AB 953 Survey: Executive Summary

During 2020, the Department of Justice (Department) conducted a survey of Wave 1, 2, and 3 agencies to learn about the impact of the Board's recommendations and data analysis within law enforcement agencies, and to identify the actions agencies are taking to advance the goals of RIPA. Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies were included in the full survey, and Wave 3 agencies were included in the portions that did not pertain to data analysis, as they had yet to begin collecting data at the time of the survey.

Fourteen of the 15 Wave 1 and 2 agencies completed the survey. Reponses indicate:

- The majority of Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies (8) have either adopted the Board's recommendations to some degree *and* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4), *or* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4). Most recommendations that agencies are adopting are associated with updating policies to reflect best practices in general (4), or data collection, analysis and/or reporting procedures (5).
- Twelve of the responding agencies have incorporated the Board's recommendations into their training. The majority of agencies (7) indicated that their training already incorporated the Board's recommendations. Three agencies used the recommendations as a source for updating or creating their training materials.
- Agencies are *reviewing* (5), providing *access* to (5) and *sharing* (5) stop data with their staff or other external groups (e.g., the public). Out of those who are providing *access*, the majority of LEAs indicated that management-level officers have access to stop data information (4). Agencies who indicated they shared stop data, most shared this information with department staff during meetings, briefings, through e-mail, or other forms of communication (4).
- Six agencies use stop data to hold staff accountable for the submission of stop data. Most agencies mentioned that departmental policy (3) or management-level officer review (3) where the mechanisms for ensuring compliance.
- All 14 agencies stated that they have a bias-free policing policy with 10 agencies adopting some portion of the model bias-free policing language provided in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report.
- Ten agencies stated having a civilian review board; however, only 50 percent indicated that the civilian review board discussed the report's findings or recommendations.
- Ten out of the 14 agencies analyzed stop data. The majority of these agencies (6) indicated that they analyzed all categories collected in their stop data. Furthermore, for those using benchmark comparisons, most use population estimates (4). Agencies are sharing their analysis findings internally with department staff (8) and to external groups, such as the public (6).
- Several agencies indicated the need for *additional funding or resources* to assist with conducting stop data analyses (7). Agencies also indicated that the *integration of data*

collection systems (5) and the *absence of other contextual variables* were barriers to conducting analyses (5).

All 11 Wave 3 agencies completed the survey. Responses indicate:

- The majority of Wave 3 agencies (7) have either adopted the Board's recommendations to some degree *and* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4), *or* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (3).
- Most agencies have not incorporated the Board's recommendations in their training (8); however, 2 of the 8 agencies indicated that their training already incorporated the best practices discussed in the Board's report.

Introduction

The DOJ Research Center conducted an analysis of survey responses collected from law enforcement agencies who are currently collecting stop data under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA). The purpose of the survey was to better understand the actions taken by these law enforcement agencies to advance the goals of RIPA.

Method

The survey was distributed to all 15 Wave 1 and Wave 2 and 11 Wave 3 RIPA stop data collection agencies. The Wave 1 and 2 survey consisted of twenty-six questions and Wave 3 survey consisted of 13 questions pertaining to LEA's experiences, actions, and policy changes that may have arisen as a result of the RIPA Board's 2020 report. Appendix A and B provide the list of questions asked in each survey.

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for each question requiring a 'Yes' or 'No' response. Qualitative content analyses were conducted to identify and summarize themes and patterns manifested in the responses to open-ended questions. For all such questions, this process included categorizing each LEA's response using phrases, sentences, and in some cases, paragraphs as units for analysis. Researchers did not code any ambiguous portions of text from which coding could only be completed by engaging in interpretive judgements or speculation. Theme and sub-theme information for each agency is provided in Appendix C.

Results

Fourteen out of 15 Wave 1 and Wave 2 law enforcement agencies participated in the survey.[1] All 11 Wave 3 law enforcement agencies participated in the survey.

Below we provide a summary of all Yes/No questions asked in the LEA survey (Table 1). The majority of agencies have incorporated the Board's recommendations in their training (86%). However, most agencies have not used the analyses provided in the Board's report to identify trends and patterns in their own stop data (64%) or change their policies/ practices as a result of the Board's findings (71%). Most agencies review stop data with staff (79%); however, a little under half are using stop data to hold their staff accountable (43%). Most agencies have a civilian review or community advisory board (71%) with 50 percent of these discussing the Board's recommendations. All of the agencies indicated that they have a bias-free policing policy and the majority indicated that they have adopted some or all of the model bias-free policing policy discussed in the Board's report (71%). Lastly, 71 percent of agencies indicated that they analyze stop data.

---

[1] The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department did not participate in the survey.

Regarding Wave 3 agencies, the majority have not incorporated recommendations in their training (73%) nor have changed their policies or practices as a result of the Board's analysis or findings (82%). The majority of agencies do not have a civilian review or community advisory board (73%) and, for those that did, none indicated that the civilian review or advisory board discussed the Board's recommendations. All of the agencies who responded indicated that they had a bias-free policing policy with the majority indicating that they have not adopted the Board's recommendations regarding a model bias-free policing policy (80%).

