

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 on the differences between stops that are officer-initiated or based on a call for service by mode of travel. The Appendix also provides stop data analyses on a variety of topics.

II. DESCRIPTION OF OVERALL STOP DATA

In 2025 — the eighth year of RIPA stop data reporting — a total of **XX** agencies reported **XX** stops. This includes stops reported by all city and county law enforcement agencies, all law enforcement agencies of California public schools and universities, and the California Highway Patrol.²

This data can show the perceived categories of identity of who is stopped, why a stop was initiated, the reason for the stop, the actions an officer takes during the stop, the result of the stop, and duration of the stop.³ These elements are described below, then applied to different identity groups to analyze the 2025 stop data in greater detail.

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.

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 [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.

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.⁴

Officers enter RIPA data based on their perception of individuals,⁵ and not on how individuals may self-identify.⁶ 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, and the primary reason the stop was initiated.⁷

This report examines the proportion of stops that are made in response to a call for service, compared to those that are officer-initiated. *Calls for service* can indicate that the community is requesting an officer to stop an individual or respond to a situation,⁸ 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.

<p style="text-align: center;">Key Terms</p> <p><i>Call for service</i> — <i>A stop made in response to a 911 call, radio call, or dispatch</i></p> <p><i>Officer-initiated</i> — <i>A stop resulting from the officer's observation, not in response to a call for service</i></p>
--

In 2025, XX percent of stops (XX stops) were officer-initiated, while XX percent of stops (XX stops) were due to a call for service.

C. Reason for Stop

Officers must report the primary reason for a stop by selecting from a set of ten options, broadly encompassing: traffic violations; reasonable suspicion of criminal activity; probable cause, either to arrest or search the person, or to take them into custody under Welfare and Institutions Code section 5150; stops based on knowledge that the person is on parole, probation, post-release or mandatory supervision, or subject to an arrest warrant; truancy; and consensual search

⁴ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(7); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(5)-(11).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ 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).)

⁷ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(1)-(3); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subds. (a)(3)-(4), (a)(12)-(15).

⁸ 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.

encounters.⁹ This report focuses on the two most common reasons: stops for traffic violations¹⁰ and stops for reasonable suspicion. The remaining eight reasons available to officers (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) are examined collectively as “other reasons.”

In 2025, XX percent of stops (XX stops) were initiated due to traffic violations, XX percent of stops (XX stops) were initiated due to reasonable suspicion, and XX percent of stops (XX stops) were initiated due to other reasons.

Figure 1. Reason for Stop [chart forthcoming]

D. Actions Taken During Stop

RIPA also requires officers to report all actions enumerated in the RIPA regulations that are taken by the officer during a stop, including all force-related and non-force related actions, such as searches and detentions.¹¹ Officers report this by selecting one or more of 36 actions taken or by reporting that no action was taken during a stop.¹² Officers must report all actions taken during a stop, meaning multiple actions may be reported during a single stop.¹³ Analyses of actions taken during stops include the prevalence of no actions taken, the frequency of use of force actions,¹⁴ the most common actions during stops (TBD for the 2025 data; *note: previously*

⁹ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14).

¹⁰ Traffic violations are further separated into three types: moving, equipment, and non-moving violations. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14)(1)(a)-(c).) “Moving violations” involve a violation of traffic laws regulating driver behavior while operating a vehicle, such as speeding or reckless driving. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14)(1)(a).) “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. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14)(1)(b).) “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. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(14)(1)(c).)

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

¹² 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 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).)

¹³ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(16)-(17).

¹⁴ Actions defined as a “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 further categorized as: lethal force, less-lethal force, and limited

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 included searches and Terry frisks,¹⁵ handcuffing, detention on a curbside or in a patrol car, and asking about parole status¹⁶), and the average number of actions taken during stop.

In 2025, [breakdown of top 4 actions taken during stops in 2025 forthcoming]. *Note: Last year this was presented in the following format: “In 2024, XX percent of all stops (XX stops) involved detention curbside or in a patrol car, XX percent (XX stops) involved a search or Terry stop, XX percent (XX stops) involved handcuffing the person stopped, and XX percent (XX stops) involved asking the person stopped about parole status”*].

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

E. Results of Stop

RIPA also 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 no action was taken.¹⁷ When entering stop data, officers can select up to 14 different options to document the result of a stop.¹⁸ Officers may select multiple results when necessary (e.g., an officer cited an individual for one offense and warned them about another).

