RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING ADVISORY BOARD

Annual Report
2024

Appendix

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A – REPORT BODY DESCRIPTIVE TABLES

A.1 Stops by Identity Group and Reason for Stop

Identity Group		Reasonable Suspicion	Traffic Violation	Other Reasons	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	17,705 (7.1%)	229,340 (91.6%)	3,338 (1.3%)	250,383 (100%)
	Black	113,456 (19.9%)	435,136 (76.1%)	22,832 (4.0%)	571,424 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	263,481 (13.4%)	1,627,841 (82.9%)	73,391 (3.7%)	1,964,713 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	11,013 (5.3%)	194,346 (93.7%)	1,979 (1.0%)	207,338 (100%)
	Multiracial	7,646 (14.7%)	42,338 (81.5%)	1,991 (3.8%)	51,975 (100%)
	Native American	2,838 (20.3%)	9,968 (71.3%)	1,171 (8.4%)	13,977 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	3,480 (13.1%)	22,211 (83.4%)	943 (3.5%)	26,634 (100%)
	White	231,785 (15.6%)	1,194,923 (80.2%)	62,568 (4.2%)	1,489,276 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	156,756 (11.9%)	1,119,284 (85.3%)	36,394 (2.8%)	1,312,434 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming*	1,276 (12.1%)	8,925 (84.6%)	352 (3.3%)	10,553 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	490,523 (15.1%)	2,624,500 (80.9%)	130,999 (4.0%)	3,246,022 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1,602 (40.2%)	2,082 (52.2%)	305 (7.6%)	3,989 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1,247 (45.8%)	1,311 (48.2%)	163 (6.0%)	2,721 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	844 (19.1%)	3,271 (74.0%)	308 (7.0%)	4,423 (100%)

Identity Group		Reasonable Suspicion	Traffic Violation	Other Reasons	Total
	10-14	6,998 (55.5%)	3,555 (28.2%)	2,047 (16.2%)	12,600 (100%)
	15-17	20,975 (30.8%)	41,857 (61.5%)	5,233 (7.7%)	68,065 (100%)
	18-24	75,829 (10.4%)	639,001 (87.5%)	15,441 (2.1%)	730,271 (100%)
	25-34	216,935 (14.8%)	1,192,691 (81.3%)	57,318 (3.9%)	1,466,944 (100%)
	35-44	170,188 (15.7%)	864,045 (79.8%)	48,413 (4.5%)	1,082,646 (100%)
	45-54	96,901 (14.2%)	557,969 (82.0%)	25,286 (3.7%)	680,156 (100%)
	55-64	47,488 (12.9%)	310,701 (84.2%)	10,868 (2.9%)	369,057 (100%)
	65+	15,234 (9.4%)	143,005 (88.5%)	3,297 (2.0%)	161,536 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	9,847 (25.4%)	26,793 (69.0%)	2,175 (5.6%)	38,815 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	641,557 (14.1%)	3,729,312 (82.2%)	166,039 (3.7%)	4,536,908 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	618,620 (14.2%)	3,588,086 (82.1%)	162,167 (3.7%)	4,368,873 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	32,784 (15.8%)	168,019 (81.2%)	6,047 (2.9%)	206,850 (100%)
Disability	Disability	42,107 (65.4%)	13,055 (20.3%)	9,270 (14.4%)	64,432 (100%)
	No Disability	609,289 (13.5%)	3,743,034 (83.0%)	158,942 (3.5%)	4,511,265 (100%)
Overall		651,404 (14.2%)	3,756,105 (82.1%)	168,214 (3.7%)	4,575,723 (100%)

*A regulations update, which was approved after the 2021 data collection period, has since changed the value label for this gender identity category to "nonbinary person."

A.2   Stops by Identity Group and Traffic Violation Type

	Identity Group	Equipment	Moving	Non-moving	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	30,784 (13.4%)	172,276 (75.1%)	26,278 (11.5%)	229,338 (100%)
	Black	95,194 (21.9%)	269,487 (61.9%)	70,454 (16.2%)	435,135 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	364,486 (22.4%)	1,042,036 (64.0%)	221,312 (13.6%)	1,627,834 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	28,003 (14.4%)	143,939 (74.1%)	22,403 (11.5%)	194,345 (100%)
	Multiracial	8,636 (20.4%)	28,021 (66.2%)	5,681 (13.4%)	42,338 (100%)
	Native American	2,302 (23.1%)	6,072 (60.9%)	1,594 (16.0%)	9,968 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	4,334 (19.5%)	14,634 (65.9%)	3,243 (14.6%)	22,211 (100%)
	White	207,998 (17.4%)	804,786 (67.4%)	182,134 (15.2%)	1,194,918 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	182,981 (16.3%)	779,360 (69.6%)	156,937 (14.0%)	1,119,278 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	1,482 (16.6%)	6,385 (71.5%)	1,058 (11.9%)	8,925 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	556,479 (21.2%)	1,693,411 (64.5%)	374,600 (14.3%)	2,624,490 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	504 (24.2%)	1,259 (60.5%)	319 (15.3%)	2,082 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	290 (22.1%)	836 (63.8%)	185 (14.1%)	1,311 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	982 (30.0%)	1,936 (59.2%)	353 (10.8%)	3,271 (100%)
	10-14	999 (28.1%)	2,127 (59.8%)	429 (12.1%)	3,555 (100%)
	15-17	8,236 (19.7%)	30,071 (71.8%)	3,550 (8.5%)	41,857 (100%)

	Identity Group	Equipment	Moving	Non-moving	Total
Age Group	18-24	123,278 (19.3%)	445,893 (69.8%)	69,824 (10.9%)	638,995 (100%)
	25-34	250,179 (21.0%)	768,820 (64.5%)	173,688 (14.6%)	1,192,687 (100%)
	35-44	176,138 (20.4%)	552,468 (63.9%)	135,436 (15.7%)	864,042 (100%)
	45-54	109,398 (19.6%)	363,493 (65.1%)	85,076 (15.2%)	557,967 (100%)
	55-64	54,065 (17.4%)	209,880 (67.6%)	46,756 (15.0%)	310,701 (100%)
	65+	18,460 (12.9%)	106,558 (74.5%)	17,986 (12.6%)	143,004 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	5,196 (19.4%)	18,199 (67.9%)	3,398 (12.7%)	26,793 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	736,541 (19.8%)	2,463,053 (66.0%)	529,701 (14.2%)	3,729,295 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	703,167 (19.6%)	2,373,288 (66.1%)	511,614 (14.3%)	3,588,069 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	38,570 (23.0%)	107,964 (64.3%)	21,485 (12.8%)	168,019 (100%)
Disability	Disability	3,000 (23.0%)	7,876 (60.3%)	2,178 (16.7%)	13,054 (100%)
	No Disability	738,734 (19.7%)	2,473,366 (66.1%)	530,919 (14.2%)	3,743,019 (100%)
	Overall	741,737 (19.7%)	2,481,252 (66.1%)	533,099 (14.2%)	3,756,088 (100%)

A.3 Stops by Identity Group and Reason for Stop - Reasonable Suspicion Subcategories

	Identity Group	Matched Suspect Description	Officer Witness	Witness Identification	Carrying Suspicious Object	Drug Transaction	Actions Indicative of Casing	Suspected of Acting as Lookout	Actions Indicative of Violent Crime	Other
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	5,923 (33.5%)	4,369 (24.7%)	3,249 (18.4%)	200 (1.1%)	122 (0.7%)	227 (1.3%)	65 (0.4%)	205 (1.2%)	6,061 (34.2%)
	Black	44,242 (39.0%)	32,131 (28.3%)	22,219 (19.6%)	2,102 (1.9%)	976 (0.9%)	1,075 (0.9%)	493 (0.4%)	1,361 (1.2%)	31,687 (27.9%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	90,474 (34.3%)	76,236 (28.9%)	40,678 (15.4%)	4,366 (1.7%)	2,398 (0.9%)	3,702 (1.4%)	1,550 (0.6%)	2,937 (1.1%)	81,370 (30.9%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	3,841 (34.9%)	2,724 (24.7%)	2,149 (19.5%)	114 (1.0%)	62 (0.6%)	155 (1.4%)	42 (0.4%)	183 (1.7%)	3,609 (32.8%)
	Multiracial	2,925 (38.3%)	2,174 (28.4%)	1,338 (17.5%)	160 (2.1%)	73 (1.0%)	149 (1.9%)	74 (1.0%)	111 (1.5%)	2,407 (31.5%)
	Native American	972 (34.3%)	705 (24.9%)	389 (13.7%)	32 (1.1%)	20 (0.7%)	32 (1.1%)	6 (0.2%)	66 (2.3%)	1,079 (38.1%)
	Pacific Islander	1,237 (35.5%)	912 (26.2%)	525 (15.1%)	44 (1.3%)	21 (0.6%)	48 (1.4%)	16 (0.5%)	42 (1.2%)	1,185 (34.1%)
	White	81,462 (35.2%)	67,992 (29.3%)	29,543 (12.7%)	2,672 (1.2%)	1,607 (0.7%)	3,061 (1.3%)	787 (0.3%)	2,277 (1.0%)	75,297 (32.5%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	51,925 (33.1%)	42,469 (27.1%)	25,357 (16.2%)	1,208 (0.8%)	1,115 (0.7%)	1,464 (0.9%)	737 (0.5%)	1,680 (1.1%)	52,998 (33.8%)
	Gender Nonconforming	398 (31.2%)	276 (21.6%)	208 (16.3%)	30 (2.4%)	17 (1.3%)	32 (2.5%)	10 (0.8%)	31 (2.4%)	481 (37.7%)

Identity Group		Matched Suspect Description	Officer Witness	Witness Identification	Carrying Suspicious Object	Drug Transaction	Actions Indicative of Casing	Suspected of Acting as Lookout	Actions Indicative of Violent Crime	Other
Gender	Cisgender Male	177,691 (36.2%)	143,695 (29.3%)	73,828 (15.1%)	8,424 (1.7%)	4,129 (0.8%)	6,934 (1.4%)	2,277 (0.5%)	5,448 (1.1%)	148,437 (30.3%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	605 (37.8%)	439 (27.4%)	392 (24.5%)	19 (1.2%)	12 (0.7%)	8 (0.5%)	6 (0.4%)	12 (0.7%)	449 (28.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	457 (36.6%)	364 (29.2%)	305 (24.5%)	9 (0.7%)	6 (0.5%)	11 (0.9%)	3 (0.2%)	11 (0.9%)	330 (26.5%)
Age Group	1-9	231 (27.4%)	148 (17.5%)	114 (13.5%)	8 (0.9%)	6 (0.7%)	7 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (1.7%)	396 (46.9%)
	10-14	2,495 (35.7%)	911 (13.0%)	1,537 (22.0%)	128 (1.8%)	51 (0.7%)	35 (0.5%)	27 (0.4%)	146 (2.1%)	2,663 (38.1%)
	15-17	7,414 (35.4%)	4,015 (19.2%)	3,898 (18.6%)	472 (2.3%)	164 (0.8%)	195 (0.9%)	106 (0.5%)	504 (2.4%)	7,653 (36.5%)
	18-24	23,645 (31.2%)	22,851 (30.1%)	10,443 (13.8%)	1,407 (1.9%)	673 (0.9%)	1,112 (1.5%)	567 (0.7%)	1,066 (1.4%)	25,305 (33.4%)
	25-34	80,552 (37.1%)	60,097 (27.7%)	34,514 (15.9%)	3,510 (1.6%)	1,863 (0.9%)	3,064 (1.4%)	1,063 (0.5%)	2,415 (1.1%)	66,498 (30.7%)
	35-44	63,021 (37.0%)	48,140 (28.3%)	26,486 (15.6%)	2,395 (1.4%)	1,394 (0.8%)	2,331 (1.4%)	757 (0.4%)	1,674 (1.0%)	51,973 (30.5%)
	45-54	33,381 (34.5%)	30,350 (31.3%)	13,825 (14.3%)	1,170 (1.2%)	733 (0.8%)	1,114 (1.1%)	368 (0.4%)	833 (0.9%)	29,460 (30.4%)
	55-64	15,437 (32.5%)	16,191 (34.1%)	6,801 (14.3%)	477 (1.0%)	328 (0.7%)	498 (1.0%)	119 (0.3%)	399 (0.8%)	13,871 (29.2%)
	65+	4,898 (32.2%)	4,535 (29.8%)	2,472 (16.2%)	123 (0.8%)	66 (0.4%)	93 (0.6%)	26 (0.2%)	131 (0.9%)	4,870 (32.0%)

