

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)

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

STOP DATA ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 27, 2025, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Subcommittee Members Present: Co-Chairs Lily Khadjavi and Chad Bianco, and Members John Dobard, Darren Greene, LaWanda Hawkins, and Chauncey Smith

Subcommittee Members Absent: Members Souley Diallo, Andrea Guerrero, and Rich Randolph

1. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CO-CHAIRS

Co-Chair Khadjavi called the meeting to order.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Each Stop Data Subcommittee (herein Subcommittee) member introduced themselves.

3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 5, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

Co-Chair Khadjavi proposed three friendly amendments to the March 5, 2025, meeting minutes: (1) Correct page 3, at the beginning of section 5, to state that the 2023 data, not the 2024 data, is posted in OpenJustice; (2) clarify on page 5, in section 5, that Co-Chair Khadjavi's statement that frisks and search rates were disproportionately high for pedestrians referred to historical LAPD data and not RIPA data; and (3) correct page 8, right before section 6, to properly attribute citation of the CHP Commissioner's statement that "in discretion bias blooms" to Member Guerrero instead of Co-Chair Khadjavi.

Co-Chair Bianco moved to approve the minutes with the three amendments introduced by Co-Chair Khadjavi; Member Hawkins seconded. Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Alexander Simpson of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) proceeded with the roll call vote:

- **AYE:** Co-Chair Bianco, Member Greene, Member Hawkins, Co-Chair Khadjavi, Member Smith
- **NAY:**
- **ABSTAIN:** Member Dobard

With five Ayes and one Abstain, the meeting minutes were approved.

4. UPDATES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAG Garrett Lindsey presented updates regarding the 2026 Report draft.

DAG Lindsey explained that, as discussed in the March 13, 2025 full Board meeting, the focus of the 2026 Report is on public safety and the impact of racial and identity profiling on public safety in particular. The Policies subcommittee offered a definition of public safety at its May 22, 2025 meeting, for purposes of the 2026 Report, as "the experience of community members

being and feeling safe from threats to their lives or well-being.” DAG Lindsey explained that the Board could use the RIPA stop data to aid in this focus, and assess whether there are particular data elements or things collected that the Board should focus on that relate to public safety and the provided definition.

Turning to the Stop Data section of this year’s report, DAG Lindsey reminded the Subcommittee that there are new data elements in the 2024 data. In reporting stop data, law enforcement agencies now differentiate between vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian stops. Previously, the Board could analyze moving, non-moving, and equipment violations for vehicle stops. DAG Lindsey explained that for this year’s data, the Board could perform a similar analysis, looking at moving, non-moving, and equipment violations for bicycle stops or differences within pedestrian stops.

Another data analysis for the Board to consider is a more detailed analysis of the outcomes of consent searches. DAG Lindsey explained that the Board now has more information on consent searches this year in the RIPA stop data collection. The Board could also look at law enforcement agencies that have prohibited pretext stops and look to see whether there are any differences when compared to other agencies.

DAG Lindsey noted that there is more information this year about officers who are conducting stops. DOJ now collects the self-identified race and ethnicity of officers in stop data, as well as other characteristics that were collected prior to 2024, such as the officers’ years of experience. The Board could analyze this data to determine how the officer’s characteristics, like identity characteristics or experience, affect their behavior in stops.

DAG Lindsey also noted that the Board could look further at the durations of stops, which the Board had done in prior reports, as the Board has now collected many years of stop data collection in the RIPA data set with regards to duration of stop and other data elements, particularly with regards to the Wave 1 agencies, who reported their data before the other agencies.

DAG Lindsey asked the Subcommittee for guidance on how it would like the Stop Data section of the report to be organized. Generally, the Stop Data section has been organized by the flow of the stop, or by the first event, with the demographic information, identity characteristics, and information on the person stopped coming after that. However, in the 2025 RIPA Report, the Board organized some of its data and analysis relating to youth in a separate section, organized by youth characteristics, which allowed readers of the report to look more closely at stops of youth in the data. DAG Lindsey explained that the 2026 Report could organize the data in a similar format for the Stop Data section as a whole. This would mean that the focus of the section would be on the identity characteristics of the person stopped first. In the alternative, the Subcommittee could elect to continue the practice of organizing information by the stop event first.

DAG Lindsey explained that there are some advantages of sorting stop data by identity characteristic first. In general, identity demographic characteristics are more understood by readers unfamiliar with the data and the analysis. Sorting by identity characteristics first allows a reader to focus on the topic they are interested in first, and/or consider how differences in the

composition of the identity group relates to the next stop event. As an example, one group might be searched more often, which would impact how we understand the rate at which law enforcement officers discover contraband in a search. These differences in the discovery rate allow the reader to form different conclusions when looking at the data in this way. Organizing the data by identity characteristic first also allows the reader to more readily connect events of one group across the stop, and it may give a reader a greater focus on systemic bias experienced by the identity group.

