

2027 ANNUAL RIPA REPORT

STOP DATA SECTION DRAFT

I. INTRODUCTION

The Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA) requires peace officers in California to record information for each stop they make, including the perceived demographic information of the person stopped, the events leading the stop, actions taken by officers during the stop, and the outcome of the stop.¹ This data is collected to document law enforcement interactions with the public and to determine whether certain identity groups experience disparate treatment during stops.

In this year's report, the Board analyzes the stop data collected in the 2025 calendar year. As in prior reports, the Board looks at all data elements collected, such as stop rates, search patterns, and use of force incidents, to determine whether there are racial and identity disparities in police stops. This chapter also analyzes modes of travel and the difference between stops that are officer-initiated or based on a call for service. Additionally, this year the chapter also contains analyses addressing particular data elements, including an analysis of the limited stop data collected that may be related to immigration enforcement, an analysis of stops related to public transportation, and an analysis of the differences between stops that are officer-initiated and ones based on a call for service, broken down by mode of travel. The Appendix also provides stop data analyses on a variety of topics.

II. DESCRIPTION OF OVERALL STOP DATA

All city and county law enforcement agencies, all law enforcement agencies of California public schools and universities, and the California Highway patrol are required to report stop data.² In total, 535 agencies³ reported 5,487,275 stops in 2025, an 8.33 percent increase in the number of stops compared to 2024.⁴ The data show the perceived race or identity of who is stopped, why a stop was initiated, the mode of transportation, the reason for the stop, the actions an officer takes during the stop, the result of the stop, and duration of the stop.⁵ These elements are described below, then applied to different identity groups to analyze the 2025 stop data in greater detail.

¹ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (a). A “stop” is defined as “any detention by a peace officer of a person, or any peace officer interaction with a person in which the peace officer conducts a search, including a consensual search, of the person’s body or property in the person’s possession or control.” (Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (g)(2).)

² Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.224, subd. (a)(17).)

³ This represents an increase in the number of agencies reporting compared to 2024, when 533 agencies reported stop data. However, it should be noted that the total number of reporting agencies fluctuates from year to year for several reasons. For instance, some agencies are very small and do not have any stops to report, while other agencies fail to submit data by the reporting deadline.

⁴ In the 2024 calendar year, California law enforcement agencies reported a total of 5,065,428 stops.

⁵ Additional analyses can be found in the Appendix of this year’s report.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

A. Perceived Categories of Identity of Who Is Stopped

RIPA requires officers to report their perception of the person stopped, including their race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, English fluency, disability status, and housing status.

RIPA requires officers to report various demographic data regarding each person stopped, including the perceived race or ethnicity of the person stopped, their perceived gender, perceived sexual orientation, perceived age, perceived English fluency, perceived disability status, and whether the person stopped is perceived to be unhoused.⁶

Officers enter RIPA data based on their perception of individuals,⁷ and not on how individuals may self-identify.⁸ This distinction is important because racial and identity profiling occurs based, in part, on an officer's perception of an individual's race and identity. Some of the demographic characteristics reported (e.g., race, ethnicity, or age) may be more perceivable based on visible factors. Other identity characteristics (e.g., sexual orientation or disability status) may not be as apparent and, therefore, may be perceived less consistently with how stopped individuals self-identify or could be influenced by factors unassociated with appearance (e.g., location of stop).

B. What Initiates a Stop

RIPA also requires officers to report context for the events that led to a stop, including the date, time, and location of a stop, whether the stop was made in response to a call for service or was officer-initiated, the mode of transportation involved, and the primary reason the stop was initiated.⁹

1. Officer-Initiated Stops vs. Calls for Service

Calls for service can indicate that the community is requesting an officer to stop an individual or respond to a situation,¹⁰ while *officer-initiated* stops indicate when an officer decides to stop an individual at the officer's discretion. As such, differences between the proportion of stops that are officer-initiated compared to calls for service may indicate areas where officers or the community direct their attention.

As in past years, the vast majority of stops reported in 2025 were officer initiated and not in response to a call

Key Terms

Call for service — A stop made in response to a 911 call, radio call, or dispatch

Officer-initiated — A stop resulting from the officer's observation, not in response to a call for service

⁶ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(7); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(5)-(11).

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ The RIPA regulations explicitly prohibit officers from asking stopped persons for their race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and age. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(5)-(8).)

⁹ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(1)-(3); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subds. (a)(3)-(4), (a)(12)-(15).

¹⁰ See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(12).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

for service.¹¹ In 2025, 92.75 percent of stops in 2025 (5,089,253 stops) were officer-initiated, and 7.25% of stops (398,022 stops) were due to a call for service.

2. Mode of Transportation

As of January 1, 2024, officers now report the mode of transportation the individual stopped was using at the time of stop. The three options include bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular stops. The majority of stops in 2025 were vehicular stops (86.66%, 4,755,474 stops), followed by pedestrian stops (12.19%, 669,024 stops), and bicycle stops (1.14%, 62,777 stops). These proportions are similar to the modes of transportation reported in 2024.¹²

3. Reason for Stop

Officers must report the primary reason for a stop by selecting from a set of ten options.¹³ This report focuses on the two most common reasons, representing more than 95 percent of all stops in 2025: stops for traffic violations and stops based on reasonable suspicion. Most stops in 2025 were initiated for traffic violations (4,737,803 stops in 2025, 86.34% of stops).¹⁴ Stops based on reasonable suspicion accounted for 9.32 percent of all stops in 2025 (511,643 stops). The remaining eight reasons available to officers are examined collectively as “other reasons” (237,827 stops in 2025, 4.33% of stops).¹⁵ These proportions are similar to the reasons for stops reported in 2024.¹⁶

Figure 1. Reason for Stop [chart forthcoming]

C. Actions Taken During Stop

RIPA also requires officers to report all actions they take during a stop, including all force-related and non-force related actions.¹⁷ Officers report this data by selecting one or more of 36 actions or, if no action was taken, by reporting that the officer took no action during the stop.¹⁸

¹¹ See 2026 RIPA Report, p. 26 (in 2024, 91.13% of stops were officer-initiated, while 8.87% were in response to a call for service).

¹² In 2024, vehicle stops were most commonly reported (85.00% of stops in 2024, 4,305,565 stops), followed by pedestrian stops (13.39% of stops in 2024, 705,637 stops), and bicycle stops (1.07% of stops in 2024, 54,226 stops).

¹³ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14).

¹⁴ Traffic violations are further separated into three types: moving, equipment, and non-moving violations. Moving violations involve a violation of traffic laws regulating driver behavior while operating a vehicle, such as speeding or reckless driving. Equipment violations include a violation of the duties outlined in traffic laws related to the proper maintenance of a vehicle, such as a broken taillight or missing license plate. Non-moving violations include a violation of traffic laws unrelated to vehicle maintenance or operation and aimed at regulating other traffic laws, such as expired registration tabs, or regulating behavior of pedestrians on or around roadways.

¹⁵ These reasons are: known to be on parole/probation/post-release community supervision/mandatory supervision, knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person, investigation to determine if person is truant, consensual encounter and search, possible conduct warranting discipline under Education Code, determine if student violated school policy, probable cause to arrest or search, probable cause to take into custody under Welfare and Institution Code section 5150.

¹⁶ In 2024, 84.18 percent of stops (4,263,835 stops) were initiated due to traffic violations, 11.13 percent (564,003 stops) were initiated due to reasonable suspicion, and 4.69 percent (237,590 stops) were initiated due to other reasons. (2026 RIPA Report, p. 27.)

¹⁷ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(8); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(16)-(17).

¹⁸ Actions taken during a stop include: Admission/Written Statement Obtained from Student, Asked for Consent to Search Person, Asked for Consent to Search Property, Asked Whether Person is on Parole, Probation, or Other

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

This year’s analysis of actions taken during stops focuses on the prevalence of no actions taken, the frequency of force-related actions,¹⁹ the average number of actions taken during stop, and the most common actions during stops,²⁰ consisting of search and discovery, *Terry* frisk and discovery, consent inquiries, and consent search and discovery.

In 2025, 11.23 percent of all stops (616,046 stops) involved a search or *Terry* frisk, 10.62 percent (582,625 stops) involved detention curbside or in a patrol car, 9.32 percent (511,591 stops) involved handcuffing the person stopped, and 3.75 percent (205,534 stops) involved asking the person stopped about their parole status.

Figure 2. Top 4 Actions Taken During Stop [chart forthcoming]

D. Results of Stop

Additionally, RIPA requires officers to report the outcome of a stop, including whether the person stopped was arrested, issued a citation or warning, property was seized, or whether no action was taken.²¹ When entering stop data, officers can select up to 14 different options to document the result of a stop.²² Officers may select multiple results when necessary (e.g., an officer cited an individual for one offense and warned them about another).

Mandatory Supervision, Curbside Detention, Field Sobriety Test, Patrol Car Detention, Canine Search, Person Photographed, Removed from Vehicle by Order, Property Seized, Ran Passenger’s Name, Searched Person, Searched Property, *Terry* Frisk, Vehicle Impounded, Search Person Consent Given, Search Property Consent Given, Handcuffed, Baton Drawn, Baton Used, Chemical Spray, Electronic Control Device Pointed, Electronic Control Device Used in Drive-Stun Mode, Electronic Control Device Used in Dart Mode, Firearm Point, Firearm Discharge, Impact Projectile Point, Impact Projectile Discharge, Canine Compliance, Canine Bite, Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact, Physical Compliance, Use of Vehicle in Apprehension of Person, No Action Taken. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(16)(B), (a)(17)(A).)

¹⁹ Actions defined as use of force include: Handcuffed, Baton Drawn, Baton Used, Chemical Spray, Electronic Control Device Pointed, Electronic Control Device Used in Drive-Stun Mode, Electronic Control Device Used in Dart Mode, Firearm Point, Firearm Discharge, Impact Projectile Point, Impact Projectile Discharge, Canine Compliance, Canine Bite, Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact, Physical Compliance, and Use of Vehicle in Apprehension of Person. Use of force actions are categorized into *Lethal Force*, *Less Lethal Force*, and *Limited Force*. *Lethal Force* includes Firearm Discharge. *Less Lethal Force* includes Baton Used, Canine Bite, Chemical Spray, Electronic Control Device Stun, Electronic Control Device Dart, Firearm Point, Use of Vehicle in Apprehension of Person, and Impact Discharge. *Limited Force* includes Handcuffing, Physical Compliance, Baton Drawn, Canine Compliance, Electronic Device Point, Firearm Unholstered, Impact Projectile Point, and Removed from Vehicle with Physical Contact. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(17)(A).)

²⁰ In the 2025 RIPA data, these are: searches and *Terry* frisks, handcuffing, detention on a curbside or in a patrol car, and asking about parole status. A *Terry* frisk is when an officer conducts a pat down search of an individual’s clothing to determine whether the individual is armed. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(16)(B)(9); *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) 392 U.S. 1.) A *Terry* frisk only requires the officer to have a reasonable suspicion the person is armed and dangerous. (See *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) 392 U.S. 1.) The Board has previously recommended that officer have probable cause for all stops or searches, including *Terry* frisks. (See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 96 fn. 326 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2023.pdf>> [as of XX, 2025].)