Identity Group		Matched Suspect Description	Officer Witness	Witness Identification	Carrying Suspicious Object	Drug Transaction	Actions Indicative of Casing	Suspected of Acting as Lookout	Actions Indicative of Violent Crime	Other
LGBT	LGBT	3,918 (39.8%)	2,519 (25.6%)	2,017 (20.5%)	96 (1.0%)	59 (0.6%)	114 (1.2%)	38 (0.4%)	119 (1.2%)	2,665 (27.1%)
	Non-LGBT	227,158 (35.4%)	184,724 (28.8%)	98,073 (15.3%)	9,594 (1.5%)	5,220 (0.8%)	8,335 (1.3%)	2,995 (0.5%)	7,063 (1.1%)	200,030 (31.2%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	220,767 (35.7%)	176,592 (28.5%)	93,433 (15.1%)	9,252 (1.5%)	5,019 (0.8%)	8,034 (1.3%)	2,883 (0.5%)	6,834 (1.1%)	193,165 (31.2%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	10,309 (31.4%)	10,651 (32.5%)	6,657 (20.3%)	438 (1.3%)	260 (0.8%)	415 (1.3%)	150 (0.5%)	348 (1.1%)	9,530 (29.1%)
Disability	Disability	18,434 (43.8%)	6,781 (16.1%)	8,594 (20.4%)	593 (1.4%)	104 (0.2%)	285 (0.7%)	48 (0.1%)	445 (1.1%)	15,725 (37.4%)
	No Disability	212,638 (34.9%)	180,461 (29.6%)	91,496 (15.0%)	9,096 (1.5%)	5,175 (0.8%)	8,164 (1.3%)	2,985 (0.5%)	6,733 (1.1%)	186,968 (30.7%)
	Overall	231,076 (35.5%)	187,243 (28.7%)	100,090 (15.4%)	9,690 (1.5%)	5,279 (0.8%)	8,449 (1.3%)	3,033 (0.5%)	7,182 (1.1%)	202,695 (31.1%)

A.4   Stops by Identity Group and Calls for Service

	Identity Group	Officer-Initiated Stops	Call for Service Stops	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	236,270 (94.4%)	14,113 (5.6%)	250,383 (100%)
	Black	498,734 (87.3%)	72,690 (12.7%)	571,424 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	1,795,149 (91.4%)	169,565 (8.6%)	1,964,714 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	198,982 (96.0%)	8,356 (4.0%)	207,338 (100%)
	Multiracial	46,668 (89.8%)	5,307 (10.2%)	51,975 (100%)
	Native American	11,804 (84.5%)	2,173 (15.5%)	13,977 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	24,169 (90.7%)	2,465 (9.3%)	26,634 (100%)
	White	1,337,855 (89.8%)	151,422 (10.2%)	1,489,277 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	1,203,729 (91.7%)	108,705 (8.3%)	1,312,434 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	9,611 (91.1%)	942 (8.9%)	10,553 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	2,931,584 (90.3%)	314,440 (9.7%)	3,246,024 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	2,844 (71.3%)	1,145 (28.7%)	3,989 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1,862 (68.4%)	859 (31.6%)	2,721 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	3,827 (86.5%)	596 (13.5%)	4,423 (100%)
	10-14	6,748 (53.6%)	5,852 (46.4%)	12,600 (100%)
	15-17	53,072 (78.0%)	14,994 (22.0%)	68,066 (100%)
	18-24	683,339 (93.6%)	46,932 (6.4%)	730,271 (100%)

Identity Group		Officer-Initiated Stops	Call for Service Stops	Total
Age Group	25-34	1,322,843 (90.2%)	144,101 (9.8%)	1,466,944 (100%)
	35-44	970,213 (89.6%)	112,433 (10.4%)	1,082,646 (100%)
	45-54	619,358 (91.1%)	60,799 (8.9%)	680,157 (100%)
	55-64	339,674 (92.0%)	29,383 (8.0%)	369,057 (100%)
	65+	150,544 (93.2%)	10,992 (6.8%)	161,536 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	31,870 (82.1%)	6,945 (17.9%)	38,815 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	4,117,763 (90.8%)	419,147 (9.2%)	4,536,910 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	3,965,697 (90.8%)	403,178 (9.2%)	4,368,875 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	183,936 (88.9%)	22,914 (11.1%)	206,850 (100%)
Disability	Disability	26,875 (41.7%)	37,557 (58.3%)	64,432 (100%)
	No Disability	4,122,738 (91.4%)	388,529 (8.6%)	4,511,267 (100%)
	Overall	4,149,633 (90.7%)	426,092 (9.3%)	4,575,725 (100%)

A.5   Stops by Identity Group and Calls for Service without Traffic Violations

Identity Group		Officer-Initiated Stops	Call for Service Stops	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	9,755 (46.4%)	11,288 (53.6%)	21,043 (100%)
	Black	68,544 (50.3%)	67,744 (49.7%)	136,288 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	188,169 (55.9%)	148,703 (44.1%)	336,872 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	5,975 (46.0%)	7,017 (54.0%)	12,992 (100%)
	Multiracial	4,804 (49.8%)	4,833 (50.2%)	9,637 (100%)
	Native American	1,948 (48.6%)	2,061 (51.4%)	4,009 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	2,158 (48.8%)	2,265 (51.2%)	4,423 (100%)
	White	155,564 (52.8%)	138,789 (47.2%)	294,353 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	96,166 (49.8%)	96,984 (50.2%)	193,150 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	792 (48.6%)	836 (51.4%)	1,628 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	338,510 (54.5%)	283,012 (45.5%)	621,522 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	854 (44.8%)	1,053 (55.2%)	1,907 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	595 (42.2%)	815 (57.8%)	1,410 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	605 (52.5%)	547 (47.5%)	1,152 (100%)
	10-14	3,315 (36.7%)	5,730 (63.3%)	9,045 (100%)
	15-17	12,068 (46.0%)	14,140 (54.0%)	26,208 (100%)
	18-24	51,779 (56.7%)	39,491 (43.3%)	91,270 (100%)

Identity Group		Officer-Initiated Stops	Call for Service Stops	Total
Age Group	25-34	144,196 (52.6%)	130,057 (47.4%)	274,253 (100%)
	35-44	116,054 (53.1%)	102,547 (46.9%)	218,601 (100%)
	45-54	67,277 (55.1%)	54,910 (44.9%)	122,187 (100%)
	55-64	32,338 (55.4%)	26,018 (44.6%)	58,356 (100%)
	65+	9,279 (50.1%)	9,252 (49.9%)	18,531 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	5,672 (47.2%)	6,350 (52.8%)	12,022 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	431,245 (53.4%)	376,351 (46.6%)	807,596 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	416,861 (53.4%)	363,926 (46.6%)	780,787 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	20,056 (51.6%)	18,775 (48.4%)	38,831 (100%)
Disability	Disability	14,803 (28.8%)	36,574 (71.2%)	51,377 (100%)
	No Disability	422,110 (54.9%)	346,121 (45.1%)	768,231 (100%)
	Overall	436,917 (53.3%)	382,701 (46.7%)	819,618 (100%)

A.6 Stops by Identity Group and Average Actions Taken During Stop

Identity Group		Overall Average Actions Taken	Average Actions Taken During Stops with Actions
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	1.15	2.24
	Black	1.53	2.57
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	1.40	2.48
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	1.11	2.16
	Multiracial	1.42	2.66
	Native American	1.55	2.49
	Pacific Islander	1.34	2.57
	White	1.34	2.47
Gender	Cisgender Female	1.23	2.20
	Gender Nonconforming	1.34	2.52
	Cisgender Male	1.43	2.56
	Transgender Man/Boy	1.71	2.42
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1.75	2.46
Age Group	1-9	1.21	1.77
	10-14	1.54	1.96
	15-17	1.51	2.22

Identity Group		Overall Average Actions Taken	Average Actions Taken During Stops with Actions
Age Group	18-24	1.31	2.37
	25-34	1.43	2.55
	35-44	1.43	2.58
	45-54	1.32	2.43
	55-64	1.23	2.30
	65+	1.13	2.05
LGBT	Non-LGBT	1.37	2.48
	LGBT	1.56	2.54
Limited English Fluency	Limited/No English Fluency	1.37	2.48
	English Fluent	1.43	2.46
Disability	No Disability	1.36	2.48
	Disability	2.04	2.50
	Overall	1.37	2.48

A.7 Stops by Identity Group and Overall Actions Taken During Stop

Identity Group		Actions Taken During Stop	No Actions Taken During Stop	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	31,119 (12.4%)	219,239 (87.6%)	250,358 (100%)
	Black	191,972 (33.6%)	379,443 (66.4%)	571,415 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	532,031 (27.1%)	1,432,637 (72.9%)	1,964,668 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	20,450 (9.9%)	186,885 (90.1%)	207,335 (100%)
	Multiracial	13,144 (25.3%)	38,831 (74.7%)	51,975 (100%)
	Native American	5,169 (37.0%)	8,807 (63.0%)	13,976 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	5,862 (22.0%)	20,772 (78.0%)	26,634 (100%)
	White	345,127 (23.2%)	1,144,135 (76.8%)	1,489,262 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	250,327 (19.1%)	1,062,091 (80.9%)	1,312,418 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	2,328 (22.1%)	8,225 (77.9%)	10,553 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	888,823 (27.4%)	2,357,118 (72.6%)	3,245,941 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1,995 (50.0%)	1,994 (50.0%)	3,989 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1,401 (51.5%)	1,320 (48.5%)	2,721 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	1,227 (27.7%)	3,196 (72.3%)	4,423 (100%)
	10-14	7,163 (56.9%)	5,436 (43.1%)	12,599 (100%)
	15-17	28,320 (41.6%)	39,745 (58.4%)	68,065 (100%)

Identity Group		Actions Taken During Stop	No Actions Taken During Stop	Total
Age Group	18-24	166,442 (22.8%)	563,812 (77.2%)	730,254 (100%)
	25-34	412,147 (28.1%)	1,054,756 (71.9%)	1,466,903 (100%)
	35-44	292,812 (27.0%)	789,814 (73.0%)	1,082,626 (100%)
	45-54	151,203 (22.2%)	528,947 (77.8%)	680,150 (100%)
	55-64	65,781 (17.8%)	303,266 (82.2%)	369,047 (100%)
	65+	19,769 (12.2%)	141,768 (87.8%)	161,537 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	14,110 (36.4%)	24,703 (63.6%)	38,813 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	1,130,765 (24.9%)	3,406,048 (75.1%)	4,536,813 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	1,084,628 (24.8%)	3,284,160 (75.2%)	4,368,788 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	60,247 (29.1%)	146,591 (70.9%)	206,838 (100%)
Disability	Disability	44,824 (69.6%)	19,603 (30.4%)	64,427 (100%)
	No Disability	1,100,036 (24.4%)	3,411,137 (75.6%)	4,511,173 (100%)
	Overall	1,144,875 (25.0%)	3,430,751 (75.0%)	4,575,626 (100%)

A.8 Stops by Identity Group and Actions Taken During Stop

Identity Group		Searched	Handcuffed	Detained	Ordered Vehicle Exit
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	13,989 (5.6%)	11,310 (4.5%)	18,090 (7.2%)	4,946 (2.0%)
	Black	117,469 (20.6%)	90,056 (15.8%)	115,352 (20.2%)	40,285 (7.1%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	292,508 (14.9%)	211,660 (10.8%)	312,432 (15.9%)	114,583 (5.8%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	8,714 (4.2%)	7,543 (3.6%)	11,259 (5.4%)	3,317 (1.6%)
	Multiracial	7,378 (14.2%)	5,892 (11.3%)	8,077 (15.5%)	2,930 (5.6%)
	Native American	3,125 (22.4%)	2,483 (17.8%)	2,786 (19.9%)	840 (6.0%)
	Pacific Islander	3,311 (12.4%)	2,547 (9.6%)	3,249 (12.2%)	1,078 (4.0%)
	White	184,787 (12.4%)	142,347 (9.6%)	204,377 (13.7%)	52,506 (3.5%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	113,116 (8.6%)	93,168 (7.1%)	147,959 (11.3%)	44,690 (3.4%)
	Gender Nonconforming	1,269 (12.0%)	932 (8.8%)	1,228 (11.6%)	668 (6.3%)
	Cisgender Male	515,043 (15.9%)	377,767 (11.6%)	524,478 (16.2%)	174,707 (5.4%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1,084 (27.2%)	1,157 (29.0%)	1,132 (28.4%)	247 (6.2%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	769 (28.3%)	814 (29.9%)	825 (30.3%)	173 (6.4%)
Age Group	1-9	473 (10.7%)	232 (5.2%)	674 (15.2%)	147 (3.3%)
	10-14	3,096 (24.6%)	2,418 (19.2%)	4,145 (32.9%)	390 (3.1%)
	15-17	14,042 (20.6%)	10,783 (15.8%)	16,221 (23.8%)	4,867 (7.2%)

