

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

STOP DATA ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 17, 2026, 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present: Co-Chair Lily Khadjavi and Members Jose Alatorre, John Dobard, Andrea Guerrero, and Chauncey Smith

Board Members Absent: Co-Chair Chad Bianco and Members Souley Diallo, LaWanda Hawkins, and Rich Randolph

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SUBCOMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Khadjavi called the meeting of the Stop Data Analysis Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Subcommittee member introduced themselves.

Co-Chair Khadjavi introduced a new member of the Subcommittee, Captain Jose Alatorre. Captain Jose Alatorre represents the California Highway Patrol (CHP) with more than 20 years of law enforcement experience. Captain Alatorre has held a variety of field and administrative assignments statewide, developing expertise in enforcement operations, organizational leadership, and statewide program management. Captain Alatorre is recognized for building high performing teams, fostering collaborative partnerships, and upholding CHP's mission of providing the highest level of safety, service, and security.

Captain Alatorre stated that he was happy to be here. He is currently assigned to the Field Support section at the CHP headquarters office in Sacramento. Before this, he was a Lieutenant Commander of the CHP Grass Valley area, and he has worked at the CHP academy as the Tactical Training Lieutenant subject matter expert for street racing sideshows and speed enforcement. Captain Alatorre stated that he was happy to be here and happy to get to work.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked if any Subcommittee members had any corrections, comments, or minor edits on the draft September 18, 2025 meeting minutes.

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson from the California Department of Justice (DOJ) noted that after sending the minutes and before this meeting, one the DOJ team members identified a couple of technical corrections to page 8 of the minutes; the second to last paragraph on page 8 had three grammar or syntactical changes: (1) cases of people that do not consent but are *searched*, rather than *searches*; (2) in the last sentence, there was an extra "should" that should be deleted; and (3) in the last sentence, there should be a hyphen between *consent-based* searches.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted two minor typos: (1) on page 8 relating to the term "probable cause;" and (2) Member Greene's name had been misspelled on page 14. Co-Chair Khadjavi then invited the Subcommittee to make a motion to approve the minutes along with these minor edits or corrections.

Member Dobard made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Member Smith. DAG Simpson took the roll call vote to approve the September 18th, 2025 Stop Data Subcommittee minutes as amended.

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

The motion passed with four ayes and one abstention.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND BOARD DISCUSSION OF PLANS FOR THE 2027 REPORT

DOJ Research Services Supervisor Daniel Harmon provided an update to the Subcommittee regarding the development of the RIPA data dashboard. Dr. Harmon explained that the dashboard is in its final stages of draft form, and DOJ would begin its internal reviews for feedback and data safety and security shortly. Dr. Harmon explained that DOJ was on track to release the data dashboard by mid-2026.

Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked DOJ for the update, and expressed that she was glad to hear there had been progress. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the Subcommittee, others, and the full Board have called for a way for the public to be able to access the data in a meaningful way. She asked whether there would be other opportunities, either for the public or others, to weigh in on the dashboard, either while it was being finalized or even after it is released.

Dr. Harmon explained that, after the dashboard is published, DOJ would welcome feedback from the public on things that they would like to see or ways to improve the dashboard.

Member Smith expressed that he would also like a chance to review. He noted that a lot of the Board members have a fair amount of expertise regarding the issues that would be covered in the dashboard, and it could be helpful to the end product.

Dr. Harmon responded that he would coordinate with the DOJ Civil Rights Enforcement Section (CRES) to see how DOJ can loop in the Board on the dashboard.

Next, DAG Garrett Lindsey provided an overview of the Stop Data section, looking at the data submitted annually by law enforcement, the RIPA data that relates to federal immigration efforts, and potential topics for the Stop Data chapter of the 2027 RIPA Report. To begin, DAG Lindsey noted that, over the years, there have been some questions about what data is collected by RIPA. He explained that an easy way to understand the data collected on the RIPA is by reviewing the CJIS 2000 form. This is the standard form that all law enforcement officers effectively fill out after completing the stop as defined in the RIPA statute and associated regulations. If individuals have a question about whether law enforcement officers submit data, a particular piece of information relating to a particular data element, or whether DOJ analyzes potential racial and identity disparities within the data elements, the form is a good place to start to try to understand that. DAG Lindsey explained that the form was included in Appendix H of the 2026 Report, on page 163.

DAG Lindsey explained that, while law enforcement officers effectively use this CJIS 2000 form to record the RIPA data and all the stop data on the form, the stop will probably be recorded by law enforcement agencies (LEAs) and submitted to DOJ in some other way. DOJ hosts a web application to submit stop data, and there are also vendors who provide a product to submit stop data to DOJ. DAG Lindsey explained that IT departments of some LEAs may also have their own system. Most LEAs use a vendor product, and those vendor products generally connect with other record management and case management products that the department is using. DAG Lindsey explained that, typically, officers do not use the paper CJIS 2000 form to enter their data, but the paper form does show what data is being collected for RIPA.