Table 1. Breakdown for Yes/No Survey Questions

	Wave 1 & 2 (N = 14)		Wave 3 (N = 11)	
Survey Question	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*	*No*
Incorporated Recommendations in Training	12 (86%)	2 (14%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)
Changed Policies/Practices as a Result of Board's Analysis or Findings	4 (29%)	10 (71%)	2 (18%)	9 (82%)
Agency has Civilian Review or Community Advisory Board	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)
Civilian Review or Community Advisory Board Discussed Recommendations[2]	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Agency has Bias-Free Policing Policy[3]	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Adopted Model Bias-Free Policing Policy Discussed in Report[4]	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)
Actions Taken in Response to Recommendations Regarding Civilian Complaint Procedures[5]	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)
Used Analyses in Report to Identify Trends and Patterns	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	-	-
Reviews Stop Data with Staff	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	-	-
Uses Stop Data to Hold Staff Accountable	6 (43%)	8 (57%)	-	-
Agency Analyzes Stop Data	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	-	-

---

[2] Calculation excludes LEA's who indicated that they did not have a civilian review or community advisory board

[3] Los Angeles World Police did not provide a response to this question

[4] Los Angeles World Police did not provide a response to this question

[5] Los Angeles World Police did not provide a response to this question

Using the Contents of the RIPA Report

The following questions asked if and how law enforcement agencies are incorporating the Board's recommendations and findings into their practices and policies. All three LEA waves submitted responses to these questions. Ten LEAs indicated that they have not changed their practices or policies as a result of the Board's findings; however, the majority of Wave 1 and 2 LEAs have either adopted the Board's recommendations to some degree *and* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4), *or* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4). Most recommendations that agencies are adopting are associated with updating policies to reflect best practices in general (4), or data collection and analysis reporting procedures (5). Furthermore, two agencies have updated their civilian complaint procedures to reflect best practices. Almost all of the responding agencies (12) indicated that they have incorporated at least some of the Board's recommendations in their training. The majority of agencies (7) indicated that some or all of their training already incorporated the Board's recommendations to some degree. Three agencies used the recommendations as a source for updating or creating their training materials.

The majority of Wave 3 agencies (7) have either adopted the Board's recommendations to some degree *and* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (4), *or* are still revising their policies to reflect best practices (3). Most agencies have not incorporated the Board's recommendations in their training (8); however, 2 of the 8 responding agencies indicated that their training already incorporated the best practices discussed in the Board's report.

"What are the main actions your agency has taken to adopt the recommendations in the RIPA Board's annual reports?"

Wave 1 and 2 Agency Results

Due to the similarities in responses, the questions "please describe how your agency has changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analyses or findings" and "please describe the actions your agency has taken in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board Report" were combined with the responses to this question.

All 14 LEAs provided comments on the aforementioned questions. Three major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

Adoption. The first theme identified was *adoption*. These comments indicated that the LEA had adopted the recommendations in the RIPA report in some way. Eight of the 14 responding agencies provided responses for this theme.

- **Adoption 1.1.1** Updated policies to incorporate recommendations (4 agencies).

- **Adoption 1.1.2** Data collection/analysis reporting recommendations (published RIPA reports, RIPA statistical dashboard, partnership with academic institutions, internal data queries) (5 agencies).
- **Adoption 1.1.3** Community Engagement/Trust building (includes hiring procedure changes) (2 agencies).
- **Adoption 1.1.4** Updated civilian complaint procedures to reflect best practices (2 agencies).

> *"Complaints can now be submitted on-line and the complaint process is attached to the form."*
> *- San Bernardino County SD*

> *"The department updated its non-bias policing policy...and tried to include the best practice recommendations from RIPA Report" - San Diego PD*

Under Review. The second theme identified was *under review*. These statements indicated that they were currently revising or reviewing their policies to reflect best practices. Eight of the 14 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Under Review 1.2.1** Currently reviewing and revising procedures/content of civilian complaint process to reflect best practices (e.g. content: classification types, forms) (5 agencies).
- **Under Review 1.2.2** Currently reviewing and revising policies to reflect best practices (3 agencies).

> *"The CHP is currently revising departmental policy to include language and guidance developed by the RIPA Board"*
> *- CHP*

> *"We have reviewed and discussed the recommendations internally and are looking for ways to address them"*
> *- Riverside County SD*

Recommendations pre-existing. The third theme identified was *recommendations pre-existing*. These statements indicated that the recommendations were already established in their policies and procedures. Five of the 14 responding agencies provided responses in line with the theme of recommendations pre-existing.

- **Recommendations Pre-Existing 1.3.1** Recommendations already established in policies/procedures (5 agencies).

> *"We believe we have met all the best practices recommendations in one way or another"*
> *- LAPD*

> *"Our agency already has a bias-based policing policy..."*
> *- Sacramento PD*

Wave 3 Agency Results

Due to either a low response rate or similarity in responses, the questions "what are the main actions you agency has taken to adopt the recommendations in the RIPA Board's annual reports," "please describe how your agency has changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analyses or findings," and "please describe the actions your agency has taken in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board report" were combined. Responses from the comments portion of the survey were also integrated into the analysis for the aforementioned questions when applicable.

All 11 LEAs provided comments on the aforementioned questions. Three major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

Adoption. Eight of the 11 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Adoption 1.1.1** Updated or created policies to incorporate recommendations and best practices (2 agencies).
- **Adoption 1.1.2** Stop data collection requirements and training (5 agencies).