In 2025, [breakdown of 2025 results of stop forthcoming]. *Note: Last year this was presented in the following format: “In 2024, stops were most often reported to result in individuals being issued a citation (TBD%, TBD stops), followed by a written or verbal warning (TBD%, TBD stops), and arrest (TBD%, TBD stops). Officers reported taking no actions as the result in under TBD percent of stops (TBD stops). Each of the remaining results of stops represented less than TBD percent of the data”*].

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), the number and type of actions taken during stops, and the

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 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).)

¹⁵ A *Terry v. Ohio* pat/frisk (hereafter *Terry* frisk) is a weapons patdown, occurring when an officer pats down an individual’s clothing to determine whether based on the officer’s reasonable suspicion 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*, *supra*, 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) (“2023 Report”), p. 96 fn. 326 <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-board-report-2023.pdf>> [CHECK PRIOR TO PUBLICATION].)

¹⁶ RIPA requires that officers report asking whether the stopped person was on parole, probation, post-release community supervision, or some other form of mandatory supervision. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(16)(B)(7).)

¹⁷ Gov. Code § 12525.5, subd. (b)(4); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(18).

¹⁸ 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.

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 all data values that apply from a list of seven broad groups (Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latine(x), Middle Eastern or South Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, and White), based on their observation only.¹⁹ In 2025, officers perceived most individuals stopped to be [breakdown of 2025 stop data forthcoming]. *Note: Last year this was presented in the following format: “Hispanic/Latine(x) (XX% of all stops, amounting to XX stops), followed by White (XX% of all stops, or XX stops), Black (XX%, XX stops), Asian (XX%, XX stops), Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, [TBD] stops), Multiracial²⁰ (XX%, XX stops), Pacific Islander (XX%, XX stops), and Native American individuals (XX%, XX stops).”*

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

1. Residential Population Comparison

[Analysis of 2025 residential population comparison forthcoming.] *Note: Last year this was presented in the following format: “Comparing the perceived racial demographics of the individuals stopped in 2025 to the residential population demographics of California in [2024 if available from ACS, otherwise 2023]²¹ demonstrates notable disparities. Individuals perceived to be Black were stopped XX percent more often than expected, and individuals perceived to be Pacific Islander XX percent more often than expected, given the population of the state. Conversely, individuals perceived to be Multiracial were stopped XX percent less often than expected, and individuals perceived to be Asian were stopped XX percent less often than expected, given the population of the state.”*

In California, individuals perceived to be [race or ethnicity group] were stopped XX% more often than expected based on residential population share.

[OR DIFFERENT BREAKOUT]

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

2. Calls for Service

[Breakdown of 2025 officer-initiated stops by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note: Last year this was presented in the following format: “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 (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian were officer-initiated, amounting to XX stops), followed by individuals perceived as Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, or XX stops). Alternatively, individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all*

¹⁹ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(5).

²⁰ For purposes of this analysis, persons who were perceived by the officer as more than one race or ethnicity are categorized as “Multiracial.”

²¹ 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.

stops of individuals perceived as Native American, or XX stops) and Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX stops) had the lowest rate of officer-initiated stops.”

[Breakdown of 2025 calls for service by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note:* Last year, this was presented in the following format: “Individuals perceived as Native American had the highest rate of stops initiated by a call for service (XX%, XX stops), followed by individuals perceived as Black (XX%, XX stops). Alternatively, individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Asian (XX%, XX stops) had the lowest rate of stops initiated by a call for service.”

3. Reason for Stop

[Breakdown of 2025 reasons for stop by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note:* Last year, this was presented in the following format, analyzing traffic violations (moving violations, equipment violations, and non-moving violations) and reasonable suspicion: “Across all races and ethnicities, traffic violations were the most common reason for a stop in 2025, followed by reasonable suspicion, and then other reasons. Moving violations were the most common type of traffic violation for all races and ethnicities... Individuals perceived to be Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, amounting to XX stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, or XX stops) were stopped for moving violations most frequently, and individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American, or XX stops) and Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX stops) the least frequently for moving violations... 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 (XX%, XX stops) and Hispanic/Latine(x) (XX%, XX stops) the most frequently for equipment violations, and individuals perceived to be Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Middle Eastern (XX%, XX stops) the least frequently for equipment violations. Individuals perceived to be Black (XX%, XX stops) and Pacific Islander (XX%, XX stops) were stopped the most frequently for non-moving violations, and individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Asian (XX%, XX stops) the least frequently for non-moving violations... Officers stopped individuals perceived to be Black (XX%, XX stops) and Native American (XX%, XX stops) more often for reasonable suspicion compared to other races and ethnicities. Officers stopped individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Asian (XX%, XX stops) the least frequently for reasonable suspicion.”