Going through the form, DAG Lindsey explained that the DOJ collects information about the reporting officer, including the identity information about the officer who conducted the stop and completed the report, some of the officer's characteristics, their agency, and their assignment. Notably, any unique identifying information of the officer is not reported in the publicly available RIPA data.

There is also information about the setting. This captures the context of the stop, such as the date, time, location, and the duration of the stop. It also captures how the stop began, what mode of transportation the person stopped was using, and whether other LEAs were involved.

DAG Lindsey further explained that information about the person stopped is recorded in the form. This includes the officer's perception of the characteristics of the individual stopped like perceived race or ethnicity, perceived gender, perceived sexual orientation, perceived age, perceived English fluency, whether they are perceived to have a disability, and their perceived housing status.

The form also records the reason for stop, including the primary legal or investigative justification for the stop like a traffic violation, reasonable suspicion or an outstanding warrant.

DAG Lindsey explained that actions taken during a stop are also recorded. This is a very robust section that documents what occurred during the stop, what questions were asked, what kinds of searches were conducted and for what reason, and whether there was a seizure or use of force during the stop. DAG Lindsey noted that the CJIS 2000 form also captures the basis for some of those actions.

Finally, the CJIS 2000 form collects the result of a stop — i.e., the final outcome of the encounter, such as the issuance of a warning, a citation, an arrest, or if the officer took no action. DAG Lindsey explained that, if there are questions about what data is collected or what we know from the RIPA data, a good place to start is the CJIS 2000 form.

Moving on to the topic of federal immigration efforts last year, DAG Lindsey explained that DOJ had conducted some preliminary analysis as to what the RIPA data can tell the Board about federal immigration efforts. He reminded the Subcommittee that first, only state and local LEAs collect and submit to RIPA data to DOJ; federal LEAs do not submit RIPA data to DOJ. However, there are some data elements that are reported by state and local LEAs that could relate to federal immigration efforts. For example, one data element captured by RIPA is whether the stop was made in conjunction with a non-reporting agency, such as when the reporting officer is working with a joint task force with a federal agency. DAG Lindsey noted that this is one of the data elements that is on the CJIS 2000 form. Another required data element relates to the result of the stop, and asks whether the stop resulted in the reporting officer contacting the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

DAG Lindsey explained that when looking at those elements in 2022, 2023, and 2024, state and local law enforcement officers reported that approximately 500 stops per year resulted in the reporting officer contacting DHS. However, DAG Lindsey cautioned that it is not always clear how this data should be interpreted. DHS contains a number of different departments, including Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), as well as Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The RIPA data does not differentiate between these different subparts of DHS, so if it is CBP, TSA or ICE, that would all be marked as DHS.

DAG Lindsey stated that another area of the RIPA data that could be relevant to understanding the federal immigration efforts is the narrative fields that officers fill out when they provide information about the stop. This is a more complete description of the stop, however the level of detail in those narrative fields can vary. DAG Lindsey explained that DOJ is dependent on the level of detail that the officer has in the narrative field, and there may be some inconsistency in

how the narrative fields are completed or what the officer believes is necessary to put into the narrative field.

DAG Lindsey noted that DOJ conducted a preliminary analysis based primarily on the review of the narrative fields for 2018 to 2024. Looking through the many, many millions of stops, DOJ found about 2,085 stops where the officer reported contacting CBP in the narrative field in some way, and about 1,869 stops where the officer reported contacting the TSA in the narrative field. DAG Lindsey explained that a lot of those entries related to air travel and things like that, like crossing the border. In some instances, officers described conducting detentions or issuing DUI violations at a border crossing. In other instances, officers reported in this narrative fields that the CBP contacted the law enforcement officers for assistance related to the border crossing. DAG Lindsey explained that certain LEAs most frequently reported involvement with DHS and CBP, including California Highway Patrol (CHP), the San Francisco Police Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) World Airport, which has a separate police department for the LAX airport. Where the officers reported contacting TSA in the available narrative fields, it was almost universally about someone bringing a prohibited item at a security checkpoint. DAG Lindsey explained that DOJ's preliminary analysis also shows that officers use the term "ICE" in the narrative fields, but it does not always relate to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. In many instances, the term "ICE" related to weather conditions or food, or things that might appear in a beverage.

DAG Lindsey explained that DOJ's preliminary review of the narrative fields also showed there were fewer than 100 reported involvements with ICE between 2018 to 2024. Of these stops, the majority related to law enforcement officers pursuing warrants or conducting warrant checks. The narratives that mentioned immigration generally did not have a strong pattern, although some might have involved someone who was involved in immigration-related violations like transporting an undocumented individual. Most of the stops were conducted by CHP, but fewer than 20 of those involved ICE. LAPD and the San Diego Police Department were the second- and third-most common agencies identified as involving ICE, and there were fewer than 10 stops between those two agencies.

