

**Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC)
DATA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

MEETING MINUTES

April 7, 2005, 9:00 a.m.

Roth's IGA West Salem Store, Salem, Oregon

LECC Data Review Subcommittee

Members Present

Jan Chaiken David Fidanque
Bill Feyerherm Greg Willeford

LECC Staff Present

Claudia Black Craig Prins
Meredith (Bud) Bliss Laura Uva

LECC Data Review Subcommittee

Members Excused

Raul Ramirez

Guests

Roland Broussard
Undersheriff Greg Olson

Welcome / Introductions

Each attendant briefly introduced himself.

Jan Chaiken, chair of the subcommittee, works with LINC, and was previously Director of the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Greg Olson is Undersheriff of Marion County, and was representing Sheriff Raul Ramirez at this meeting.

OASIS Update

Chaiken explained that the LECC had previously found the OASIS data attractive because it displays responses to the interactions contacts have had with the police, and its methods are well-established because it has been active for a number of years. One disadvantage of OASIS is that the information about traffic stops is not specific enough to meet the Committee's needs to understand details of traffic stops. In addition, the size of the minority population sample in OASIS is not nearly big enough to draw any conclusions about experiences or opinions of minority group members in any single year. For the future, he suggested the subcommittee explore oversampling minority populations and/or adding to the survey a supplementary question or two that would be relevant to this committee.

[David Fidanque arrived at approximately 9:20 a.m.]

Bliss reported that there are three years of OASIS data available right now. The fourth year is currently being collected, and Bliss estimated that it would probably be available in June.

Because it is important for this committee to produce and publicize information, Chaiken believed the best use of the time of this meeting would be to prioritize working with data that were already in hand. He suggested aggregating all three years of available OASIS data in order to create a larger sample size of minority populations so that there would be

an increased chance of detecting differences in the minority populations' experiences and opinions. An objection was raised that this approach would not take into account events of specific years that may have affected responses. Fidanque suggested that they also continue to compare each year's data in order to keep track of trends. Bliss, who would be in charge of analyzing the data, assured the subcommittee that blending three or four years of data would be relatively easy to do. He added that his office also has county data which will allow them to look at the variations in perceptions based on county.

Chaiken also suggested that in writing up the results, Oregon data should be compared with that of other states or jurisdictions in order to give some sense of balance to the overall picture. Chaiken said that he would work with Bliss to assemble some comparable national and jurisdiction-level data.

Chaiken suggested that the subcommittee write a collective statement on their interpretation of the data in addition to Bliss' analysis. Chaiken also requested that, when Bliss sends the committee the data, he include the exact survey questions in order to facilitate evaluation of wording. All members of the subcommittee agreed to be on the "Non-Emergency Response Team" to look at the tabulations of the previous data and to write paragraphs on how they interpret the data. This should be accomplished by the time of the next subcommittee meeting.

Publicizing Data and Analyses

Broussard asked what was going to be done with the OASIS data once it was compiled and analyzed. Chaiken responded that only the full committee decides how to publicize the results, because the data must be viewed in the context of the work of the LECC Community Relations Subcommittee. He mentioned that it is important to avoid publicizing premature or incomplete statistics that might be misleading. Bliss suggested that the subcommittee bring their analyses to the next full LECC meeting for discussion. Chaiken added that LECC data releases will appear on the Criminal Justice Commission's website, as they have in the past. Feyerherm suggested also sharing the data and analyses with groups such as the Sheriffs, Chiefs of Police, and District Attorneys Associations. Providing data to these groups needs to be done on an ongoing basis. Chaiken asked for there to be an addition of "what information should be released, to whom, and by what methods" to the June LECC agenda.

Oversampling

Bliss discussed the two approaches the committee could take to oversampling minority populations. One would be to try to get the OASIS group to oversample by targeting certain telephone prefixes based on demographics. Another approach is to "piggyback" on the other surveys that the OASIS group performs that target, for various reasons, specific cities, counties or regions with different kinds of questions. However, these are usually sporadic surveys that cannot be planned for very far in advance.