4. Actions Taken During Stop

a. Action vs. No Action

[Breakdown of 2025 stops where actions were taken compared to stops where no action was taken by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note:* Last year, this was presented in the following format: “Officers reported taking “no action” most often in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, amounting to XX stops) and Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, or XX stops). Officers reported taking no action least often during stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American, or XX stops) and Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX 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.

b. Use of Force

[Breakdown of 2025 stops involving reported uses of force by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note: Last year, this was presented in the following format: “Officers used any type of force the most often in stops of individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American, amounting to XX stops), Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX stops), and Hispanic/Latine(x) (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x), or XX stops).”²² Force was reported the least often in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, or XX stops), Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, or XX stops), and White (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as White, or XX stops).”*

[Breakout box with key finding(s) forthcoming.] *Note: Last year, this was: “A stop involving a person perceived to be Black was more likely to involve lethal or less-lethal force than a stop involving a person perceived to be another racial or ethnic group.”*

[Breakdown of 2025 stops involved reported uses of limited, less-lethal, and lethal force by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note: Last year, this was presented in the following format: “In 2025, officers reported using limited, less-lethal, and lethal force most often against individuals perceived to be Native American, Black, or Multiracial.”²³ Officers reported using limited force most often in stops of individuals they perceived as Native American (XX%, XX stops) and Black (XX%, XX stops), and least often in stops of individuals they perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Asian (XX%, XX). Less-lethal force was reported to be used most often in stops of individuals perceived as Black (XX%, XX stops) and Multiracial (XX%, XX stops), and least often in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX%, XX stops) and Asian (XX%, XX stops)... Officers reported few instances of lethal force overall (XX%, XX stops across all racial and ethnic groups) but reported using lethal force most often in stops involving individuals perceived to be Black (XX%, XX stops) and Multiracial (XX%, XX stops). Additionally, officers reported no instances of lethal force in stops of individuals they perceived as Native American and Pacific Islander.”*

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

c. Top 4 Actions During Stop

[Breakdown of top four actions taken during stops in 2025 by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note: Last year, this was presented in the following format: “As noted above (see Section II.D, supra), across all stops, the top four actions taken by officers during a stop are: (1) searches/Terry stops; (2) handcuffing; (3) detainment curbside or in a patrol car; and (4) asking the parole status of the person stopped... Officers reported the highest rates of searches and*

²² Actions defined as a “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 also Pen. Code, § 16780, subd. (a).)

²³ 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 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).)

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.

Terry stops, handcuffing, and detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops for individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American, amounting to XX stops involving searches/frisks; XX%, XX stops involving handcuffing; XX%, XX stops involving detainment) and Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, amounting to XX stops involving searches/frisks; XX%, XX stops involving handcuffing; XX%, XX stops involving detainment). Officers reported the lowest rates of searches and Terry stops, handcuffing, and detainment curbside or in a patrol car in stops for individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, amounting to XX stops involving searches/frisks; XX%, XX stops involving handcuffing; XX%, XX stops involving detainment) and Asian (XX%, XX stops involving searches/frisks; XX%, XX stops involving handcuffing; XX%, XX stops involving detainment). Officers asked the parole status of individuals perceived to be Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, amounting to XX stops) and Multiracial (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Multiracial, or XX stops) at the highest rates, and individuals perceived to be Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, or XX stops) and Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, or XX stops) at the lowest rates.”

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

d. Average Number of Actions

[Breakdown of average number of actions taken during stops in 2025 by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note:* Last year, this was presented in the following format: “Officers reported taking the highest average number of actions in stops of individuals perceived to be Black (XX actions per stop, $SD^{24}=XX$, range= XX actions) and Native American (XX, $SD=XX$, range= XX). The lowest number of actions were reported in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX, $SD=XX$, range= XX) and Asian (XX, $SD=XX$, range= XX).”

Figure 8. Average Number of Actions Taken During Stop by Perceived Race/Ethnicity: All Stops [chart forthcoming]

5. Results of Stop

[Breakdown of 2025 results of stop by perceived race/ethnicity forthcoming.] *Note:* Last year, this was presented in the following format: “Among stops of individuals perceived to be Asian, 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 Black and Native American, warning was the most common result of stop, followed by citation, then arrest.²⁵ ... Officers reported the highest arrest rates for individuals perceived to be Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American,

²⁴ 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.

