



**Summary Comparison of the 2022 & 2023 Annual Reports of the California
Racial & Identity Profiling Advisory Board**

Conducted by
Brian L. Withrow, Ph.D.

For the
Peace Officer Research Association of California
September 2023

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Policy Recommendations	3
Qualifications of the Analyst	4
Overview of Structural Differences of 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports	4
Comparison of Stop Data Analyses	5
Demographics	5
Calls for Service	5
Primary Reason for the Stop	5
Actions Taken by Officers During the Stops	6
Results of the Stops	6
Tests for Racial/Ethnic Disparities	6
Searches	7
Comparison of Policy Focus Areas	8
Appendix	10
Table 1: Comparison of the Tables of Contents	10
Table 2: Comparison of Stop Data Demographics	15
Table 3: Comparison of Primary Reason for the Stop	15
Table 4: Comparison of Actions Taken During the Stops	16
Table 5: Comparison of Results of Stops	16
Table 6: Comparison of Tests Between Racial/Ethnic Disparities (Part 1)	17
Table 7: Comparison of Tests for Racial/Ethnic Disparities (Part 2)	17

Executive Summary

In January 2023, the Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC) released a critical analysis of California's Racial & Identity Profiling Advisory (RIPA) Board's 2022 Annual Report. Commissioned by PORAC and developed by Dr. Brian Withrow, one of the nation's leading experts on racial profiling, this report found that the data RIPA used was incomplete and that their methodology did not hold up to statistical rigor – severely limiting the conclusions we can draw from the data.

While PORAC firmly agrees that racial bias exists across nearly every industry, including law enforcement, it is of the utmost importance that these analyses are conducted in a statistically sound and transparent manner. That is why when the RIPA Board released their 2023 report without addressing the issues that PORAC had identified in their 2022 report, PORAC once again commissioned Dr. Withrow to compare RIPA's 2022 and 2023 reports with the intent to determine any changes in the structure, scope, methodology, findings, and policy recommendations of the new report. While we acknowledge that any changes from 2022 to 2023 may not constitute a trend, this comparative analysis does reveal some rather dramatic and unexplained shifts in the 2023 report, including:

- **Shifting Methodology – Veil of Darkness Analysis Removed:** The RIPA Board chose to remove the “Veil of Darkness” statistical test for racial and ethnic disparities with no explanation – an analysis which RIPA had previously used to measure the difference in the racial breakdown of stopped drivers in the daytime vs nighttime to suggest that light conditions impact an officer's ability to perceive the race of the driver before the stop. This is a dramatic shift in analysis and the public deserves an explanation for why this test was abandoned.
- **New Focus on Mental Health:** The report devoted significantly more attention to the mental health impacts of being policed, arguing that police presence may do more to traumatize residents than improve their perception of public safety. However, their finding is supported by cherry-picked research which only connects police *violence* to mental health without establishing a connection to police *presence*. One source is cited twelve times in this section – calling into question what the actual research consensus is. The discussion also ignores benefits to public health, mental health, and stress reduction associated with real reductions of violent crime.
- **Increased Concerns Around Youth Contacts:** The 2023 RIPA Report pays much closer attention to youth contacts with law enforcement and expresses concern about ethnic disparities within youth interactions with the police. However, the data makes no distinction between youth contacts with law enforcement that occurred within school settings from those that occurred outside of school settings. As a result, there is no way to determine whether these contacts were officer initiated or in response to a request or call for service generated by teachers, counselors, or administrators. For those enforcement actions that occur within schools, it is essential that the RIPA Board include additional variables to measure the influence of school disciplinary policies and practices on enforcement outcomes.
- **Misunderstanding of Pretext Stops:** There is a significantly increased focus on pretext stops. Pretext stops are defined in the report as when an officer pulls someone over for a minor traffic violation with the intent to investigate a hunch regarding a different crime. However, there is no universally agreed-upon consideration of a “minor infraction” or parameters for when to consider a typical stop that revealed evidence of additional criminal behavior as a pretext stop. Without a clear way for an officer to report his or her “hunch” on the RIPA form, the analytical approach for

identifying stops as pretextual relies on the difference between what they report as the initial reason for the stop and the violation charged. This leaves the report uninformed about routine police operations and considers far more stops as pretextual than actually exist.