DAG Lindsey explained that there is a webpage, [ice.gov/statistics](https://ice.dhs.gov/statistics), with information on ICE operations in the state of California. That data goes up to 2024, but there is no data on that starting in 2025. DAG Lindsey noted that there may be some third party sources where DOJ could get similar data, but direct data from ICE, where the Subcommittee could see rates of detentions and arrests and isolated to California, is not publicly available for 2025. He noted that the Subcommittee might be interested in whether there is a relationship between ICE immigration activity and other stops, but that this would be hard to identify based on the data sets that DOJ collects. DAG Lindsey explained that, looking at the 2025 RIPA data, DOJ might be able to analyze whether an ICE action related to the three regions in California that ICE reports (San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego). Prior to 2025, an individual could look at how many arrests were in those three regions broadly, but it would be difficult to assess more specifically, and it would also be difficult to come to any conclusions, even if DOJ had the best sort of data that ICE used to produce. DAG Lindsey explained that because of this, there is a difficulty in matching up particular California local state law and state law enforcement operations and connecting it to an ICE action.

Member Smith stated that he appreciated the presentation and that he had some questions. First, as to DAG Lindsey's comment that there has been limited access to ICE data starting in 2025, he asked if DOJ knew whether ICE does not collect the information anymore, or if this issue is that they no longer make it publicly available like they used to.

DAG Lindsey responded that he could not say, but that third parties are in litigation to try to get that data. This may mean that such data is still collected, but it is just not produced in the way it used to be produced on the [ice.gov/statistics](https://ice.dhs.gov/statistics) website.

Member Smith asked what type of third parties DAG Lindsey was referring to.

DAG Lindsey explained that he could not state whether this is a reliable source of this information, but one entity he did look at, the Deportation Data Project, appeared to have information about ICE operations that they received via a public records request or litigation. Their website is deportationdata.org, but this is not a California State source and it is a third party, so it is not a direct source.

Member Smith thanked DAG Lindsey and explained that the main thing he was trying to get to is whether it might be possible for the Subcommittee to still obtain the information if it is being collected, even though it is not as transparent as it used to be. It sounds like that might be possible. Member Smith wanted to put a pin in that as an FYI or something that the Subcommittee can consider.

Next, Member Smith asked DAG Lindsey to clarify his comments about ICE's field offices in the jurisdictions of San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

DAG Lindsey clarified that ICE reports the actions it takes as being part of the San Francisco, Los Angeles, or San Diego reporting areas, but he did not know exactly where ICE has its field offices.

Member Smith asked whether DAG Lindsey knew how other areas, such as the Central Valley, would be reported by ICE.

DAG Lindsey responded that he believed most of the Central Valley would probably be reported in the San Francisco area of responsibility.

Member Smith responded that it sounded broad, so a particular city or county acts like a jurisdictional or regional anchor.

DAG Lindsey agreed and further explained that the San Diego area is actually pretty small because it is basically just the southern border. In addition, he explained that most states are actually reported with other states in the data.

Member Guerrero stated that she appreciated Member Smith's interest in trying to tap this data and noted that her organization tracks this data pretty closely. She stated that she believed this data is outside of the bounds of what the RIPA Board is looking at, as that data collection is not under the purview of the Board. It is currently being generated from FOIA requests, and that there are websites that are tracking it. Member Guerrero noted there are questions about the integrity of that data. To the extent the Subcommittee can see patterns and trends in the way that the data is being captured, which is covering the whole state, it is just based on the jurisdictions that ICE has. Member Guerrero opined that the Board could refer to this data, but that the Board has a lot of work to do in looking into its own data. She noted that the one data point that the RIPA Board does have that relates to DHS agencies is the "pass off" data, when state or local LEAs pass people off to DHS. This is a data point the Board has been capturing for a number of years. Member Guerrero explained that there are limited exceptions for when that can happen, and that is a data point the Board is able to cross check against state-required data through the Truth Act, which requires a regional reporting by county sheriffs to the community about that "pass off" data. She explained that an individual can cross check what ICE is telling everyone that they are doing and make sure that it is within the allowed exceptions.