²¹ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(4); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(18).

²² Results of stop include: Written Warning, Verbal Warning, Citation, In-Field Cite and Release, Custodial Arrest Pursuant to an Outstanding Warrant, Custodial Arrest without Warrant, Field Interview Card, Noncriminal Transport, Contact Legal Guardian, Psychiatric Hold, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Referral, School Administrator Referral, School Counselor Referral, and No Action. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(18).)

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

In 2025, stops were most frequently reported to result in individuals being issued a citation (48.38%, 2,654,517 stops), followed by a written or verbal warning (35.42%, 1,943,642 stops), and arrest (11.11%, 609,603 stops). Officers reported taking no action as the result in five percent of stops (274,448 stops). Each of the remaining results of stops represented less than five percent of the data. These results are similar to the results of stops reported in 2024.²³

Figure 3. Most Frequent Results of Stop [chart forthcoming]

III. STOP DATA ANALYSIS BY PERCEIVED DEMOGRAPHIC

In this section, the Board analyzes the reasons stops were initiated (including whether stops were initiated by a call for service and the reported mode of transportation), the number and type of actions taken during stops, and the outcome of stops by perceived demographic group to illustrate the experiences of different demographic groups, as documented by the 2025 stop data.

A. Race and Ethnicity

Officers must report their perception of a stopped person's race or ethnicity by selecting one or more values from a list of seven groups (Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latine(x), Middle Eastern or South Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, and White).²⁴ Persons who were perceived by the officer as more than one race or ethnicity are categorized as Multiracial. As noted above, this data is based on an officer's perception only and may not reflect the stopped person's actual race or ethnicity.

In 2025, officers perceived most individuals stopped to be Hispanic/Latine(x) (43.21%, 2,370,910 stops), followed by White (31.21%, 1,712,366 stops), Black (12.07%, 662,536 stops), Asian (5.96%, 326,917 stops), Middle Eastern/South Asian (5.67%, 311,133 stops), Multiracial (1.12%, 61,386 stops), Pacific Islander (0.50%, 27,489 stops), and Native American individuals (0.26%, 14,537 stops).

Figure 4. Percent of All Stops by Perceived Race/Ethnicity [chart forthcoming]

1. Residential Population Comparison

Comparing the perceived racial demographics of the individuals stopped in 2025 to the residential population demographics of California in 2024²⁵ demonstrates notable

In 2025, individuals perceived to be Black were stopped 131.69 percent more often than expected, and individuals perceived to be Asian 51.60 percent less frequently than expected, based on residential population share.

²³ In 2024, stops most often resulted in the issuance of a citation (49.96% of stops in 2024, 2,378,532 stops), followed by a written or verbal warning (34.58% of stops in 2024, 1,751,279 stops), and arrest (12.42% of stops in 2024, 629,325 stops). Officers reported taking no action as a result of stops in less than six percent of stops in 2024 (289,735 stops). Each of the remaining results of stops represented less than five percent of the data. (2026 RIPA Report, p. 28.)

²⁴ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(5).)

²⁵ The residential population demographics data are downloaded from Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS). 2024 data are used instead of 2025 because Census microdata is released at a later date than the Census' American Community Survey data. More detailed information on methodology for this analysis can be found in [Appendix XX](#).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

disparities.²⁶ Individuals perceived to be Black were stopped 131.69 percent more frequently than expected, and individuals perceived to be Pacific Islander 52.02 percent more frequently than expected, given the population of the state. Conversely, individuals perceived to be Multiracial were stopped 81.82 percent less frequently than expected, and individuals perceived to be Asian were stopped 51.60 percent less frequently than expected, given the population of the state.

Figure 5. Stop Disparities by Perceived Race and Ethnicity [chart forthcoming]

2. Calls for Service

Across all races and ethnicities, officer-initiated stops were far more common than calls for service in 2025. Individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian had the highest rate of officer-initiated stops (97.21%, 302,456 stops), followed by individuals perceived as Asian (96.37%, 315,063 stops). Alternatively, individuals perceived to be Native American (87.86%, 12,772 stops) and Black (88.75%, 588,024 stops) had the lowest rate of officer-initiated stops.

Individuals perceived as Native American had the highest rate of stops initiated by a call for service (12.14%, 1,765 stops), followed by individuals perceived as Black (11.25%, 74,512 stops). Alternatively, individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.79%, 8,677 stops) and Asian (3.63%, 11,854 stops) had the lowest rate of stops initiated by a call for service.

3. Mode of Transportation

Officers stopped individuals for vehicular stops most frequently when they perceived those individuals to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (96.04%, 298,816 stops) or Asian (93.94%, 307,111 stops); in contrast, officers stopped individuals for vehicular stops least frequently when they perceived those individuals to be Native American (77.90%, 11,324 stops) or Black (79.96%, 529,748 stops).

Officers stopped individuals they perceived as Native American (20.73%, 3,014 stops) and Black (19.11%, 126,603 stops) as pedestrians most frequently and stopped individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (3.56%, 11,071 stops) and Asian (5.29%, 17,309) as pedestrians least frequently compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

Officers stopped individuals they perceived as Native American (1.37%, 199 stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (1.28%, 30,276 stops) most frequently for bicycle stops and individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.40%, 1,246 stops) and Asian (0.76%, 2,497 stops) least frequently for bicycle stops compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

4. Reason for Stop

Across all races and ethnicities, traffic violations were the most common reason for stops in 2025, followed by reasonable suspicion, and then other reasons. Officers stopped individuals based on reasonable suspicion most frequently when they perceived those individuals to be Black (15.42%, 102,163 stops) and Native American (14.01%, 2,037 stops). Officers stopped

²⁶ Though the methods used in this analysis are commonly used in research monitoring law enforcement patterns, there are several limitations to the methodology used in this analysis. For example, we cannot identify if stops in the RIPA data are of unique individuals, or if the same individuals were stopped multiple times. Additionally, stop location may not be related to residential status. Please see [Appendix XX](#) for a comprehensive list of considerations and limitations.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

individuals based on reasonable suspicion least frequently when they perceived those individuals to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.91%, 9,049 stops) and Asian (3.90%, 12,748 stops).

Moving violations were the most common type of traffic violation for all races and ethnicities. Individuals perceived to be Asian (73.14%, 225,028 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (71.30%, 212,613 stops) were stopped for moving violations most frequently, and individuals perceived to be Native American (55.95%, 6,243 stops) and Black (56.71%, 295,128 stops) were stopped for moving violations least frequently.

For all races/ethnicities except for individuals perceived to be Asian, equipment violations were the second most common traffic violation, followed by non-moving violations. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be Native American (26.88%, 2,999 stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (24.94%, 514,018 stops) the most frequently for equipment violations, and Asian (12.62%, 38,815 stops) and Middle Eastern (14.93%, 44,521 stops) the least frequently. Individuals perceived to be Black (18.88%, 98,249 stops) and Pacific Islander (18.15%, 4,310 stops) were stopped the most frequently for non-moving violations, and individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (13.77%, 41,058 stops) and Multiracial (14.23%, 7,441 stops) the least frequently for non-moving violations.

5. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

For all races and ethnicities, officers report taking no action during stop for most stops. However, there appear to be disparities in the number of stops where no action is taken during the stop by perceived race or ethnicity group. Officers reported taking “no action” most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (91.75%, 285,465 stops) and Asian (90.26%, 295,089 stops). Officers reported taking no action least frequently during stops of individuals perceived to be Black (68.67%, 454,953 stops) and Native American (70.29 %, 10,218 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers used force-related actions most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (16.64%, 2,419 stops), Black (15.97%, 105,804 stops), and Hispanic/Latine(x) (10.47%, 248,160 stops).²⁷ Force-related actions were reported least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.99%, 9,304 stops), Asian (3.70%, 12,088 stops), and White (8.27%, 141,644 stops).²⁸

Officers reported using force-related actions most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American, Black, and Hispanic/Latine(x), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian, Asian, and White.

²⁷ Actions defined as use of force include the use of a baton, canine bites, use of chemical sprays, use of electronic control device, discharging a firearm, pointing a firearm, handcuffing, impact discharge, removal from vehicle with physical contact, and other contact. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(17); see Pen. Code, § 16780, subd. (a).)

²⁸ Use of force actions are further categorized into lethal force, less-lethal force, and limited force. Lethal force includes discharging a firearm. Less-lethal force includes baton use, canine bites, use of a chemical spray, use of electronic control device, pointing a firearm, and impact discharge. Limited force includes handcuffing, other

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

Force-related actions can be disaggregated into limited force, less-lethal force, and lethal force. In 2025, officers reported using limited force most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Native American (16.18%, 2,352 stops) and Black (15.34%, 101,652 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.86%, 8,912 stops) and Asian (3.52%, 11,522 stops).

Less-lethal force was reported to be used most frequently in stops of individuals perceived as Black (0.62%, 4,125 stops) and Multiracial (0.47%, 291 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.12%, 388 stops) and Asian (0.17%, 565 stops).

Officers rarely reported instances of lethal force (< 0.01% across all racial and ethnic groups), but reported the most instances of lethal force use in stops of individuals perceived to be Hispanic/Latine(x) (<0.01%, 55 stops) and Black (<0.01%, 27 stops). Officers reported no instances of lethal force in stops of individuals they perceived as Pacific Islander.

Figure 6. Most Severe Use of Force by Perceived Race/Ethnicity [chart forthcoming]

c. Top 4 Actions During Stop

Across all stops, the top four actions taken by officers during a stop are: (1) searches/*Terry* frisks;²⁹ (2) handcuffing; (3) detainment curbside or in a patrol car; and (4) asking the parole status of the person stopped. For each of the perceived demographics below, the Board analyzes how these top four actions are differentiated within the perceived demographic category.

Officers reported the highest rates of searches and *Terry* frisks in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (17.07%, 2,482 stops) and Black (18.50 %, 122,548 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of searches and *Terry* frisks in stops for individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (3.16%, 9,823 stops) and Asian (3.94%, 12,896 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of handcuffing in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (16.36 %, 2,378 stops) and Black (15.52%, 102,799 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of handcuffing in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.88%, 8,965 stops) and Asian (3.54%, 11,577 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops for individuals perceived to be Native American (15.36 %, 2,233 stops) and Black (15.39%, 101,946 stops). Officers reported the lowest detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (3.91%, 12,155 stops) and Asian (4.81%, 15,729 stops).

Officers asked the parole status of individuals perceived to be Black (5.55%, 36,778 stops) and Multiracial (5.02%, 3,083 stops) at the highest rates, and individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (1.48%, 4,591 stops) and Asian (1.53%, 4,997 stops) at the lowest rates.

Figure 7. Top 4 Actions During Stop by Perceived Race/Ethnicity [chart forthcoming]

contact, and removal from a vehicle with physical contact. (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(17); see Pen. Code, § 16780, subd. (a).)

