

**CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD (BOARD)**

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

**STOP DATA ANALYSIS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**June 18, 2024, 2:02 p.m. – 3:39 p.m.**

**Subcommittee Members Present:** Co-Chair Lily Khadjavi, Member LaWanda Hawkins, Member Darren Greene, Member John Dobard

**Subcommittee Members Absent:** Member Rich Randolph, Member Andrea Guerrero, Member Chad Bianco

**1. Introductions**

Co-Chair Khadjavi called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. Each STOP Data Subcommittee (herein Subcommittee) member introduced themselves.

**2. Introduction of New Board Member**

Member Greene introduced himself. He spent 25 years in the California Highway Patrol and his adolescence in Los Angeles. He was excited to work with the Subcommittee.

**3. Approval of August 29, 2023, Meeting Minutes**

Co-Chair Khadjavi opened the meeting by asking board members to review the draft meeting minutes from the Subcommittee's August 29, 2023, meeting.

Board members noted the date in the draft meeting minutes needed correction.

Member Hawkins motioned to approve the meeting minutes with the amended corrections, of which Member Dobard seconded.

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Kendal Micklethwaite of the California Department of Justice (DOJ) proceeded with the roll call vote:

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

With four Ayes, the meeting minutes were approved with the amended corrections.

**4. Update by DOJ Research Services on Data Processing and Analysis**

Daniel Harmon, PhD, Research Data Supervisor at the DOJ Research Services, presented the 2025 Report Preliminary Stop Data Overview.

He gave an initial summary of the ongoing analyses for the 2023 data. His goals were to provide a first look at the 2023 RIPA data, stratify data for youth and policing for initial analyses, and discuss other planned analyses and areas that may warrant deeper investigations.

539 agencies reported a total of 4,721,135 stops in 2023; 823,773 were stops of people aged 1-24.

Looking at overall data stratified by ages 1-17, 18-24, and 25+. Broad patterns were consistent across all three age categories:

- Hispanic/Latine(x) makes up most of stops
- White makes up second most stops
- Black makes up approximately 12% of stops

Focusing on youth of 17 and under, traffic stops are the predominant reason for making up the most for each ethnic identity, except for Black youth – where suspicion makes up more of a reason.

Most stops of persons for person 17 years old and under are officer-initiated regardless of identity and race. This is maintained for most gendered expression, except for transgender girls and boys, where calls for service are more or the same as officer-initiated, respectively. Harmon cautions on drawing conclusions because the population of transgender youth is small.

The DOJ Research Services looked at four types of actions taken for all age groups: searched, handcuffed, detained curbside or in patrol car, and ordered vehicle exit. Broad patterns were consistent across perceived race and ethnicity where searched and detained occurred more often than handcuffed and ordered vehicle exit.

An exception existed for Native Americans where the number detained curbside or in a patrol car were less than those handcuffed. Again, Harmon stated that the results may be influenced by a small population.

The overall average of all stops across all ages is 0.61. When stratified around identity, those with perceived LGBT, limited/no English fluency, and disability were above that average.

When stratified by race and age, youth had higher average actions taken for stops. Black, Hispanic/Latine(x), multiracial, and Native American youth had above 1 average stop.

Member Khadjavi asked when Harmon said actions taken for stops, whether he was regarding only the four actions previously stated (searched, handcuffed, detained curbside or in patrol car, and ordered vehicle exit). Harmon responded no. The average actions per stop incorporated other actions taken. Member Khadjavi stated that those four actions with law enforcement can negatively impact youth.

They stratified the ages into more groups: 1-9, 10-11, 12-14, 15-17, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+. In the 12-14 age range, 36.07% included action of detained curbside or in patrol car and 27.19% included action of handcuffs. It dips down after the 12-14 age range.

The overall average of percent of stops with a field interview card filled out for all ages was 3.17%. Black perceived race had over 6% of their stops with field interview cards completed. When stratified by ages, the 12-14 age range spiked for the percent of stops with a field interview card filled out.

They looked at three results for stops: warning, citation, and arrest. For overall age ranges, the most frequent results of stops by race and ethnicity showed a consistent pattern of citations being the most common, followed by warning and then arrest. There is an exception for Native American identity, where warnings are more frequent than citations.

When divided by age ranges, there exists a similar pattern. Above age 18, the order of frequency is citation, warning, and arrest. However, arrests are most common for the 12-14 age group. Furthermore, warning is the most common from 1-11.

Going forward they will look at:

- Tests for racial and ethnic disparities
- Intersections between age, race, and ethnicities
- Charge types
- Specific actions
- Age based disparities
- Duration of stop
- Consent searches and pre-textual stops with analysis in relation to youth

Harmon opened the floor for Board comment.