Identity Group		Searched	Handcuffed	Detained	Ordered Vehicle Exit
Age Group	18-24	87,405 (12.0%)	61,896 (8.5%)	93,745 (12.8%)	42,851 (5.9%)
	25-34	236,419 (16.1%)	177,460 (12.1%)	242,917 (16.6%)	85,476 (5.8%)
	35-44	169,008 (15.6%)	127,921 (11.8%)	176,174 (16.3%)	52,683 (4.9%)
	45-54	80,015 (11.8%)	60,801 (8.9%)	91,424 (13.4%)	23,230 (3.4%)
	55-64	32,423 (8.8%)	25,559 (6.9%)	39,288 (10.6%)	8,642 (2.3%)
	65+	8,396 (5.2%)	6,761 (4.2%)	11,031 (6.8%)	2,199 (1.4%)
LGBT	LGBT	7,825 (20.2%)	6,925 (17.8%)	8,570 (22.1%)	2,368 (6.1%)
	Non-LGBT	623,456 (13.7%)	466,914 (10.3%)	667,053 (14.7%)	218,117 (4.8%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	599,936 (13.7%)	448,170 (10.3%)	643,828 (14.7%)	207,248 (4.7%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	31,345 (15.2%)	25,669 (12.4%)	31,795 (15.4%)	13,237 (6.4%)
Disability	Disability	27,538 (42.7%)	26,831 (41.6%)	27,171 (42.2%)	2,170 (3.4%)
	No Disability	603,740 (13.4%)	447,005 (9.9%)	648,446 (14.4%)	218,313 (4.8%)
	Overall	631,281 (13.8%)	473,839 (10.4%)	675,623 (14.8%)	220,485 (4.8%)

A.9   All Actions Taken During Stop by Race and/or Ethnicity

Action Taken	Asian	Black	Hispanic/Latine (x)	Middle Eastern/South Asian	Multiracial	Native American	Pacific Islander	White
Removed from Vehicle by Order	4,946 (2.0%)	40,285 (7.1%)	114,583 (5.8%)	3,317 (1.6%)	2,930 (5.6%)	840 (6.0%)	1,078 (4.0%)	52,506 (3.5%)
Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact	690 (0.3%)	7,311 (1.3%)	16,072 (0.8%)	394 (0.2%)	512 (1.0%)	103 (0.7%)	191 (0.7%)	6,842 (0.5%)
Field Sobriety Test	3,510 (1.4%)	8,965 (1.6%)	49,468 (2.5%)	2,516 (1.2%)	831 (1.6%)	389 (2.8%)	614 (2.3%)	27,979 (1.9%)
Curbside Detention	9,557 (3.8%)	63,004 (11.0%)	178,667 (9.1%)	6,269 (3.0%)	4,680 (9.0%)	1,484 (10.6%)	1,854 (7.0%)	131,368 (8.8%)
Handcuffed	11,310 (4.5%)	90,056 (15.8%)	211,660 (10.8%)	7,543 (3.6%)	5,892 (11.3%)	2,483 (17.8%)	2,547 (9.6%)	142,347 (9.6%)
Patrol Car Detention	9,667 (3.9%)	62,434 (10.9%)	157,306 (8.0%)	5,728 (2.8%)	4,225 (8.1%)	1,551 (11.1%)	1,693 (6.4%)	90,093 (6.0%)
Canine Search	127 (0.1%)	510 (0.1%)	1,998 (0.1%)	63 (0.0%)	56 (0.1%)	28 (0.2%)	21 (0.1%)	1,359 (0.1%)
Firearm Point	598 (0.2%)	5,828 (1.0%)	12,117 (0.6%)	356 (0.2%)	330 (0.6%)	101 (0.7%)	153 (0.6%)	6,154 (0.4%)
Firearm Discharge	19 (0.0%)	69 (0.0%)	165 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)	5 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	102 (0.0%)
Electronic Control Device	30 (0.0%)	372 (0.1%)	674 (0.0%)	24 (0.0%)	24 (0.0%)	17 (0.1%)	10 (0.0%)	500 (0.0%)
Impact Projectile Discharge	10 (0.0%)	85 (0.0%)	209 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	8 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	137 (0.0%)
Canine Bite	22 (0.0%)	100 (0.0%)	239 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	8 (0.1%)	5 (0.0%)	192 (0.0%)
Baton	2 (0.0%)	50 (0.0%)	136 (0.0%)	3 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	104 (0.0%)
Chemical Spray	19 (0.0%)	110 (0.0%)	170 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	13 (0.0%)	8 (0.1%)	6 (0.0%)	144 (0.0%)

Action Taken	Asian	Black	Hispanic/Latine (x)	Middle Eastern/South Asian	Multiracial	Native American	Pacific Islander	White
Other Physical of Vehicle Contact	2,410 (1.0%)	8,082 (1.4%)	22,846 (1.2%)	1,953 (0.9%)	713 (1.4%)	258 (1.8%)	362 (1.4%)	23,513 (1.6%)
Person Photographed	1,265 (0.5%)	5,762 (1.0%)	17,593 (0.9%)	668 (0.3%)	659 (1.3%)	155 (1.1%)	296 (1.1%)	13,408 (0.9%)
Asked for Consent to Search Person	4,232 (1.7%)	29,395 (5.1%)	98,669 (5.0%)	2,484 (1.2%)	2,656 (5.1%)	654 (4.7%)	1,008 (3.8%)	57,068 (3.8%)
Searched Person	12,710 (5.1%)	106,855 (18.7%)	266,990 (13.6%)	7,962 (3.8%)	6,671 (12.8%)	2,891 (20.7%)	3,028 (11.4%)	170,241 (11.4%)
Asked for Consent to Search Property	2,882 (1.2%)	21,805 (3.8%)	66,876 (3.4%)	1,786 (0.9%)	1,826 (3.5%)	467 (3.3%)	720 (2.7%)	37,129 (2.5%)
Searched Property	6,509 (2.6%)	60,709 (10.6%)	138,279 (7.0%)	3,797 (1.8%)	3,854 (7.4%)	1,424 (10.2%)	1,623 (6.1%)	89,982 (6.0%)
Property Seized	2,412 (1.0%)	12,637 (2.2%)	35,603 (1.8%)	1,300 (0.6%)	1,154 (2.2%)	543 (3.9%)	545 (2.0%)	34,711 (2.3%)
Vehicle Impound	1,670 (0.7%)	8,886 (1.6%)	40,827 (2.1%)	1,310 (0.6%)	836 (1.6%)	314 (2.2%)	362 (1.4%)	17,846 (1.2%)
Admission/Written Statement Obtained from Student	26 (0.0%)	115 (0.0%)	673 (0.0%)	14 (0.0%)	34 (0.1%)	4 (0.0%)	5 (0.0%)	241 (0.0%)
No Action Taken	219,239 (87.6%)	379,443 (66.4%)	1,432,637 (72.9%)	186,885 (90.1%)	38,831 (74.7%)	8,807 (63.0%)	20,772 (78.0%)	1,144,135 (76.8%)
Search Person Consent Given	3,802 (89.8%)	26,873 (91.4%)	91,826 (93.1%)	2,254 (90.7%)	2,410 (90.7%)	549 (83.9%)	892 (88.5%)	50,292 (88.1%)
Search Property Consent Given	2,499 (86.7%)	19,525 (89.5%)	60,978 (91.2%)	1,587 (88.9%)	1,590 (87.1%)	377 (80.7%)	616 (85.6%)	31,688 (85.3%)

A.10 All Actions Taken During Stop by Gender

Action Taken	Cisgender Female	Gender Nonconforming	Cisgender Male	Transgender Man/Boy	Transgender Woman/Girl
Removed from Vehicle by Order	44,690 (3.4%)	668 (6.3%)	174,707 (5.4%)	247 (6.2%)	173 (6.4%)
Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact	4,776 (0.4%)	194 (1.8%)	27,103 (0.8%)	24 (0.6%)	18 (0.7%)
Field Sobriety Test	21,241 (1.6%)	276 (2.6%)	72,633 (2.2%)	75 (1.9%)	47 (1.7%)
Curbside Detention	87,836 (6.7%)	429 (4.1%)	307,410 (9.5%)	703 (17.6%)	505 (18.6%)
Handcuffed	93,168 (7.1%)	932 (8.8%)	377,767 (11.6%)	1,157 (29.0%)	814 (29.9%)
Patrol Car Detention	71,176 (5.4%)	856 (8.1%)	259,682 (8.0%)	564 (14.1%)	419 (15.4%)
Canine Search	688 (0.1%)	14 (0.1%)	3,448 (0.1%)	9 (0.2%)	3 (0.1%)
Firearm Point	4,185 (0.3%)	39 (0.4%)	21,310 (0.7%)	69 (1.7%)	34 (1.2%)
Firearm Discharge	60 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	306 (0.0%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.0%)
Electronic Control Device	114 (0.0%)	5 (0.0%)	1,525 (0.0%)	5 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)
Impact Projectile Discharge	57 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	399 (0.0%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Canine Bite	78 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	505 (0.0%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Baton	36 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	266 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)
Chemical Spray	84 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	387 (0.0%)	3 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Other Physical of Vehicle Contact	17,852 (1.4%)	109 (1.0%)	42,033 (1.3%)	81 (2.0%)	62 (2.3%)

Action Taken	Cisgender Female	Gender Nonconforming	Cisgender Male	Transgender Man/Boy	Transgender Woman/Girl
Person Photographed	9,222 (0.7%)	94 (0.9%)	30,344 (0.9%)	66 (1.7%)	80 (2.9%)
Asked for Consent to Search Person	29,421 (2.2%)	411 (3.9%)	165,947 (5.1%)	234 (5.9%)	153 (5.6%)
Searched Person	97,591 (7.4%)	1,130 (10.7%)	476,922 (14.7%)	1,015 (25.4%)	690 (25.4%)
Asked for Consent to Search Property	24,145 (1.8%)	337 (3.2%)	108,698 (3.3%)	182 (4.6%)	129 (4.7%)
Searched Property	57,797 (4.4%)	689 (6.5%)	246,887 (7.6%)	456 (11.4%)	348 (12.8%)
Property Seized	17,279 (1.3%)	182 (1.7%)	71,215 (2.2%)	120 (3.0%)	109 (4.0%)
Vehicle Impound	14,747 (1.1%)	174 (1.6%)	57,033 (1.8%)	59 (1.5%)	38 (1.4%)
Admission/Written Statement Obtained from Student	343 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	767 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
No Action Taken	1,062,091 (80.9%)	8,225 (77.9%)	2,357,118 (72.6%)	1,994 (50.0%)	1,320 (48.5%)
Search Person Consent Given	26,285 (89.3%)	354 (86.1%)	151,920 (91.5%)	210 (89.7%)	129 (84.3%)
Search Property Consent Given	21,192 (87.8%)	289 (85.8%)	97,100 (89.3%)	166 (91.2%)	113 (87.6%)

A.11 All Actions Taken During Stop by Age Group

Action Taken	1-9	10-14	15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Removed from Vehicle by Order	147 (3.3%)	390 (3.1%)	4,867 (7.2%)	42,851 (5.9%)	85,476 (5.8%)	52,683 (4.9%)	23,230 (3.4%)	8,642 (2.3%)	2,199 (1.4%)
Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact	31 (0.7%)	58 (0.5%)	682 (1.0%)	6,148 (0.8%)	12,828 (0.9%)	7,994 (0.7%)	3,200 (0.5%)	951 (0.3%)	223 (0.1%)
Field Sobriety Test	29 (0.7%)	65 (0.5%)	691 (1.0%)	17,102 (2.3%)	35,880 (2.4%)	21,094 (1.9%)	11,265 (1.7%)	5,814 (1.6%)	2,332 (1.4%)
Curbside Detention	313 (7.1%)	2,447 (19.4%)	10,262 (15.1%)	53,321 (7.3%)	139,612 (9.5%)	103,436 (9.6%)	55,874 (8.2%)	24,853 (6.7%)	6,764 (4.2%)
Handcuffed	232 (5.2%)	2,418 (19.2%)	10,783 (15.8%)	61,896 (8.5%)	177,460 (12.1%)	127,921 (11.8%)	60,801 (8.9%)	25,559 (6.9%)	6,761 (4.2%)
Patrol Car Detention	387 (8.7%)	2,010 (16.0%)	7,230 (10.6%)	47,102 (6.5%)	123,248 (8.4%)	87,681 (8.1%)	42,659 (6.3%)	17,387 (4.7%)	4,991 (3.1%)
Canine Search	3 (0.1%)	13 (0.1%)	86 (0.1%)	575 (0.1%)	1,486 (0.1%)	1,171 (0.1%)	576 (0.1%)	210 (0.1%)	42 (0.0%)
Firearm Point	14 (0.3%)	154 (1.2%)	1,026 (1.5%)	4,375 (0.6%)	9,748 (0.7%)	6,520 (0.6%)	2,670 (0.4%)	901 (0.2%)	228 (0.1%)
Firearm Discharge	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	12 (0.0%)	40 (0.0%)	152 (0.0%)	91 (0.0%)	47 (0.0%)	24 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)
Electronic Control Device	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)	16 (0.0%)	144 (0.0%)	715 (0.0%)	477 (0.0%)	217 (0.0%)	65 (0.0%)	12 (0.0%)
Impact Projectile Discharge	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	38 (0.0%)	173 (0.0%)	144 (0.0%)	64 (0.0%)	23 (0.0%)	14 (0.0%)