²⁹ As noted above, a *Terry* frisk only requires the officer to have a reasonable suspicion the person is armed and dangerous. (See *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) 392 U.S. 1.) The Board has previously recommended that officer have probable cause for all stops or searches, including *Terry* frisks. (See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 96 fn. 326 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2023.pdf>> [as of XX, 2025].)

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers reported taking the highest average number of actions in stops of individuals perceived to be Black (0.89 actions per stop, $SD^{30} = 1.68$, range = 0-19 actions) and Native American (0.83, $SD = 1.61$, range = 0-12). The lowest number of actions were reported in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.19, $SD = 0.82$, range = 0-14) and Asian (0.23, $SD = 0.91$, range = 0-17).

6. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched³¹ individuals perceived to be Native American (13.65 %, 1,984 stops) and Black (10.71%, 70,987 stops) most frequently and individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.20%, 6,847 stops) and Asian (2.91%, 9,504 stops) least frequently. Officers reported the highest discovery rates in searches of individuals perceived as Multiracial (30.15%, 1,498 stops) and White (29.48%, 36,819 stops) and the lowest discovery rates in searches of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (22.21%, 1,521 stops) and Asian (23.97%, 2,278 stops).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be Black (3.63%, 24,053 stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (2.35%, 55,796 stops) most frequently, and conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.47%, 1,462 stops) and Asian (0.49%, 1,587 stops) least frequently. Officers reported the highest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals they perceived as Black (13.39%, 3,221 stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (12.17%, 6,790 stops) and the lowest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals they perceived as Native American (6.37%, 13 stops) and Pacific Islander (8.22%, 25 stops).

c. Consent Inquiries

Across all stops reported, officers asked for consent to search in 3.28 percent of stops (180,106 stops). Of those who consented, 81.64 percent were searched (124,379 stops). Of those who did not consent to search, 61.08 percent (16,951 stops) were searched. Officers asked for consent to search most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be Black (4.48%, 29,688 stops) and Multiracial (4.00%, 2,458 stops) and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.92%, 2,864 stops) and Asian (1.21%, 3,956 stops). Of those that consented, officers searched individuals they perceived as Pacific Islander (86.31%, 605 stops) and White (85.40%, 32,195 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived as Black

³⁰ When reporting an average value of a set of data, we will additionally report the standard deviation (SD) and range of the underlying set. The standard deviation is a measure of how dispersed the data are in relation to the average. A larger standard deviation indicates the data points are more spread out, while a smaller standard deviation indicates the data points are clustered more closely around the average. It is found by calculating the square root of the squared difference from the average. For example, if there are five stops of length 2 minutes, 4 minutes, 7 minutes, 11 minutes, and 16 minutes, the average stop length is 8 minutes. The difference from the average for each stop is -6, -4, -1, -3, and 8, and the square of those differences is 36, 16, 1, 9, and 64. The average of those numbers is 25, which means that the standard deviation would be about 5. If the five stops were all the same length, the standard deviation would be zero. The range states the lowest and highest value in the set.

³¹ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

(78.29%, 19,863 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (79.51%, 1,913 stops) least frequently. Of those who did not consent to search, officers searched individuals they perceived as Multiracial (65.26%, 248 stops) and Black (62.47%, 2,697 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived as Native American (57.58%, 38 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (58.30%, 267 stops) least frequently.

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Across all stops reported, officers performed searches³² where consent was the only basis for search in 13.42 percent of searches (69,027 stops). Officers reported discovering evidence/contraband in 18.34 percent (12,663 stops) of searches where consent was the only basis. Officers most frequently reported performing searches where consent was the only basis in stops of individuals perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x) (15.81% of searches, 37,650 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (13.41% of searches, 1,121 stops). Officers reported performing consent searches least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (6.94%, 158 stops) and Black (10.03%, 9,882 stops). Officers reported the highest discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be Pacific Islander (26.01%, 84 stops) and Native American (25.32%, 40 stops). Officers reported the lowest discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be Black (14.76%, 1,459 stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (17.38%, 6,544 stops).

7. Results of Stop

Among stops of individuals perceived to be Asian, Black, Hispanic/Latine(x), Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Pacific Islander, and White, citation was the most common result of stop, followed by warning, and arrest. Among individuals perceived to be Native American, warning was the most common result of stop, followed by citation, then arrest.³³

Officers reported the highest arrest rates for individuals perceived to be Native American (21.16%, 3,076 stops) and Black (15.05%, 99,740 stops) compared to the other racial/ethnic groups. Officers also reported taking no action most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (8.39%, 1,219 stops) and Black (6.68%, 44,252 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (2.50%, 7,763 stops) and Asian (2.82%, 9,232 stops).

Figure 8. Most Frequent Results of Stop and No Action Rates by Perceived Race/Ethnicity
[chart forthcoming]

B. Gender

The vast majority of stops in 2025 (99.14%, 5,440,244 stops) involved persons perceived as cisgender.³⁴ In 2025, officers perceived most stopped individuals to be cisgender men/boys (71.25%, 3,909,918), while individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls were the second most common perceived gender identity (27.89%, 1,530,326). The remaining stops are

³² Consent only applies to searches of property or person being conducted during the stop, not *Terry* frisks. In the RIPA data, only the presence of a *search* requires an officer to indicate a basis for that search; officers do not have to indicate a basis for search in *Terry* frisks.

³³ Please see Table **X** in Appendix **XX** for more detailed counts and percentages.

³⁴ Cisgender means a person whose gender identity and gender expression align with the person's assigned gender identity at birth, whereas transgender means a person whose gender identity and gender expression do not align with the gender assigned at birth. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11 § 999.226, subd. (a)(6)(B).)

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

comprised of persons perceived as nonbinary individuals (0.57%, 31,285),³⁵ transgender men/boys (0.18%, 9,795), and transgender women/girls (0.11%, 5,951).

1. Calls for Service

For all gender categories, officer-initiated stops were far more common than calls for service. Individuals perceived as cisgender women/girls (93.29%, 1,427,704 stops) and cisgender men/boys (92.59%, 3,620,307 stops) had the highest rate of officer-initiated stops. Alternatively, individuals perceived as transgender women/girls (77.01%, 4,583 stops) and transgender men/boys (81.87%, 8,019 stops) had the lowest rate of officer-initiated stops.

However, individuals perceived to be transgender had at least twice as high of a rate of stops initiated by calls for service (22.99%, 1,368 stops of transgender women/girls and 18.13%, 1,776 stops of transgender men/boys), compared to nonbinary individuals (8.45%, 2,645 stops), cisgender men/boys (7.41%, 289,611 stops), and cisgender women/girls (6.71%, 102,622 stops).

2. Mode of Transportation

Across all gender categories measured in the RIPA data, vehicular stops were most common, followed by pedestrian stops, and then bicycle stops. Officers made vehicular stops most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be cisgender women/girls (89.68%, 1,372,454 stops) and cisgender men/boys (85.57%, 3,345,761 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (64.01%, 3,809 stops) and transgender men/boys (68.57%, 6,716 stops).

Officers reported stopping individuals they perceived to be transgender as pedestrians more frequently compared to the other genders (34.85%, 2,074 stops of transgender women/girls and 29.98%, 2,937 stops of transgender men/boys). Officers stopped individuals they perceived to be cisgender women/girls (9.94%, 152,128 stops) and cisgender men/boys (12.98%, 507,664 stops) the least frequently as pedestrians compared to other genders.

Officers made bicycle stops most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be transgender men/boys (1.45%, 142 stops) and cisgender men/boys (1.44%, 56,493 stops) and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be nonbinary (1.05%, 330 stops) and cisgender women/girls (0.38%, 5,744 stops).

3. Reason for Stop

Across all genders, traffic violations were the most common reason for stop, followed by reasonable suspicion, and then other reasons. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be transgender about twice as frequently for reasonable suspicion (25.37%, 1,510 stops of perceived transgender women/girls and 21.88%, 2,143 stops of perceived transgender men/boys) compared to other genders. Individuals perceived to be cisgender were stopped least frequently for reasonable suspicion (7.44%, 113,889 stops of perceived cisgender women/girls and 10.00%, stops of 391,156 perceived cisgender men/boys), along with people perceived as nonbinary (9.41%, 2,945 stops).

For all genders, officers stopped individuals for moving violations the most frequently, followed by equipment violations, and then non-moving violations. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be nonbinary (68.82%, 18,206 stops) and cisgender women/girls (65.87%, 895,819 stops) the most frequently, and individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys (53.34%, 3,493 stops)

³⁵ If an officer reports someone as nonbinary and another gender, they are counted as nonbinary.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

and transgender women/girls (55.76%, 2,043 stops) the least frequently for moving violations. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be transgender the most frequently for equipment violations (32.81%, 2,149 stops of perceived transgender men/boys and 28.60%, 1,048 stops of perceived transgender women/girls) and least frequently for individuals they perceived to be cisgender women/girls (17.32%, 235,572 stops) and nonbinary (22.27%, 5,890 stops). Officers stopped individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (16.81%, 228,608 stops) and cisgender men/boys (16.28%, 544,049 stops) the most frequently for non-moving violations and individuals perceived to be nonbinary (8.91%, 2,357 stops) and transgender men/boys (13.85%, 907 stops) the least frequently.

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (83.81%, 1,282,565 stops) and nonbinary individuals (78.10%, 24,434 stops). Officers reported taking no action least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender women/girls (59.17%, 3,521 stops) and transgender men/boys (61.39%, 6,013 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers used force the most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender (21.06%, 1,253 stops of transgender women/girls and 20.75%, 2,032 stops of transgender men/boys), and the least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (6.62%, 101,347 stops) and nonbinary (9.74%, 3,046 stops).

In 2025, officers reported using limited and less-lethal force more frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender, compared to people perceived to be cisgender and nonbinary. Officers used limited force most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as transgender women/girls (20.65%, 1,229 stops) and transgender men/boys (19.89%, 1,948 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as cisgender women/girls (6.45%, 98,655 stops) and nonbinary (9.39%, 2,939). Officers used less-lethal force most frequently in stops of individuals perceived as transgender men/boys (0.86%, 84 stops) and transgender women/girls (0.39%, 23 stops), and least frequently in stops of cisgender women/girls (0.18%, 2,681 stops) and nonbinary (0.33%, 104 stops).

While officers reported few instances of lethal force overall, officers used more instances of lethal force in stops of cisgender men/boys (<0.01%, 96 stops) and cisgender women/girls (<0.01%, 11 stops). Officers reported 0 instances of lethal force in stops of individuals they perceived as transgender men/boys.

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers reported the highest rates of searches and *Terry* frisks in stops of individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (19.78%, 1,177 stops) and transgender men/boys (19.09%, 1,870 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of searches and *Terry* frisks in stops of individuals they perceived to be cisgender women/girls (6.81%, 104,220 stops) and nonbinary (9.27%, 2,901 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of handcuffing in stops of individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (20.79%, 1,237 stops) and transgender men/boys (20.22%, 1,981 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of handcuffing in stops of individuals they perceived to

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

be cisgender women/girls (6.43%, 98,341 stops) and nonbinary (9.21%, 2,882 stops involving handcuffing).