Member Hawkins asked what a field interview card is. DAG Micklethwaite answered that a field interview card is something an officer can elect to fill out during a contact. It is unclear how each agency uses a field interview card.

The more common uses of field interview cards are for entries into the CalGang database. However, not all field interview cards are entered into the CalGang database. Policies on them vary throughout different agencies. For example, the Los Angeles Police Department field interview cards also collect information on someone's social media, who they are associated with, and what neighborhood they are in.

Member Khadjavi thanked DAG Micklethwaite for their clarification and added that in the 2024 RIPA Board Report they recommended the prohibition of field interview cards when unnecessary.

Member Hawkins asked Harmon whether the youth data used school law enforcement or law enforcement in general. Harmon answered that it was law enforcement in general. DAG Micklethwaite stated that a majority of youth interactions with law enforcement were outside of school settings.

Member Hawkins asked how they should address the spikes of action of detained curbside or in patrol car, percent of stops with a field interview card filled out, and arrests observed in the 12-14 age group.

DAG Micklethwaite answered that the full RIPA Board is an advisory board, and they could vote to send a letter of recommendations to the California Legislature. She also stated that at the end of the year they send recommendation letters to POST. However, she believes that Member

Hawkins was asking about what the Board could do regarding one specific agency. Ultimately, the information in the report is for the community and hopefully the community can use the report to leverage change.

Supervising Deputy Attorney General (SDAG) Christine Chuang confirmed. She stated that regional analyses could be explored for recommendations. If the public has a concern, regarding one specific agency or geography, the data will be available for them.

Member Hawkins noted that POST now has a process to de-certify law enforcement officers who engage in profiling. She asked if this information could be sent to POST.

SDAG Chuang stated that the Complaints and Accountability Committee is exploring the SB 2 process in detail. With regards to Member Hawkin's question, POST already has access to the RIPA data and all past reports. She does not know the extent as to which POST uses the RIPA data for SB 2 as it is a regulated process.

## **5. Break**

The Subcommittee continued without a break.

## **6. Board Discussion of Stop Data Selection of the Draft 2025 Report**

DAG Garrett Lindsey discussed the geographical differences or similarities in the RIPA data.

There are nearly 40 million Californians living in 163,696 square miles. It may be more useful to understand what RIPA results look like for law enforcement agencies operating in similar regions.

The second and third largest reporting agencies for RIPA were the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department with more than 10 percent of RIPA stops. Without a regional analysis, it may seem that Los Angeles County is almost of the RIPA stops.

Different regions have different racial and ethnic makeups. Racial and ethnic groups may see themselves buried in aggregate data because their experience is not represented. Regional analysis is beneficial to ensure their data is represented.

Opposite results of similar amplitude may cancel each other out in aggregate data. For example, more warnings in one area and less warnings in another result in a neutral aggregate. Showing it regionally reveals this difference.

The DOJ discussed having eight regions. This is feasible for Research Services and small enough to be digestible. If there are too many regions, they may be too small to be significantly significant. DAG Lindsey noted that the regions should have similar populations and demographics.

One challenge is that there are some agencies operating statewide, such as the California Highway Patrol. The challenge is how to convert the address of the stop into what region it occurred in. There could be errors on the information of a stop, and the location could be

misrepresented. He states that they could separate statewide agencies once they feel more confident of stops.

DAG Lindsey stated that grouping the RIPA stops by counties is sensible. There are 58 counties that have not changed since 1957. However, counties are very different from each other, and there is not an easy way to organize the counties in a method that is easy to aggregate.

In looking at different ways to group these counties. He has a few examples:

1. District Court of Appeals
  - a. The positives are that it is related to criminal cases, and they have been consistent since 1984.
  - b. The negative is that it is organized by the appellate in their respective region. A rural grouping is nonexistent as each district has a large metropolitan area.
2. Department of Transportation
  - a. The positive is that it is related to stops because it is related to how people move. Traffic stops are a large percentage of stops in the RIPA dataset.
  - b. The negative is that there is 12 regions, larger than the ideal eight groupings. Another issue is that Kern County is split between two regions.
3. Department of Education
  - a. The positive is that it is how the Department of Education assesses local agencies.
  - b. The negative is that there are 11 regions, larger than the ideal eight groupings. There is a different pattern of organization compared to the previous recommendations, but he states it is still sensible.
4. County Population Density
  - a. The positive is that they are grouped by similar and relevant characteristics.
  - b. The negative is that the population density may change year-by-year. A sudden influx of people into one region may mean that the population density becomes incomparable. The population density may also go against a persons' own lived experience.