Policy Recommendations

If the RIPA Board truly has an interest in eliminating racial bias, their analyses must be viewed as a neutral presentation of information, as opposed to information selected to confirm a pre-existing opinion or narrative. The following recommendations are those we believe would increase the trustworthiness of the Board's important work and ought to be considered for inclusion in their upcoming annual report:

- **Improved Data Collection:** It is simply not possible, legally or scientifically, to allege racial profiling as currently defined in California by AB 953 using the data the RIPA Board has chosen to collect on its form that officers fill out after each stop. The only measure of a resident's identity-related criteria happens *after* the stop is initiated. However according to AB 953, to allege individuals are stopped on the basis of their identity-related criteria, it is essential to measure what officer perceives the resident to be *prior* to the stop at a minimum.
- **Veil of Darkness Analysis:** The RIPA Board should explain why they abandoned the "Veil of Darkness" statistical test for racial and ethnic disparities and acknowledge whether or not this dramatic shift invalidates previous reports which used this analysis up until their 2023 report.
- **Independent Statistical Analysis:** The RIPA Board is housed within the DOJ – which means that the DOJ has a vested interest in RIPA's success. If the DOJ maintains that any and all opinions, policy recommendations, research, etc., issued on behalf of the RIPA Board do not reflect those of the Department, that neutrality would be better served by hiring an independent, outside statistician or researcher with a specialty in law enforcement and racial profiling.
- **Discussion of Limitations:** It is standard statistical best practice to discuss the limitations of any analysis. We recommend that the RIPA Board include a section on their own limitations moving forward – to show where there is room for improvement and where the data is insufficient to draw certain conclusions.

Qualifications of the Analyst

Brian L. Withrow, Ph.D. is a professor in the School of Criminal Justice and Criminology at Texas State University. Dr. Withrow began his career as a State Trooper with the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) in 1981, shortly after earning a Bachelor of Criminal Justice degree from Stephen F. Austin State University. During the 'active policing' phase of his career he was a State Trooper, Training Officer, Inspector and Bureau Manager at the Austin Headquarters. While at DPS, Dr. Withrow earned his Master of Public Administration degree from Texas State University.

Dr. Withrow left active policing in 1993 to manage a police leadership and executive development program called the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University. While at Sam Houston, he completed his Doctor of Philosophy degree in Criminal Justice. In 1999, he accepted his first academic appointment as an Assistant Professor at Wichita State University. In 1999, he accepted an invitation to join the faculty at Texas State University where he remains.

Dr. Withrow maintains an active research agenda that focuses on police operations and officer decision making. He has published two books on racial profiling, one book on research methods and one book on police ethics. Dr. Withrow's scholarly research has been published in numerous academic journals. He is the author of numerous reports on racial profiling. He is also often asked to assist in litigation relating to allegations of racial profiling.

Overview of Structural Differences of 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports

Both the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses provide statistical findings relating to stop data. These include:

- Stop data demographics
- Identity demographic of individuals stopped by officers
- Calls for service
- Primary reason for stop
- Actions taken by officers during stops
- Results of stops
- Stops and searches
- Tests for racial/ethnic disparities

Both the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses devote attention and make recommendations within the following policy focus areas:

- Profiling Policies and Accountability
- Calls for Service and Bias by Proxy
- Civilian Complaints
- POST Training and Recruitment
- Accountability

The 2022 RIPA analysis devotes more attention than the 2023 RIPA analysis to:

- Policies addressing the profiling of transgendered people, and
- Data driven approaches to disability justice.

The 2023 RIPA analysis devotes substantially more attention than the 2022 RIPA analysis to:

- The mental health impacts of being policed on communities impacted by racial and identity profiling

- Pretextual stops
- Youth contacts with law enforcement
- Public use of RIPA data, and
- Amendments to RIPA regulations

See Table 1 for a more detailed comparison.

Comparison of Stop Data Analyses

I. Demographics

The number of agencies reporting to RIPA more than tripled from 18 in 2022 to 58 in 2023. However, the number of contacts reported to RIPA increased only by 246,881 stops:

- In 2022 there were 2,937,662 reported contacts.
- In 2023 there were 3,184,543 reported contacts.

The percentages of contacts by race/ethnicity changed slightly from 2022 to 2023:

- The percentage of individuals perceived to be Hispanic increased slightly from 40.1 percent in 2022 to 42.4 percent in 2023.
- The percentage of individuals perceived to be white decreased slightly from 31.7 percent in 2022 to 30.7 percent in 2023.