Officers reported the highest rates of detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops of individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (21.31%, 1,268 stops) and transgender men/boys (18.33%, 1,795 stops). Officers reported the lowest rate of detainment curbside or in a patrol car for individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (8.34%, 127,606 stops) and cisgender men/boys (11.45%, 447,664 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of asking about parole status in stops of transgender women/girls (5.41%, 322 stops) and transgender men/boys (5.14%, 503 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of asking about parole status in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (2.38%, 36,466 stops) and nonbinary (2.87%, 897 stops).

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers took the highest average number of actions in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender women/girls (1.04 actions, SD = 1.68, range= 0-12 actions) and transgender men/boys (1.00, SD = 1.68, range= 0-13). The lowest number of actions were reported in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (0.39, SD = 1.13, range= 0-16) and nonbinary (0.54, SD = 1.37, range= 0-16).

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched³⁶ individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (13.28%, 790 stops) and transgender men/boys (11.73%, 1,149 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived to be cisgender women/girls (5.13%, 78,461 stops) and nonbinary (7.08%, 2,216 stops) least frequently. Officers discovered evidence/contraband most frequently in searches of individuals perceived to be transgender (28.99%, 229 searches of individuals perceived to be transgender women/girls and 28.89%, 332 stops of individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys) and least frequently in searches of individuals perceived to be cisgender (25.44%, 19,963 stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls and 26.60%, 86,575 stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender men/boys).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys (3.84%, 376 stops) and transgender women/girls (3.06%, 182 stops) most frequently, and conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be nonbinary (0.82%, 255 stops) and cisgender women/girls (0.83%, 12,692 stops) least frequently. Officers reported the highest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived as nonbinary (13.33%, 34 stops) and cisgender men/boys (12.00%, 10,573 stops) and the lowest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived as transgender women/girls (9.34%, 17 stops) and cisgender women/girls (9.75%, 1,238 stops).

³⁶ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers asked for consent to search most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys (5.29%, 518 stops) and transgender women/girls (4.92%, 293 stops). Officers asked for consent to search least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (1.76%, 26,924 stops) and nonbinary (3.07%, 961 stops). Of those that consented, officers searched individuals they perceived to be nonbinary (85.60%, 660 stops) and cisgender women/girls (82.54%, 18,280 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived to be transgender men/boys (75.48%, 314 stops) and transgender women/girls (79.32%, 188 stops) least frequently. Of those that did not consent, officers searched individuals they perceived to be nonbinary (75.79%, 144 stops) and cisgender women/girls (62.68%, 2,995 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived to be transgender men/boys (59.80%, 61 stops) and transgender women/girls (57.14%, 32 stops) least frequently.

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches where consent was the only basis for search most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as cisgender men/boys (13.99% of searches, 58,451 stops) and transgender men/boys (11.45% of searches, 171 stops). Officers performed searches where consent was the only basis for search least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as nonbinary (9.45% of searches, 250 stops) and cisgender women/girls (10.97% of searches, 10,043 stops). Officers reported the highest discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be transgender women/girls (33.93%, 38 stops) and cisgender women/girls (21.98%, 2,207 stops). Officers reported the lowest discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be nonbinary (13.60%, 34 stops) and transgender men/boys (17.54%, 30 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be transgender men/boys (13.15%, 1,288 stops) and nonbinary (10.51%, 3,288 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be cisgender women/girls (4.27%, 65,305 stops) and cisgender men/boys (5.22%, 203,977 stops). Among individuals perceived to be cisgender (52.42%, 802,132 stops) and nonbinary (52.94%, 16,561 stops), officers issued a citation at the highest rate, followed by warning, and then arrest. For individuals perceived to be transgender, officers reported warnings as the most common result of stop, followed by arrest for transgender women/girls (24.16%, 1,438 stops) and citation for transgender men/boys (25.27%, 2,475 stops).³⁷

C. Age

Most individuals stopped in 2025 were perceived to be between 25-34 years old (30.11%, 1,652,038 stops), followed 35-44 (25.01%, 1,372,161 stops), and 45-54 (15.88%, 871,206 stops). Officers stopped youth perceived as 1-9 years old (0.07%, 4,005 stops), 10-14 (0.23%, 12,879 stops), and 15-17 (1.28%, 70,253 stops) least frequently. Other perceived age categories were 18-24 (14.71%, 806,975 stops), 55-64 years (8.34%, 457,409 stops), and 65+ years (4.38%, 240,349 stops).

³⁷ Please see Table X in Appendix XX for more detailed counts and percentages.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

1. Calls for Service

Among all age groups, officer-initiated stops were far more common than calls for service. However, youth perceived to be 10-14 (41.80%, 5,383 stops) and 15-17 (20.82%, 14,627 stops) had the highest rates of stops initiated by a call for service amongst all age groups. Individuals perceived to be 18-24 (5.27%, 42,499 stops) and 65+ years (5.45%, 13,094 stops) had the lowest rates of stops initiated by a call for service. Individuals perceived to be 18-24 (94.73%, 764,476 stops) and 65+ years (94.55%, 227,255 stops) had the highest rates of officer-initiated stops and youth perceived to be 10-14 (58.20%, 7,496 stops) and 15-17 years (79.18%, 55,626 stops) had the lowest rates of officer-initiated stops.

2. Mode of Transportation

Across all ages except 10-14 years old, vehicular stops were most common, followed by pedestrian stops, and then bicycle stops. Officers made vehicle stops most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 18-24 (91.89%, 741,534 stops) and 65+ (91.12%, 218,999 stops) and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be 10-14 (31.11%, 4,007 stops) and 15-17 years old (64.58%, 45,369 stops).

Officers stopped individuals perceived to be 10-14 (56.95%, 7,334 stops) and 15-17 years old (31.49%, 22,121 stops) as pedestrians most frequently and 18-24 (7.46%, 60,213 stops) and 65+ years old (8.42%, 20,241 stops) least frequently, compared to other age groups.

Officers stopped individuals perceived to be 10-14 (11.94%, 1,538 stops) and 15-17 year olds (3.93%, 2,763 stops) most frequently in bicycle stops and individuals perceived to be 65+ (0.46%, 1,109 stops) and 18-24 years old (0.65%, 5,228 stops) least frequently in bicycle stops, compared to other age groups.

3. Reason for Stop

For all age groups except individuals perceived to be 1-9 years old, traffic violations were the most common reason for stop,³⁸ followed by reasonable suspicion, and then other reasons. Officers reported the highest rates of stops based on reasonable suspicion for youth perceived to be 10-14 (31.66%, 4,077 stops), followed by youth perceived to be 15-17 (23.50%, 16,508 stops). Officers stopped individuals perceived to be 65+ (5.92%, 14,238 stops) and 18-24 (6.94%, 55,970 stops) least frequently for reasonable suspicion compared to the other age groups.

Moving violations were the most frequent type of traffic violation for all age groups. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be 65+ (72.74%, 158,914 stops) and youth perceived to be 15-17 years old (68.27%, 31,023 stops) most frequently, and youth perceived to be 1-9 (55.66%, 1,829 stops) and 10-14 years old (59.09%, 3,056 stops) were stopped the least frequently for moving violations. For all age groups except those perceived to be 65+ years old, equipment violations were the second most common traffic violation, followed by non-moving violations. Officers stopped youth perceived to be 1-9 (33.57%, 1,103 stops) and 10-14 years old (27.82%, 1,439 stops) the most frequently, and individuals perceived to be 65+ (13.30%, 29,066 stops) and 55-64 years old (17.96%, 71,783 stops) the least frequently for equipment violations. Officers

³⁸ A small child may be the subject of a traffic stop report in some circumstances. For example, if an officer stops a vehicle and orders all occupants, including children, to exit the vehicle and sit on the curb, the officer would generally report the stop of the small child. See Cal. Code Regs. tit. 11, § 999.227, subd. (b)(1)(B). 38.28% (1,258) traffic violation stops involving a 1-9 year old also involved an adult. 20.19% (1,044) traffic violation stops involving a 10-14 year old also involved an adult.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

stopped individuals perceived to be 35-44 (18.22%, 209,955 stops) and 45-54 years old (17.42%, 129,997 stops) the most frequently, and youth perceived to be 15-17 (10.46%, 4,755 stops) and 1-9 years old (10.77%, 354 stops) the least frequently for non-moving violations.

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action least frequently in stops involving youth perceived to be 10-14 (48.88%, 6,295 stops) and 15-17 (59.04%, 41,475 stops). Officers took no action most frequently in stops involving individuals perceived to be 65+ (88.34%, 212,325 stops) and 55-64 years old (83.51%, 381,959 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers reported using force-related actions most frequently in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 years old (21.67%, 2,791 stops) and 15-17 years old (20.37%, 14,314 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be 65+ (4.32%, 10,378 stops) and 1-9 years old (4.87%, 195 stops).

Among all age groups, officers used limited force most frequently in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 (20.86%, 2,686 stops) and 15-17 (19.21%, 13,494 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 65+ (4.20%, 10,103 stops) and 1-9 (4.74%, 190 stops). Officers used less-lethal force most frequently in stops of youth they perceived as 15-17 (1.16%, 818 stops) and 10-14 (0.82%, 105 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 65+ (0.11%, 271 stops) and 1-9 (0.12%, 5 stops).

Officers reported few instances of lethal force (<0.01%) for all age groups. Officers reported 0 instances of lethal force in stops of youth perceived to be 1-9 and 10-14 years old.

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers reported the highest rates of searches and *Terry* frisks in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 (24.00%, 3,091 stops) and 15-17 years old (23.17%, 16,277 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of searches and frisks in stops of youth they perceived to be 1-9 (6.54%, 262 stops) and individuals perceived to be 65+ years old (4.82%, 11,595 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of handcuffing in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 (20.93%, 2,695 stops) and 15-17 years old (19.59%, 13,764 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of handcuffing in stops of youth they perceived to be 1-9 (4.04%, 162 stops) and individuals perceived to be 65+ years old (4.19%, 10,076 stops).

Officers reported the highest rates of detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 (28.60%, 3,684 stops) and 15-17 years old (21.00%, 14,755 stops). Officers reported the lowest rates of detainment curbside or in a patrol car of individuals perceived to be 65+ (5.90%, 14,178 stops) and 55-64 years old (8.61%, 39,364 stops).

Officers asked parole status most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 35-44 (4.29%, 58,798 stops) and 15-17 years old (4.13%, 2,899 stops). Officers asked about parole status least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 65+ (1.50%, 3,609 stops) and youth perceived to be 10-14 (2.08%, 268 stops).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers took the highest average number of actions in stops of youth perceived to be 10-14 years old (1.09 actions, SD = 1.48, range = 0-17 actions) and 15-17 years old (1.06, SD = 1.70, range = 0-18) and the lowest number of actions in stops of individuals perceived to be 65+ years old (0.27, SD = 0.93, range = 0-15) and 1-9 years old (0.37, SD = 0.97, range = 0-9).