Turning to the 2027 RIPA Report, DAG Lindsey explained that DOJ has identified a number of potential topics for the Subcommittee to consider. These are suggestions, and DOJ appreciates the guidance and direction that the Subcommittee can provide, so the draft can be the most responsive to the interests of the Subcommittee and the Board generally. One potential topic is to expand on and analyze the available RIPA data that may be related to federal immigration enforcement actions and also bring in the 2025 data along with the data already discussed

between 2018 and 2024. The Subcommittee could also expand on the analysis conducted in the 2026 Report, relating to different modes of transportation and whether there are racial and identity disparities that could be significant in that area. In particular, the Subcommittee could more clearly distinguish the stops relating to calls for service from officer-initiated stops on transportation types to better understand the difference in transportation policing. DAG Lindsey explained that, last time, the Subcommittee did not disambiguate the transportation numbers between the officer-initiated stops and the stops relating to calls for service in the 2026 Report. One difference to consider here would be that, if an officer knocks on someone's door, that ends up in the RIPA data as a pedestrian stop, so that would be a call for service pedestrian stops, which may be a reason to distinguish there. DAG Lindsey explained that the Subcommittee might also want to understand how differences in the number of persons stopped in a vehicle stop might impact a stop, and the differences in policing that come from that. People may be carpooling more or less depending on things relating to their background. DAG Lindsey explained that there may be information on that, and it is possible for there to be differences related to adult passengers when they approach a vehicle. DOJ looked at the feasibility of this type of analysis and it is possible, however the Subcommittee should know that as they further divide data, there may be some really small groups in any of these divisions and as the focus becomes narrower and narrower, there may not be enough data to really make a conclusion.

DAG Lindsey explained that the Subcommittee could also look at conducting a longitudinal analysis of the data received over the last four years. The Board now has a full set of data from all reporting agencies for the last four years, from 2022 to 2025. The Subcommittee could look at the data in its entirety over those four years, and this might be helpful to assess trends or identify particular types of reform to see if there was an impact. However, this type of analysis does come with some caveats. The Subcommittee should not ignore the possibility that the trends seen may be because the officers are facing different circumstances over time as well. For example, the Subcommittee might also be interested in looking at consent search rates and search discovery rates to look into different search practices and disparities, to see if there are trends there. Search discovery rate disparities are also useful to understand how probable cause is ascertained. The Subcommittee could also assess whether there are differences in stops relating to calls for service or officer-initiated stops over time, and what the proportion of stops are reported as a call for service or officer-initiated, which could maybe indicate there is a change in policing towards more or less discretion. The Subcommittee could also look at particular kinds of stops, such as whether there are more or less loitering stops, which could sometimes be as pretextual stops, or whether there are more or less mental health-related stops, which could impact other behavior in the stops. The Subcommittee could also examine whether there has been more, less, or different kinds of use of force reported over the four years. DAG Lindsey cautioned again that looking at the four years, there may not be a meaningful amount of data to do any sort of prediction. The Subcommittee should also consider what time periods they are looking at – for example, are they looking at the data by years or by quarters? The Subcommittee may also want to narrow down the list of the variables examined over time, and then examine them based on a concrete research question. DAG Lindsey noted that it is also possible that the changes over time are actually very small. It is very consistent over the past four years.

DAG Lindsey concluded his presentation, and Co-Chair Khadjavi invited Subcommittee members to share any questions or comments they may have before moving into a broader discussion about what the Subcommittee would like to focus on in this year's Report.

Member Dobard thanked DAG Lindsey for his presentation, and expressed that he was interested in a longitudinal analysis. He heard DAG Lindsey say that it is possible to do that with four years of data and asked whether it was possible to go back further than four years and also acknowledge the limitations in the data.

DAG Lindsey explained that it may be possible, although there is different data collected over time, so the challenges with that type of analysis increase as the analysis is expanded out. There

have also been different ways of collection, so the Subcommittee could not assess whether there has been a statewide change when not including all the local and state agencies. DAG Lindsey explained that there are more limitations when the analysis is prior to 2022 because it would no longer be collecting all the state and local LEAs and it would be a different sample.

Member Dobard clarified that while it is possible, it could get more complicated to do such an analysis. DAG Lindsey affirmed.

Co-Chair Khadjavi related that her understanding was that some agencies like CHP and LAPD started reporting in the very first years of RIPA, and that each year, there was a larger wave of agencies participating in RIPA data collection. For some of those agencies, the Subcommittee could go back further, but statewide, it is only the most recent years that are representative of the entire state.

DAG Lindsey agreed and noted that there have been different changes in the reporting requirements and regulations across those years, both in terms of what DOJ collects, and in how things are categorized, which means that the Subcommittee may not actually be able to make those comparisons. There are more challenges in comparing period to period as you expand out, which is something for the Subcommittee to consider. DAG Lindsey explained that the question of whether the Subcommittee could compare the data from the first year of RIPA to the last year would come down to the research question proposed.