The percentages of contacts by gender did not change from 2022 to 2023.

The percentage of contacts with a perceived disability (1.2 percent) did not change. Although, mental illness, the most commonly perceived disability in both years, increased from 70.3 (in 2022) percent to 75.1 percent (in 2023).

See Table 2 for a more detailed comparison.

II. Calls for Service

From 2022 to 2023 there were no changes in the:

- Percentage of contacts initiated by a call for service.
- The racial/ethnic representation with either the calls for service or officer-initiated contact categories.

III. Primary Reason for the Stop

There was no appreciable change in the primary reason for the stop from 2022 to 2023:

- In 2022, the most commonly reported primary reasons for the stop were traffic violations (86.1 percent) and reasonable suspicion (11.5 percent)
- In 2023, the most commonly reported primary reasons for the stop were traffic violations (86.5 percent) and reasonable suspicion (10.5 percent).

In both 2022 and 2023:

- Middle Eastern/South Asian individuals had the highest proportion of stops reported as traffic violations and the lowest proportion of their stops reported as reasonable suspicion and other.

From 2022 to 2023, there was a slight change in the primary reason for the stop involving Black individuals relative to other groups:

- In 2022, Black individuals had the lowest proportion of their stops (77.9 percent) reported as traffic violations. In 2023, Black individuals again had the lowest proportion of their stops reported as traffic violations, although this percentage increased to 80.5 percent.
- Because the vast majority of reported primary reasons for the stop is a traffic violation, this change is not significant.

See Table 3 for a more detailed comparison.

IV. Actions Taken by Officers During Stops

There are no appreciable differences in the actions taken during stops from 2022 to 2023. The percentage of contacts wherein the officer reported no action taken during the stop decreased very slightly from 2022 (80.9 percent) to 2023 (80.1 percent). There are also no appreciable differences in the distribution of actions taken from 2022 to 2023.

Furthermore, individuals perceived to be Black appear to be the most represented group wherein a police officer reports taking some action during a contact (*see note below*).

See Table 4 for a more detailed comparison.

V. Results of Stops

“Issued citation” remained the most commonly reported result of stops from 2022 (52.7 percent) to 2023 (52.0 percent). “Arrests” increased from 10.6 percent in 2022 to 12.8 percent in 2023.

In both the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses, stops involving individuals perceived to be Black most frequently resulted in no action (*see note below*).

NOTE: It is important to differentiate between the ‘none’ response for the Actions Taken During Stops variable and the ‘no action’ response for the Results of Stop variable. Although similar, they have very different contextual meanings, particularly within racial profiling research. The reporting options for the Actions Taken During Stops variable are characterized best as either a force option (e.g., firearm use, chemical spray use, etc.) or detention decision (e.g., curbside detention, patrol car detention, etc.) occurring during a contact. The reporting options for the Results of Stop variable are best characterized as enforcement dispositions (e.g., citation for infraction, warning, referral to another person or agency, etc.). Both Annual Reports indicate that Black individuals experience more force or detention events during stops (Actions Taken During Stops) and stops involving Black individuals most frequently result in no enforcement disposition (Results of the Stops). Both findings are often interpreted as discriminatory.

See Table 5 for a more detailed comparison.

VI. Tests for Racial/Ethnic Disparities

There is a slight difference in the number of tests for racial/ethnic disparities between the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses:

- In 2022 four independent tests for racial/ethnic disparities were conducted. These include:
 - Residential population comparison
 - Discovery rate analysis

- Veil of darkness analysis
- Use of force analysis
- In 2023 three independent tests for racial/ethnic disparities were conducted. These include:
 - Residential population comparison
 - Discovery rate analysis
 - Use of force analysis
- For the residential population comparison:
 - Multiracial individuals were stopped *more* frequently than expected in 2023 (81.6 percent in 2022, compared to 88.9 percent in 2023).
 - Black individuals were stopped *less* frequently than expected in 2023 (151.5 percent in 2022, compared to 107.8 percent in 2023).
- For the discovery rate analysis:
 - Individuals perceived to be Black had the highest search rates in both 2022 (20.7 percent) and 2023 (20.1 percent).
 - Individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian had the lowest search rates in both 2022 and 2023 (3.5 percent each year).
 - Search discovery rates did not vary between racial/ethnic groups in either year.
- For the use of force analysis:
 - The odds of an individual perceived as Black to experience use of force during a stop decreased from 1.32 times in 2022 to 1.24 times in 2023.
 - The odds of an individual perceived as Hispanic to experience use of force during a stop decreased from 1.16 times in 2022 to 1.09 times in 2023.
 - The odds of an individual perceived as Asian to experience use of force during a traffic stop decreased slightly from 0.80 times in 2022 to 0.69 times in 2023.
 - The odds of an individual perceived as 'Other' race to experience use of force during a traffic stop increased slightly from 0.82 times in 2022 to 0.84 in 2023.