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched³⁹ individuals they perceived as 10-14 (13.22%, 1,703 stops) and 15-17 years old (10.97%, 7,709 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived as 65+ (3.63%, 8,727 stops) and 1-9 years old (4.57%, 183 stops) least frequently. Officers discovered evidence/contraband most frequently in searches of individuals they perceived to be 45-54 (29.06%, 18,877 stops) and 15-17 year olds (28.71%, 2,213 stops) and least frequently in searches of individuals they perceived to be 18-24 (21.15%, 9,777 stops) and 10-14 years old (23.25%, 396 stops).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be 15-17 (8.10%, 5,691 stops) and 10-14 years old (7.17%, 924 stops) most frequently, and conducted *Terry* frisks of individuals perceived to be 65+ (0.54%, 1,288 stops) and 55-64 years old (0.93%, 4,234 stops) least frequently. Officers reported the highest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals they perceived as 18-24 (13.18%, 2,711 stops) and 25-34 years old (12.86%, 4,433 stops) and the lowest discovery rates in *Terry* frisks of individuals they perceived as 65+ (7.22%, 93 stops) and 10-14 years old (8.33%, 77 stops).

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers asked for consent to search most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be 10-14 (4.52%, 582 stops) and 15-17 years old (4.37%, 3,069 stops) and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to be 65+ (1.24%, 2,991 stops), 55-64 (2.32%, 10,600 stops), and 1-9 (2.32%, 93 stops). Of those who consented to search, officers searched individuals they perceived to be 1-9 (84.71%, 72 stops) and 55-64 years old (84.70%, 7,359 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived to be 10-14 (75.05%, 364 stops) and 18-24 years old (76.39%, 14,706 stops) least frequently. Of those who did not consent to search, officers searched individuals they perceived to be 1-9 (75.00%, 6 stops) and 10-14 (71.13%, 69 stops) most frequently and individuals they perceived to be 18-24 (57.44%, 1,733 stops) and 45-54 years old (60.49%, 2,906 stops) least frequently.

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches where consent was the sole basis for search most frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 1-9 (19.28% of searches, 43 stops) and 45-54 years old (14.69% of searches, 11,549 stops). Officers performed searches where the sole basis for search was consent least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 10-14 (7.71% of searches, 167 stops) and 15-17 year olds (10.06% of searches, 1,065 stops). Officers reported the highest discovery rates

³⁹ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be 10-14 (23.35%, 39 stops) and 55-64 years old (21.55%, 892 stops). Officers reported the lowest discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be 1-9 (11.63%, 5 stops) and 18-24 years old (12.11%, 1,035 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action most frequently in stops of youth perceived to be 1-9 (27.34%, 1,095 stops) and 10-14 (10.84%, 1,396 stops) years old, and least frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be 65+ (3.03%, 7,290 stops) and 55-64 (3.68%, 16,846 stops). For youth perceived to be 1-9 and 15-17, the most common result of stop reported was warning (33.28%, 1,333 stops of 1-9 year olds and 33.53%, 23,556 stops of 15-17 year olds), followed by citation (29.24%, 1,171 stops of 1-9 year olds and 33.18%, 23,311 stops of 15-17 year olds), and then arrest (5.52%, 221 stops of 1-9 year olds and 15.85%, 11,135 stops of 15-17 year olds). For youth perceived to be 10-14, officers reported warning as the most common result of stop (28.44%, 3,663 stops), followed by arrest (20.85%, 2,685 stops), and then citation (16.93%, 2,181 stops). For individuals perceived to be 18 and older, officers reported citations as the most common result of stop, followed by warning, and then arrest.

D. Disability Status

Officers reported that they perceived stopped individuals to have a disability in 0.83% (45,426 stops) of all stops in 2025. Of those stops, the most commonly perceived disability was mental health (60.64% of stops with a perceived disability, 27,548 stops), followed by “other”⁴⁰ (13.52%, 6,143 stops), speech impairment (8.65%, 3,928), deafness (5.57%, 2,529), multiple disabilities (6.00%, 2,727), developmental (3.77%, 1,714), blindness (1.80%, 817), and hyperactivity (0.04%, 20).

1. Calls for Service

Officer initiated stops were the majority of stops in 2025 for all demographic groups, except for perceived disability status. The majority of stops of individuals with a perceived disability were initiated by a call for service (57.49%, 26,116 stops), while the opposite was true for individuals without a perceived disability (6.83%, 371,906 stops initiated by a call for service).

2. Mode of Transportation

Officers stopped individuals perceived to have a disability most frequently as a pedestrian stop (74.50%, 33,841 stops), followed by vehicular stops (24.64%, 11,194 stops), and then bicycle stops (0.86%, 391 stops). Officers stopped individuals perceived as having no disability most frequently in vehicular stops (87.18%, 4,744,280 stops), followed by pedestrian stops (11.67%, 635,183 stops), and then bicycle stops (1.15%, 62,386 stops).

3. Reason for Stop

As with most other demographic groups, officers most commonly reported traffic violations as the reason for stopping individuals perceived as having no disability (86.86%, 4,726,801 stops), followed by reasonable suspicion (9.09%, 494,922 stops), and then other reasons for stops (4.05%, 220,125 stops). For individuals perceived to have a disability, officers reported other

⁴⁰ The discrete “other disability” category allows an officer to report they perceived a disability not within one of the discrete categories.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

reasons as the most common reason for stop (38.97%, 17,702 stops)⁴¹, followed by reasonable suspicion (36.81%, 16,721 stops), and then traffic violations (24.22%, 11,002 stops). With respect to traffic violation stops, officers reported similar patterns for both groups in equipment violations, moving violations, and non-moving violations.

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action more than twice as frequently in stops of individuals perceived as having no disability (78.91%, 4,294,064 stops), compared to stops of individuals perceived to have a disability (32.24%, 14,643 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers reported higher rates of any type of force in stops of individuals perceived to have a disability (46.18%, 20,977 stops) compared to stops of individuals perceived to not have a disability (9.31%, 506,456 stops). Officers reported higher rates of lethal (0.02%, 11 stops), less-lethal (1.41%, 641 stops), and limited force (44.74%, 20,325 stops) in stops of individuals perceived to have a disability compared to stops of individuals perceived to not have a disability (<0.01%, 100 stops involved lethal force, 0.32%, 17,164 stops involved less-lethal force, 8.99%, 489,192 stops involved limited force).

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers searched and *Terry* frisked, handcuffed, detained curbside or in a patrol car, and asked about parole status in stops of individuals perceived to have a disability (41.92%, 19,042 stops involved searches/frisks, 45.23%, 20,546 stops involved handcuffing, 36.43%, 16,548 stops involved detainment, 5.04%, 2,290 stops involved asking about parole status) more frequently compared to stops of individuals perceived to not have a disability (10.97%, 597,004 stops involved searches/frisks, 9.02%, 491,045 stops involved handcuffing, 10.40%, 566,077 stops involved detainment, 3.73%, 203,244 stops involved asking about parole status).

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers reported taking almost three times as many actions during stops of individuals perceived to have a disability (1.84 actions, SD = 1.84, range = 0-14 actions) compared to stops of individuals perceived to not have a disability (0.57, SD = 1.40, range = 0-19).

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched⁴² individuals they perceived as having a disability about three times more frequently (26.45%, 12,015 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as having no disability (7.28%, 396,047 stops). Officers reported higher discovery rates in stops of individuals they

⁴¹ See the first subheading for Reason for Stop for a list of “other” reasons.

⁴² Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

perceived as having no disability (26.61%, 105,384 stops) compared to stops of individuals they perceived as having a disability (19.44%, 2,336 stops).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers reported higher *Terry* frisk rates in stops of individuals perceived to have a disability (8.03%, 3,646 stops) compared to stops of individuals they perceived as not having a disability (1.80%, 97,967 stops). The opposite trend exists for discovery rates; Officers reported discovery rates about two times higher for individuals they perceived as not having a disability (11.93%, 11,692 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as having a disability (5.87%, 214 stops).

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers asked individuals they perceived to have a disability (8.50%, 3,860 stops) for consent to search more frequently compared to individuals they perceived as having a disability (3.24%, 176,246 stops). Of the individuals that consented to search, officers searched individuals they perceived as having no disability (81.70%, 121,909 stops) more frequently than individuals they perceived as having a disability (78.71%, 2,470 stops). The same pattern exists for the stops where the individual did not consent to search – officers searched individuals they perceived as having no disability (61.30%, 16,568 stops) more frequently compared to individuals they perceived as having a disability (53.05%, 383 stops).

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches based only on consent more frequently in stops of individuals they perceived to have no disability (13.61%, 67,898 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as having a disability (7.33%, 1,129 stops). Officers reported higher discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived as having no disability (18.42%, 12,509 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as having a disability (13.64%, 154 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action in stops of individuals perceived to have a disability at higher rates (8.79%, 3,992 stops) than individuals perceived to have no disability (4.97%, 270,456 stops). Among stops of individuals perceived to have a disability, officers reported arrest as the most common result of stop (30.90%, 14,037 stops), followed by warning (20.28%, 9,213 stops), and citation (9.59%, 4,355 stops). Among stops of individuals perceived to not have a disability, officers reported citation as the most common result of stop (48.70%, 2,650,162 stops), followed by warning (35.55%, 1,934,429 stops), and arrest (10.94%, 595,566 stops).

E. English Fluency

In 2025, officers reported that they perceived the stopped individual to have English fluency in 93.72% (5,142,857) of all stops. In the remaining 6.28% (344,418) of stops, the officer perceived the individual as having limited or no English fluency.

1. Calls for Service

Officer-initiated stops were more common than calls for service for individuals regardless of English fluency. Although individuals perceived to be fluent in English had a lower rate of stops initiated by a call for service (7.22%, 371,468 stops) than those perceived to have limited/no English fluency (7.71%, 26,554 stops), that difference was less than one percentage point. Individuals perceived to be fluent in English had a similar rate of officer-initiated stops (92.78%,

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

4,771,389 stops) as individuals perceived to have limited/no English fluency (92.29%, 317,864 stops).

2. Mode of Transportation

Officers stopped individuals they perceived as fluent in English and individuals they perceived as having limited/no English fluency at similar rates for vehicular (86.58%, 4,452,925 English fluent stops and 87.84%, 302,549 limited/no English fluency stops), pedestrian (12.27%, 631,156 English fluent stops and 10.99%, 37,868 limited/no English fluency stops), and bicycle stops (1.14%, 58,776 English fluent stops and 1.16%, 4,001 limited/no English fluency stops).

3. Reason for Stop

For individuals regardless of perceived English fluency, traffic violation was the most common reason for stop (86.29%, 4,437,697 stops for English fluent and 87.13%, 300,106 stops for limited/no English fluency), followed by reasonable suspicion (9.33%, 479,748 stops for English fluent and 9.26%, 31,895 stops for limited/no English fluency), and then other reasons (4.38%, 225,410 stops for English fluent and 3.61%, 12,417 stops for limited/no English fluency). There were negligible differences between these two groups' reason for stop rates. With respect to traffic violation stops, officers also reported similar patterns for both groups in equipment violations, moving violations, and non-moving violations.