Co-Chair Khadjavi agreed and also noted that some of that reporting period was also during the pandemic, where there were dramatic changes and things well across the state in every aspect of our lives. She opined that if the Subcommittee is able to look at older data, it would be like a before, and then hop, and then look at the more recent. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated she wanted to emphasize Member Dobard's comment, and expressed support for a longitudinal analysis. She stated that the Subcommittee wants to see if there are jurisdictions that, when they make policy changes, that can be seen reflected in stops. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated this would be very valuable to do, and she would love to see that as a focus of this year's Report.

Member Smith noted that, because the data on referrals to DHS is somewhat limited based on the preliminary review, he wondered whether it could also be helpful to look at perceived English fluency or limited English ability as one of the categories of information collected during the stop as a proxy, alone or in combination with perceived race or ethnicity, as a way to get a better understanding of whether there could be some bias related to immigrant communities.

DAG Lindsey stated that the difficulty is, while there is some connection there, the connection would not always be direct because people can have a limited English proficiency and they have no immigration involvement, or they can speak fluent English and they have a different immigration status. The Policies section of the Report is going to be looking at limited English proficiency, as well as some issues related to that.

Member Smith stated that the issue is something the Subcommittee should consider, and in doing so, they could provide some form of qualification as to the analysis. He noted that even when it comes to race or ethnicity, it is based on officer perception, so there is always some degree of potential inaccuracy based on what officers perceive and then the actuality of the situation. Given the data set that the Board has, the Subcommittee should think about different creative ways to potentially try to get towards using the data in a way that sheds some degree of light on the main problem. Member Smith stated he thought this is one thing the Subcommittee should consider, and if it chooses to go that route, it could provide some, some description in the methods. It is imperfect, but it is a way to get at the main issue.

DAG Lindsey agreed that this was definitely something to consider and that DOJ could explore, but again, someone who has limited English proficiency does not necessarily mean there is an immigration involvement, so there is limited ability to look at that.

Member Smith thanked DAG Lindsey and stated that he would be interested in seeing some content on that if possible.

Member Guerrero stated that the issue of data collection is a ripe one, and there have been efforts at the federal level to replicate the RIPA law so that we can get some federal data going. But, with the data available to the Subcommittee regarding contact between agencies, it is limited but the Subcommittee should make use of it. Member Guerrero noted the Subcommittee had delved into the duty to intervene last year, so taking a look at that is important. Member Guerrero noted that there are available data sets that DOJ captures and asked what the array of DOJ data is — not federal data, not stop data, but other DOJ data that might help the Subcommittee understand what's going on.

DAG Lindsey answered that this was something that DOJ could look at exploring as a future topic, and that he believed DOJ collects other data sets just to see if there is something in the other data sets that might relate to the RIPA data, such as URSUS data, for example, relating to use of force and things like that.

Member Guerrero noted that the state protections from California law enforcement involvement have this huge carve out for joint task forces, so an understanding of how many joint task forces there are would be helpful. This is something that is supposed to be reported through the state mandated Truth Act forms, but the information collected from those is wildly different from what an individual may get out of Public Records Act requests. Member Guerrero expressed that she did not know if DOJ tracks joint task forces, which is not stop data, but it is data on the number and location of joint task forces, which would be good to know because they are such a large carve out of state protections.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that Member Guerrero had raised the duty to intervene, and expressed that she was really moved by last year's meeting. Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that it was very informative when the Board talked about immigration actions and California. She wondered whether that discussion would be part of the Policies subcommittee section, but also asked Member Guerrero whether she had more specific comments or ideas or suggestions for how this Subcommittee could focus on that.

Member Guerrero replied that when the Board had the meeting on duty to intervene, the nation was just beginning to understand that local police have a role to play, and since that time, we have seen instances of local police intervention recording attempts at prosecution and all of that. Member Guerrero stated that the Subcommittee might give thought to how data collection could inform that work or how policy research could inform that work. She stated that, although this would be for the Policies section, there is legislation moving at the state level to strengthen accountability measures around use of force by federal agents, and that has to do with duty to intervene, duty to investigate, and duty to prosecute.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that she heard Member Guerrero mention use of force and expressed that might be an inroad or an opening for this Report in general, but also for this Subcommittee.

Member Guerrero responded that she believed the Subcommittee might have to think out-of-the-box a little bit as Member Smith has been urging, to really think about how the Subcommittee can get at meaningful data that can help inform policy making and community protection, and in providing more guidance. The Board did not lay it out other than at that special meeting it had, but guidance around duty to intervene and what that looks like. So, for example, we know that that local LEAs are creating incident reports when we get calls around federal actions, so we can think about whether we should be providing any guidance or should we be drawing from those to look at best practices, because that is a form of data collection that local law enforcement is doing that is outside of the stop data. It is more qualitative in nature, but they are generating incident reports. Member Guerrero stated she did not know if there is any easy way to capture all

those incident reports related to federal immigration actions, but they are a wealth of information, one by one, and would be more so if they could somehow be aggregated.

Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that it would be powerful if there was a space for this. She did not know about this Subcommittee and the Board, but there is powerful work to be done to support this, to really enhance community safety and support this duty to intervene. Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that this is very complicated, but it is something that she would love to see the Board make progress on, even though she was not sure exactly the entry point. That said, Co-Chair Khadjavi asked if there are other issues that Subcommittee members wanted to raise that are policy-intertwined. She noted that this Subcommittee is always in service to the other subcommittees, so other ideas will emerge in the later meetings too, such as, for example, English proficiency as a point of focus. Nevertheless, she invited Subcommittee members to raise additional ideas.

Member Guerrero noted two areas that could be of interest to the Subcommittee: First, some longitudinal analysis of whether anything has changed over 10 years, because the Board will soon have ten years of data. Member Guerrero noted that she looks closely at the consent search data, and the consent search data has been changing over time in certain agencies and that has to do often with consent decrees or litigation. She suggested maybe getting a handle on what things have changed or not changed. This could even be anecdotal, or it could be in the aggregate. The Board knows overall the instances of disparities are consistent year-over-year, but if DOJ could identify where there have been changes, for better or worse, across the data over 10 years, this would be meaningful and would be good for the Subcommittee to see and understand. The second area of interest would be around homelessness. Capturing an individual's perceived housing status is new to the Board, and going a little bit deeper to understand what that data is telling the Subcommittee would be great, because it is pretty alarming.

Member Dobard stated that he would like to add to this discussion and also elaborate a little bit on what he had mentioned earlier about the longitudinal analysis. He wanted to elaborate or add to what Member Guerrero mentioned. Member Dobard expressed that it is important to have that analysis at this time, in part because of what Member Guerrero just mentioned. This will be the 10th Report, and that is a good opportunity to look back. It is unfortunate that the Board faces some of the data limitations it does, but, nevertheless, it is important to have that as part of the 10th Report that will be out. Another reason it is important is that, as Member Guerrero mentioned, for the Board and others who may follow the data, we know that there is consistency, but for folks who are not following it closely, that is not necessarily the case, so having at least one report that can talk about that to some degree is useful for the public, so that folks do not have to go necessarily go back to every single report and figure that out for themselves.

Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked Member Dobard for his perspective, and added that, as to this idea of the longitudinal analysis, there are many things that have not changed, and it is very frustrating. There also may be things that have changed, and it would be nice to highlight those. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that it is always a strong focus on consent because that is a place where policy really can be set by agencies and how much this idea of consent is used or not. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the Board has seen agencies change in their emphasis, and it would be nice to see if that is captured in the data.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted that mental health-related stops was something that DAG Lindsey had talked about, and she remembered that years ago, the full Board had the opportunity to hear from some communities where the local law enforcement was aligning, for example, with a social worker or others, and depending on the nature of a call that was coming in, it would affect who was who was sent out. It would be great to find something similar, even if there were smaller communities. There might be something that is not captured at the statewide level because there are so many stops statewide, but actually there might be smaller communities where you can actually see the impact of a policy. In this way, the longitudinal analysis might

not necessarily be done in a comprehensive way for every question or type of action. It might be that it is valuable to find some smaller jurisdictions that promoted a particular policy and then look to see specifically what has happened there, even if it would not be seen on the state level in the full aggregate.

DAG Lindsey agreed and explained that this is why a full longitudinal analysis could be beneficial, because you need the comparison. An interesting question to think about is whether the community that adopted the change saw a change and whether the change was divergent from the rest of the state or among the rest of the state. DAG Lindsey noted that there is going to be a difficulty in identifying what changes are actually implemented — whether the effort was done with full fidelity, or whether there was an announcement and then it was silently rolled back — which does make such an analysis more difficult. However, one of the strengths of the longitudinal analysis is that the Subcommittee can see both whether there was a change and how that change looked like compared to the rest of the state, and whether there was a lasting impact as well.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that there is a great research team at DOJ and expressed her hope that will be a combination of looking at the data and stepping back to look at policies from specific agencies and seeing how those interplay on all the ways described by DAG Lindsey. Maybe there is an impact or maybe for various reasons it did not affect things. But, being able to dig deeper that way, even if it is not in a systematic, every single jurisdiction, maybe given the statewide look then there are particular agencies where the Subcommittee can work more deeply. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked if, ideally, the Subcommittee could highlight whether there are agencies where they can measure the impact of the policy change (and if not, of course, that is troubling too; that is a key part of the Report), are there some practices the Subcommittee can point to that would be captured exactly by doing a longitudinal analysis? Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted that if there are areas that would intertwine with the Policies subcommittee, this is a place to put it in.