DAG Lindsey displayed a mockup of identity-first analysis to the Subcommittee. The mockup showed the data organized first by looking at the total number of stops by race and ethnicity, then looking just at calls for service by race and ethnicity, and then looking just at results of stop by race and ethnicity. This organization would allow the Board to analyze what is happening from event to event and assess whether there are any differences in the composition of those events by race and ethnicity. The Board could also potentially look at particular areas of intersectionality more closely with this approach.

DAG Lindsey next presented a second mockup sorted by stop flow, or the events within a stop. This organization, which has been used in prior Stop Data sections, may be more useful to understand how particular police practices, such as search practices, impact groups across the board.

DAG Lindsey explained that some of the topics that would be helpful for the Subcommittee to discuss at this meeting were: (1) how the Stop Data section could contribute to this year's theme of public safety; (2) what kind of data analysis should be included in the Stop Data section this year, particularly with the focus on public safety and in light of the new data elements available this year; and (3) how the data should be organized, whether by individual characteristic, by stop event, or by a different approach.

Subcommittee Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether it would be possible to have bar graphs, showing, for example, search rates by race and ethnicity as compared to different members of the California population, and how the search rates vary, and then have a separate graph showing discovery rates, disaggregating the data by identity group first. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the mockups made it difficult to visualize how the data could be organized.

DAG Lindsey explained that there would be differences in how the proposed approach organized the data compared to the approach in the Stop Data section from prior years. If the Board is looking at a particular data element, such as search rate, one approach would organize all the data showing differences in identity characteristics relating to the search rate before moving on to other data elements, such as differences in the stop rate, or differences in the discovery rate. Another approach would be to organize the data by identity characteristic, which would look at all of the differences in identity characteristics across each data element (search rate, stop rate, discovery rate, etc.). DAG Lindsey explained that these proposed changes are more related to how the data is presented and organized, which could change how the reader of the report can understand the data in the report, and how one event in a stop affects the next, or how a reader could more closely assess issues like intersectionality in the data.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that in the past, the Board has looked at data elements like search rates, and analyzed them first by race and ethnicity. Co-Chair Khadjavi wanted to clarify that there was a possibility that, by presenting the data in a different way—by disaggregating first by race and ethnicity—it might make some analyses, such as an intersectional analysis and potentially other breakdowns, more easy to understand.

DAG Lindsey explained that the question for the Subcommittee was how the data should be presented, considering the data could not be shown all at once. The Board has the opportunity to choose what order to present the data, whether by race and ethnicity first, and then showing different events within each race and ethnicity, or show the data by event first, and then the different identity characteristics within that event. Co-Chair Khadjavi explained that the Subcommittee would circle back to the issue after hearing from Research Services.

DOJ Research Data Specialist III Dr. Eric van Holm presented next. Dr. van Holm explained that the Research Services team had only had the 2024 data for about a month, and had been cleaning the data and preparing it for the analyses to come. The initial analysis of the data showed that there were approximately 5.1 million stops in 2024, or about 400,000 more stops than in 2023, collected from 533 agencies.

Dr. van Holm explained that Research Services was considering two sets of analyses based on feedback from the Board. Dr. van Holm explained that, as always, DOJ was open to suggestions on ways to modify any of its analyses to better fit the expectations of the Board.

Analysis #1: Agency-Level Analysis

The first set of analyses is at the agency level. Dr. van Holm explained that during meetings, the Board has been very interested in the potential of a regional analysis, using the RIPA data for all agencies across the state to understand differences within agencies, as well as differences in how stops occur across regions. These analyses have been described in a few different ways throughout the meetings; terms like “hotspot” and “concentration” have been used. However, Dr. van Holm explained that the RIPA data does not show stops by individual geolocation, and therefore the Board could not conduct a specific analysis at the level of a hotspot. However, the Board could conduct a regional analysis, aggregating those stops to the agency level, in order to understand those differences across agencies.

Dr. van Holm listed some potential outcomes by aggregating the stop data to the agency level, and noted that the Board could assess things like the percentage of stops for each agency of different racial groups, or comparing two community regional demographics to each other—for example, which agencies have the most disproportionate percentage of stops of individuals perceived to be Black, or which agency has the most disproportionate share of stops of individuals perceived to be Asian. The Board could also look at individual agencies to assess things like the percentage of stops for each agency, and the percentage of stops resulting in an arrest, no action, or different data elements such as searches or uses of force. In this manner, the Board could assess which agencies had the highest percentage of stops with particular actions within them, or could look within the stop to understand different regional or agency level factors that drive those outcomes.