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action at a relatively similar rate during stops of both individuals perceived to be fluent in English (78.70%, 4,047,639 stops) compared to those perceived to have limited/no English fluency (75.80%, 261,068 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers reported relatively similar rates of any type of force in stops of individuals perceived to have limited/no English fluency (11.29%, 38,871 stops) compared to stops of individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (9.50%, 488,562 stops). Officers reported using less-lethal and limited force at similar rates in stops of individuals they perceived to have limited/no English fluency (0.39%, 1,356 stops involved less-lethal force, 10.89%, 37,508 stops involved limited force) and individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (0.32%, 16,449 stops involved less-lethal force and 9.18%, 472,009 stops involved limited force). Officers reported low rates of lethal force use for both groups (<0.01%) but used lethal force in 104 stops of individuals perceived to be fluent in English and in seven stops of individuals perceived to have limited/no English fluency.

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers reported similar rates of searches and *Terry* frisks, handcuffing, detainments curbside or in a patrol car, and asks about parole status in stops of individuals perceived to have limited/no English fluency (12.80%, 44,071 stops involving searches/frisks; 10.95%, 37,709 stops involving handcuffing; 10.39%, 35,798 stops involving detainments; and 4.05%, 13,940 stops involving asking about parole status) compared to stops of individuals perceived to be fluent in English (11.12%, 571,975 stops involving searches/frisks; 9.21%, 473,882 stops involving handcuffing; 10.63%, 546,827 stops involving detainments; and 3.73%, 191,594 stops involving asking about parole status).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers reported taking more actions during stops of individuals perceived to have limited/no English fluency (0.69 actions, SD = 1.56, range= 0-15 actions) in 2025, compared to stops of individuals perceived to be fluent in English (0.57, SD = 1.40, range= 0-19).

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched⁴³ individuals they perceived to have limited/no English fluency at a relatively similar rate (8.79%, 30,271 stops) as individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (7.35%, 377,791 stops). However, officers reported higher discovery rates in searches of individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (26.71%, 100,908 stops) compared to individuals they perceived to have limited/no English fluency (22.50%, 6,812 stops).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers reported relatively similar *Terry* frisk and discovery rates for individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (1.84%, 94,634 *Terry* frisks and 11.69%, 11,062 frisks with evidence/contraband discovered) and individuals they perceived to have limited/no English fluency (2.03%, 6,979 *Terry* frisks and 12.09%, 844 frisks with evidence/contraband discovered).

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers reported similar rates in asking for consent to search (3.28% average between both groups, 180,106 stops total) and search rates among those who consented (81.64% average between both groups, 124,379 stops total) for both individuals they perceived to be fluent in English and individuals they perceived as having limited/no English fluency. However, officers searched individuals they perceived as having limited/no English fluency (66.84%, 1,127 stops) without receiving consent to search more frequently compared to individuals they perceived to be fluent in English (60.71%, 15,824 stops).

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches based only on consent at relatively similar rates for both individuals they perceived as fluent in English (13.31% of searches, 63,532 stops) and individuals they perceived as having limited/no English fluency (14.81% of searches, 5,495 stops). Officers reported relatively similar discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived as having limited/no English fluency (19.53%, 1,073 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as being fluent in English (18.24%, 11,590 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action as a result of stops at a relatively similar rate for individuals perceived to be fluent in English (5.08%, 261,469) compared to those perceived to have limited/no English fluency (3.77%, 12,979). For both groups, citation was the most common result of stop (48.49%, 2,493,632 stops for English fluent and 46.71%, 160,885 stops for

⁴³ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

limited/no English fluency), followed by warning (35.32%, 1,816,673 stops for English fluent and 36.86%, 126,969 stops for limited/no English fluency), and then arrest (10.96%, 563,856 stops for English fluent and 13.28%, 45,747 stops for limited/no English fluency).

F. Sexual Orientation

Of all stops in 2025, 46,094 (0.84%) involved persons perceived by the reporting officer as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and all other sexual orientations other than heterosexual (LGB+).

1. Calls for Service

Officer-initiated stops were far more common than calls for service across perceived sexual orientation groups. However, there was a substantial disparity in rates between those perceived to be LGB+ and those perceived to be straight/heterosexual. Officers reported 19.74 percent (9,099 stops) of stops involving individuals perceived to be LGB+ were initiated due to a call for service, compared to 7.15 percent (388,923 stops) of stops of individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual. Individuals perceived to be LGB+ (80.26%, 36,995 stops) had a lower rate of officer-initiated stops compared to straight/heterosexual individuals (92.85%, 5,052,258 stops).

2. Mode of Transportation

Officers stopped individuals perceived as straight/heterosexual more frequently for vehicular stops (86.80%, 4,722,806 stops) and at about the same rate for bicycle stops (1.14%, 62,292 stops) compared to individuals perceived as LGB+ (70.87%, 32,668 vehicular stops and 1.05%, 485 bicycle stops). Officers stopped individuals perceived as LGB+ more frequently for pedestrian stops (28.08%, 12,941 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (12.06%, 656,083 stops).

3. Reason for Stop

For both individuals perceived to be LGB+ and those perceived to be straight/heterosexual, traffic violation was the most common reason for stop, followed by reasonable suspicion, and then other reasons. However, officers reported stopping individuals they perceived to be LGB+ for reasonable suspicion (19.99%, 9,214 stops) over twice as frequently as they stopped individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (9.23%, 502,429 stops). Additionally, officers reported stopping individuals they perceived to be LGB+ for other reasons (11.17%, 5,150 stops) more than twice as frequently as they stopped individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (4.28%, 232,677 stops).⁴⁴

Officers stopped individuals they perceived to be LGB+ for equipment violations (26.61%, 8,442 stops) more frequently than individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (21.24%, 999,553 stops). However, officers reported stopping individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual more frequently for moving (62.36%, 2,934,513 stops) and non-moving violations (16.40%, 772,007 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as LGB+ (59.25%, 18,801 stops for moving violations and 14.14%, 4,487 stops for non-moving violations).

⁴⁴ See the first subheading for Reason for Stop for a list of “other” reasons.

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action more frequently during stops of individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (78.66%, 4,280,190 stops), compared to stops of individuals perceived to be LGB+ (61.87%, 28,517 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers used force-related actions almost twice as frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be LGB+ (19.11%, 8,809 stops) compared to stops of individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (9.53%, 518,624 stops). Officers used lethal (0.01%, 3 stops), less-lethal (0.56%, 257 stops), and limited force (18.55%, 8,549 stops) more frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be LGB+ compared to stops of individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (<0.01%, 108 stops involved lethal force, 0.32%, 17,548 stops involved less-lethal force, 9.21%, 500,968 stops involved limited force).

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers reported higher rates of searches and *Terry* frisks (19.28%, 8,887 stops), handcuffing (18.53%, 8,541 stops), detainment curbside or in a patrol car (20.50%, 9,447 stops), and parole status inquiries (5.34%, 2,462 stops) in stops of individuals perceived to be LGB+ compared to stops of individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (11.16%, 607,159 stops involved searches/frisks, 9.25%, 503,050 stops involved handcuffing, 10.53%, 573,178 stops involved detainment, and 3.73%, 203,072 stops involved parole status inquiries).

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers took more actions during stops of individuals perceived to be LGB+ (1.03 actions, SD = 1.74, range= 0-14 actions) compared to stops of individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (0.58, SD = 1.41, range= 0-19).

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers searched⁴⁵ individuals perceived to be LGB+ more frequently (13.87%, 6,392 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as straight/heterosexual (7.38%, 401,670 stops). However, officers reported similar discovery rates for both groups (26.13%, 1,670 searches of LGB+ individuals and 26.40%, 106,050 searches of straight/heterosexual individuals).

b. *Terry* Frisk and Discovery

Officers reported relatively similar rates of *Terry* frisks and discovery for individuals perceived to be LGB+ (2.36%, 1,086 *Terry* frisks and 11.23%, 122 frisks with evidence/contraband discovery) and straight/heterosexual (1.85%, 100,527 *Terry* frisks and 11.72%, 11,784 frisks with evidence/contraband discovery).

⁴⁵ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers asked for consent to search individuals they perceived to be LGB+ at a relatively similar rate (5.84%, 2,690 stops) compared to individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (3.26%, 177,416 stops). Among those who consented to search, officers searched individuals they perceived to be LGB+ (82.48%, 1,827 stops) and straight/heterosexual (81.62%, 122,552 stops) at relatively similar rates. However, among those who did not consent to search, officers searched individuals they perceived to be LGB+ more frequently (69.26%, 329 stops) compared to individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (60.94%, 16,622 stops).

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches where consent was the only basis for search at relatively similar rates for both individuals they perceived as straight/heterosexual (13.44% of searches, 68,109 stops) and LGB+ (11.77% of searches, 918 stops). Officers reported higher discovery rates in consent searches of individuals they perceived to be LGB+ (23.64%, 217 stops) compared to individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (18.27%, 12,446 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action as a result of stops at almost twice the rate for individuals perceived to be LGB+ (9.58%, 4,417 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be straight/heterosexual (4.96%, 270,031 stops). For stops both groups, officers reported citations as the most common result of stop, followed closely by warnings, and then arrest. Additionally, officers arrested individuals perceived to be LGB+ at almost twice the rate (23.02%, 10,612 stops) as individuals they perceived to be straight/heterosexual (11.01%, 598,991 stops).

G. Housing Status

In 2025, officers reported that they perceived 3.50% (192,003 stops) of the individuals they stopped to be unhoused.

1. Calls for Service

For both individuals perceived to be unhoused and individuals perceived to be housed, officer-initiated stops were far more common than calls for service. Still, individuals perceived to be unhoused had stops initiated by a call for service far more frequently (36.27%, 69,645 stops) than individuals perceived to be housed (6.20%, 328,377 stops).

2. Mode of Transportation

Officers stopped individuals perceived as housed in vehicle stops (89.46%, 4,737,338 stops) more frequently compared to individuals they perceived as unhoused (9.45%, 18,136 stops). Officers stopped individuals perceived as unhoused in pedestrian stops (86.25%, 165,593 stops) and bicycle stops (4.31%, 8,274 stops) much more frequently compared to individuals they perceived as housed (9.51%, 503,431 pedestrian stops and 1.03%, 54,503 bicycle stops).

3. Reason for Stop

Approximately sixty-three percent (62.75%, 120,484 stops) of stops involving unhoused individuals were on the basis of reasonable suspicion — the highest rate of reasonable suspicion-based stops across all demographic groups. Officers reported stopping individuals perceived to be unhoused for reasonable suspicion about seven times more than individuals perceived to be housed (7.39%, 391,159 stops). Officers reported stopping individuals they perceived to be

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

unhoused for other reasons (22.93%, 44,031 stops) five times more than individuals perceived to be housed (3.66%, 193,796 stops). Conversely, officers stopped individuals they perceived to be housed for traffic violations (88.95%, 4,710,316 stops) much more frequently compared to individuals they perceived to be unhoused (14.32%, 27,487 stops).

