Additionally, duration of stop is something that has been mentioned but is not part of this year's Stop Data analysis though it may be included in the Policies section. This is a topic of great interest because duration of a stop really changes the tenor and experience of a stop, and we have data that is being collected about it.

Member Smith stated that this year's Report includes a disaggregation of the data by mode of transportation (i.e., pedestrian vs. cyclist vs. motorist). In the future, it would be helpful to also disaggregate people who are using public transportation because, in many jurisdictions, depending on how the geographic structure is laid out and the nature of policing, stops can disproportionately occur for people of color and low-income people on public transportation. This has been a significant issue in both Los Angeles and the Bay Area. Member Smith has been in communication with organizations that work on those issues, and it is very important. At the local agency level, within their internal non-RIPA stop information, this data is collected, so if it is possible to get this information statewide by agency, it could be helpful for people to understand how things are playing out within that specific context.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that for the first time, with the 2024 data, it was possible to disaggregate stops of people in vehicles, people on bicycles, and pedestrians and descriptive statistics about search rates and discovery rates were provided for these categories. While the RIPA data does not explicitly provide a window into public transit, it would be important to discuss this issue and its importance to policies.

Member Guerrero stated that transit officers are not defined as "peace officers" under state law, so they are not collecting stop data and the only way the Board would see that data is if police are contracted to be transit officers or are engaged in that work. This could be something for the Board's consideration, thinking about changes to the law or regulations.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that a companion to this topic is getting a geographic snapshot of where pedestrian stops are happening, even if they are not happening literally on public transit. We can see that there is more to tease out about the experience of pedestrians than the Board has had a chance to in this particular Report, and this is the first year that the Board can disaggregated these categories.

With respect to the vision for future reports, Co-Chair Khadjavi reiterated the subcommittee's interest in changes in agencies' policies regarding consent-based searches and an examination of changes that may be demonstrated in the agencies' stop data following changes in their policies. She stated that the duration of stops is also of great interest to the subcommittee because the

duration of a stop can really change the experience of the person stopped.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the Subcommittee might be interested in a longitudinal analysis of the stop data. This may be something that is already happening in the Policies section, but this would be the second year that the Board could separate out drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. The Board can think about whether there are ways to capture if any change is happening and, if so, where.

Member Smith stated that given the significance of the issue, the Board should review the information that is available about interactions with police and immigrant communities. Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked Member Smith and noted that the full Board would be meeting an additional time this year to hold a meeting dedicating to understanding and talking about what is happening on the ground in California with ICE and law enforcement. DAG Manners stated that the Board would meet on October 9, 2025, 9:00 am - 1:00 pm to discuss the interaction between law enforcement and immigrant communities and on October 16, 2025, 9:00 am-1:00 pm to discuss the Board's final thoughts and potential edits to the Draft 2026 RIPA Report.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the presentation of the co-occurrence analysis needs to include clarification about the story that the data is telling.

Lastly, Co-Chair Khadjavi invited Subcommittee members to reach out to DOJ if they identify any typos, comments, or edits for the draft Report.

8. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Khadjavi adjourned the meeting at 11:57 a.m.