Action Taken	1-9	10-14	15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Canine Bite	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (0.0%)	70 (0.0%)	229 (0.0%)	188 (0.0%)	58 (0.0%)	23 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)
Baton	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	6 (0.0%)	31 (0.0%)	135 (0.0%)	79 (0.0%)	36 (0.0%)	15 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)
Chemical Spray	2 (0.0%)	2 (0.0%)	20 (0.0%)	37 (0.0%)	187 (0.0%)	130 (0.0%)	64 (0.0%)	23 (0.0%)	8 (0.0%)
Other Physical of Vehicle Contact	177 (4.0%)	377 (3.0%)	1,398 (2.1%)	8,581 (1.2%)	19,817 (1.4%)	14,926 (1.4%)	8,762 (1.3%)	4,250 (1.2%)	1,848 (1.1%)
Person Photographed	26 (0.6%)	274 (2.2%)	1,421 (2.1%)	5,270 (0.7%)	13,449 (0.9%)	10,757 (1.0%)	5,399 (0.8%)	2,434 (0.7%)	775 (0.5%)
Asked for Consent to Search Person	150 (3.4%)	706 (5.6%)	3,739 (5.5%)	24,998 (3.4%)	73,453 (5.0%)	54,723 (5.1%)	26,472 (3.9%)	9,770 (2.6%)	2,154 (1.3%)
Searched Person	373 (8.4%)	2,752 (21.8%)	12,555 (18.4%)	77,701 (10.6%)	216,300 (14.7%)	156,256 (14.4%)	73,813 (10.9%)	29,953 (8.1%)	7,642 (4.7%)
Asked for Consent to Search Property	87 (2.0%)	447 (3.5%)	2,547 (3.7%)	19,755 (2.7%)	50,731 (3.5%)	35,838 (3.3%)	16,903 (2.5%)	5,907 (1.6%)	1,273 (0.8%)
Searched Property	236 (5.3%)	1,121 (8.9%)	5,944 (8.7%)	44,112 (6.0%)	116,652 (8.0%)	83,027 (7.7%)	37,630 (5.5%)	14,175 (3.8%)	3,277 (2.0%)
Property Seized	73 (1.7%)	641 (5.1%)	2,445 (3.6%)	9,124 (1.2%)	31,297 (2.1%)	26,504 (2.4%)	12,562 (1.8%)	5,069 (1.4%)	1,189 (0.7%)
Vehicle Impound	30 (0.7%)	82 (0.7%)	1,327 (1.9%)	13,741 (1.9%)	26,676 (1.8%)	17,048 (1.6%)	8,296 (1.2%)	3,780 (1.0%)	1,070 (0.7%)
Admission/Written Statement Obtained from Student	6 (0.1%)	453 (3.6%)	618 (0.9%)	31 (0.0%)	3 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)

Action Taken	1-9	10-14	15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
No Action Taken	3,196 (72.3%)	5,436 (43.1%)	39,745 (58.4%)	563,812 (77.2%)	1,054,756 (71.9%)	789,814 (73.0%)	528,947 (77.8%)	303,266 (82.2%)	141,766 (87.8%)
Search Person Consent Given	139 (92.7%)	622 (88.1%)	3,293 (88.1%)	23,130 (92.5%)	67,223 (91.5%)	49,710 (90.8%)	24,002 (90.7%)	8,848 (90.6%)	1,930 (89.6%)
Search Property Consent Given	77 (88.5%)	407 (91.1%)	2,203 (86.5%)	17,807 (90.1%)	45,276 (89.2%)	31,788 (88.7%)	14,961 (88.5%)	5,229 (88.5%)	1,110 (87.2%)

A.12 All Actions Taken During Stop by LGBT, Limited English Fluency, or Disability Group

Action Taken	Non-LGBT	LGBT	English Fluent	Limited/No English Fluency	No Disability	Disability
Removed from Vehicle by Order	218,117 (4.8%)	2,368 (6.1%)	207,248 (4.7%)	13,237 (6.4%)	218,313 (4.8%)	2,170 (3.4%)
Removed from Vehicle by Physical Contact	31,721 (0.7%)	394 (1.0%)	30,876 (0.7%)	1,239 (0.6%)	31,672 (0.7%)	443 (0.7%)
Field Sobriety Test	92,949 (2.0%)	1,323 (3.4%)	83,338 (1.9%)	10,934 (5.3%)	93,216 (2.1%)	1,050 (1.6%)
Curbside Detention	392,150 (8.6%)	4,734 (12.2%)	376,707 (8.6%)	20,177 (9.8%)	381,983 (8.5%)	14,896 (23.1%)
Handcuffed	466,914 (10.3%)	6,925 (17.8%)	448,170 (10.3%)	25,669 (12.4%)	447,005 (9.9%)	26,831 (41.6%)
Patrol Car Detention	328,012 (7.2%)	4,685 (12.1%)	318,338 (7.3%)	14,359 (6.9%)	317,232 (7.0%)	15,464 (24.0%)
Canine Search	4,123 (0.1%)	39 (0.1%)	3,805 (0.1%)	357 (0.2%)	4,078 (0.1%)	84 (0.1%)
Firearm Point	25,353 (0.6%)	284 (0.7%)	24,225 (0.6%)	1,412 (0.7%)	24,807 (0.5%)	830 (1.3%)
Firearm Discharge	365 (0.0%)	5 (0.0%)	359 (0.0%)	11 (0.0%)	346 (0.0%)	24 (0.0%)
Electronic Control Device	1,620 (0.0%)	31 (0.1%)	1,581 (0.0%)	70 (0.0%)	1,455 (0.0%)	196 (0.3%)
Impact Projectile Discharge	449 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	430 (0.0%)	29 (0.0%)	394 (0.0%)	65 (0.1%)

Action Taken	Non-LGBT	LGBT	English Fluent	Limited/No English Fluency	No Disability	Disability
Canine Bite	579 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)	552 (0.0%)	34 (0.0%)	555 (0.0%)	31 (0.0%)
Baton	299 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)	293 (0.0%)	13 (0.0%)	285 (0.0%)	21 (0.0%)
Chemical Spray	464 (0.0%)	10 (0.0%)	455 (0.0%)	19 (0.0%)	422 (0.0%)	52 (0.1%)
Other Physical of Vehicle Contact	59,560 (1.3%)	577 (1.5%)	57,994 (1.3%)	2,143 (1.0%)	57,969 (1.3%)	2,168 (3.4%)
Person Photographed	39,239 (0.9%)	567 (1.5%)	36,621 (0.8%)	3,185 (1.5%)	37,810 (0.8%)	1,996 (3.1%)
Asked for Consent to Search Person	193,816 (4.3%)	2,350 (6.1%)	188,009 (4.3%)	8,157 (3.9%)	189,313 (4.2%)	6,852 (10.6%)
Searched Person	570,113 (12.6%)	7,235 (18.6%)	549,096 (12.6%)	28,252 (13.7%)	551,453 (12.2%)	25,893 (40.2%)
Asked for Consent to Search Property	132,046 (2.9%)	1,445 (3.7%)	127,746 (2.9%)	5,745 (2.8%)	130,467 (2.9%)	3,023 (4.7%)
Searched Property	302,837 (6.7%)	3,340 (8.6%)	292,790 (6.7%)	13,387 (6.5%)	297,663 (6.6%)	8,512 (13.2%)
Property Seized	87,894 (1.9%)	1,011 (2.6%)	83,890 (1.9%)	5,015 (2.4%)	86,086 (1.9%)	2,818 (4.4%)
Vehicle Impound	71,252 (1.6%)	799 (2.1%)	63,866 (1.5%)	8,185 (4.0%)	71,367 (1.6%)	684 (1.1%)

Action Taken	Non-LGBT	LGBT	English Fluent	Limited/No English Fluency	No Disability	Disability
Admission/Written Statement Obtained from Student	1,099 (0.0%)	13 (0.0%)	1,083 (0.0%)	29 (0.0%)	1,069 (0.0%)	43 (0.1%)
No Action Taken	3,406,048 (75.1%)	24,703 (63.6%)	3,284,160 (75.2%)	146,591 (70.9%)	3,411,137 (75.6%)	19,603 (30.4%)
Search Person Consent Given	176,745 (91.2%)	2,153 (91.6%)	171,229 (91.1%)	7,669 (94.0%)	172,784 (91.3%)	6,113 (89.2%)
Search Property Consent Given	117,574 (89.0%)	1,286 (89.0%)	113,458 (88.8%)	5,402 (94.0%)	116,211 (89.1%)	2,648 (87.6%)

A.13 Stops by Identity Group and Search/Discovery Rates

Identity Group		Search Rate	Contraband/Evidence Discovered
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	13,989 (5.6%)	3,872 (27.7%)
	Black	117,469 (20.6%)	32,097 (27.3%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	292,508 (14.9%)	75,533 (25.8%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	8,714 (4.2%)	2,109 (24.2%)
	Multiracial	7,378 (14.2%)	2,151 (29.2%)
	Native American	3,125 (22.4%)	913 (29.2%)
	Pacific Islander	3,311 (12.4%)	899 (27.2%)
	White	184,787 (12.4%)	54,989 (29.8%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	113,116 (8.6%)	29,808 (26.4%)
	Gender Nonconforming	1,269 (12.0%)	324 (25.5%)
	Cisgender Male	515,043 (15.9%)	141,991 (27.6%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1,084 (27.2%)	249 (23.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	769 (28.3%)	191 (24.8%)
Age Group	1-9	473 (10.7%)	162 (34.2%)
	10-14	3,096 (24.6%)	724 (23.4%)
	15-17	14,042 (20.6%)	4,180 (29.8%)
	18-24	87,405 (12.0%)	21,952 (25.1%)

Identity Group		Search Rate	Contraband/Evidence Discovered
Age Group	25-34	236,419 (16.1%)	63,926 (27.0%)
	35-44	169,008 (15.6%)	48,677 (28.8%)
	45-54	80,015 (11.8%)	22,518 (28.1%)
	55-64	32,423 (8.8%)	8,620 (26.6%)
	65+	8,397 (5.2%)	1,803 (21.5%)
LGBT	LGBT	7,825 (20.2%)	1,885 (24.1%)
	Non-LGBT	623,456 (13.7%)	170,678 (27.4%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	599,936 (13.7%)	164,385 (27.4%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	31,345 (15.2%)	8,178 (26.1%)
Disability	Disability	27,538 (42.7%)	4,711 (17.1%)
	No Disability	603,740 (13.4%)	167,851 (27.8%)
Overall		631,281 (13.8%)	231,356 (5.1%)

Notes. Searches of person and searches of property are captured in separate data fields and were combined for calculating search rates for a given identity group. Percentages for discovering contraband and/or evidence are calculated based on the number of individuals from the given identity group where officers reported searching the individual or their property, rather than the total number of stopped individuals from the given identity group.

A.14   Consent Inquiries and Search Rates

Identity Group	Asked for Consent and Response			Consent Response Search Rates	
	Asked for Consent	Consent Received	Consent Not Received	Consent Received & Searched	Consent Not Received & Searched
Asian	5,052 (2.0%)	4,511 (89.3%)	541 (10.7%)	3,961 (87.8%)	317 (58.6%)
Black	36,277 (6.3%)	33,084 (91.2%)	3,193 (8.8%)	27,373 (82.7%)	1,896 (59.4%)
Hispanic/Latine(x)	117,928 (6.0%)	109,551 (92.9%)	8,377 (7.1%)	92,614 (84.5%)	5,148 (61.5%)
Middle Eastern/South Asian	3,059 (1.5%)	2,766 (90.4%)	293 (9.6%)	2,358 (85.2%)	178 (60.8%)
Multiracial	3,169 (6.1%)	2,841 (89.6%)	328 (10.4%)	2,518 (88.6%)	206 (62.8%)
Native American	791 (5.7%)	656 (82.9%)	135 (17.1%)	588 (89.6%)	93 (68.9%)
Pacific Islander	1,198 (4.5%)	1,048 (87.5%)	150 (12.5%)	931 (88.8%)	83 (55.3%)
White	66,455 (4.5%)	58,265 (87.7%)	8,190 (12.3%)	51,129 (87.8%)	4,974 (60.7%)
Overall	233,929 (5.1%)	212,722 (90.9%)	21,207 (9.1%)	181,472 (85.3%)	12,895 (60.8%)

Notes. Asked for consent to search person and asked for consent to search property are captured in separate data fields and were combined for calculating rates for officers asking for consent to search.