Riverside PD also fell under the adoption theme and indicated that they created a Chief Advisory Board that collaborates with community stakeholders to ensure proper policing strategies, but they did not fall under a sub-theme for adoption.

Under Review. Nine of the 11 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Under Review 1.2.2** Currently reviewing and revising policies to reflect best practices (4 agencies).
- **Under Review 1.2.3** Currently implementing or training staff on stop data collection procedures (6 agencies).

- **Recommendations Pre-Existing.** Three of the 11 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme. These agencies indicated that the Board's recommendations were already incorporated in their civilian complaint procedures.

"Please describe how your agency has incorporated the findings or recommendations included in the RIPA Board's annual reports in its training (e.g., roll-call training, academy courses, or other forms of training)".

Twelve of the 14 responding LEAs indicated that they have incorporated RIPA Board findings or recommendations into their training. Three major themes were identified in the LEA's responses.

Incorporated. The first theme was *incorporated*. These statements indicated **how** they have incorporated best practices into their training. Four of the 12 responding agencies provided responses in accordance with this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Incorporated 2.1.1** Information used as a source for developing/updating training (3 agencies).
- **Incorporated 2.1.2** Officers required to know or are reminded of policies consistent with recommendations (2 agencies).

> *"We teach the requirements of AB 953 data collection and remind everyone of existing policies consistent with the RIPA Board's recommendations"* – San Jose PD

> *"We have implemented a training video and bulletin to educate department members"* - Orange County SD

Under Review **2.2.1.** The second theme was *under review*. These statements indicated that they are currently updating or developing training materials in line with best practices. Two of the 12 responding agencies provided responses for this theme.

> *"The CHP is currently updating departmental training curriculum in compliance with AB 953..."* - CHP

> *"...in the process of developing implicit bias and bias by proxy training for its civilian personnel based on Board Recommendations"* - San Diego PD

Pre-Existing Training **2.3.1.** The last theme was *pre-existing training*. These statements discussed training but did not indicate how the recommendations were incorporated. Seven of the 12 responding agencies provided responses in line with the theme of pre-existing training. Two of these 7 agencies also mentioned incorporation of recommendations into other trainings or are currently reviewing their trainings to make new adoptions of recommendations.

> *"Deputies receive ongoing training"*
> *- Riverside County SD*

> *"Adopted both in policy and roll call training bulletins"*
> *- Fresno PD*

Wave 3 Agency Results

Due to a low response rate, themes were not able to be identified in the Wave 3 agency responses. Two agencies indicated that the Board's recommendations were already incorporated into their pre-existing training. One agency indicated that they are currently reviewing and revising their trainings to reflect best practices. Lastly, one agency stated that policies are made known to officers during training and one agency indicated that they used the Board's recommendations as a source for updating their training.

"Please describe how your agency used the analyses included in the RIPA Board 2020 annual report to identify trends and patterns in your agency's stop data".

Five out of the 14 LEAs indicated that they used the analyses included in the Board's 2020 annual report to identify trends in their stop data. Themes and sub-themes were not identified due to the low response count. Three agencies used the report to develop additional analyses aimed at identifying patterns in their stop data. The other 2 agencies indicated that they used the analyses but either did not describe how they used them or it was unclear on how they used them to identify trends and patterns in their stop data.

Stop Data and Staff

These questions asked if and how law enforcement agencies are reviewing stop data with their staff and incorporating the data into their accountability procedures. Wave 1 and 2 LEAs submitted responses to these questions. The majority of LEAs indicate that they are *reviewing* (5), providing *access* to (5), or sharing (5) stop data with their staff and other external groups. Out of those who indicated providing *access*, the majority of LEAs indicated that management or supervisory-level officers have access to stop data information (4). Regarding agencies who indicated they *shared* stop data, most shared this information with department staff during meetings, briefings, through e-mail, or other forms of communication (4). Six Wave 1 and 2 agencies use stop data to hold staff accountable for the submission of stop data. Most agencies mentioned that departmental policy (3) or management-level officer review (3) were the mechanisms for ensuring compliance.

"Please describe how your agency reviews the stop data with your staff."

Eleven out of the 14 LEAs indicated that they review stop data with their staff with 10 providing additional information for how they review data with staff. Four major themes were identified in the LEA's responses.

Reviews **3.1.1.** The first theme identified was *reviews*. Statements falling under this theme indicated that management or supervisor-level officers conduct reviews of the stop data. Five of the 10 responding agencies provided responses in accordance with this theme.

> *"Agency stop data is reviewed by supervisors and managers"*
> *- CHP*

> *"Daily reviews are conducted by watch commanders to ensure compliance and deficiencies are corrected immediately"*
> *- San Bernardino County SD*

Discussed. The second theme was *discussed*. These statements indicated that stop data was discussed with either department staff or the public. Three of the 10 responding agencies provided responses for this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Discussed 3.2.1** Stop data information discussed with department staff (e.g., meetings, briefings, electronic communication) (3 agencies).
- **Discussed 3.2.2** Information discussed with the public (1 agency).