Dr. van Holm also explained that the Board could also aggregate stops and bring in external data on counties and agencies to understand different factors of the region and agency. County or regional demographics could play a factor in how law enforcement agencies are handling stops. The Board's analysis could look at data collected by the census, such as information on urbanization, commuting patterns, and population density, or other factors, such as crime rates or even the agency type (police department or sheriff's department), which may have some influence on outcomes for each agency.

Dr. van Holm presented, as an example, a snapshot showing Riverside, San Diego, and Imperial counties, and the various agencies that are within those areas and how they are spread out across these counties and the region. Dr. van Holm highlighted some potential research questions that could be studied: For example, the Board could compare agencies within the same county, and assess how each agency type affects outcomes of stops. The Board could attempt to determine whether sheriff's offices and police departments have different outcomes across the different measures described previously, or whether there is a trend that one type of agency has more or less of a particular outcome. The Board could also look at whether crime rates at the county level are correlated with particular data elements, such as use of force or other actions taken during a stop. Dr. van Holm also noted that the Board could assess what counties have higher rates or lower rates of particular outcomes, and assess relative trends across regions. These analyses could be multifaceted to account for all of those different agency and regional factors simultaneously, to determine which factors are most directly correlated with those outcomes of interest.

Analysis #2: Co-Occurrence Analysis

The second analysis proposed by the Board would be an analysis of the "life cycle" of a stop, to understand how different factors within a stop, in terms of demographics and actions, are related within a stop. Dr. van Holm explained that there are limitations in the data which would not allow the Board to assess the sequence of events occurring within a stop. Law enforcement officers do not record the order of events within a stop for the purposes of the RIPA data—i.e., what action taken occurs first, and what occurs next. However, Dr. van Holm explained that, based on some basic assumptions, the Board can assess four stages of a stop.

The first stage is the information preceding the stop: the officer's perception of the person stopped, the demographics of the officer, the location of the stop, and whether the person stopped was a pedestrian, in a vehicle, or on a bicycle. The second stage is the reason for the stop: whether there was a call for service, or whether it was an officer initiated stop. The third stage is the actions taken during the stop. The fourth stage is the result of stop: whether there is an arrest, for example, or no action taken.

Dr. van Holm explained that these four distinct areas of a stop can be understood as a sequence, but the data does not reveal a sequence of actions taken during a stop, or how different actions taken influence each other. The Board can analyze these four stages of a stop and how they impact each other, and there is a relationship and sequencing of stops within those four stages. The Board can analyze, for example how demographics differ and influence the reason for stops,

how those demographics end up impacting the result of stop, and how earlier stages influence later stages.

This type of analysis could answer questions about stops and actions, such as what actions are most likely to co-occur during a stop, how demographics change the odds of certain actions being taken, or how actions impact the odds of certain outcomes when they begin with similar conditions. Additionally, this analysis could look at whether there are disparities in the type of consent given (e.g., verbal, implied, or written) and the type of search that is conducted, or this could be looked at as a factor that drives outcomes or results of stops. The Board could also look at search and discovery rates in the different types of stops (e.g., vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian); how different inputs, such as demographics, impact the duration of stops; or the relationship of the reason for stop (e.g., calls for service or officer-initiated stops) to other variables, such as demographics.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked to clarify what Dr. van Holm meant when referring to the order of steps and whether those steps refer back to concrete actions taken during stops. Dr. van Holm confirmed that they do.

Member Greene noted that 539 agencies were reporting in 2023, and in 2024 there were 533. Member Greene asked what happened to the other six agencies in 2024. Dr. van Holm stated he was not able to answer this question off hand, but can speak to this at a future presentation.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that it sounds like there was a 10 percent increase in the total number of stops between 2023 and 2024, and asked whether that could be attributed to particular agencies. Dr. van Holm stated the Research Services team will look into whether this change was attributable to a specific agency or a general trend across all agencies.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked when there would be presentation from DOJ about the full RIPA data. Dr. van Holm stated that DOJ was preparing to give a presentation at a future meeting.

Member Hawkins stated that the report was good and provided a lot of detail. Member Hawkins expressed interest in understanding what happened to the six agencies that did not report in 2024, as noted by Member Greene, and asked whether the report covered whether there were any disparities in the stop data at the time of the George Floyd protests. Dr. van Holm noted that this data is from 2024. Member Hawkins asked whether the data would cover the more recent protests in 2024, and Dr. van Holm noted that the data covers any stops from any of the reporting agencies (including U.C. and C.S.U. police agencies) in 2024, so that may be a trend that could be identified. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that a longitudinal analysis might implicitly cover these questions about COVID and the protests, although it may not be as much of an impact for the 2024 reporting year.