A.15 Consent Search Rates

Identity Group	Proportion of Stops Involving Consent Only Searches	Proportion of Searches with Consent Only Basis	Proportion of Stops Involving Consent Plus Searches	Proportion of Searches with Consent Plus Bases	Proportion of Stops Involving Other Discretionary Searches	Proportion of Searches with Other Discretionary Basis
Asian	2,085 (0.8%)	2,085 (14.9%)	1,880 (0.8%)	1,880 (13.4%)	3,278 (1.3%)	3,278 (23.4%)
Black	12,390 (2.2%)	12,390 (10.5%)	14,799 (2.6%)	14,799 (12.6%)	45,511 (8.0%)	45,511 (38.7%)
Hispanic/Latine(x)	46,509 (2.4%)	46,509 (15.9%)	45,801 (2.3%)	45,801 (15.7%)	85,305 (4.3%)	85,305 (29.2%)
Middle Eastern/South Asian	1,194 (0.6%)	1,194 (13.7%)	1,152 (0.6%)	1,152 (13.2%)	2,175 (1.0%)	2,175 (25.0%)
Multiracial	972 (1.9%)	972 (13.2%)	1,590 (3.1%)	1,590 (21.6%)	2,079 (4.0%)	2,079 (28.2%)
Native American	316 (2.3%)	316 (10.1%)	290 (2.1%)	290 (9.3%)	973 (7.0%)	973 (31.1%)
Pacific Islander	475 (1.8%)	475 (14.3%)	420 (1.6%)	420 (12.7%)	862 (3.2%)	862 (26.0%)
White	25,666 (1.7%)	25,666 (13.9%)	25,665 (1.7%)	25,665 (13.9%)	51,693 (3.5%)	51,693 (28.0%)
Overall	89,607 (2.0%)	89,607 (14.2%)	91,597 (2.0%)	91,597 (14.5%)	191,876 (4.2%)	191,876 (30.4%)

Notes. "Consent Only" searches refers to searches where "consent given" was the sole basis that officers provided for performing a search. "Consent plus" searches are searches where officers reported "consent given" in addition to some other basis for performing the search. "Other discretionary searches" refers to searches where officer safety/safety of others, condition of supervision, suspected weapons, visible contraband, odor of contraband, canine detection, evidence of a crime, exigent circumstances/emergency, and suspected violation of school policy search bases were one of the search bases that officers provided for performing the search.

A.16 Consent Search Discovery Rates

Identity Group	Discovery Rates		
	Consent Only Searches	Consent Plus Basis	Other Discretionary Searches
Asian	439 (21.1%)	636 (33.8%)	1,007 (30.7%)
Black	1,777 (14.3%)	4,384 (29.6%)	12,806 (28.1%)
Hispanic/Latine(x)	8,203 (17.6%)	14,007 (30.6%)	23,544 (27.6%)
Middle Eastern/South Asian	188 (15.7%)	384 (33.3%)	629 (28.9%)
Multiracial	162 (16.7%)	526 (33.1%)	641 (30.8%)
Native American	62 (19.6%)	108 (37.2%)	355 (36.5%)
Pacific Islander	101 (21.3%)	131 (31.2%)	280 (32.5%)
White	5,661 (22.1%)	9,195 (35.8%)	17,510 (33.9%)
Overall	16,593 (18.5%)	29,371 (32.1%)	56,772 (29.6%)

A.17 Stops by Identity Group and Stop Result for Handcuffed Individuals

Identity Group		No Action	Arrested	Other	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	870 (7.7%)	8,184 (72.4%)	2,256 (19.9%)	11,310 (100%)
	Black	9,605 (10.7%)	57,510 (63.9%)	22,941 (25.5%)	90,056 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	18,683 (8.8%)	147,492 (69.7%)	45,485 (21.5%)	211,660 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	594 (7.9%)	5,248 (69.6%)	1,701 (22.6%)	7,543 (100%)
	Multiracial	448 (7.6%)	3,952 (67.1%)	1,492 (25.3%)	5,892 (100%)
	Native American	153 (6.2%)	1,986 (80.0%)	344 (13.9%)	2,483 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	183 (7.2%)	1,981 (77.8%)	383 (15.0%)	2,547 (100%)
	White	10,004 (7.0%)	107,248 (75.3%)	25,095 (17.6%)	142,347 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	6,564 (7.0%)	68,251 (73.3%)	18,353 (19.7%)	93,168 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	61 (6.5%)	677 (72.6%)	194 (20.8%)	932 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	33,787 (8.9%)	263,394 (69.7%)	80,586 (21.3%)	377,767 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	80 (6.9%)	736 (63.6%)	341 (29.5%)	1,157 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	48 (5.9%)	543 (66.7%)	223 (27.4%)	814 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	18 (7.8%)	155 (66.8%)	59 (25.4%)	232 (100%)
	10-14	170 (7.0%)	929 (38.4%)	1,319 (54.5%)	2,418 (100%)
	15-17	1,112 (10.3%)	5,039 (46.7%)	4,632 (43.0%)	10,783 (100%)
	18-24	6,532 (10.6%)	38,670 (62.5%)	16,694 (27.0%)	61,896 (100%)

Identity Group		No Action	Arrested	Other	Total
Age Group	25-34	15,923 (9.0%)	124,486 (70.1%)	37,051 (20.9%)	177,460 (100%)
	35-44	10,418 (8.1%)	93,926 (73.4%)	23,577 (18.4%)	127,921 (100%)
	45-54	4,540 (7.5%)	45,538 (74.9%)	10,723 (17.6%)	60,801 (100%)
	55-64	1,477 (5.8%)	19,660 (76.9%)	4,422 (17.3%)	25,559 (100%)
	65+	350 (5.2%)	5,193 (76.8%)	1,218 (18.0%)	6,761 (100%)
LGBT	Non-LGBT	40,116 (8.6%)	328,513 (70.4%)	98,285 (21.0%)	466,914 (100%)
	LGBT	424 (6.1%)	5,088 (73.5%)	1,413 (20.4%)	6,925 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	39,058 (8.7%)	313,146 (69.9%)	95,966 (21.4%)	448,170 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	1,482 (5.8%)	20,455 (79.7%)	3,732 (14.5%)	25,669 (100%)
Disability	No Disability	39,320 (8.8%)	321,545 (71.9%)	86,140 (19.3%)	447,005 (100%)
	Disability	1,220 (4.5%)	12,054 (44.9%)	13,557 (50.5%)	26,831 (100%)
	Overall	40,540 (8.6%)	333,601 (70.4%)	99,698 (21.0%)	473,839 (100%)

A.18 Stops by Identity Group and Action Taken as a Result of Stop

Identity Group		Action Taken as a Result of Stop	No Action Taken as a Result of Stop	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	236,785 (94.6%)	13,598 (5.4%)	250,383 (100%)
	Black	500,782 (87.6%)	70,642 (12.4%)	571,424 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	1,780,763 (90.6%)	183,950 (9.4%)	1,964,713 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	197,946 (95.5%)	9,392 (4.5%)	207,338 (100%)
	Multiracial	47,593 (91.6%)	4,382 (8.4%)	51,975 (100%)
	Native American	12,481 (89.3%)	1,496 (10.7%)	13,977 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	24,296 (91.2%)	2,338 (8.8%)	26,634 (100%)
	White	1,361,059 (91.4%)	128,218 (8.6%)	1,489,277 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	1,207,249 (92.0%)	105,184 (8.0%)	1,312,433 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	9,291 (88.0%)	1,262 (12.0%)	10,553 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	2,939,307 (90.6%)	306,717 (9.4%)	3,246,024 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	3,448 (86.4%)	541 (13.6%)	3,989 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	2,409 (88.5%)	312 (11.5%)	2,721 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	3,107 (70.2%)	1,316 (29.8%)	4,423 (100%)
	10-14	10,514 (83.4%)	2,086 (16.6%)	12,600 (100%)
	15-17	58,844 (86.5%)	9,222 (13.5%)	68,066 (100%)
	18-24	662,253 (90.7%)	68,018 (9.3%)	730,271 (100%)

Identity Group		Action Taken as a Result of Stop	No Action Taken as a Result of Stop	Total
Age Group	25-34	1,323,005 (90.2%)	143,939 (9.8%)	1,466,944 (100%)
	35-44	983,621 (90.9%)	99,024 (9.1%)	1,082,645 (100%)
	45-54	623,763 (91.7%)	56,394 (8.3%)	680,157 (100%)
	55-64	344,448 (93.3%)	24,609 (6.7%)	369,057 (100%)
	65+	152,135 (94.2%)	9,404 (5.8%)	161,539 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	34,446 (88.7%)	4,369 (11.3%)	38,815 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	4,127,262 (91.0%)	409,647 (9.0%)	4,536,909 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	3,972,033 (90.9%)	396,841 (9.1%)	4,368,874 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	189,675 (91.7%)	17,175 (8.3%)	206,850 (100%)
Disability	Disability	55,606 (86.3%)	8,826 (13.7%)	64,432 (100%)
	No Disability	4,106,077 (91.0%)	405,189 (9.0%)	4,511,266 (100%)
Overall		4,161,708 (91.0%)	414,016 (9.0%)	4,575,724 (100%)

A.19   Stops by Identity Group and Stop Result

Identity Group		Warning	Citation	Arrest	Total
Race and/or Ethnicity	Asian	73,463 (29.3%)	134,271 (53.6%)	28,620 (11.4%)	250,383 (100%)
	Black	190,717 (33.4%)	193,227 (33.8%)	101,994 (17.8%)	571,424 (100%)
	Hispanic/Latine(x)	581,760 (29.6%)	846,198 (43.1%)	339,590 (17.3%)	1,964,713 (100%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	61,334 (29.6%)	121,398 (58.6%)	15,863 (7.7%)	207,338 (100%)
	Multiracial	16,779 (32.3%)	22,054 (42.4%)	8,542 (16.4%)	51,975 (100%)
	Native American	4,619 (33.0%)	4,281 (30.6%)	3,843 (27.5%)	13,977 (100%)
	Pacific Islander	8,381 (31.5%)	11,538 (43.3%)	4,167 (15.6%)	26,634 (100%)
	White	507,881 (34.1%)	608,920 (40.9%)	230,607 (15.5%)	1,489,277 (100%)
Gender	Cisgender Female	405,197 (30.9%)	603,783 (46.0%)	186,472 (14.2%)	1,312,433 (100%)
	Gender Nonconforming	2,909 (27.6%)	4,962 (47.0%)	1,293 (12.3%)	10,553 (100%)
	Cisgender Male	1,035,023 (31.9%)	1,331,668 (41.0%)	543,594 (16.7%)	3,246,024 (100%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1,115 (28.0%)	852 (21.4%)	1,077 (27.0%)	3,989 (100%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	690 (25.4%)	621 (22.8%)	790 (29.0%)	2,721 (100%)
Age Group	1-9	1,257 (28.4%)	1,119 (25.3%)	464 (10.5%)	4,423 (100%)
	10-14	2,563 (20.3%)	1,645 (13.1%)	2,303 (18.3%)	12,600 (100%)
	15-17	17,979 (26.4%)	21,384 (31.4%)	11,244 (16.5%)	68,066 (100%)
	18-24	210,653 (28.8%)	353,293 (48.4%)	94,923 (13.0%)	730,271 (100%)

Identity Group		Warning	Citation	Arrest	Total
Age Group	25-34	452,279 (30.8%)	607,427 (41.4%)	252,311 (17.2%)	1,466,944 (100%)
	35-44	348,154 (32.2%)	431,555 (39.9%)	196,276 (18.1%)	1,082,645 (100%)
	45-54	229,494 (33.7%)	284,993 (41.9%)	105,721 (15.5%)	680,157 (100%)
	55-64	122,590 (33.2%)	167,337 (45.3%)	52,440 (14.2%)	369,057 (100%)
	65+	59,960 (37.1%)	73,132 (45.3%)	17,534 (10.9%)	161,536 (100%)
LGBT	LGBT	10,456 (26.9%)	12,479 (32.1%)	9,875 (25.4%)	38,815 (100%)
	Non-LGBT	1,434,480 (31.6%)	1,929,409 (42.5%)	723,351 (15.9%)	4,536,909 (100%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	1,381,748 (31.6%)	1,855,346 (42.5%)	693,502 (15.9%)	4,368,874 (100%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	63,188 (30.5%)	86,542 (41.8%)	39,724 (19.2%)	206,850 (100%)
Disability	Disability	11,573 (18.0%)	5,117 (7.9%)	16,683 (25.9%)	64,432 (100%)
	No Disability	1,433,349 (31.8%)	1,936,764 (42.9%)	716,539 (15.9%)	4,511,266 (100%)
	Overall	1,444,936 (31.6%)	1,941,888 (42.4%)	733,226 (16.0%)	4575725 (100%)

A.20   Agency Stop Count Frequency and Differences between 2021 and 2022

Due to its large size, Tables A.20 is available in an .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

A.21   Top 100 Traffic Violation Offense Codes Submitted by Los Angeles Police Department

Due to its large size, Tables A.21 is available in an .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

A.22   Reasonable Suspicion Offense Codes Submitted for Stops of Students made on K-12 Grounds

Due to its large size, Tables A.22 is available in an .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

A.23   Civilians' Complaints Against Peace Officers 2018-2022

Due to its large size, Tables A.23 is available in an .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

A.24   2022 Disposition Types of Racial Profiling Complaints in 2022

Due to its large size, Tables A.24 is available in an .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

APPENDIX B – DISPARITY TEST METHODS

B.1 Residential Population Comparison Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. Using data collected by the United States Census Bureau to compare the racial and ethnic composition of residential populations with the composition of individuals stopped by law enforcement is a common method for monitoring enforcement patterns. There are several known limitations associated with using residential data in comparison to law enforcement stop data. A residential population (i.e., the racial and/or ethnic distribution of individuals who reside within a given area) represents the people who may be stopped by officers. However, individuals may be stopped outside of their residential area (e.g. commuting to work, tourists). The rate of these "commuter" stops likely varies from agency to agency, and RIPA stop data do not include information on where stopped individuals reside. Additionally, agencies may concentrate their patrol efforts in certain areas and may not have an equal likelihood of encountering residents throughout all areas in their jurisdiction. Individuals from different groups may also engage in activities, such as driving, with different average frequencies, making them more or less likely to be stopped. Another consideration concerns the difference between the numbers of times a person may appear in the RIPA stop data compared to the residential population data collected by the United States Census Bureau. A person may be stopped multiple times within a given calendar year, which would require multiple stop data entries for the same person. Identifying whether a person appears in the data more than once is not possible with the information collected in the RIPA stop data. On the other hand, the United States Census Bureau attempts to only count a person once within the American Community Survey (ACS) by implementing procedures that are intended to address unduplicated responses in their data collection efforts.[1] Due to our inability to estimate the number of recurrent stop actions – individuals who experience a stop action more than once in a year –we report the stop actions per capita rather than an estimate of the number of individuals per capita experiencing a stop action.