> *"Data discussed with supervisors and officers, as well as the community following media stories related to RIPA stop data" - San Diego PD*

> *"Agency stop data discussed during meetings and briefings"*
> *- CHP*

Shares. The third theme was *shares*. These statements indicated that stop data information was shared with to either internal staff or external groups. Five of the 10 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Shares 3.3.1** Stop data information shared with department staff (e.g., meetings, briefings, electronic communication) (4 agencies).
- **Shares 3.3.2** Information shared with the public or other external groups (2 agencies).

"The information was formulated into a document that was shared during meetings, briefings, and via e-mail" *- San Diego County SD*	*"Managers share weekly stop data reports with supervisors"* *- Los Angeles County SD*

Access. The last theme identified was *access*. These statements indicated that the department provided access to stop data information to internal staff or external groups. Five of the 10 responding agencies provided responses for this theme and were categorized into three sub-themes.

- **Access 3.4.1** Management or supervisor-level officers have access to the stop data information (4 agencies).
- **Access 3.4.2** Stop data reports made available to department staff (2 agencies).
- **Access 3.4.3** Agency-generated reports made available to public (2 agencies).

""The Board's report is available to all members of the department" *- Los Angeles PD*	*"All managers currently have the ability to view the information on a daily basis"* *- San Diego County SD*

"Please describe how your agency uses stop data to hold your staff accountable."

Six out of the 14 responding LEAs indicated that they used stop data to hold their staff accountable. Two major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses,

Data Review Procedures. The first theme was *data review procedures*. These statements indicated that management-level officers review data or internal audit procedures were intended to ensure officer compliance. Four of the six responding agencies provided responses in line with this and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Data Review Procedures 4.1.1** Management level officers review stop data to ensure compliance (3 agencies).
- **Data Review Procedures 4.1.2** Internal audit procedures implemented to ensure stop data collection compliance (1 agency).

> *"Agency stop data is reviewed by supervisors and managers and staff are held accountable for any violations of policy and procedures"*
> *- CHP*

> *"Developed internal inspection procedures to make sure stop data is accurate, collected, and submitted"*
> *- San Diego PD*

Policies **4.2.1.** The second theme was *policies*. These statements indicated that policies were put in place to ensure compliance. Three of the six responding agencies provided responses for this theme.

> *"Entry of stop data is mandated per department policy, failure to do so could be grounds for discipline"*
> *- San Francisco PD*

> *"The accountability component deals with regulation compliance currently"*
> *-San Bernardino County SD*

Bias-Free Policing

These questions aimed to discover if and how law enforcement agencies are holding staff accountable for compliance with their bias-free policing policy. All three LEA waves submitted responses to these questions. The majority of Wave 1 and 2 agencies *discussed* specific measures for ensuring compliance with their bias-free policing policy (11) or procedures for determining non-compliance (8). More specifically, most agencies stated that departmental policies are used to hold staff accountable (10).

The majority of Wave 3 agencies *discussed* specific measures for ensuring compliance with their bias-free policing policy (8) or actions taken in response to non-compliance (5). More specifically, agencies indicated that training or supervision (5) and departmental policies (4) are intended to hold staff accountable. Agencies indicated that violations of their bias-free policing policy would result in additional training (3) and other corrective action or discipline (5).

"How does your agency hold staff accountable for compliance and respond to non-compliance with the bias-free policing policy?"

Wave 1 and 2 Agency Results

All 14 agencies indicated that they have a bias-free policing policy. Thirteen of the 14 responding agencies discussed how their staff are held accountable for compliance with their bias-free policing policy. Three major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

Compliance Assurance. The first theme was *compliance assurance.* These statements indicated that policies and procedures ensured compliance. Eleven of the 13 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into three sub-themes.[6]

- **Compliance Assurance 5.1.1** Have policies intended to hold staff accountable (10 agencies).
- **Compliance Assurance 5.1.2** Conducts audits of civilian complaint reports to ensure compliance (3 agencies).
- **Compliance Assurance 5.1.3** Provide training and supervision to meet policy expectations (1 agency).

> *"Departmental policy prohibits racial or identity profiling and discrimination of any kind"*
> - CHP

> *"SDPD holds personnel accountable by establishing clear expectations in policy and procedures…"*
> - San Diego PD

[6] Oakland Police Department did not provide any information in response to this question.

Non-Compliance Determination Procedures. The second theme was *non-compliance determination procedures.* These statements discussed that, if a violation is reported or identified, an investigation is initiated to determine whether a violation of policy occurred. Eight of the 13 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme.

> *"If there is a policy violation, a personnel/administrative investigation is initiated"*
> *- Orange County SD*

> *"Any violations reported are taken seriously and investigated as necessary"*
> *- Los Angeles PD*

Non-Compliance Response. The third theme was *non-compliance response.* These statements discussed how non-compliance would be addressed. Five of the 13 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Non-Compliance Response 5.3.1** Additional training or education (2 agencies).
- **Non-Compliance Response 5.3.2** Unspecified corrective action/discipline (5 agencies).

> *"All employees are held accountable through training and progressive discipline, when necessary"*
> *- CHP*

> *"Failure to comply with any policy results in disciplinary action"*
> *- Long Beach PD*

Wave 3 Agency Results

Ten out of the 11 Wave 3 LEAs indicated that they have a bias-free policing policy and provided additional information for how they hold their staff accountable for compliance with this policy.[7] Three major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

Compliance Assurance. Eight of the 10 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Compliance Assurance 5.1.1** Have policies intended to hold staff accountable (4 agencies).
- **Compliance Assurance 5.1.3** Provide training and/or supervision to meet policy expectations (5 agencies).