On that point, Member Dobard noted that there were subcommittees meeting later this week. Member Dobard affirmed that, if the Subcommittee proceeds with the longitudinal analysis, it should absolutely be paired and complemented with some discussion, analysis of what policies have been adopted over these years, what have shown promise, what have not gone the way the Subcommittee wishes they would have gone. He could see those being complimentary and being an important major focus for this upcoming Report, but obviously, they would need to talk about that with the Policies subcommittee.

Going back to the slide, Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that she appreciated the idea of separating out calls for service and officer-initiated stops. She thought the Subcommittee had even heard from folks in law enforcement on the Board before who have wanted to highlight that as well. Co-Chair Khadjavi also appreciated everything else that had been listed — especially use of force, looking at loitering stop rates, longitudinal analysis, and so on — all looked like valuable avenues to explore, even though not everything can be a priority all the time. Co-Chair Khadjavi was not sure if DAG Lindsey was coming with this list thinking to narrow it down, but everything looked very promising on every front.

DAG Lindsey noted that one thing to look into is, understanding there is going to be seasonality in the data, does the Subcommittee want to look at the data year by year, or maybe accepting that the Subcommittee would see some seasonality, do they also want to try to look at it with a little finer point? That also might help with how the Subcommittee presents the policies information as well, because the policies typically are not going to start January 1 of each year. DAG Lindsey opined that the Subcommittee can discuss how to present the longitudinal analysis — do they want to look at it quarterly, monthly, or maybe a different way to present information to the public? He noted that the Subcommittee has to explain the seasonality because there may be

significant seasonality here, but you may be able to visually observe some trends in the past seasonality.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that she did not know what story the data will tell, but her gut is that when the research team actually goes to look at particular trends, it may become apparent that there is a good basis for dividing up the time periods in a certain way so that they aren't arbitrary. Co-Chair Khadjavi explained that she was not saying years are arbitrary, but there may be other reasons, like a policy might not be rolled out on January 1. Although it complicates the first pass through and trying to look at some of these, Co-Chair Khadjavi thought it would be valuable to not think of it only as annual data. She noted that there is also a big challenge lurking behind, that DAG Lindsey raised earlier, which is that what was collected in the first years is not the same as what is being collected now. But, that does not mean they are not apples and donkeys; they are apples and pretty close oranges, so it is worth the comparison.

DAG Lindsey agreed and noted that the difference is more like there needs to be an asterisk, but the challenges will not become apparent really until the Subcommittee really tries to dial in on some of these.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that, rewinding on the slide regarding transportation analysis, there was the possible idea of looking, in particular, to see how not only how driver and pedestrian and cyclist stops might be different (which the Subcommittee can now immediately disaggregate the way the data is collected now), but also by type of transportation and number of people in vehicle. She asked if anyone would like to say more about that, or if it caught the ear of any other Subcommittee members.

DAG Lindsey replied that previously, prior to collecting that information, the Subcommittee did an analysis that tried to disambiguate on pedestrians and bicyclists based on Penal Code charges in the 2023 Report, and that helped us understand categories. One thing that is also possible is that a stop on a bus is considered a pedestrian stop. The Subcommittee may want to look at the few Penal Code stops that are really only public transportation stops, in particular the fare dodging charge or a charge for something like possessing a weapon on public transportation. DAG Lindsey explained that these also might be something else to look into the transportation aspect of expanding the data the Subcommittee has on transportation. DAG Lindsey additionally noted that there are different commuter patterns that are correlated with race, at least on the number of passengers in the car, so the Subcommittee could also think about the different approaches in stops when there are more people in the car, that also have had downstream effects on the stop outcomes and or even decisions to make a stop.

Member Smith stated that looking into that specific topic would be really helpful. Member Smith has been working in partnership with organizations that have a significant interest in the issue of racial disparities and stops for people who are riding public transportation, and as mentioned, fare evasion is one of the main ways that bubbles up in the data. He stated that if it is possible, that would be extremely helpful to some people in the field that are interested in the topic and looking at how racial profiling plays out in different parts of transportation.

DAG Lindsey replied that DOJ would start getting the wheels turned on looking at that.

Co-Chair Khadjavi added that something that has come up in past years and has been somewhat looked at, although not always comprehensively, is the idea of picking a particular violation code and then tracing through how that impacts folks. As an example with cars, some municipalities raise the idea that if someone has expired registration, maybe that is not what the community wants law enforcement spending most of its time on. The question would be whether we could have enforced or encouraged people or find ways for people to keep registration current that does not end up getting bogged down in law enforcement. Co-Chair Khadjavi did not remember offhand if there are some communities in California who decided that is not a public safety issue, and maybe that is not the basis we want for a stop. She stated it would be interesting to see if,

getting back to the longitudinal analysis, there was a way to see if particular violations are handled differently now by any municipalities. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated she was going to see if she could find either some news stories or other things related to particular cities or agencies in California is considering handling some violation in a different way, and then the Subcommittee can see if that played out.