Member Greene stated that the demographic data reported for calls for service may change based on the time of day. For example, the demographics at 3:00 p.m. may be different than the demographics at 3:00 a.m. Member Greene asked if this could be broken down in the data. Dr. van Holm stated that it may be possible to identify these trends within the stops.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked DOJ if there were any updates related to the data dashboard. DAG Alexander Simpson explained the DOJ has been working to select the appropriate vendor for the data dashboard, to find a vendor to service the needs of the RIPA board and the public generally. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the discussion of data organization earlier in this meeting points to the need to have a data dashboard where members of the public can choose the factors they want to focus on and look at intersections of demographic characteristics, such as race, and outcomes. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that a data dashboard with these capabilities would speak to public interest and accessibility of the data.

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

5. BOARD DISCUSSION OF THE 2026 REPORT DRAFT AND DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Co-Chair Khadjavi opened discussion of the draft 2026 Report and reminded the Subcommittee that the theme for this year's report is public safety which was discussed in depth at the last Policies subcommittee meeting.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that she sees the Subcommittee's work as doing two things: providing analysis that supports the report as a whole, and identifying findings that can inform policy changes to improve the wellbeing of Californians. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked Subcommittee members to consider whether there are topics and analyses they could focus on that point to policy changes or recommendations, including evaluating the effectiveness of policy changes that agencies have already made.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked Subcommittee members if anyone had strong feelings about the organization of this year's Stop Data section. Member Greene recommended presenting all pertinent mitigating factors (such as time of day, type of stop, or calls for service) first, before demographic data, so that readers can see the point the Board is making at the outset. Member Greene expressed concern that presenting the demographic data first, followed by the mitigating factors, those might be glossed over and the reader may move on to the next topic.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that this is the first year that types of stops can be disaggregated (e.g., vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle stops), so once the team has had a chance to break down the types of stops, it may be valuable to look at the driver experience separately from the pedestrian experience. She asked DOJ to see if there are pronounced differences in the demographics by type of stop.

Member Dobard stated that, in light of this year's theme, he favored beginning with demographic analysis to center the issue of profiling directly, with contextual elements, including the mitigating factors noted by Member Greene, added afterward. Member Dobard stated that this approach would be consistent with the Board's intent to understand the impact of profiling on public safety and the degree to which that impact is disparate across groups.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Co-Chair Khadjavi asked Subcommittee members to consider areas for additional analysis identified in Section III of the draft report. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that the Policies subcommittee developed a definition of public safety and asked

whether the Stop Data Subcommittee would like to focus on any particular data elements, in light of this definition.

Member Dobard stated that framing the data by demographic group would be important, but there wasn't one particular data analysis that came to mind for the Subcommittee to focus on.

Co-Chair Khadjavi directed Subcommittee members to consider the suggested analyses listed in the proposed draft, including concentration analysis. Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that, at the last Board meeting, Member Guerrero commented on the value of looking at the agency or regional level how consent was used, and how practices may vary by region or agency. Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed an interest in focusing on areas where there could be a policy or practice change, rather than doing every possible analysis of the data. In particular, Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed interest in consent-type concentration, stop duration, and disparate search and discovery rates as related to different policy practices.

Dr. van Holm stated that Research Services could look at the percentage of stops that have consent-only searches and how that is associated with different outcomes that the agency tends to see, as well as how regional factors influence the consent and search practices of those agencies.

With respect to different types of stops, Co-Chair Khadjavi noted that historically the experience of drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists may be different in different regions, including Los Angeles and elsewhere, and that the disparities we see along racial and ethnic lines may be more pronounced. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked the Subcommittee if they think this would be a valuable framing for an analysis, since this is the first year the Board can separate out the experience of drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists.

Member Smith stated this would be a helpful form of analysis. Member Greene emphasized it would be important to include as much context as possible for these types of analysis, such as demographics, city or area, and time of day. For example, Member Greene stated that, stopping a lot of bicycles at 3:00 p.m. would raise some flags, but this would not raise flags if it occurred at 3:00 a.m. Co-Chair Khadjavi expressed that this may speak to the importance of the basis for stops as well, and asked the Subcommittee to consider what nuance might be needed or valuable for these sections.

With respect to consent searches, Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that this is a particularly important area for the Board to examine and develop potential recommendations to remove officer discretion where there are very pronounced disparities. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether the new data elements include distinguishing between verbal, implied, and written consent, and DAG Lindsey confirmed that it does. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked that the Board be provided with a code book of all the data elements.