---

[7] Los Angeles World Police did not provide a response to either of these questions.

Non-Compliance Identification and Investigation. Three of the 10 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and indicated that, if a violation is reported or identified, an investigation is initiated to determine if there was a violation of policy.

Non-Compliance Response. Five of the 10 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into two sub-themes.

- **Non-Compliance Response 5.3.1** Additional training (3 agencies).
- **Non-Compliance Response 5.3.2** Corrective action/discipline (5 agencies).

Stop Data Collection and Analysis

These questions asked if and how law enforcement agencies are analyzing their stop data. Wave 1 and 2 agencies submitted responses to these questions. Ten out of the 14 agencies analyzed stop data. The majority of these agencies (6) indicated that they analyzed all categories collected in their stop data. Most agencies (4) use population estimates as a benchmark comparison when analyzing their stop data. Agencies are sharing their analysis findings internally with department staff (6) and to external groups, such as the public (8). Lastly, data collection system integration (5), funding and resources (7), and the variables included (5) were barriers indicated by the agencies for conducting stop data analyses.

"What categories does the analysis include (e.g., reason for stop, action taken during stop, result of stop)?"

All 10 LEAs who indicated that they analyzed stop data provided information for categories analyzed. Two major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

All Categories (Unspecified). The first theme identified was *all categories (unspecified).* Six of the 10 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme.

- **All Categories (Unspecified) 6.1.1** All categories captured in the stop data are included in analyses (6 agencies).

> *"We use all the categories depending on what we are trying to look at and analyze"*
> - Los Angeles PD

> *"All of the above"*
> - San Francisco PD

Specific Incident Categories. The second theme identified was *specific incident categories.* Five of the 10 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme and were categorized into four sub-themes.

- **Specific Incident Categories 6.2.1** Reason for contact/stop (4 agencies).
- **Specific Incident Categories 6.2.2** Actions taken (2 agencies).
- **Specific Incident Categories 6.2.3** Search information (3 agencies).
- **Specific Incident Categories 6.2.4** Result of incident (5 agencies).

> *"SDPD has done preliminary analyses related to stops, searches, arrests, citations, and field interviews"* - San Diego PD

> *"LASD regularly audits stops and back seat detentions…along with how the call was cleared"*
> - Los Angeles County SD

In addition to their statements falling under the "specific incident categories" theme, the Orange County Sheriff's Department also indicated that they analyze perceptions of age, limited English proficiency, LGBT, gender, race, and disability.

"What, if any, benchmark comparisons are used?"

Eight of the 10 LEAs who indicated that they analyzed stop data provided benchmark comparisons information. Themes were not identified due to the lack of uniformity in the responses. The majority of agencies (4) use population estimates as a benchmark comparison when analyzing their stop data.

"With whom are the findings shared?"

Nine of the 10 LEAs who indicated that they analyzed stop data also provided information about with whom the findings are shared. Two major themes were identified in the LEAs' responses.

Internal to Agency. The first theme identified was *internal to agency.* These comments indicated that findings were shared with internal agency staff. Eight of the 9 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme and were categorized into three sub-themes.

- **Internal to Agency 8.1.1** Executive staff (3 agencies).
- **Internal to Agency 8.1.2** Command staff (4 agencies).
- **Internal to Agency 8.1.3** Other/unspecified department staff (5 agencies).

> *"Our command staff will get the results of the analysis"*
> *- Los Angeles PD*

> *"All sworn and non-sworn members are provided information related to RIPA's data"*
> *- San Diego County SD*

External to Agency. The second theme identified was *external to agency.* These comments indicated that findings were shared with individuals external to the agency. Six agencies indicated that they shared their findings with the public. In additional to sharing with the public, the Los Angeles County SD also shares their findings with the Office of Inspector General for LA County and the Civilian Oversight Commission for LA County.

"What, if any, external resources is your agency engaging for this analysis (e.g., academics, police commissions, civilian review bodies, or local advisory boards)?"

Nine of the 10 LEAs who specified that they analyzed stop data also indicated that they are currently or are thinking about using external resources to analyze their stop data. Themes

and sub-themes were not identified due lack of uniformity in responses. Five agencies (CHP, Long Beach PD, Los Angeles PD, Oakland PD, and San Francisco PD) indicated that they are inquiring about or are already working with an academic institution. Two (2) agencies (San Diego PD and San Diego County SD) indicated that they are working with the Center for Policing Equity. Oakland PD indicated that, in addition to working with an academic institution, they are working with a federal monitoring team. Lastly, the Los Angeles PD and Los Angeles SD stated that they are working with the City and County Office of the Inspector General, respectively.

"What, if any, barriers to analyzing stop data has your agency encountered?"

Due to the similarities in responses, the questions "what, if any, additional resources are needed to assist your agency in analyzing stop data?" and "please provide any other comments you believe would be useful in understanding the resources and activities that your agency is engaging to advance the goals of RIPA or if there are other areas that could be included in the RIPA reports that your agency would find beneficial" were combined with the responses to this question.

