


Chula Vista PD Race and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) Stop Data

In 2015, California passed Assembly Bill (AB) 953, the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA), that required each law enforcement agency that employs peace officers to annually report data on all stops to the Attorney General, with the goal of preventing racial profiling and disparity. As part of the RIPA mandate, law enforcement agencies are required to collect perceived demographic characteristics and other detailed data from all pedestrian and traffic stops. This dashboard displays the RIPA data that has been collected by Chula Vista Police Department from January 2022-June 2023. The goal of providing these visualizations is to deepen Chula Vista residents' understanding of the kind of data that is collected under RIPA to further develop community trust and transparency.

January 2022-June 2023

What demographics are included in RIPA stops? (N = 15,443)

Figure 1: Stops by Ethnicity/Race



Chula Vista Population in 2022 by Ethnicity/Race (N = 276,785)





Figure 2: Stops by Perceived Gender



Figure 3: Stops by Perceived Age



LGBT

Stops of individuals perceived to be LGBT comprised less than one percent. (**<1%**)

Limited English Fluency

Officers perceived approximately one percent of individuals stopped to have limited or no English fluency. (**1%**)

Disability

Officers perceived less than one percent of the individuals they stopped to have one or more disabilities. (**<1%**)

Calls for Service- Was the stop officer initiated or a call for service?

Figure 7: Calls for Service Status by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N = 15,443)




Figure 8: Calls for Service Status by Perceived Gender (N = 15,443)




Figure 9: Calls for Service Status by Perceived Age (N = 15,443)





Figure 10: Calls for Service Status by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)



What was the primary reason for the stop?

Note: "Other" category includes: consensual encounter resulting in a search; investigation to determine whether the person was truant; knowledge of outstanding arrest warrant/wanted person; known to be on parole/probation/post-release community supervision (PRCS)/mandatory supervision

Figure 11: Stop Reason by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N = 15,439)




Figure 12: Stop Reason by Perceived Gender (N = 15,439)




Figure 13: Stop Reason by Perceived Age (N = 15,439)





Figure 14: Stop Reason by Perceived Disability Status, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)



Was action taken by officers during stops?

Figure 15: Action Outcome by Perceived Ethnicity/Race (N= 15,443)




Figure 16: Action Outcome by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 17: Action Outcome by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)





Figure 18: Action Outcome by Perceived Disability Status, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N= 322)



What action occurred during an officer stop by perceived race/ethnicity?

Figure 19: Property Search by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)




Figure 20: Curbside Detention by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)




Figure 21: Handcuffed by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)





Figure 22: Ordered Vehicle Exit by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)



What action occurred during an officer stop by perceived gender & age?

Figure 23: Property Search by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 24: Curbside Detention by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 25: Handcuffed by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 26: Ordered Vehicle Exit by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 27: Property Search by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)




Figure 28: Curbside Detention by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)




Figure 29: Handcuffed by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)





Figure 30: Ordered Vehicle Exit by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)



What action occurred during an officer stop by perceived LGBT status, limited English fluency, & disability?

Figure 31: Property Search by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)




Figure 32: Curbside Detention by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)




Figure 33: Handcuffed by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)





Figure 34: Ordered Vehicle Exit by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)



What was the result of the stop?

Figure 35: Result of Stop by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)




Figure 36: Result of Stop by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 37: Result of Stop by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)





Figure 38: Result of Stop by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N = 322)



What was the result of the stop by race/ethnicity?

Figure 39: Warning by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)





Figure 40: Arrest by Perceived Race/Ethnicity (N= 15,443)



What was the result of the stop by gender & age?

Figure 41: Warning by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 42: Arrest by Perceived Gender (N= 15,443)




Figure 43: Warning by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)





Figure 44: Arrest by Perceived Age (N= 15,443)



What was the result of the stop by LGBT, limited English fluency, & disability status?

Figure 45: Warning by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N= 322)





Figure 46: Arrest by Perceived Disability, LGBT, and Limited English Fluency (N= 322)



Use of Force Analysis

Methodological Note: The data presented are use of force incidents during RIPA stops. As such, there will be variation reported by CVPD. For CVPD's use of force dashboard, please visit: <https://www.chulavistaca.gov/departments/police-department/about-us/transparency-and-accountability/use-of-force-uof>

Of the 23 actions taken by officers during stops that are reportable under RIPA, at least nine constitute types of force. For the purpose of these analyses, the nine actions taken by an officer during a stop, regardless of the officer's intent or civilian compliance level, are considered uses of force. These actions are: firearm discharged or used; electric control device used; impact projectile discharged or used; canine bit or held person; baton or other impact weapon used; firearm pointed at person; chemical spray used; person removed from vehicle by physical contact; other physical or vehicle contact (instances when the purpose of such contact is to restrict movement or control a person's resistance). There were no firearm discharges reported in RIPA data during the reporting period.

Figure 47: Use of Force by Perceived Ethnicity/Race (N= 264)




Figure 48: Use of Force by Perceived Gender (N= 264)

No cases where Use of Force was used involved a perceived Transgender individual.





Figure 49: Use of Force by Perceived Age (N= 264)



Less Lethal Force Analysis

Methodological Note: To better analyze the various levels of force, six of the nine use of force actions were categorized as less lethal force. These actions include: electronic control device used; impact projectile discharged or used; canine bit or held person; baton or other impact weapon used; firearm pointed at person; chemical spray used.

Figure 50: Less Lethal Force by Ethnicity/Race (N= 131)




Figure 51: Less Lethal Force by Gender (N= 131)





Figure 52: Less Lethal Force by Age (N= 131)



Of all stopped individuals where officers reported using less lethal force, less than **5%** were perceived to be LGBT, have a disability, or have limited English fluency. **(N = 1)**

Limited Force Analysis

Methodological Note: To better analyze the various levels of force, 2 of the nine use of force actions were categorized as limited force. These actions include: person removed from vehicle by physical contact; other physical or vehicle contact (instances when the purpose of such contact is to restrict movement or control a person's resistance).

Figure 54: Limited Force by Ethnicity/Race (N= 141)




Figure 55: Limited Force by Gender (N= 141)





Figure 56: Limited Force by Age (N= 141)



Of all stopped individuals where officers reported using limited force, **5%** were perceived to be LGBT, have a disability, or have limited English fluency. **(N = 9)**