NOTE: The odds ratios in these analyses compare the odds of experiencing use of force during a traffic stop for each racial/ethnic group when compared to the odds for an individual perceived as white to experience use of force during a traffic stop. Odds ratios greater than one (1) indicate an elevated risk of experiencing use of force during a traffic stop.

See Table 6 for a more detailed comparison.

VII. Searches

In the 2022 RIPA analysis individuals perceived to be Multiracial were the most likely individuals to be asked for consent to search.

In the 2023 RIPA analysis, when compared to white individuals:

- Black individuals were 4 times as likely to be asked for consent to search.
- Hispanic individuals were 2.4 times as likely to be asked for consent to search.
- Multiracial individuals were 2.2 times as likely to be asked for consent to search.

In the 2023 RIPA analysis, Black individuals stopped for traffic offenses were 5.2 times as likely to experience a search based solely on their supervision status (e.g., parole or probation) than white individuals stopped for a traffic offense. Notably, neither analysis (2022 nor 2023) considers the disproportionately higher percentage of Black individuals subjected to search predicated on a supervision status.

See Table 7 for a more complete comparison.

Comparison of Policy Focus Areas

The most substantial differences between the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses are related to the attention these two reports devote to various policy areas. Both analyses devote attention to and make recommendations relating to:

- Profiling Policies and Accountability
- Calls for Service and Bias by Proxy
- Civilian Complaints
- POST Training and Recruitment

Even so, the amount of additional attention given to Profiling Policies and Accountability in the 2023 RIPA analysis is notable.

The 2022 RIPA analysis devotes limited attention to:

- Policies addressing the profiling of transgendered people
- Data driven approaches to disability justice

In contrast, with the exception of some limited findings in the stop data analysis, the 2023 RIPA analysis is nearly silent on these issues. This may be due to the relatively small percentage of stops involving transgendered or disabled individuals.

The major difference between the 2022 and 2023 RIPA analyses is related to the following policy areas:

- The mental health impacts of being policed on communities impacted by racial and identity profiling
- Pretextual stops
- Youth contacts with law enforcement

The 2023 RIPA analysis actually begins with a discussion on the mental health impacts of policing in communities that are alleged to be victimized racial and identity policing. This discussion is placed *before* the findings on the stop data, indicating its level of importance to the RIPA Board. The RIPA analysis argues that an increased police presence may do more to traumatize local residents than improve their perception of public safety. Importantly, this finding is principally supported by research relating to police *violence* rather than police *presence*. The causal relationship between police presence and measures of mental health is not established in the research literature. Within this section of the 2023 Annual Report there are several problematic passages:

- “While policing today may not explicitly target certain communities, analysis of the RIPA stop data reveals multiple racial disparities related to officer actions, suggesting that Black, Indigenous, and other people of color are still targets.” (p. 23). This conclusion is not supported by the data in the 2023 Annual Report. While there appears to be an over-representation of some racial and ethnic

minority groups in some enforcement activities, the analysis does not provide evidence that these groups are being “targeted.”

- In the paragraph following this passage (bottom of page 23 and continuing to page 24), the RIPA analysis argues that “scholars” have documented increased levels of punitive outcomes in policing interactions with racial and minority individuals. There are twelve footnote citations within this paragraph. All cite the same source, which calls into question the level of agreement that may or may not exist among a broader range of researchers working on this research.
- The discussion conflates strategies characterized as “aggressive policing,” “active engagement tactics with individuals in high crime areas,” increased police presence and other legitimate policing strategies with “police violence.”
- The discussion completely ignores the potential benefits to public health, mental health and stress reduction among residents that may be associated with real reductions of violent crime.