Thirteen of the 14 responding agencies provided comments on one or all of the aforementioned questions that, as a whole, are associated with barriers to analyzing stop data and additional resources needed to conduct stop data analysis.[8] Three major themes were identified but no sub-theme information was identified due to the lack of uniformity across the responses.

Data Collection Systems. The first theme identified was that there were barriers with the data collection system itself. These comments indicated that the integration of data collection systems made it difficult to analyze data or that it was difficult to export data to analyze it.   Five of the 13 responding agencies provided responses in line with this theme.[9]

> *"We are in the process of implementing a new CAD/RMS system, which will allow us to analyze the data" - Riverside County SD*

> *"Expanding the department's existing technological capabilities would assist in analyzing this data" - Long Beach PD*

Funding and/or Resources. The second theme identified was that there were barriers with funding and/or resources. These comments indicated that additional funding for staff and other resources (e.g., training, model analysis examples, guidelines for "Veil of Darkness" formula),

---

[8] Orange County Sheriff did not respond to any of these questions.

[9] CAD is the abbreviation for computer-aided dispatch and RMS stands for records management systems. CAD systems collect initial incident information and then provide this information to one or more RMS.

were necessary to conduct stop data analyses.   Seven of the 13 responding agencies provided responses in line for this theme.

> *"Additional resources that are needed for our agency to analyze stop data is additional staffing and funding" - Sacramento PD*

> *"Due to the volume of data to be analyzed, the CHP anticipates moderate costs associated with the analysis" - CHP*

Variables. The third theme identified was that there were barriers with the absence of specific variables in the stop data. These comments indicated that additional variables are needed in the dataset to conduct a more complete analysis (e.g., experiencing homelessness, cooperativeness of suspect, timing variables, department-specific variables, etc.). Five of the 14 responding agencies provided responses related to this theme.

> *"It would be helpful to have more information such as census tract data, crime data, and suspect data for the areas as well as cooperativeness of the individual…" - LAPD*

> *"It would be helpful to add another category related to whether the person stopped/detained was …[experiencing homelessness]" - San Diego PD*

APPENDIX A
AB 953 Stop Data & Resources - Wave 1 and 2 Survey Questions

Contact Information

First and Last Name
Title
Agency Name
Work Telephone Number:
Email

Using the Contents of the RIPA Report

1) What are the main actions your agency has taken to adopt the recommendations in the RIPA Board's annual reports?

2) Has your agency incorporated the findings or recommendations included in the RIPA Board's annual reports in its training (e.g., roll-call training, academy courses, or other forms of training)?
2a) Please describe how your agency has incorporated the findings or recommendations included in the RIPA Board's annual reports in its training (e.g., roll-call training, academy courses, or other forms of training).

3) Has your agency used the analyses included in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report to identify trends and patterns in your agency's stop data?
3a) Please describe how your agency used the analyses included in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report to identify trends and patterns in your agency's stop data.

4) Has your agency changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analysis or findings?
4a) Please describe how your agency has changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analyses or findings.

Stop Data & Staff

5) Does your agency review the stop data with your staff?
   5a) Please describe how your agency reviews the stop data with your staff.

6) Does your agency use stop data to hold your staff accountable?
   6a) Please describe how your agency uses stop data to hold your staff accountable.

Discussing RIPA Report

7) Does your agency have a civilian review or community advisory board?

8) Has the civilian review or community advisory board discussed the findings or recommendations of the reports?

Bias-Free Policing

9) Does your agency have a bias-free policing policy?
 9a) How does your agency hold staff accountable for compliance and respond to non-compliance with the bias-free policing policy?

10) Has your agency adopted any portion of the model Bias-Free Policing language provided in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report?

Civilian Complaint

11) Has your agency taken any actions in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report?
11a) Please describe the actions your agency has taken in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board Report.

Your Agency's Stop Data Collection and Analysis

12) Does your agency analyze stop data?
12a) What categories does the analysis include (e.g., reason for stop, actions taken during stop, result of stop)?
     12b) What, if any, benchmark comparisons are used?
12c) What, if any, external resources is your agency engaging for this analysis (e.g., academics, police commissions, civilian review bodies, or local advisory boards)?

13) What, if any, barriers to analyzing stop data has your agency encountered?

14) What, if any, additional resources are needed to assist your agency in analyzing the stop data?

15) If your agency collects additional data elements, other than those mandated by RIPA regulations, please indicate what data you are collecting and why.

Other Comments

16) Please provide any other comments you believe would be useful in understanding the resources and activities that your agency is engaging to advance the goals of RIPA or if there are other areas that could be included in the RIPA reports that your agency would find beneficial.

APPENDIX B
AB 953 Stop Data & Resources - Wave 3 Survey Questions

Contact Information

First and Last Name
Title
Agency Name
Work Telephone Number:
Email

Using the Contents of the RIPA Report

1) What are the main actions your agency has taken to adopt the recommendations in the RIPA Board's annual reports?

2) Has your agency incorporated the findings or recommendations included in the RIPA Board's annual reports in its training (e.g., roll-call training, academy courses, or other forms of training)?
2a) Please describe how your agency has incorporated the findings or recommendations included in the RIPA Board's annual reports in its training (e.g., roll-call training, academy courses, or other forms of training).