Co-Chair Khadjavi next raised the topic of officer demographic data, including their self-identified race and the length of time they have served. Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether any Subcommittee members wanted to add to the suggestion that was discussed at the last Board meeting to look at how officer identity relates to the actions taken during a stop and the outcome of the stop. Co-Chair Khadjavi also asked whether the Policies subcommittee had entertained

any questions regarding officer identity or length of time they have served, and Member Dobard responded that they had not.

Co-Chair Khadjavi asked whether an analysis of officer demographics in relation to actions taken during a stop and the outcome of the stop might be of interest to the POST subcommittee. Member Greene stated that the question of an officer's race in relation to the race of the person stopped is interesting, but you get what you are looking for. Member Greene stated that you may find that one demographic is searching another demographic more, but to go beyond the race of the individual and the race of the officer speaks more to the background of the officer. For example, the workday of a bilingual officer who speaks fluent Spanish will go a lot smoother than an officer who has the same background as the person they stop but does not speak their language. Member Greene expressed that the analysis would go beyond the race of the individual, but he is not sure how to quantify that; accordingly, Member Greene stated that if the Board is going to make policy recommendations, they should have more than just what's on the surface to make those suggestions. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the reason this item is of interest is because, as law enforcement has diversified, there is a question of whether that has changed outcomes or if there are aspects of policy and policing culture that feed into the issues we're seeing.

Member Smith asked what the Subcommittee would be trying to get to by including an analysis of officers' self-identified race. Member Smith noted Co-Chair Khadjavi's earlier example of looking at the self-identified race of officers and the race of the person stopped in relation to the different types of actions that could occur during a stop, and asked to confirm whether that would be how the Subcommittee looks at this issue area. Co-Chair Khadjavi confirmed that it would.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also asked the Subcommittee to consider the remaining analyses proposed in the draft: duration of stop, longitudinal analysis of Wave 1 and Wave 2 reporting agencies, and looking at agencies that have language prohibiting pretextual stops. Member Smith noted that the draft proposed looking at search and discovery rates within race and ethnicity. Member Smith suggested also looking at uses of force within that context.

Co-Chair Khadjavi noted a prior public comment that different agencies may have different approaches to what they consider to be pretextual stops, and what it means to prohibit them, which may be reflected in the data, meaning this analysis in the Stop Data section could support the Policies section of the report.

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

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Michelle Wittig stated that several law enforcement agencies have made policy changes to limit stops and citations for low-level, non-safety related vehicle violations. As we know, others have enacted limitations on pretextual stops. Accordingly, this year's analysis could sort by whether a given law enforcement agency has enacted each of these policy reforms to be able to discern their so-called effects. Second, Ms. Wittig suggested that the Board consider developing and

widely disseminating a template for local law enforcement agencies, including the essential data charts and associated narrative, to use as the outline for their local reports so that agencies would meet a minimal standard of transparency. Third, regarding establishing the likely sequence of events in stops, Ms. Wittig encouraged the Board to consider testing the fit of one structural equations model that specifies perception of race as a predictor of a given outcome against an alternative model specifying perception of race as merely a co-occurrence with a given outcome. Ms. Wittig also proposed that once ten years of data are available, DOJ should prepare one summative document distilling the major insights the Board has achieved, taking into account new data elements that have been added over the years, as well as critiques of early reports, and articulating the Board's current understanding of the nature and occurrence of racial and identity profiling, its relationship to pretext stops, and similar contentious issues.

Richard Hylton stated that this has been stimulating, but also disappointing because people who should know more than he does, appear to not know as much as he does. Mr. Hylton stated that law requires the DOJ to respond to his requests for data in a timely fashion, but instead it merely ignores his requests. He noted a recent delay of two and a half months in responding to his request, and expressed disappointment.

Hearing no further comments, Co-Chair Khadjavi thanks the members of the public for their comments and moved to the next agenda item.

7. NEXT STEPS

The meeting concluded with a summary of next steps. Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the Subcommittee had laid out a broad agenda for DOJ with a rich data set, and expressed interest in seeing the preliminary analysis at the next meeting. Co-Chair Khadjavi also noted that the Subcommittee would also like an explanation as to why fewer agencies reported in 2024, compared to 2023, and why there was a large increase in the number of stops, in addition to the various points of analyses that were proposed in today's discussion. DOJ will also provide the Subcommittee with a codebook of 2024 data elements.

8. ADJOURN

Board Member Dobard moved to adjourn, and Board Member Hawkins seconded the motion. Co-Chair Khadjavi adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:00 p.m.