The 2023 RIPA analysis devoted to pretextual stops is considerable. Since the beginning of the racial profiling controversy (circa 1995), pretextual stops have been a source of considerable disagreement. The need to control this behavior is well established. Unfortunately, a workable operational definition of a pretextual stop has evaded the research agenda.

The 2023 Annual Report offers the following definition:

“A pretext stop is when an officer stops someone for a lawful traffic violation or minor infraction with the intention to use the stop to investigate a hunch regarding a different crime that by itself would not amount to reasonable suspicion or probable cause.” (p. 61)

This is an acceptable conceptual definition of a pretextual stop. Unfortunately, the actual measurement of this within a data set is extremely problematic. First, agreement on what we should consider a “minor infraction” is not absolute. Second, it is not clear whether a stop for a minor infraction that revealed evidence of additional criminal behavior (absent a “hunch” would be considered a pretextual stop). Third, it is not clear how a police officer would report a “hunch”. It appears the analytical approach for identifying stops as pretextual will rely on a difference between what a police officer reports as the initial reason for the stop and the actual violation charged. Such an approach would be immensely problematic and uninformed of routine police operations.

Finally, the RIPA Board is clearly concerned about the interaction between law enforcement and youth. In particular, the 2023 RIPA analysis expresses a concern about the disparities within youth/police contacts. This emphasis is well placed given the recent attention given to school violence, the use of school resource officers and the overall status of public education by researchers. Additional caution is in order with respect to the analysis of this part of the data set. Because these enforcement actions often occur within the context of a school setting, additional variables that measure the influence of school administrators on enforcement outcomes must be considered.

Appendix

Table 1. Comparison of the tables of contents for the 2022 and 2023 RIPA Analyses.

2022 TABLE OF CONTENTS	2023 TABLE OF CONTENTS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
INTRODUCTION	
ANALYSIS OF 2020 STOP DATA	ANALYSIS OF 2021 STOP DATA
A. Introduction Stop Data Demographics	1. Introduction
B. Stop Data Demographics	2. Stop Data Demographics
1. Identify Demographic of Individuals Stopped by Officers	2.1 Identity Demographics of Individuals Stopped by Officers
2. Calls for Service	2.2 Calls for Service
3. Primary Reason for Stop	2.3 Primary Reason for Stop
4. Actions Taken by Officers During Stops	2.4 Actions Taken by Officers During Stops
5. Results of Stops	2.5 Results of Stop
C. Tests for Racial/Ethnic Disparities	3. Tests for Racial/Ethnic Disparities
1. Residential Population Comparison	3.1 Residential Population Comparison
2. Discovery Rate Analysis	3.2 Discovery Rate Analysis
3. Veil of Darkness Analysis	
4. Use of Force Analysis	3.3 Use of Force Analysis
POLICY FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS	
A. From Data to Policies Addressing the Profiling of Transgender People	NOTE: The discussion on policies relating to the profiling of transgendered people is limited in the 2023 RIPA analysis.
1. RIPA Stop Data Relevant of Best Practices Recommendations	
2. Best Practices Recommendations	
3. Proposed Legislation	
4. Vision for Future Reports	
B. Data Driven Approaches to Disability Justice	NOTE: The discussion on data driven approaches to disability is limited in the 2023 RIPA analysis.
1. Data Analysis: Search/Discovery Rates and Use of Force Data Review	
2. Best Practices Recommendations for Policies	
C. Stops and Searches	
1. Consent Searches	
2. Known Supervision Stops and Searches	
3. Pretext Stops	NOTE: The discussion in pretextual stops is expanded substantially from the 2022 to the 2023 report, see below.

RACIAL AND IDENTIFY PROFILING POLICIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- A. Criteria Used to Evaluate Bias-Free Policing Policies**
- B. Wave 3 and 4 Agencies' Bias-Free Policing Policies Review**

POLICIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Internal Accountability**
 - 2.1 Effects of Agency Culture
 - 2.2 Role of Supervisors
 - 2.3 Internal Affairs Departments
 - 2.4 Data and Policy Analysis
- 3. External Accountability**
 - 3.1 Attorney General Oversight
 - 3.2 Civil Litigation
 - 3.3 Criminal Oversight
 - 3.4 Civilian Review Boards
 - 3.5 Inspector General
 - 3.6 Police Commissions
 - 3.7 San Francisco Department of Police Accountability
- 4. Conclusion**
- 5. Vision for Future Reports**