3) Has your agency changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analysis or findings?
3a) Please describe how your agency has changed policies or practices as a result of the RIPA Board's stop data analyses or findings.

Discussing RIPA Report

4) Does your agency have a civilian review or community advisory board?

5) Has the civilian review or community advisory board discussed the findings or recommendations of the reports?

Bias-Free Policing

    6) Does your agency have a bias-free policing policy?
6a) How does your agency hold staff accountable for compliance and respond to non-compliance with the bias-free policing policy?

7) Has your agency adopted any portion of the model Bias-Free Policing language provided in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report?

Civilian Complaint

11) Has your agency taken any actions in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board 2020 Annual Report?
    11a) Please describe the actions your agency has taken in response to the best practices recommendations regarding civilian complaint procedures and forms provided in the RIPA Board Report.

Other Comments

12) Please provide any other comments you believe would be useful in understanding the resources and activities that your agency is engaging to advance the goals of RIPA or if there are other areas that could be included in the RIPA reports that your agency would find beneficial.

APPENDIX C
Agency Survey Responses Tables

Table 1. Main Actions Taken and Training Recommendations

Agency	Main Actions Taken	Incorporated in Training	Used Analyses in Report to Identify Trends/ Patterns	Incorporated Recommendations in Training Description
Wave 1 and 2 Agencies				
CHP	Data collection/analysis reporting; Policy revision in progress	Yes	No	Currently reviewing/revising training
Fresno PD	Updated Policies	Yes	No	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Long Beach PD	Policy revision in progress	No	Yes	N/A
Los Angeles CO SD	Policy revision in progress; Recommendations pre-existing	Yes	No	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Los Angeles PD	Recommendations pre-existing	Yes	No	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Oakland PD	Recommendations pre-existing	No	No	N/A
Orange CO SD	Updated civilian complaint procedures; Policy revision in progress	Yes	No	Used as source for updating training materials
Riverside CO SD	Policy revision in progress	Yes	No	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Sacramento PD	Policy revision in progress; Recommendations pre-existing	Yes	No	Policies made known to officers; Recommendations pre-existing in training
San Bernardino CO SD	Updated policies; Data collection/analysis reporting; Updated civilian complaint procedures; Other	Yes	Yes	Other
San Diego CO SD	Data collection/analysis reporting; Other	Yes	Yes	Recommendations pre-existing in training
San Diego PD	Updated policies; Data collection/analysis reporting; Policy revision in progress	Yes	Yes	Currently reviewing/revising training; Recommendations pre-existing in training
San Francisco PD	Updated policies; Policy revision in progress	Yes	Yes	Used as source for updating training materials
San Jose PD	Data collection/analysis reporting; Recommendations pre-existing	Yes	No	Used as source for updating training materials; Policies made known to officers
Wave 3 Agencies				

Alameda CO SD	Updated policies; Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements	Yes	N/A	Policies made known to officers
Bakersfield PD	Stop data collection requirements and training; Pre-existing recommendations in civilian complaint policies	Yes	N/A	Currently reviewing/revising training
Fresno CO SD	Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements	No	N/A	N/A
Kern CO SD	Stop data collection requirements; Currently reviewing/revising policies	No	N/A	N/A
LA School PD	Stop data collection requirements; Currently reviewing/revising policies	No	N/A	N/A
LA World Airport Police	Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements; Currently reviewing/revising policies	No	N/A	N/A
Riverside PD	Created Chief's Advisory Board; Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements; Pre-existing recommendations in civilian complaint policies	No	N/A	N/A
San Francisco SD	Updated policies	No	N/A	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Santa Clara CO SD	Currently reviewing/revising policies	No	N/A	Recommendations pre-existing in training
Stockton PD	Stop data collection requirements and training; Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements; Pre-existing recommendations in civilian complaint policies	Yes	N/A	Used as source for updating training materials
Ventura CO SD	Stop data collection requirements and training; Currently implementing/reviewing stop data collection requirements	No	N/A	N/A

Table 2. Civilian Complaint and Civilian Review Board Recommendations			
Agency	Civilian Complaint Procedure Recommendations	Has Civilian Review or Community Advisory Board	Civilian Review/Community Advisory Board Discussed RIPA Board Report
Wave 1 and 2 Agencies			
CHP	No	Yes	Yes
Fresno PD	No	No	N/A
Long Beach PD	No	Yes	No
Los Angeles CO SD	No	Yes	Yes
Los Angeles PD	No	Yes	Yes
Oakland PD	No	Yes	No
Orange CO SD	Yes	Yes	No
Riverside CO SD	No	No	N/A
Sacramento PD	Yes	No	N/A
San Bernardino CO SD	Yes	No	N/A
San Diego CO SD	No	Yes	No
San Diego PD	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Francisco PD	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Jose PD	No	Yes	No
Wave 3 Agencies			
Alameda CO SD	No	No	N/A
Bakersfield PD	No	No	N/A
Fresno CO SD	No	No	N/A
Kern CO SD	Yes	No	N/A
LA School PD	No	No	N/A
LA World Airport Police	N/A	No	N/A
Riverside PD	Yes	Yes	No
San Francisco SD	No	No	N/A
Santa Clara CO SD	Yes	Yes	No
Stockton PD	Yes	Yes	No
Ventura CO SD	No	No	N/A