There are also concerns with response bias in compiling information derived from residential surveys, such as the census; some groups are more difficult to count, and may be underestimated in official data. The COVID-19 pandemic presented additional challenges to the Census Bureau's data collection efforts that subsequently affected the 2020 ACS data.[2] The Census Bureau announced that, for purposes of addressing non-response bias due to pandemic-related data collection disruptions, the methodology implemented for the 2020 ACS data is different from previous years. This methodological change will be applied to subsequent estimates that include 2020 data. For additional information about the methodological changes implemented,

---

[1] For more information about the United States Census Bureau's procedures for addressing duplicate responses, please visit <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2021/04/how_we_unduplicated.html> [as of Nov. 15, 2023].

[2] For information about the United States Census Bureau's American Community Survey, please visit <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/about.html> [as of Nov. 15, 2023].

please visit <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/technical-documentation/user-notes/2022-03.html>.

In addition to general concerns with residential population benchmarking, there are also several limitations that are unique to comparing RIPA stop data to ACS data. First, 2022 ACS data were not available through Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) at the time this report was written.[3] The 2022 RIPA stop data demographics were instead compared to the 2021 ACS demographics. Moreover, RIPA stop data regulations and the ACS categorize racial and/or ethnic groups differently.[4] ACS data have racial and/or ethnic groups that are not explicitly captured by RIPA regulations. These individuals within the ACS have been collectively grouped together in an "Other" category that does not have a match in RIPA regulations.

Finally, the source of race and/or ethnicity information for each dataset is collected differently. Race and/or ethnicity is recorded for RIPA based on officer's perception, while ACS respondents self-identify. This distinction represents a key difference in objectives between the two databases. The purpose of RIPA is to eliminate racial and identity profiling, a practice that is based on how officers perceive the individuals they stop. RIPA data are intended to facilitate the implementation of policies that will achieve this purpose. On the other hand, the objective of the ACS is to provide a representation of information regarding community residents. Thus, comparisons between these datasets operate under the assumption that officers' perceptions often agree with how an individual self identifies.

Statistical Analysis. Stop demographics for each police department, sheriff's department, district attorney's office, or coroner's office were compared to their primary city or county of service, respectively.[5] For example, the racial and/or ethnic distribution of individuals stopped by San Francisco Police Department was compared to the racial and/or ethnic distribution of San Francisco city residents in the ACS data. There are two exceptions; the first is for California Highway Patrol, which was compared to the state population. Second, only municipal police, county sheriff agencies, county district attorney offices, and county coroner's offices were included in the residential analyses since their agency jurisdictions are clearly defined in ways that allow comparison to ACS data. The agencies that were excluded due to their jurisdictions failing to align with sampled geographic areas in the ACS will not have 2021 ACS population estimates displayed in Table C.1.1.

In RIPA reports published prior to 2022, one year estimates captured in the ACS data were used for residential comparisons. However, one year estimates only provide data for populations of 65,000 or more. Beginning with the 2022 RIPA report, it was necessary to start using the five year ACS estimates in order to capture residential population data for these areas as smaller

---

[3] For information about IPUMS, please visit <https://www.ipums.org/> [as of Nov. 15, 2023].
[4] For example, RIPA regulations explicitly include Israeli individuals in the Middle Eastern/South Asian group, but the ACS does not have an Israeli category.
[5] These comparisons are approximate since agency jurisdictions do not always map perfectly to the boundaries of their primary city or county of service.

agencies began to submit RIPA data. Five year ACS estimates provide population data for all areas, no matter the size of the population served. However, unlike the one year estimates, the five year ACS estimates do not provide racial and ethnicity categorizations that are specific enough to create a comparable grouping to serve as a benchmark for the Middle Eastern/South Asian racial and/or ethnic group captured in the RIPA data. The following table provides information for the racial and/or ethnic categories used from the ACS data and the associated RIPA racial and/or ethnic group for which comparisons were made against.

B.1.1 Census Table B03002

ACS Variable Name	ACS Variable Label	RIPA Racial and/or Ethnic Comparison Group
B03002_003	Not Hispanic or Latino: White alone	White
B03002_004	Not Hispanic or Latino :Black or African American alone	Black
B03002_005	Not Hispanic or Latino: American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Native American
B03002_006	Not Hispanic or Latino: Asian alone	Asian
B03002_007	Not Hispanic or Latino: Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Pacific Islander
B03002_008	Not Hispanic or Latino: Some other race alone	N/A
Multiracial B03002_009 B03002_019	Not Hispanic or Latino: Two or more races Hispanic or Latino: Two or more races	Multiracial
Hispanic/Latino B03002_013 B03002_014 B03002_015 B03002_016 B03002_017 B03002_018	Hispanic or Latino: White alone Hispanic or Latino: Black or African American alone Hispanic or Latino: American Indian and Alaska Native alone Hispanic or Latino: Asian alone Hispanic or Latino: Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone Hispanic or Latino: Some other race alone	Hispanic/Latino

Benchmarking using residential population data involves comparing the distribution of racial and/or ethnic groups stopped by law enforcement to the distribution of residents in the areas serviced by agencies who submitted data in 2023. Since all law enforcement agencies were required to submit stop data in 2023, we did not have to apply the weighting process that was required in previous years. Weighting by agencies was implemented previously with the intention that the overall state residential population comparison was more reflective of just the areas served by agencies that collected RIPA data.

The proportion of the state population within racial and ethnic groups in the ACS is used as a benchmark for the racial and ethnic composition of statewide RIPA reported stops. For example,

to calculate the proportion of Asian individuals residing in California, we would take the group's respective estimate for the number of Asian residents and divide it by the total state population estimate. This number is then compared to the number of stopped individuals that were perceived to be Asian divided by the total number of stops.

The jurisdiction-specific residential population benchmarks are generated by calculating each racial group's proportion within the respective jurisdiction using the estimates reported in the ACS. Each racial group's proportion is calculated by taking each individual group's estimate and dividing it by the sum of the total population for a given jurisdiction. For example, if we want to find the population benchmark of Asian individuals for the San Benito County Sheriff's Office, we would take the group's respective estimate for the number of Asian residents residing in San Benito County and divide it by the total county population estimate. This number is then compared to the number of stopped individuals perceived to be Asian reported by San Benito County Sheriff's Office divided by the total number of stops reported by this agency. Agency residential population comparisons are repeated for each agency separately.

B.2   Statewide Per Capita Stop Action Rates Methodology

In Appendix Section B.1 we describe the methods used to compare the racial and/or ethnic composition of people stopped with the racial and/or ethnic composition of residents, both statewide and within specific jurisdictions. Additionally, we used ACS data to calculate a statewide per capita rate of experiencing a specific stop action[6] for different racial and/or ethnic groups during 2022. Since the number of people within each racial and/or ethnic group varies, per capita rates[7] provide a meaningful way to make comparisons between groups.

For example, if we wanted to calculate the per capita rate of searches for individuals perceived as Native American, we would take the frequency of searches reported for this group and divide the number by the population estimate reported for Native Americans in the ACS for the state of California. We then take this number and multiply it by 100,000. The resulting number (X) is the per capita search rate of Native American residents of California and can be read as for every 100,000 Native American residents, officers reported performing X searches of people they perceived as Native American. The limitations and considerations associated with this type of analysis are consistent with those discussed when comparing stop data to residential population data. Please see Appendix Section B.1 for further information regarding considerations and limitations to such approaches.

B.3   Discovery Rate Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. Discovery rate analyses avoid some of the issues associated with other methods because they do not require the stop data to be compared to external

---

[6] For the purposes of this explanation, the term "stop actions" is not limited to the list of actions taken by officer during stop as defined under section 999.226 (12)(A)(1-23) of the RIPA regulations. Rather, "stop actions" refers to a broader set of data elements reported, such as the primary reason for stop, actions taken by officer during the stop, and the result of stop.

[7] A per capita rate is: for every 100,000 residents of a race and/or ethnicity group, the number of stops of the race and/or ethnicity group involving the given stop action.

information (e.g. residential population data). However, discovery rate analyses also rely on assumptions about the behavior of individuals in different identity groups. Disparate treatment between racial and/or ethnic groups is identified when search and discovery rates are opposed (e.g. Black individuals have high search rates but low discovery rates).[8] When these statistics do not move in opposite directions, it is more difficult to determine whether disparate treatment is present. It is also possible that there are observable factors that could influence an officer's decision to search someone that are not captured by RIPA stop data. The effectiveness in predicting the presence of contraband based on certain suspicious behaviors may also vary between racial and/or ethnic groups.[9] Finally, the strength of the assumptions for discovery rate analyses may vary depending on the type of search being conducted. For example, consent searches include all searches where the only basis included was consent given. Thus, these searches do not include an element of probable cause, which may impact the assumptions underlying their analysis and results.

Statistical Analysis. The discovery rate analysis was conducted in two steps. First, linear probability models were used to test whether there were differences in search rates between White individuals and each racial and/or ethnic group of color independently. Second, similar analyses were used to test for differences in contraband or evidence discovery rates during stops with searches. Each of these analyses were applied to all agencies combined, all municipal agencies combined (excluding California Highway Patrol), and for each individual agency. Both sets of analyses included the following considerations:

1. The four racial and/or ethnic groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Native American, and Pacific Islander individuals.

2. A set of high dimensional fixed effects were included in the analysis as controls, including gender, age, hour of the day, day of the week, month of the year, and the officer conducting the stop.

3. The standard errors were clustered at the officer level to better allow for unobserved correlations between stops made by the same officers.