CALLS FOR SERVICE AND BIAS BY PROXY

- A. Introduction**
- B. Data Analysis Write Up**
- C. Responding to Bias-Based Calls for Service**
 - 1. Updates on Trainings, Policies, and Procedures for Dispatchers and LEAs
 - 2. Bias Response Teams: Implementing Restorative Justice Approach to Bias-Based Calls for Services
 - 3. Alternatives to Police Responses and Diverting Calls for Service
- D. Responding to a Mental Health Crisis**
 - 1. Fundamental Principles of Community-Based Crisis Response
 - 2. Lessons Learned from Emerging Crisis Response Models
- D. Vision for Future Reports**

CALLS FOR SERVICE AND BIAS BY PROXY

- 1. 911 Dispatchers and Calls for Service**
 - 1.1 Training
 - 1.2 Technology and Information
 - 1.3 988 Suicide and Crises Lifeline
 - 1.4 Resource Line and Database (211)
 - 1.5 Conclusion

CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS: POLICIES AND DATA ANALYSIS

- A. Overview of Civilian Complaint Data**
- B. Wave 3 and 4 Agencies' Civilian Complaint Form Review**
- C. Standardizing California LEA Civilian Complaint Processes and Procedures**
 - 1. Current State Law
 - 2. Board Recommendations to the Legislature

CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Overview of Civilian Complaint Data**
 - 2.1 Analysis of Civilian Complaint Data Submitted by RIPA Reporting Agencies
 - 2.2 Analysis of Racial and Identify Profiling Civilian Complaint Data Submitted by RIPA Reporting Agencies
- 3. Dispositions of Civilian Complaints for RIPA Agencies**

D. Vision for Future Reports

- 3.1 Agency-Level Data Snapshot: 2021 Civilian Complaints for Wave 1, 2, and 3 Agencies
- 3.2 Complaints Made in Jail Systems
- 4. Cross-Year Comparisons**
- 4.1 Wave 1 Agency Complaints Reported (2017-2021)
- 4.2 Wave 1 Total Racial and Identify Profiling Complaints
- 4.3 Wave 2 Agency Complaints Reported (2017-2021)
- 4.4 Wave 2 Racial and Identity Profiling Complaints
- 4.5 Wave 3 Total Complaints Reported (2017-2021)
- 4.6 Wave 3 Racial and Identity Profiling Complaints
- 5. Civilian Complaint Processes and Bests Practices**
- 5.1 Statutory Definition of “Civilian Complaint”
- 5.2 Civilian Complaint Procedures, from Beginning to End
- 6. Auditing the Complaints Process**
- 7. Use of Complaints in Early Intervention Systems**
- 8. Conclusions**

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

A. Addressing Biases in Peace Officers in the Hiring Phase

- 1. AB 846 Summary
- 2. The Board’s Assessment of AB 846’s Mandates and Suggested Next Steps for Stakeholders

B. Law Enforcement Training Related to Racial and Identify Profiling

- 1. Introduction and Background
- 2. Oversight of POST
- 3. Legislative Mandates for Racial and Identity Profiling
- 4. POST Training Program
- 5. POST and RIPA Training Review

C. Visions and Next Steps

POST TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

1. Introduction and Background

2. RIPA Board’s Review of POST Courses

- 2.1 Basic Academy LD 42 Cultural Diversity/Discrimination Course
- 2.2 Racial Profiling Train-the Trainer Curriculum Update

3. Recent Trends and Developments

- 3.1 Recent Legislation with RIPA Board Input
- 3.2 State Agency Reviews of Law Enforcement Training in California

4. Best Practices, Recommendations, and Conclusions

- 4.1 Recommendations for the Legislature
- 4.2 Recommendations for POST

5. Vision for Future Reports

NOTE: The attention paid to the mental impacts of being policed are substantially less in the 2022 RIPA analysis.

THE MENTAL HEALTH IMPACTS OF BEING POLICED ON COMMUNITIES IMPACTED BY RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING

1. Introduction

2. Racial Profiling and Public Health

3. Bias by Proxy Calls

4. Police – Initiated Stops
5. Police Reforms to Reduce Stops Disparities

NOTE: Although the 2022 RIPA analysis pays some attention to pretextual stops, it is considerably less than the attention this issue receives in the 2023 RIPA analysis.