Member Smith stated that San Francisco is one jurisdiction that has made significant movement on stops based on administrative issues like registration, paperwork stuff, and also very minor equipment issues. If the Subcommittee was interested in looking for examples, that is one jurisdiction to consider that may be helpful. Member Smith stated that it is still a work in progress in Los Angeles, but that might be another to look at.

Member Alatorre stated that he believed Berkeley PD recently did the same.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted there have been there have been comments in the past or even rhetoric in the committee meetings about public safety, and if that is the overriding goal, then having these administrative violations handled differently because it is a very productive part of how it is done. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated she heard Berkeley, San Francisco, and maybe some movement in LA, but it would be of interest to see if that is already measurable. She noted that Berkeley might have been the municipality she had read about, but she could not remember when or if it was more a proposal or if it was something they were implementing. But the data will tell us a story.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether there were other comments or suggestions from Board members. Seeing none, the Subcommittee took a scheduled five-minute break.

5. BREAK

Following the break, Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether the Subcommittee members felt like the discussion had captured what they wanted ahead this year and, in particular, if there was anyone who had a suggestion, idea, concern that they wanted to raise. Seeing no hands, Co-Chair Khadjavi turned to the public comment portion of the meeting.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

An individual who would like to be known as the Jamaican gave public comment. He stated that some people know him by name, and even though he tries to travel incognito, he sees that despite his having said it in previous meetings, the minutes of the reports identify him by name and where he's from. He would rather not see that, as it feels a little bit like doxxing. If he asks or refuses not to give his location or his name, it should not appear in the minutes of a report.

The Jamaican stated that he continues to be disappointed by much of the discussion he hears as to what purports to be factual with respect to RIPA data. He attended the meetings that led up to the adoption of the reporting rules. He attended most recent meetings ever since, and we continue to have discussions that speak of what data is and what data isn't. Homelessness was at the core of discussions on to what needed to be collected, and it was led by the Los Angeles Police Department, who now have problems with homelessness and the capture of homeless data. The Jamaican asked the Subcommittee not to speak as though it is something de novo. We have always had it. We have always had the ability to speak intelligently about the numbers. For example: in San Diego, if you look at 2024 data, you will use the unhoused flag to identify about thirteen and a half thousand perceived unhoused people. However, if you use the narrative fields together with what they were charged with, how they were cited, how they were arrested, you will find a number of other records, perhaps 20% more. People were camping in the riverbank bed. People were camping on sidewalks. Many of those are not captured in the homeless unhoused flag. So, he urged the Subcommittee to be honest about this. He believed, the first time that he looked at it in detail, that there were about 1.2 million people who can be perceived as

how has been unhoused since 2018. In San Diego alone, the number is in triple digits, and we have representation for every year.

With respect to the pretext flag, LAPD's data is robust and should be respected. With respect to San Francisco, that data is not available except perhaps to people who have connections. The Jamaican explained that he has no connections, so he have not been able to get it, and opined that perhaps the Subcommittee can help him to get it.

Finally, getting data. The Jamaican explained that people like himself are irritants to the DOJ CJIS. He has four or five CPRA requests for data that he has yet to get. Many of them are well overdue, so perhaps doctors should heal themselves. He does not remember the exact quotation, but we should not be speaking about transparency when we do not practice it.

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

7. NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURNMENT

Co-Chair Khadjavi explained that there was one item that was not raised earlier when it came up in the presentation, which was the data dashboard. She expressed that it was very welcome to hear there is significant movement on that, and that this is something that the Board has called for strongly in the past. She stated that she really appreciates all those who are working on that.

Looking to the next steps, Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the Policies subcommittee meeting is this Thursday. She asked whether anyone from DOJ can remind the Subcommittee of when the next full Board meeting is.

DAG Simpson stated that the next subcommittee meeting is the meeting of the Policies subcommittee on Thursday, March 19, 2026 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Following that, the Accountability and Civilian Complaints subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, 2026 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. The full Board meeting is set for Thursday, April 23, 2026 from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that she really appreciated the suggestions that were made, the comments, the many strands, the focus that might be parts of focus of this year's Report. She asked if anyone else had anything to add. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that very important things are highlighted, including, as Member Dobard noted, the fact that the Board was coming up on 10 years of reporting, so the idea of a longitudinal focus is really critical, and she especially appreciates the specific things that were raised.

8. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked the Subcommittee and the staff at DOJ, and explained that she knows it is a heavy lift from all the work that law enforcement does collecting the data and then through to the research questions worked on this year.

Hearing no objections, Co-Chair Khadjavi adjourned the meeting.