Using these criteria, we estimated the effect of an individual (i) belonging to a racial and/or ethnic group of color (m) on a resulting binary search or contraband/evidence discovery outcome (j) with the aforementioned controls (…) using the following specification:

$$Outcome_{j,i} = \beta_{j,0} + \beta_{j,1}m_i + \ldots$$

---

[8] See Anwar and Fang, *An Alternative Test of Racial Prejudice in Motor Vehicle Searches: Theory and Evidence* (2006) Am. Econ. Rev. 96(1) <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/000282806776157579>.
[9] See Simoui et al., *The Problem of Infra-Marginality in Outcome Tests for Discrimination* (2017) Ann. Appl. Stat. 11(3) <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.05376.>

APPENDIX C – DISPARITY TEST TABLES

C.1 Residential Population Comparison Tables

C.1.1 Per Capita Rates by Race and/or Ethnicity

Race and/or Ethnicity	2021 ACS California Population Estimate	2022 RIPA Stops Reported	Stops Per 100,000 California Residents
Asian	5,802,086	250,383	4,315.4
Hispanic/Latine(x)	12,772,440	1,964,714	15,382.4
Black/African American	2,128,184	571,424	26,850.3
Middle Eastern/South Asian	-	207,338	
Multiracial	4,235,217	51,975	1,227.2
Native American	124,341	13,977	11,240.9
Other	149,096	-	
Pacific Islander	134,692	26,634	19,774.0
White	14,109,297	1,489,277	10,555.3
Overall	39,455,353	4,575,725	11,597.2

C.1.2 RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Statewide Population Distribution by Race and/or Ethnicity

		A	B	C	D	E	F
	Equation			A-B	C/B*100	A/B	E/E(w)
Agency	Race and/or Ethnicity	RIPA 2022	ACS 2021	Absolute % Difference	Relative % Difference	Disparity Index	Ratio of Disparity
Overall	Asian	5.47%	14.71%	-9.23%	-62.79%	0.37	0.41
	Black	12.49%	5.39%	7.09%	131.52%	2.32	2.54

		A	B	C	D	E	F
	Equation			A-B	C/B*100	A/B	E/E(w)
Agency	Race and/or Ethnicity	RIPA 2022	ACS 2021	Absolute % Difference	Relative % Difference	Disparity Index	Ratio of Disparity
	Hispanic	42.94%	32.37%	10.57%	32.64%	1.33	1.46
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	4.53%					
	Multiracial	1.14%	10.73%	-9.6%	-89.42%	0.11	0.12
	Native American	0.31%	0.32%	-0.01%	-3.07%	0.97	1.06
	Other		0.38%				
	Pacific Islander	0.58%	0.34%	0.24%	70.51%	1.71	1.87
	White	32.55%	35.76%	-3.21%	-8.98%	0.91	
Municipal	Asian	5.09%	14.71%	-9.62%	-65.41%	0.35	0.38
	Black	13.67%	5.39%	8.27%	153.37%	2.53	2.79
	Hispanic	43.15%	32.37%	10.78%	33.29%	1.33	1.47
	Multiracial	1.29%	10.73%	-9.45%	-88.01%	0.12	0.13
Municipal	Native American	0.33%	0.32%	0.01%	3.31%	1.03	1.14

		A	B	C	D	E	F
	Equation			A-B	C/B*100	A/B	E/E(w)
Agency	Race and/or Ethnicity	RIPA 2022	ACS 2021	Absolute % Difference	Relative % Difference	Disparity Index	Ratio of Disparity
	Other		0.38%				
	Pacific Islander	0.6%	0.34%	0.26%	76.91%	1.77	1.95
	White	32.47%	35.76%	-3.29%	-9.2%	0.91	

Notes. 2022 RIPA stop data were compared to 2021 residential population data from the American Community Survey. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.1. For agency breakdowns, please see Table C.1.3 in the .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

C.2   Search and Discovery Rate Regression Analysis Tables

C.2.1 Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race and/or Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic/ Latine(x)	Other
Overall	Coefficients	***-0.038 (0.001)	***0.006 (0.001)	***-0.004 (0.001)	***-0.028 (0.001)
	Observations	1,739,618	2,060,675	3,453,928	1,789,180
	Adjusted R^2	0.272	0.296	0.286	0.271
Municipal	Coefficients	***-0.059 (0.001)	***0.010 (0.001)	***-0.011 (0.001)	***-0.043 (0.001)

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic/ Latine(x)	Other
	Observations	1,073,200	1,318,379	2,160,840	1,088,644
	Adjusted R^2	0.246	0.259	0.259	0.242

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.3. Each set of model statistics for a particular agency and race and/or ethnicity corresponds to a single regression test. Each model only contained a single racial/ethnic group of color and White individuals; White individuals were the reference group for all analyses. 'Overall' refers to all agencies combined while 'Municipal' excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using the Benjamini-Hochberg Procedure for multiple comparisons *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model. For agency breakdowns, please see Table C.2.3 in the .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

C.2.2 Regression Statistics for Search Discovery Rates by Race and/or Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic/ Latine(x)	Other
Overall	Coefficients	***-0.018 (0.005)	***-0.020 (0.002)	***-0.016 (0.002)	***-0.025 (0.004)
	Observations	198,776	302,256	477,295	207,315
	Adjusted R^2	0.112	0.117	0.120	0.109
Municipal	Coefficients	**-0.016 (0.005)	***-0.021 (0.003)	***-0.015 (0.002)	***-0.027 (0.004)
	Observations	183,845	283,296	437,760	191,834

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic/ Latine(x)	Other
	Adjusted R^2	0.101	0.109	0.107	0.099

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.3. Each set of model statistics for a particular agency and race and/or ethnicity corresponds to a single regression test. Each model only contained a single racial/ethnic group of color and White individuals; White individuals were the reference group for all analyses. 'Overall' refers to all agencies combined while 'Municipal' excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using the Benjamini-Hochberg Procedure for multiple comparisons *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model. For agency breakdowns, please see Table C.2.4 in the .xlsx file at https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ripa-appendix-tables-2024.xlsx.

APPENDIX D – LETTERS FROM THE RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING BOARD

D.1.1 Racial and Identity Profiling Board, Letter to the Legislature in Support of AB 93 (March 16, 2023)

State of California Racial and Identity
Profiling Advisory Board

RIPA BOARD c/o
1515 CLAY STREET, 20TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 70550
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0550

Public: (510) 879-3311
Facsimile: (510) 622-2270

March 16, 2023

The Honorable Isaac Bryan
Chair, Senate Committee on Public Safety
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, California 94249-0055

Submitted via Position Letter Portal

Re: Support for Assembly Bill 93, As Amended February 23, 2023 – Criminal procedure:
        consensual searches

Dear Assembly Member Bryan:

The Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board (RIPA Board) submits this letter in strong support to
Assembly Bill 93 (AB 93). Under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA), the Legislature
established the RIPA Board as a nineteen-member state advisory board composed of civil rights
advocates, clergy, academics, and law enforcement. The RIPA Board's primary duty is to review and
analyze policies and practices as well as analyzing stop data and civilian complaint data in order to
make recommendations aimed at eliminating racial and identity profiling in California.

The RIPA Board applauds the efforts to address disparities in policing by prohibiting the practice of
consent searches entirely. The Board would like to encourage the Legislature to consider introducing
legislation in the future that will adopt the RIPA Board's recommendation to end all suspicionless
searches, including probation or supervision searches and inquiries.[1]

The Board's research and data show that suspicionless searches are a significant source of disparities
in policing. One possibility for these disparities is because there are no objective criteria of who to
search and why, making the stops vulnerable to the explicit and implicit biases of the officer
conducting the search.[2] In the Board's annual 2023 Report, the data on consent only searches

---

[1] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p 89.
[2] See generally Ridgeway, *Assessing the Effect of Race Bias in Post-Traffic Stop Outcomes Using Propensity Scores*
(2006) 22 J. Quant. Criminol. 1 <https://www.rand.org/pubs/reprints/RP1252.html> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; see also, e.g.,
Eberhardt, *How racial bias works -- and how to disrupt it* (June 2020) TED
<https://www.ted.com/talks/jennifer_l_eberhardt_how_racial_bias_works_and_how_to_disrupt_it/transcript?language=
en>[as of Mar. 13, 2023]; Quattlebaum, *Let's Get Real: Behavioral Realism, Implicit Bias, and the Reasonable Police
Officer* (2018) 14 Stan. J. C.R. & C.L. 1, 17 <https://law.stanford.edu/publications/lets-get-real-behavioral-realism-
implicit-bias-and-the-reasonable-police-officer/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].

(searches for which the only basis provided by the officer is "consent given") revealed that stopped individuals perceived as Black were 4 times as likely, individuals perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x) were 2.4 times as likely, and individuals perceived as Multiracial were 2.2 times as likely to be asked for consent to search during a traffic stop than individuals perceived as White.[3] During traffic stops, individuals perceived as Black were searched with the sole basis for search reported as "consent given" 3.75 times more and individuals perceived as Hispanic/Latine(x) 2.5 times more than individuals perceived as White.[4]

After examining stop data from 2020 and 2021, the RIPA Board recommended the following in its 2023 Report:

Recommendation: Prohibiting certain searches, such as consent searches or supervision searches, and instead requiring probable cause for any search.[5]

Several agencies and states have already adopted policies to eliminate consent searches; notably the California Highway Patrol (CHP) had a moratorium on consent searches from 2001 to 2006.[6] The recommendation to prohibit consent searches originally came from a team of managers at CHP after reviewing consent search data showing significant disparities.[7] As evidenced by the RIPA data, the CHP makes the most total stops of any law enforcement agency in California. An analysis of the 2021

---

[3] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p 71.
[4] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 72.
[5] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), pp. 89, 96; Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2022), pp. 116, 130.
[6] California Highway Patrol Bans Consent Searches Following Review of Data Collection Showing Discriminatory Pattern (Apr. 2001) ACLU <https://www.aclu.org/press-releases/california-highway-patrol-bans-consent-searches-following-review-data-collection> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
[7] California Highway Patrol Bans Consent Searches Following Review of Data Collection Showing Discriminatory Pattern (Apr. 2001) ACLU <https://www.aclu.org/press-releases/california-highway-patrol-bans-consent-searches-following-review-data-collection> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].

RIPA data showed that CHP rarely uses consent searches compared to other agencies, and in 2021, the CHP[8]:

- Reported asking for consent to search a person or their property during roughly 0.1 percent of stops, whereas the other 57 law enforcements agencies that collected data in 2021 reported asking for consent to perform searches during 7.7 percent of stops.
- Reported conducting consent only searches during approximately 0.01 percent of stops, whereas the other collecting agencies reported conducting consent only searches during 2.7 percent of stops.

The data from 2021 demonstrate that, despite making over half (54.9%) of the overall stops reported in 2021, the CHP conducted a much smaller proportion of total stops which involved asking for consent to perform a search (0.9%) or conducting a consent-only search (0.5%).

As the Board identified in its 2022 RIPA report, several states, including Connecticut,[9] Minnesota,[10] New Jersey,[11] and Rhode Island,[12] have imposed limits on consent searches, either through their legislatures or court rulings. In 2020, the state of Connecticut also restricted consent searches by passing a law banning officers from requesting consent to search a vehicle stopped for a motor vehicle violation.[13] One agency who adopted the policies found that by prohibiting consent searches, "[p]olice searches were more successful at finding contraband, i.e. a 63-percentage point increase, and the department ceased to be identified as having a disparity in subsequent annual analyses."[14]

Given likely disparities in enforcement, the low discovery rates (rate of finding contraband or evidence) during stops where officers performed these searches, and the success of agencies and states who have adopted these policies, the Board is encouraged to see the Legislature taking action to eliminate them.

Similar to consent searches, supervision searches[15] and inquiries are vulnerable to the same biases because officers have wide discretion regarding who to ask about their supervisions status and whether they conduct a search.

One area the bill could address is preventing supervision inquiries – or an officer asking if someone is on supervision. Studies have shown that Black community members are more likely to be asked if they

---

[8] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 32.
[9] Conn. Gen. Stats. §§ 54-33b; 54-33o.
[10] See *State v. Fort* (Minn. 2003) 660 N.W.2d 415, 416.
[11] See *State v. Carty* (2002) 170 N.J. 632.
[12] See R.I. Gen. Laws, § 31-21.2-5.
[13] Conn. Gen. Stats. §§ 54-33b; 54-33o.
[14] Ross et al., *Testing for Disparities in Traffic Stops: Best Practices from the Connecticut Model* (2020) Criminology & Public Policy, p. 1297 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1745-9133.12528> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
[15] In California, there are multiple forms of state and local supervision, including parole, probation, post-release community supervision (PRCS), and mandatory supervision. If a person is on supervision, they may be searched by officers only if it is an explicit term of the person's supervision conditions. See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 2355; Cal. Pen. Code, § 1203; Cal. Pen. Code § 3450; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, §§ 3079-3079.1; al. Pen. Code § 1170 (h)(5)(B); *People v. Sanders* (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 318, 333; *People v. Reyes* (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 743, 750-754; *In re Jaime P.* (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 128.

are on supervision than White community members. In a study reviewing Oakland Police Department's stop data and comparing it to body worn camera footage, researchers found "officers were more likely to mention the word probation in conversations with African American community members" and also used more severe legal words – such as "arrest" or "prison" – in comparison to White community members.[16] Several agencies have adopted policies preventing these inquiries in an effort to rebuild trust between the community and law enforcement, including the Oakland Police Department[17] and the Berkeley Police Department.[18] For law enforcement agencies, prohibiting supervision inquiries is a policy change that could lead to big gains in community trust and respect that ultimately improve public safety.[19]

In addition to eliminating supervision inquiries, the Board recommends that the Legislature also severely limit supervision searches. The Oakland Police Department[20] and the Berkeley Police Department[21] both have policies that limit when an officer can conduct a supervision search and instead require all searches to be based on probable cause or reasonable suspicion. The 2023 RIPA Report noted that traffic stops involving supervision only searches (searches where the stopped person's supervision status was the only basis provided for performing the search) were highest among individuals perceived to be Black (2.6%). All other racial or ethnic groups had a lower percentage of stops involving supervision only searches (Hispanic/Latine(x) - 0.9%, Multiracial - 0.9%, Pacific Islander - 0.6%, Native American - 0.5%, White - 0.5%, Asian - 0.2%, and Middle Eastern/South Asian - 0.2%).[22] Disparities in supervision search rates during traffic violation stops led to more than twice as many supervision searches of individuals perceived as Black (9,863) compared to individuals perceived as White (4,172).[23]

Research has shown that supervision searches are not an effective crime-fighting tool. As the below graph shows, contraband was discovered during only fifteen percent of all traffic violation stops involving supervision only stops.[24] Stops for traffic violations involving supervision only searches for individuals perceived to be Black or Hispanic/Latine(x) resulted in contraband discovery less frequently (12.3% and 14.2%, respectively) compared to all other racial or ethnic groups.[25] These statistics suggest that these suspicionless searches are not as effective as other types of stops and searches in locating contraband.