DAG Lindsey states that there are several ways to group counties and that they could consider methods other people used. Lindsey suggests, however, that they stick to groupings along one dimension, as multidimensional groupings may be harder to explain. He also suggests combining characteristics with geography so that there is a combined geographical region and characteristic of reason.

DAG Lindsey asked the Subcommittee for feedback regarding next steps.

Member Dobard stated he would like to get the regional analysis into the 2025 Report. He supports the Department of Transportation as he is more familiar with their geographic and demographic grouping. He asked if there was a strong rationale for a maximum of eight groupings since the Department of Transportation had 12.

DAG Lindsey stated that if there are too many groupings, some regions are so small that they may not have information to report, erasing events that occur within their group because they cannot be reported.

Co-Chair Khadjavi agreed that more than eight is too many groupings. She agreed that the Department of Transportation made the most sense. The District Court of Appeals is impracticable because an urban center should not be a part of each group. She wondered if Kern County could be merged if they used the Department of Transportation map.

Member Dobard understood.

Member Greene stated that the California Highway Patrol divided California into eight field divisions like the Department of Transportation. He suggested to look at the California Highway Patrol's map for inspiration.

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that there was previously a data dashboard provided by the DOJ. She wondered if there was a way to make the data accessible to the public.

## **7. Break**

The Subcommittee adjourned for a break at 3:09 p.m. and re-established quorum at 3:15 p.m.

## **8. Board Discussion of Stop Data Section of the Draft 2025 Report**

Co-Chair Khadjavi stated that the focus of youth in the report was a great idea. She said that it is pertinent that the trends in the report be made known to the public. There is robust research that shows law enforcement has an impact on youth. In the Policies subcommittee meeting, they had presenters from the California Highway Patrol and Los Angeles Police Department speak on pretext stops. The DOJ used to host a data dashboard, which she hopes can be revived. Now individual law enforcement agencies have set up their own data dashboards, but she views a place that can hold the aggregated data would be useful. She notes that in the absence of a data dashboard, the data should be accessible in other ways.

Co-Chair Khadjavi also wanted to note in the public record that the data summarized in the report should be in the appendices, so that if a member of the public wanted the raw numbers that lead to the conclusions, they could find it.

Member Greene, Member Dobard, and Member Hawkins agrees.

DAG Micklethwaite restated the action items for the DOJ:

- Continue focus on youth
- Continue discussion of previous analyses in Stop Data section, such as pre-text stops
- Making recommendations of public accessibility of RIPA data, either through a dashboard or another form

Co-Chair Khadjavi confirmed.

## **9. Public Comment**

Co-Chair Khadjavi moved on to public comment.

Michele Wittig from the Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform stated that California Highway Patrol data and individual law enforcement agencies' data should be analyzed separately, instead of together in regional analyses because she believes they obscure rather than illuminate answers to the questions that RIPA is asking.

Secondly, Wittig asked the DOJ to make their executable files available for those who are doing data analyses for their local law enforcement agency. That way, they can work on identical analyses that the state is doing. She proposes that the DOJ put a tracker on the data so the DOJ can monitor any person analyzing the data to ensure there are no misrepresentations of the data.

Karen Glover, Associate Professor of Sociology, Criminology, and Justice Studies at California State University, San Marcos, had technical issues and was not able to audibly voice her comment. She put in the video chat that she endorses individual law enforcement analyses.

Richard Hylton from San Diego said that the data is inaccurate. A past presenter to the Subcommittee used addresses in the analysis of data, but no one has access to people's addresses. Another presenter used multiracial, which is a racial category not defined by the DOJ. He states Paul Henderson, Director of the Department of Police Accountability in San Francisco, is a person who recognizes that the use of the multiracial category has been used to obscure the actual race of people. There have been over 500,000 people coded as belonging to three or more races. There is no scenario in which someone can identify a person as belonging to three or more races. In 2022, the DOJ reported that there were nine people reported with seven races. From his calculations, that was 4,579 people. Even more, his data is incomplete and believes this deserves more attention because this will affect disparities on Black people.

Co-Chair Khadjavi thanked the public for their comment.

## **10. Next Steps**

Co-Chair Khadjavi clarified next steps. The DOJ has their action items. Co-Chair Khadjavi announced that the next RIPA Full Board meeting was upcoming and encouraged members of the public to attend.

## **11. Adjourn**

Member Dobard made a motion to adjourn; Member Greene seconded. Co-Chair Khadjavi facilitated the vote.

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

With four Ayes, the Subcommittee adjourned the meeting at 3:39 p.m.