Table 3. Stop Data and Staff

Agency	Reviews Stop Data with Staff	Reviewing Stop Data with Staff Description	Stop Data Used for Staff Accountability	Stop Data Accountability Description
CHP	Yes	Management-level officers review; Discussed with department staff	Yes	Management-level officers review stop data to ensure compliance; Compliance ensured by policy
Fresno PD	No	N/A	No	N/A
Long Beach PD	Yes	Management-level officers review	No	N/A
Los Angeles CO SD	Yes	Other	No	N/A
Los Angeles PD	Yes	Shared with external group; Department staff have access	No	N/A
Oakland PD	Yes	Management-level officers review	Yes	Management-level officers review stop data to ensure compliance
Orange CO SD	No	N/A	No	N/A
Riverside CO SD	Yes	Shared with department staff; Management-level officers have access	Yes	Management-level officers review stop data to ensure compliance
Sacramento PD	No	N/A	No	N/A
San Bernardino CO SD	Yes	Management-level officers review; Discussed with department staff; Shared with department staff and public	Yes	Compliance ensured by policy
San Diego CO SD	Yes	Shared with department staff; Management-level officers have access; Department staff have access; Public has access	No	N/A
San Diego PD	Yes	Management-level officers review; Discussed with department staff; Discussed with public	Yes	Internal audit procedures
San Francisco PD	Yes	Management-level officers have access; Public has access	Yes	Compliance ensured by policy
San Jose PD	Yes	Shared with department staff; Management-level officers have access	No	N/A

Table 4. Bias-Free Policing Policy			
Agency	Has Bias-Free Policing Policy	Staff Accountability for Compliance with Policy	Adopted Model Bias-Free Policing Policy Language
Wave 1 and 2 Agencies			
CHP	Yes	Department policies; Non-compliance addressed with training and corrective action/discipline	Yes
Fresno PD	Yes	Reported violation investigated	Yes
Long Beach PD	Yes	Department policies; Non-compliance addressed with corrective action/discipline	Yes
Los Angeles CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Conduct audits; Reported violation investigated	Yes
Los Angeles PD	Yes	Reported violation investigated	No
Oakland PD	Yes	No response	No
Orange CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Reported violation investigated	Yes
Riverside CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Reported violation investigated	No
Sacramento PD	Yes	Conduct audits	No
San Bernardino CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Non-compliance addressed with training and corrective action/discipline	Yes
San Diego CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Reported violation investigated	Yes
San Diego PD	Yes	Department policies; Conduct audits; Training and supervision; Reported violation investigated; Non-compliance addressed with corrective action/discipline	Yes
San Francisco PD	Yes	Department policies; Non-compliance addressed with corrective action/discipline	Yes
San Jose PD	Yes	Department policies; Reported violation investigated	Yes
Wave 3 Agencies			
Alameda C CO SD	Yes	Non-compliance addressed with training and corrective action/discipline	No
Bakersfield PD	Yes	Department policies; Reported violation investigated; Non-compliance addressed with training and corrective action/discipline	No
Fresno CO SD	Yes	Training and supervision	No
Kern CO SD	Yes	Reported violation investigated; Non-compliance addressed with training and corrective action/discipline	Yes
LA School PD	Yes	Supervision	No
LA World Airport Police	N/A	N/A	N/A
Riverside PD	Yes	Department policies; Non-compliance addressed with corrective action/discipline	No
San Francisco SD	Yes	Training and supervision	No
Santa Clara CO SD	Yes	Department policies; Training and supervision	Yes
Stockton PD	Yes	Department policies	No

Ventura CO SD	Yes	Training; Reported violation investigated; Non-compliance addressed with corrective action/discipline	No

Table 5. Analyzing Stop Data

Agency	Analyzes Stop Data	Categories Analyzed	Benchmark Comparisons	Findings Shared	Barriers to Analyzing Stop Data
CHP	Yes	All Categories	Other incident types	N/A	Funding/Resources; Variables
Fresno PD	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data collection systems; Funding/Resources
Long Beach PD	Yes	All Categories	Currently identifying benchmark comparisons	Department staff	Data collection systems
Los Angeles CO SD	Yes	All Categories; Result of incident	Audit data	Public; Office of Inspector General for LA County & Civilian Oversight Commission for LA County	Data collection systems
Los Angeles PD	Yes	All Categories	Population estimates; Crime statistics; Other incident data	Command staff; Public	Variables
Oakland PD	Yes	Reason for contact; Search info; Result of incident	N/A	Executive staff; Command staff	Variables
Orange CO SD	Yes	Reason for contact; Actions taken; Search info; Result of incident; Other	N/A	Executive staff; Command staff; Department staff	N/A
Riverside CO SD	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Data collection systems
Sacramento PD	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Funding/Resources
San Bernardino CO SD	Yes	Reason for contact; Actions taken; Result of incident	Population estimates	Executive staff; Command staff; Public	Funding/Resources
San Diego CO SD	Yes	All Categories	Population estimates	Department staff; Public	Funding/Resources

San Diego PD	Yes	Reason for contact; Search info; Result of incident	Population estimates	Department staff; Public	Funding/Resources; Variables
San Francisco PD	Yes	All Categories	Trends over time; Geographic districts	Department staff; Public	Data collection systems; Funding/Resources
San Jose PD	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	Variables