Officers stopped individuals they perceived as unhoused more frequently for equipment (33.07%, 9,090 stops) and non-moving violations (31.38%, 8,626 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as housed (21.21%, 998,905 stops were equipment violations and 16.30%, 767,868 stops were for non-moving violations). However, officers stopped individuals they perceived as housed more frequently for moving violations (62.49%, 2,943,543 stops) compared to individuals they perceived as unhoused (35.55%, 9,771 stops).

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

Officers reported taking no action during stops more than three times as frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be housed (80.50%, 4,262,683 stops), compared to stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused (23.97%, 46,024 stops).

b. Use of Force

Officers used force-related actions approximately four times as frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused (38.70%, 74,304 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be housed (8.56%, 453,129 stops). Officers used less-lethal (0.89%, 1,704 stops) and limited force (37.81%, 72,593 stops) more frequently in stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused compared to stops of individuals perceived to be housed (0.30%, 16,101 stops involved less-lethal force, and 8.25%, 436,924 stops involved limited force). Officers reported using lethal force in less than 0.01 percent of stops of each group (104 stops of individuals perceived to be housed and 7 stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused).

c. Top Four Actions During Stop

Officers reported higher rates of searches and *Terry* frisks, handcuffing, detainment curbside or in a patrol car, and asks about parole status in stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused (43.54%, 83,604 stops involving searches/frisks; 38.13%, 73,206 stops involving handcuffing; 48.18%, 92,507 stops involving detainment; and 13.02%, 24,991 stops involving asking about parole status) compared to stops of individuals perceived to be housed (10.06%, 532,442 stops involving searches/frisks; 8.28%, 438,385 stops involving handcuffing; 9.26%, 490,118 stops involving detainment; and 3.41%, 180,543 stops involving asking about parole status).

d. Average Number of Actions

Officers took more than four times as many actions during stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused (2.14 actions, SD = 1.98, range= 0-17 actions) compared to stops of individuals perceived to be housed (0.52, SD = 1.35, range= 0-19).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

5. Search and Discovery

a. Search and Discovery

Officers reported searching⁴⁶ individuals they perceived to be unhoused in 32.13 percent (61,684 stops) of stops and 6.54 percent (346,378 stops) of stops of individuals perceived to be housed. Officers reported higher discovery rates in searches of individuals perceived to be unhoused (36.93%, 22,782 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be housed (24.52%, 84,938 stops).

b. Terry Frisk and Discovery

Officers reported a higher rate of *Terry* frisks for individuals perceived to be unhoused (5.07%, 9,725 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be housed (1.74%, 91,888 stops). However, the discovery rate was relatively similar for the two groups (11.67%, 10,722 stops of individuals perceived to be housed and 12.17%, 1,184 stops of individuals perceived to be unhoused).

c. Consent Inquiries

Officers asked for consent to search individuals they perceived to be unhoused (13.55%, 26,018 stops) more than four times more frequently compared to individuals they perceived to be housed (2.91%, 154,088 stops). Officers reported slightly elevated rates of searching individuals they perceived to be unhoused, whether they consented (83.15%, 17,892 stops) or not (64.79%, 2,915 stops), compared to individuals they perceived to be housed (81.39%, 106,487 stops where the individual consented and was searched, 60.37%, 14,036 stops where the individual did not consent and was searched).

d. Consent Searches and Discovery

Officers performed searches where consent was the only basis for search at relatively similar rates for both individuals perceived as housed (13.62% of searches, 60,020 stops) and unhoused (12.19% of searches, 9,007 stops). Officers reported higher discovery rates in consent searches of individuals perceived to be unhoused (25.68%, 2,313 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be housed (17.24%, 10,350 stops).

6. Results of Stop

Officers reported taking no action in stops almost twice as frequently for individuals perceived to be unhoused (9.51%, 18,253 stops) compared to individuals perceived to be housed (4.84%, 256,195 stops). Additionally, compared to every demographic group presented in this chapter, officers reported the highest arrest rates for individuals they perceived to be unhoused. Officers arrested almost half of all stopped individuals they perceived to be unhoused (48.53%, 93,171 stops). Alternatively, officers gave citations to almost the same proportion of individuals they perceived as housed (49.83%, 2,638,720 stops).

IV. ADDITIONAL STOP DATA ANALYSES

This year, the Board includes several additional analyses of the 2025 stop data, including an analysis of the limited RIPA data available regarding stops that may be related to immigration enforcement, an expanded transportation analysis examining stops occurring in the public

⁴⁶ Search rates only include stops involving searches of a person or property, but not *Terry* frisks. *Terry* frisk rates only include stops involving *Terry* frisks, not searches of person or property.

transportation context, and revisiting how transportation mode intersects with the way a stop begins.

A. Immigration Enforcement Related Stops

1. Background and Context

During the period covered by this report (January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025), the frequency and character of immigration enforcement activity in California substantially increased.⁴⁷ In its July 11, 2025 meeting,⁴⁸ the Board expressed concerns about the relationship between state and local law enforcement agencies, federal immigration enforcement, and racial profiling. To address these concerns, the Board held a meeting on October 9, 2025 on the subject of racial and identity profiling in immigration enforcement.⁴⁹ In this year's Report, the Board continues to examine this issue by assessing what the RIPA stop data shows about reported stops with an immigration-enforcement nexus.

It is important to note at the outset that RIPA data is only collected from peace officers employed by state and local law enforcement agencies, and not federal agents.⁵⁰ Additionally, the California Values Act, Senate Bill 54 (SB 54), codified at Government Code section 7284 et seq., effective January 2018, generally restricts California law enforcement agencies from using personnel, facilities, or other state and local resources to participate in immigration enforcement, with some enumerated exceptions.⁵¹ However, state and local law enforcement are still permitted

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Fry, *Immigration arrests quietly increase by 1,500% in San Diego*, CalMatters (Jan. 29, 2026) <<https://calmatters.org/justice/2026/01/san-diego-immigration-arrest-surge/>> [as of XX, 2026] (reporting more than 4,500 ICE administrative arrests in San Diego between May and October 2025, compared to fewer than 300 in the same period the prior year, based on ICE records obtained by the Deportation Data Project); Ordonio, *48% of people ICE arrested in Northern California have no criminal record*, Mission Local (Dec. 4, 2025) <<https://missionlocal.org/2025/12/sf-ice-arrests-criminal-history/>> [as of XX, 2026] (reporting that ICE arrests in Northern California more than tripled between January 20 and October 15, 2025, compared to the same period the prior year, and that deportations from California rose 78 percent over the same period). The underlying data is published by the Deportation Data Project, a research initiative based at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law (<<https://deportationdata.org/>>), which compiles ICE records released in response to Freedom of Information Act requests.

⁴⁸ More information about this meeting can be found on the Board's website at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/meetings> [as of XX, 2026].

⁴⁹ More information about the Board's October 9, 2025 meeting, including the minutes from that meeting, the materials presented, and a recording of the meeting can be found on the Board's website. (See Cal. Dep't. of Justice, Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board Meetings <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/meetings> [as of XX, 2026].)

⁵⁰ Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (b) [requiring reporting by each state and local agency that employs peace officers].

⁵¹ See California Values Act, Stats. 2017, ch. 495, § 3, codified at Gov. Code, § 7284 et seq.; see also Gov. Code, § 7284.6 [specifying limitations on use of state and local resources for immigration enforcement]. As noted in the Government Code, state and local law enforcement agencies are permitted to investigate, enforce, or detain individuals upon reasonable suspicion of, or arresting for a violation of, Section 1326(a) of Title 8 of the United States Code (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(1)); respond to a request from immigration authorities for information about a specific person's criminal history (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(2)); conduct enforcement or investigative duties associated with a joint law enforcement task force (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(3)); make inquiries into information necessary to certify an individual who has been identified as a potential crime or trafficking victim (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(4)); or give immigration authorities access to interview an individual in agency or department custody subject to providing inmates with the required notification under the TRUTH Act before the interview (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (b)(5)). In *United States v. California*, 921 F.3d 865, 876 (9th Cir. 2018), the Ninth Circuit described examples of the exceptions to SB 54 as follows, while upholding the law:

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

to engage with federal authorities — for example, through participation in joint task forces — which may raise concerns related to racial and identity profiling.⁵²

In passing RIPA, the Legislature found that profiling “alienates people from law enforcement” and erodes “trust among the people” police serve.⁵³ Some research examining federal-local cooperation in immigration enforcement has found a similar impact; one study found that interior immigration-enforcement cooperation undermines trust in police among undocumented immigrants and makes crime reporting less likely.⁵⁴ Another study found no evidence of an increase in FBI-index crime rates for jurisdictions that limit entanglement with immigration enforcement.⁵⁵ Accordingly, the Board seeks to identify any changes in the 2025 RIPA data that may have resulted from increased immigration enforcement actions. It does so by looking at the three data elements that can potentially document involvement with immigration enforcement actions: DHS referrals as a result of stops; stops conducted with the assistance of a non-reporting agency; and narrative fields explaining the reason for stops.

1. Limitations of RIPA Data on Immigration-Enforcement Related Stops

It is important to note that there is limited RIPA data relating to immigration-enforcement related interactions. First and foremost, RIPA applies only to stops by California state and local law enforcement officers. Law enforcement agencies outside of California, or federal agents, including those employed by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), or other Department of Homeland Security (DHS) components, are not required to submit RIPA data. Additionally, RIPA stop data collection is limited to the enumerated data elements detailed in the RIPA statute.⁵⁶

Only one RIPA data element directly relates to immigration enforcement: specifically, whether the officer referred the person stopped to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as the result of the stop.⁵⁷ Another data element may indirectly relate to immigration enforcement: law enforcement officers are required to report whether the stop was conducted with the assistance of a non-reporting agency, which can include joint task force operations with federal agencies.⁵⁸ Additionally, officers may also include immigration-enforcement related information in the narrative description field.⁵⁹ Each of these sources is underinclusive. For example, during a stop,

For example, although agencies generally cannot “[t]ransfer an individual to immigration authorities,” such an undertaking is permissible if “authorized by a judicial warrant or judicial probable cause determination,” or if the individual has been convicted of certain enumerated crimes. [Gov. Code.] §§ 7282.5[, subd.](a), 7284.6[, subd.](a)(4). Similarly, the restrictions on sharing personal information are also relaxed if the individual has been convicted of an enumerated crime, or if the information is available to the public. *Id.* §§ [Gov. Code.] 7282.5[, subd.](a), 7284.6[, subd.](a)(1)(C)-(D).

⁵² More information about joint task forces and its intersection with AB 953’s prohibition on racial and identity profiling can be found in the Policies chapter of this report.

⁵³ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (d)(3).

⁵⁴ Wong et al., *How Interior Immigration Enforcement Affects Trust in Law Enforcement* (2021) 19 Perspectives on Politics 357, 357–360.

⁵⁵ Hausman, *Sanctuary Policies Reduce Deportations Without Increasing Crime* (2020) 117 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 27262, 27262–27264.

⁵⁶ Gov. Code, § 12525.5.

⁵⁷ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(18)(L).

⁵⁸ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.227, subd. (a)(4).