---

[16] See Eberhardt, J. L., Stanford Univ. SPARQ, Strategies for Change: Research Initiatives and Recommendations to Improve Police-Community Relations in Oakland, Calif. (June 2016) p. 17 <https://stanford.app.box.com/v/Strategies-for-Change> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
[17] Oakland Police Dept., Dept. General Order R-02: Searches of Individuals on Probation, Parole, Mandatory Supervision and PRCS (Post-Release Community Supervision) ("Dept. General Order R-02") (Oct. 2019).
[18] Berkeley Police Dept., Law Enforcement Services Manual, Policy 311 Search and Seizure ("Policy 311 Search and Seizure") (2021), Section 311.5.
[19] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2022), pp. 127-128 (discussing law enforcement agency policies and rationales).
[20] Berkeley Police Dept. Policy 311 Search and Seizure, Section 311.
[21] Oakland Police Dept., Dept. General Order R-02.
[22] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 73.
[23] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 73.
[24] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 73.
[25] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 73.

Traffic Violation Supervision Only Search Rates

Traffic Violation Supervision Only Discovery Rates

The Board is pleased to support AB 93, and hopes to work with you in a future year to amend the Penal Code to prohibit probation inquiries and searches to situations where the law enforcement officer has reasonable suspicion or probable cause the person committed a crime.

Thank you for your time and attention. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like to discuss these important matters further.

Regards,

Andrea Guerrero
RIPA Board Co-Chair

cc: Caleb.Rabinowitz@asm.ca.gov

D.1.2 Racial and Identity Profiling Board, Letter to the Legislature in Support of SB 50 (March 21, 2023)

State of California Racial and Identity
Profiling Advisory Board

RIPA BOARD c/o
1515 CLAY STREET, 20TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 70550
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0550

Public: (510) 879-3311
Facsimile: (510) 622-2270

March 21, 2023

The Honorable Steven Bradford
Chair, Senate Committee on Public Safety
1021 O Street, Suite 7210
Sacramento, California 95814

Submitted via Position Letter Portal

Re: Support for Senate Bill 50, As Amended February 13, 2023 – Vehicles: enforcement

Dear Senator Bradford:

The Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board (RIPA Board) submits this letter in support to Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) concerning pretextual stops and civilian traffic enforcement programs. Under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA), the Legislature established the RIPA Board as a nineteen-member state advisory board composed of civil rights advocates, clergy, academics, and law enforcement. The RIPA Board's primary duty is to review and analyze policies and practices as well as analyzing stop data and civilian complaint data in order to make recommendations geared to eliminate racial and identity profiling in California.

The RIPA Board wishes to express its support for SB 50, but recommends an amendment to address and incorporate the RIPA Board's recommendation to entirely eliminate pretextual traffic stops and searches. The RIPA Board appreciates SB 50's effort to address disparities in policing by prohibiting stops for a specific traffic offenses to "limit enforcement of traffic laws and minor offenses that pose a low risk to public safety and show significant disparities in the rate of enforcement." However, in its 2023 Report, the RIPA Board made a broader recommendation:

Recommendation 1: Eliminate all pretextual stops and subsequent searches and ensure that a stop or search is based on reasonable suspicion or probable cause, respectively.[1]

The issue of pretextual stops is much more pervasive than eliminating enforcement of the Vehicle Code sections identified in SB 50. Without prohibiting the conduct entirely, community members remain vulnerable to pretextual stops; for example, an officer may stop someone for speeding pretextually in order to investigate an unrelated hunch.

---

[1] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 89; see also Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2022), p. 144.

Not only does the Board support the elimination of pretextual stops entirely, the Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code[2] and the White House have called for an end to the practice. In a 2022 Executive Order, the White House stated its support for this position[3]:

> Building trust between law enforcement agencies and the communities they are sworn to protect and serve also requires accountability for misconduct and transparency through data collection and public reporting. It requires proactive measures to prevent profiling based on actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or disability, including by ensuring that new law enforcement technologies do not exacerbate disparities based on these characteristics. **It includes ending discriminatory pretextual stops** . . .[4]

The White House's support for this change in the law underscores the importance of addressing discriminatory stops by ending the practice entirely.[5]

In California, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) – one of the largest law enforcement agencies in the state – adopted new policies requiring officers to have reasonable suspicion or probable cause for *all* stops, searches, and questioning. The LAPD policy addresses the issue of pretext stops, stating: "[P]retextual stops shall not be conducted unless officers are acting upon articulable information in addition to the traffic violation, which may or may not amount to reasonable suspicion, regarding a serious crime (i.e., a crime with potential for great bodily injury or death)."[6] The policy has an exception that prohibits stops for any traffic infraction unless the violation "significantly interferes with public safety," giving officers' broad discretion to determine what stops are for public safety. The policy also allows for pretext stops under certain circumstances, such as suspicion of a serious crime, if the officer can articulate a basis for the search on their body worn camera.[7]

Banning the practice entirely is imperative to addressing profiling and reducing disparities in policing. There are numerous Vehicle and Penal Code violations that can be used as a pretext for a stop. Without a complete ban, the bases for pretext stops can be shifted to codes not listed within the bill, and thus the practice will likely continue. Many agencies have carved out an exception to stops for certain

---

[2] See Annual Report and Recommendations, Committee on the Revision of the Penal Code (Dec. 2022) <http://www.clrc.ca.gov/CRPC/Pub/Reports/CRPC_AR2022.pdf> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
3 Executive Order on Advancing Effective, Accountable Policing and Criminal Justice Practices to Enhance Public Trust and Public Safety (May 25, 2022) [emphasis added].
[4] *Ibid.*
[5] Of note, in his remarks about the department's investigation into the Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD), the U.S. Attorney General sharply criticized the use of pretextual stops, noting LMPD relied heavily on pretext stops in Black neighborhoods and officers in specialized enforcement teams frequently made pretext stops in Black neighborhoods. See Attorney General Merrick B. Garland Delivers Remarks on Civil Rights Violations by the Louisville Metro Police Department and Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government (Mar. 8, 2023) U.S. Department of Justice <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-merrick-b-garland-delivers-remarks-civil-rights-violations-louisville> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
[6] L.A. Police Dept., Limitation on Use of Pretextual Stops: 1/240.06 ("LAPD Limitation on Pretextual Stops") (Mar. 2022) p. 1.
[7] *Ibid.*

violations if there is a concern for public safety. If officers can make stops where there is a public safety concern, then a complete ban on pretext stops would merely refocus the stop to one of public safety, rather than a stop based upon pretext. In doing so, resources will be better directed to public safety, as opposed to unfruitful pretext stops that also may be based upon bias.[8]

The RIPA Board, the White House, law enforcement leadership, and advocates have called for the end of pretextual stops. If SB 50 is amended to end the practice, it would be the first statewide policy eliminating the practice entirely and would set a precedent for the rest of the country. We have the opportunity and support to make these changes that may reduce racial and identity profiling within the state.

The RIPA Board would also like to voice its support for SB 50's proposal to amend the Penal Code to allow for municipalities to create civilian traffic enforcement programs. In its 2023 Report, the RIPA Board made the following recommendation:

Recommendation 2: Limit armed law enforcement responses to traffic enforcement by allowing for stops only if there is a concern for public safety and explore amending the vehicle code to more broadly move traffic enforcement out of law enforcement's purview (e.g., to a civilian traffic unit).[9]

The Board would also like to express its support for SB 50's proposal to amend the Penal Code to allow for local governments to create civilian traffic enforcement departments. One approach municipalities are taking to eliminate pretextual stops is the creation of a traffic enforcement program made up of civilians instead of armed officers.[10] "The purpose of removing officers from certain types

---

[8] "Specifically, research shows pretextual stops are costly – with limited efficacy in reducing crimes – and utilize valuable resources that could be redirected to more effective public safety measures. Studies of RIPA data show officers spend a significant amount of time – nearly 80,000 hours in 2019 – on traffic stops that lead to no enforcement action or discovery of contraband; for local law enforcement departments, 28,000 of those hours were spent on enforcing non-moving violations, which are more likely to be pretextual. Not only do these stops take away time from investigating crimes that are more serious, they are also costly. One study estimates that Sacramento County Sheriff's Department spent $35.5 million and San Diego County Sheriff's Department spent $43.9 million annually on enforcing traffic violations that resulted in a warning or no action taken." Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), pp. 63-64 [citing Lofstrom et al., *Racial Disparities in Law Enforcement Stops* (Oct. 2021) Public Policy Inst. of Cal. (PPIC) <https://www.ppic.org/publication/racial-disparities-in-law-enforcement-stops/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]]; Reimagining Community Safety in California: From Deadly and Expensive Sheriffs to Equity and Care-Centered Wellbeing (Oct. 2022) Catalyst Cal. and ACLU of Southern Cal. <https://catalyst-ca.cdn.prismic.io/catalyst-ca/126c30a8-852c-416a-b8a7-55a90c77a04e_APCA+ACLU+REIMAGINING+COMMUNITY+SAFETY+2022_5.pdf> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].
[9] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 89.
[10] "Berkeley, Oakland, and Los Angeles are all developing traffic safety departments that will absorb some of the responsibilities of police departments. In Berkeley, the new program known as BerkDOT will include an unarmed traffic unit, crossing guards, parking enforcement, paving, collision investigations, and traffic control." Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p 106, citing Reimagining Public Safety/BerkDOT (May 2021) Task Force Meeting Agenda <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/legislative-body-meeting-agendas/Reimagining-Public-Safety-Task-Force%205-19%20Meeting%20Packet%20%28rev%29.pdf > [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; Oakland Reimagining Public Safety Task Force: Report and Recommendations (Apr. 2021) City of Oakland, p. 224 <https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Oakland-RPSTF-Report-Final-4-29-21.pdf> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; L.A. Motion 20-0875 (2021) Ad Hoc Police Reform, p. 2 <https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-0875_mot_06-30-2020.pdf> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].

of traffic enforcement is twofold: to increase public safety by having officers focus their skills and resources on serious criminal activity and to reduce unnecessary interactions between the public and the police." [11]

A bill currently pending in Congress would create a program that would award municipalities with a $100 million grant to develop civilian traffic enforcement agencies. [12] Currently, California limits traffic stops to peace officers because of how "traffic officers" are defined under Vehicle Code, section 21100. Without the proposed amendment to the Vehicle Code, municipalities will not be able to participate in this program. Presently, cities such as Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oakland are considering creating these programs but cannot move forward until the law is amended. The RIPA Board strongly supports the proposed change in the law that will allow for communities to rethink law enforcement's role in traffic. [13]

We thank you for your consideration of the Board's recommendations and encourage the committee to adopt these additional amendments. By eliminating the practice of pretextual stops and reducing law enforcement's role in traffic enforcement, we can improve public safety, prevent profiling of individuals, and save lives. [14][15]

Thank you for your time and attention. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like to discuss these important matters further.

Regards,

Andrea Guerrero
RIPA Board Co-Chair

---

[11] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p. 105.

[12] H.R. 852 (Reg. Sess. 2023-2024) – To direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program for civilian traffic violation enforcement.

[13] Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), pp. 105-107.

[14] "Throughout the country, during any type of stop, law enforcement killed Black individuals at more than twice the rate of White individuals and Hispanic/Latino(x) individuals at 1.3 to 1.4 times than White individuals. Studies also show "Black Californians are about three times more likely to be seriously injured, shot, or killed by the police relative to their share of the state's population. A majority of these killings by law enforcement began as a traffic violation stop or police responding to a non-violent offense." Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p 63, citing Mapping Police Violence <https://mappingpoliceviolence.us/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; Lofstrom et al., *Racial Disparities in Traffic Stops* (Oct. 2022) PPIC <https://www.ppic.org/publication/ racial-disparities-in-traffic-stops/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; Washington Post Police Shooting Database: Fatal Force ("Fatal Police Shooting Database") <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/investigations/police-shootings-database/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023].

[15] "Nationally, in just a five-year span, law enforcement killed nearly 600 people after a stop for a traffic ticket. In California during that same five-year span, from 2017 to 2021, police killed 70 people during a traffic stop." Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board, Annual Report (2023), p 63, citing Mapping Police Violence <https://mappingpoliceviolence.us/> [as of Mar. 13, 2023]; See also Levin, *US Police have killed nearly 600 people in traffic stops since 2017, data shows* (Apr. 2022) The Guardian <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/apr/21/us-police-violence-traffic-stop-data> [as of Mar. 13, 2022]