POLICY FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS

1. Pretextual Stops

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Data-Driven Policy Reform on Pretextual Stops
- 1.3 Who is Stopped and How do Pretext Stops Unfold?
- 1.4 How Do These Pretext Stops Impact Public Safety?
- 1.5 How do these Pretext Stops Affect the Community’s Health and their Perception of Police Legitimacy?
- 1.6 History of Pretext Stops
- 1.7 Leadership’s Call to Action to Prevent Harms of Pretextual Stops
- 1.8 Data Analysis
- 1.9 Consent and Supervision Searches During Stops for Traffic Violations
- 1.10 Bicycle-Related Stops
- 1.11 Pedestrian Roadway Violation Stops
- 1.12 Loitering Related Stops
- 1.13 Developing Models” Policies and Practices that Eliminate Pretextual Stops and Limit Officer Discretion in Routine Encounters
- 1.14 Reimagining Traffic Enforcement
- 1.15 Board Recommendations and Conclusions

NOTE: Although the 2022 RIPA analysis pays some attention to youth contacts with law enforcement, it is considerably less than the attention this issue receives in the 2023 RIPA analysis.

2. Youth Contacts with Law Enforcement

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Data Analysis
- 2.3 Profiling of Youth – Trends and Impacts
- 2.4 Use of Force/Actions Taken Towards Youth
- 2.5 Searches of Youth
- 2.6 Field Interview Cards and Criminalization of Youth
- 2.7 Conclusion and Vision for Future Reports
- 3. Youth Contacts with Law Enforcement: Addressing the Profiling of Students
 - 3.1 Introduction
 - 3.2 Current Context of Schools
 - 3.3 School-Based Law Enforcement
 - 3.4 Data Considerations
 - 3.4 Policy Considerations and Vision for Future Reports

NOTE: Not addressed in the 2022 RIPA analysis

PUBLIC USE OF RIPA DATA

1. Introduction

2. Public Policy Institute of California

3. Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County

4. Center for Policing Equity

NOTE: Not formally addressed in the 2022 RIPA analysis.

AMENDMENTS TO RIPA REGULATIONS

RELEVANT LEGISLATION ENACTED IN 2021

RELEVANT LEGISLATION ENACTED IN 2022

Table 2. Comparison of stop data demographics between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

	2022 Report	2023 Report
Number of Agencies Reporting	18	58
Total Number of Contacts	2,937,662	3,184,543
Racial/Ethnic Perception of Individuals Stopped <i>(Percentages)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic (40.1) • White (31.7) • Black (16.5) • Asian (5.2) • Middle Eastern/So. Asian (4.7) • Multiracial (0.9) • Pacific Islander (0.5) • Native American (0.2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic (42.4) • White (30.7) • Black (15.0) • Asian (5.3) • Middle Eastern/So. Asian (4.8) • Multiracial (1.0) • Pacific Islander (0.5) • Native American (0.3)
Gender of Individuals Stopped <i>(Percentages)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male cisgender (72.7) • Female cisgender (27.0) <p>All other categories constituted less than 1 percent combined.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male cisgender (72.1) • Female cisgender (27.5) <p>All other categories constituted less than 1 percent combined.</p>
Individuals Stopped with Perceived Disability <i>(Percentages)</i>	1.2 percent (70.3% of these were mental health disability)	1.2 percent (75.1% of these were mental health disability)

Table 3. Comparison of primary reason for the stop between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

	2022 Report	2023 Report
Reason	Traffic violation (86.1 %) Reasonable suspicion (11.5 %) All others (less than 3 %)	Traffic violation (86.8% Reasonable suspicion (10.5%) All others (less than 3 %)
Race/Ethnicity	<p>Middle Eastern/South Asian individuals had the highest proportion of their stops reported as traffic violations (95.4%) and the lowest proportion of their stops reported as reasonable suspicion (4.1%) and “Other” (0.6%).</p> <p>Relative to other groups, Black individuals had the lowest proportion of their stops reported as traffic violations (77.9%) and the highest proportion of their stops reported as reasonable suspicion (18.8%). Native American individuals had the highest proportion of any racial/ethnic group of their stops reported as “Other” (3.7%).</p>	<p>Relative to other groups, Middle Eastern/South Asian individuals had the highest proportion of their stops reported as traffic violations (95.6%) and the lowest proportion of their stops reported as reasonable suspicion (3.7%) and “Other” (0.6%).</p> <p>Relative to other groups, Black individuals had the highest proportion of their stops reported as reasonable suspicion (16.2%) and the lowest proportion of their stops reported as traffic violations (80.5%). Native American individuals had the highest proportion of their stops reported as “Other” (3.8%) relative to other groups.</p>