⁵⁹ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14)(B).

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

if an officer took other actions that relate to immigration enforcement, for instance, request citizenship or immigration documents or informally coordinating with federal agents, because these types of actions are not reflected in any structure field within the RIPA data collection, the RIPA data would not include this information. Although there are narrative fields that an officer can use to enter information regarding a stop, these narrative fields are not specific to immigration enforcement, and a narrative reference to DHS, ICE, CBP, or TSA may describe only the context of a stop rather than cooperation with immigration authorities or participation in immigration enforcement activities.

This section presents the limited RIPA data available rather than a comprehensive accounting of the relationship between RIPA stops and immigration enforcement. This information is provided only to understand the limited information collected by RIPA, and conclusions about immigration enforcement activity or state and local officer interactions relating to immigration enforcement within the state should not be drawn because of the limited information available.

2. DHS Referrals as a Result of Stop

[Analysis of 2025 stops reporting referrals to DHS forthcoming]

3. Stops Conducted with the Assistance of a Non-Reporting Agency

[Analysis of 2025 stops conducted with assistance from a non-reporting agency forthcoming]

4. Review of Narrative Fields

[Limited analysis of 2025 narrative fields related to immigration enforcement tentatively forthcoming]

B. Expanded Transportation Analysis

In prior reports, the Board has examined the relationship between transportation mode (vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian stops) and perceived race or ethnicity and other demographic characteristics, using the “Type of Stop” data element added in 2024.⁶⁰ This year, the Board expands that analysis in two ways: First, the Board examines, to the extent possible from RIPA data, stops occurring on public transportation, including the most common transit-related stop reasons and how they differ across demographic groups. Second, the Board updates the Mode of Travel Analysis presented in the 2026 Report with 2025 data, examining type of stop, search and *Terry* frisk rates, discovery rates across vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian stops and between officer-initiated and call-for-service stops.

Policing in public transit may differ substantially from policing on roadways or in other public spaces. The transit environment is a defined space, fare-payment rules are unique to transit, and the rider population is not demographically representative of California’s general population.⁶¹ Riders may be stopped for conduct that has no close analogue in ordinary street policing,

⁶⁰ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(2); see also Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.A [Mode of Travel Analysis], at pp. 59–63.

⁶¹ See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.A [Mode of Travel Analysis], at p. 60 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2026.pdf>> [as of XX, 2026], citing information from see the American Community Survey <<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs.html>> [as of XX, 2026].

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

including proof-of-payment inspections, fare-evasion allegations, station or platform rules, and other code-of-conduct enforcement.⁶²

Recent reports and studies on transit policing in California illustrate why public transportation may warrant a more careful analysis. In particular, fare-enforcement has been identified as a possible source of disproportionate policing or profiling. A 2022 study examining train fare enforcement in Los Angeles found that order-maintenance policing⁶³ was most intense at stations in gentrifying neighborhoods and that, at the average station, fare-evasion citations were more often issued to Black and Latinx riders.⁶⁴ The authors further found that Black and Latinx riders were more likely than White riders to receive fare-evasion citations even after accounting for relevant local social-structural characteristics.⁶⁵

Some advocates have been critical of the efficacy and impacts of fare-enforcement. The Center for Policing Equity’s (“CPE”) 2025 report on BART fare enforcement, *BART Fare Enforcement: Balancing Goals, Community Concerns, and Human Costs*, found that, among other things, fare-enforcement stops were less likely than other BART Police Department stops to produce searches or contraband. In an analysis of 2022 RIPA data, CPE found discretionary searches occurred in 6.8 percent of fare-evasion stops, compared with 17.6 percent of non-fare-evasion stops, and contraband was found in 2.1 percent of fare-evasion stops, compared with 7.7 percent of other stops. The report further concluded that fare enforcement did not appear connected to a measurable reduction in violent crime or disorder complaints, and that the current approach to fare enforcement imposes disproportionate burdens on Black and low-income riders.⁶⁶

Fare enforcement is used by some transit agencies as a component of a public safety model. Los Angeles County Metro has published a series of monthly public safety reports describing a public safety model that combines law enforcement, transit security, private security, homeless-outreach teams, ambassadors, and station-based interventions. These reports illustrate how fare

⁶² See Pub. Util. Code, § 99580 et seq. (authorizing local transportation agencies to enact ordinances governing conduct on transit property, including penalties for specified prohibited conduct); see also, e.g., Bay Area Rapid Transit District, *Customer Code of Conduct* (adopted 2013, amended 2021 & 2022) <<https://www.bart.gov/about/bod/policies>> [as of XX, 2026] (setting out passenger conduct rules, including with respect to fare payment, paid-area access, smoking, eating and drinking, and other prohibited conduct); Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, *Customer Code of Conduct*, ch. 6-05 of Metro’s Administrative Code (amended June 1, 2023) <https://media.metro.net/about_us/ethics/images/codeofconduct_customer.pdf> [as of XX, 2026] (setting out analogous code-of-conduct rules for the Los Angeles Metro system).

⁶³ “Order maintenance policing” is understood to be to be discretionary, officer-initiated low level, “quality of life” conduct undertaken to secure the “absent of disorder” in shared public places, such as enforcement relating to loitering, public disturbance, and, particularly relevant here, fare evasion. See, e.g., Livingston, *Police Discretion and the Quality of Life in Public Places: Courts, Communities, and the New Policing*, 97 Colum. L. Rev. 551, 558 & n.20 (1997).

⁶⁴ Johnson & Patterson, *The Policing of Subway Fare Evasion in Postindustrial Los Angeles* (2022) 24 *Punishment & Society* 457, 458–459, 468–472. The authors examined citations issued from December 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 at various LA Metro subway stations, and considered it with local demographic information and crime rates retrieved from the American Community Survey and the FBI, respectively. *Id.* at 462-466. The authors estimated the population of station users with the American Community Survey’s estimate of demographics of transit commuters local to the station. *Id.* at 466.

⁶⁵ Johnson & Patterson, *The Policing of Subway Fare Evasion in Postindustrial Los Angeles* (2022) 24 *Punishment & Society* 457, 468-472.

⁶⁶ Center for Policing Equity, *BART Fare Enforcement: Balancing Goals, Community Concerns, and Human Costs* (2025) at pp. 24-31, 38-40, 48-50 <<https://policingequity.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/CPE-BART-Report.pdf>> [as of XX, 2026].

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

enforcement and code-of-conduct enforcement can overlap with other safety initiatives. For example, Los Angeles County Metro’s October 2024 report described public-safety surge activities that included foot patrols, turnstile engagement, TAP-card checks, and increased citations and arrests for trespassing, narcotics, and weapons; it also described TAP-to-Exit and general fare enforcement as recurring sources of rider comments, both positive and negative.⁶⁷

Public transit stops may be a source of racially disproportionate policing with a relationship to policing tactics and public safety policies. This may warrant a more intentional analysis into these tactics, policies, and outcomes.

1. Identifying Public Transportation Stops in RIPA Data

RIPA data does not include a dedicated data element identifying whether a stop occurred on or within a public transportation system. As described in the 2026 Report, riders on buses, trains, and other forms of public transit who are not on a bicycle or in a vehicle are reported as “pedestrian stops” for purposes of the “Type of Stop” data element.⁶⁸ However, certain code violations are specific to, or strongly associated with, the public transportation context. For example, stops based on charges related to fare evasion under Penal Code section 640 may be reasonably interpreted as involving public transportation.⁶⁹ This section presents data on stops identifiable as occurring on public transportation based on charges specific to the public transportation context. [Additional discussion on research methods forthcoming.]

2. Stops Identifiable as Public Transportation Stops

3. Difference Between Groups Within Transit-Related Stops

[Content in development]

C. Mode of Travel Analysis and Officer-Initiated vs. Call for Service by Mode of Travel

This subsection updates the Mode of Travel Analysis presented in the 2026 Report and expands that analysis with a new comparison of officer-initiated and call-for-service stops separated by mode of travel. This expanded analysis helps the Board to better understand the differences between officer-initiated and calls for service stops across modes of travel.

By their nature, police exercise less discretion in responding to a call for service. Calls for service stops happen when an officer makes a stop during the course of responding to a call for service, radio call, or dispatch.⁷⁰ Last year, the Board observed that while officer-initiated stops generally had a much lower rate of arrest than calls for service, when we excluded traffic data, we found that officer-initiated stops had characteristics more similar to calls for service.⁷¹ This

⁶⁷ LA County Metro, Board Report 2024-0827 – Monthly Update on Public Safety (Oct. 24, 2024) at pp. 3, 12, 16, 19 <<https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2024-0827/>> [as of XX, 2026].

⁶⁸ See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(2); Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.A.

⁶⁹ See Pen. Code, § 640 (prohibiting specified conduct on or in a public transportation system, including fare evasion).

⁷⁰ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(12).

⁷¹ See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.C (Stop Results Between Calls For Service and Officer-Initiated Stops), at p. 69 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2026.pdf>> [as of XX, 2026].

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.

analysis comparing these two stop categories could provide insights into differences in officer behavior across transportation types.

Among bicycle stops, officers stopped individuals they perceived as Black (6.84%, 423 stops) and Multiracial (5.62%, 38 stops) were stopped most frequently due to a call for service. Officers stopped individuals they perceived as Pacific Islander (1.72%, 4 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (1.77%, 22 stops) least frequently due to a call for service. Officers initiated stops most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Pacific Islander (98.28%, 229 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (98.23%, 1,224 stops), and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Black (93.16%, 5,762 stops) and Multiracial (94.38%, 638 stops).

Among pedestrian stops, officers stopped individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (55.26%, 6,118 stops) and Asian (53.16%, 9,202 stops) the most frequently due to a call for service. Officers stopped individuals they perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x) (44.68%, 120,243 stops) and White (45.52%, 104,994 stops) the least frequently due to a call for service. Officers initiated stops most frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x) (55.32%, 148,874 stops) and White (54.48%, 125,637 stops) and the least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (44.74%, 4,953 stops) and Asian (46.84%, 8,107 stops).

Among vehicular stops, officers stopped individuals they perceived as Black (2.12%, 11,235 stops), Hispanic/Latine(x) (2.12%, 44,001 stops), and Native American (2.12%, 240 stops) the most frequently due to a call for service. Officers stopped individuals they perceived as Asian (0.84%, 2,584 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (0.85%, 2,537 stops) the least frequently due to a call for service. Officers most frequently initiated stops of individuals they perceived as Asian (99.16%, 304,527 stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (99.15%, 296,279 stops) and least frequently in stops of individuals they perceived Black (97.88%, 518,513 stops), Hispanic/Latine(x) (97.88%, 2,027,516 stops), and Native American (97.88%, 11,084 stops).

[Content in development]

1. Officer Initiated vs. Calls for Services by Mode of Travel

[Content in development]

V. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

[Area for Board discussion—What recommendations, if any, would the Board like to make to law enforcement agencies, the Legislature, etc.?.]

VI. VISION FOR FUTURE REPORTS

[Area for Board discussion—What topics would the Board like to focus on in future reports?]

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW

This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board's consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board, or the California Department of Justice.