²⁵ 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.

amounting to XX stops) and Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX stops), compared to the other racial/ethnic groups. Officers also reported taking no action most often in stops of individuals perceived to be Black (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Black, or XX stops) and Native American (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Native American, or XX stops), and least often in stops of individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian, or XX stops) and Asian (XX% of all stops of individuals perceived as Asian, or XX stops).”

Figure 9. Most Frequent Results of Stop and No Action Rates by Perceived Race/Ethnicity
[chart forthcoming]

B. Gender

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by gender]

C. Age

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by age]

D. Disability Status

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by disability status]

E. English Fluency

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by English fluency]

F. Sexual Orientation

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by sexual orientation]

G. Housing Status

[Analysis forthcoming, similar content to above but analyzed by housing status]

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 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

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.

increased.²⁶ In its July 11, 2025 meeting,²⁷ 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 identify profiling in immigration enforcement.²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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.³⁰ However, state and local law enforcement are still permitted to engage with federal authorities — for example, through participation in joint task forces — which may raise concerns related to racial and identity profiling.

²⁶ 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.

²⁷ More information about this meeting can be found on the Board’s website at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab953/meetings> [as of XX, 2026].

²⁸ See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, *Meeting Notice and Agenda* (Oct. 9, 2025), <<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-notice-agenda-10092025.pdf>> [as of XX, 2026].

²⁹ Gov. Code, § 12525.5, subd. (b) [requiring reporting by each state and local agency that employs peace officers].

³⁰ 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:

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).

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 passing RIPA, the Legislature found that profiling “alienates people from law enforcement” and erodes “trust among the people” police serve.³¹ 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.³² Another study found no evidence of an increase in FBI-index crime rates for jurisdictions that limit entanglement with immigration enforcement.³³ Accordingly, the Board seeks to identify any changes in the 2025 RIPA data that may have resulted from increased immigration enforcement actions.

2. 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 and does not capture stops, encounters, or enforcement actions by law enforcement agencies outside of California or federal officers, including actions carried out by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), or other Department of Homeland Security (DHS) components. Additionally, RIPA stop data collection is limited to the enumerated data elements detailed in the RIPA statute.³⁴

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.³⁵ 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.³⁶ Additionally, officers may also include immigration-enforcement related information in the narrative description field.³⁷ Each of these sources is underinclusive. For example, stops involving immigration-status questioning, requests for documents, database checks, jail-transfer decisions, or informal coordination with federal officers are not reflected in any structured field within the RIPA data collection. 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 to understand the information collected by RIPA, and should not be understood as a conclusive reporting of immigration enforcement activity within the state.

³¹ Pen. Code, § 13519.4, subd. (d)(3).

³² Wong et al., *How Interior Immigration Enforcement Affects Trust in Law Enforcement* (2021) 19 Perspectives on Politics 357, 357–360.

³³ Hausman, *Sanctuary Policies Reduce Deportations Without Increasing Crime* (2020) 117 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 27262, 27262–27264.

³⁴ Gov. Code, § 12525.5.

³⁵ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(18)(L).

³⁶ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.227, subd. (a)(4).

³⁷ 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.

3. DHS Referrals as a Result of Stop

[Analysis of 2025 stops reporting referrals to DHS forthcoming]

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

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

5. 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 2024.³⁸ 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.³⁹ Riders may be stopped for conduct that has no close analogue in ordinary street policing, including proof-of-payment inspections, fare-evasion allegations, station or platform rules, and other code-of-conduct enforcement.⁴⁰

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 policing 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. The authors further found that Black and Latinx riders

³⁸ 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.

³⁹ See Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.A [Mode of Travel Analysis], at p. 60.

⁴⁰ 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>> [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> [setting out analogous code-of-conduct rules for the Los Angeles Metro system].

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.

were more likely than White riders to receive fare-evasion citations even after accounting for relevant local social-structural characteristics.⁴¹

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.⁴²

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 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.⁴³

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.⁴⁴ 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 California Penal Code section 640 may be reasonably interpreted as involving public transportation.⁴⁵ 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.]**

⁴¹ 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.

⁴² 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>>.

⁴³ 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/>>.

⁴⁴ See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, § 999.226, subd. (a)(2); Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, 2026 Annual Report (2026), Section IV.A.

⁴⁵ See Pen. Code, § 640 [prohibiting specified conduct on or in a public transportation system, including fare evasion].

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.

2. Stops Identifiable as Public Transportation Stops

[Content in development]

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.

[Content in development]

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

[Content in development]

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.