Table 4. Comparison of actions taken during stops between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

	2022 Report	2023 Report
No Action	80.9%	80.1%
Action Taken	19.1%	19.9%
Actions Within “Actions Taken” Category	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Search (11.9%) • Curbside or patrol car detention (10.4%) • Handcuffing (9.5%) • Verbally ordered from a vehicle (3.9%) <p>All other “actions taken” categories represent less than 3% each.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Search (11.9%) • Curbside or patrol car detention (11.3%) • Handcuffing (9.8%) • Verbally ordered from a vehicle (4.3%) <p>All other “actions taken” categories represent less than 3% each.</p>
Race/Ethnicity	Black drivers had the highest proportion of actions taken (31%)	Individuals perceived to be Black had the highest rate of being searched (20.1%), detained (17.9%), handcuffed (15.4%), and removed from vehicle 7.6%).

Table 5. Comparison of results of stops between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

	2022 Report	2023 Report
Results (<i>Percentage</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issued citation (52.7%) • Issued warning (27.6%) • Arrest (10.6%) • No reportable action (7%) <p>Each of the other results represented less than 7 percent of the data.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issued citation (52.0%) • Issued warning (26.3%) • Arrest (12.8%) • No reportable action (7.6%) <p>Each of the other results represented less than 6 percent of the data.</p>
Race/Ethnicity	<p>Officers reported taking no action as the result of stop most frequently during stops of individuals they perceived to be Black (13.1%).</p> <p>Officers tended to take no action as the result of stop least often (3%) during stops of individuals they perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian.</p>	<p>Officers reported taking no action as the result of stops most frequently during stops of individuals they perceived to be Black (13.2%), relative to stops of other racial/ethnic groups.</p>

Table 6. Comparison of tests for racial/ethnic disparities between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

	2022 Report	2023 Report
Residential Population Comparison	Multiracial individuals were stopped 81.6 percent less frequently than expected, while Black individuals were stopped 151.5 percent more frequently than expected.	Multiracial individuals were stopped 88.9 percent less frequently than expected, while Black individuals were stopped 107.8 percent more frequently than expected.
Discovery Rate Analysis	Out of all racial/ethnic groups, stopped individuals perceived as Black had the highest search rates (20.7%), while stopped individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian had the lowest search rate (3.5%). Search discovery rates did not vary as widely between racial/ethnic groups as did search rates.	Out of all racial/ethnic groups, stopped individuals perceived as Black had the highest search rates (20.1%), while stopped individuals perceived as Middle Eastern/South Asian had the lowest search rate (3.5%). Search discovery rates did not vary as widely across racial/ethnic groups as did search rates.
Veil of Darkness Analysis	Darkness decreased the rates at which Black (-2.1 percentage points) and Hispanic (-2.3 percentage points) individuals were stopped compared to white individuals.	Not reported.
Use of Force Analysis	Specifically, compared to whites, the odds of officers using force during a stop were 1.32 times and 1.16 times as high for Black and Hispanic individuals, respectively. Asian and Other individuals whom officers stopped had lower odds of having force used against them (0.80 and 0.82 respectively), relative to the odds for individual officers perceived as white.	Use of force odds ratios (compared to white individuals): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black (1.24 times) • Hispanic (1.09 times) • Other (0.84 times) • Asian (0.69 times)

Table 7. Comparison of tests for racial/ethnic disparities between 2022 and 2023 RIPA Board Reports.

2022 Report	2023 Report
The rate at which officers asked for consent to perform a search ranged from 0.7 percent of stopped individuals perceived to be Middle Eastern/South Asian to 4.1 percent of stopped individuals perceived to be Multiracial.	Black individuals were 4 times as likely; Hispanic/Latino(x) individuals were 2.4 times as likely; and Multiracial individuals were 2.2 times as likely as white individuals to be asked for consent to search during a traffic stop.
The results of this analysis reveal a trend in the 2019 and 2020 RIPA data: Black or Multiracial individuals are	Black individuals stopped for traffic offenses are 5.2 times as likely to experience a search based solely

asked for consent to search at a higher rate than those who are perceived to be white.	upon supervision status compared to white individuals stopped for traffic offenses.
--	---