Chaiken liked the first approach. Feyerherm added that, because it is a random digit dial telephone survey, you simply need to oversample the blocks from certain prefixes, which is preferable to the approach that creates specialized samples but does not allow it to

work backwards and re-weight the oversample groups to get a good state estimate. If the OASIS group is in the middle of interviewing now, they may be able to add an additional weighted sample from areas that correspond accordingly. This may not cost much money and could possibly be put into place this fiscal year. Chaiken agreed that this would be easy for them, but stated that he thinks they should add this weighted sample at the end, in order to allow the OASIS group to finish the sample that they intended first. Feyerherm agreed. Broussard suggested oversampling northeast Portland, up to NE 185th Avenue. He brought up the point that most other parts of Oregon have significantly sized white populations in addition to African American populations, and therefore oversampling any region would bring about a higher sample of white people in addition to black people. Chaiken responded to this concern by saying that, although this solution is not perfect, it is still an improvement from the current situation in which the minority sample is extremely small.

Chaiken, Feyerherm and Fidanque agreed to be on what they termed the “Emergency Response Team” for selecting which questions will be asked as an oversampling subset. They will correspond by e-mail. If the OASIS group agrees to add an oversampling section on the LECC’s behalf, Chaiken agreed to talk with them directly about who to oversample and how.

Bliss suggested trying to duplicate as closely as possible the Public Perception Survey of 1999, which involved a statewide sample, a long survey, and oversampling of the Portland and Woodburn areas. This would give them a valuable comparison with information from six years ago.

At the next meeting, the subcommittee will address the questions they would like the OASIS team to add or reword. Because the LECC is one of the primary sponsors of the OASIS survey, Bliss is confident that they will be responsive to the requests of the committee.

Feyerherm and Fidanque suggested collecting only the data from the subset of questions pertinent to the LECC. Chaiken responded that the context in which questions are asked can influence the responses. He said they should think of that for next year, but for now they cannot expect them to change it this late. Fidanque added that deleting some questions could produce a dramatic cut in cost, since OASIS charges based on the length of the survey, the number of clients they have in the survey and the number of respondents. Chaiken added that they do want to look at the information regarding driving patterns and basic demographics in addition to information in response to the LECC questions. This is a difficult issue because the questions that are dispensable depend on who the other sponsors are.

The committee decided that Bliss should circulate the electronic version of the most current OASIS questionnaire/response document.

Budget Update

Prins described the current status of resources. The Ways and Means Committee co-chairs' budget includes \$100,000 for the next biennium, which is significantly less than the budget for the current biennium.

The funding for the current biennium is intact through July of 2005. There remains an unobligated amount of \$35,000. Fidanque offered a motion, and the Data Review Subcommittee voted unanimously, to authorize the staff to spend what is prudent, up to the currently unobligated amount, for enhancing the sample of people called in the ongoing OASIS interviews. Chaiken agreed to be the contact person on this topic.

Fidanque advised the subcommittee to share a synopsis of the work of the LECC with the legislature in order to try to increase their funding in the next biennium. Even though the committee will not have a formal report completed in time, a conversation with the legislature should begin now.

Prins suggested meeting with Senator Gordley to give the informal report. The Public Safety Subcommittee on Way and Means meeting, of which Senator Gordley is chair, will be on April 21, 2005 at 1:00 p.m. There will be opportunity for public testimony at approximately 1:30 p.m. that day. Prins would like a copy of the short informal report before that date, so that he can give copies to Linda Gilbert (DAS Budget Analyst) and Doug Wilson (LFO Budget Analyst). He requested that Fidanque attend the meeting.

Law Enforcement Agency Data Collection Efforts

Bliss stated that, when they first began collecting law enforcement agency data, they got most data from the Hillsboro Police Department, which was the first agency to collect traffic stop data, and the Oregon State Police (OSP). They were later able to obtain some data from the Beaverton, Corvallis and Eugene Police Departments but, after the LECC became inactive, the commission ceased collecting data.

Other agencies have now indicated willingness to participate, but the LECC needs to inform them that it is active and interested in collecting data. Willeford added that they continue to collect data from OSP. Bliss affirmed Fidanque's statement that data from Multnomah County is needed. Although the City of Portland has been willing to provide that data, the LECC did not collect it in the past because of issues with the dispatch system that made it difficult to collect data. The last Bliss heard was that they were planning to begin using new equipment on January 1, 2004, and might be willing to provide data to the LECC after they had collected it for a year and done their own analyses.

Chaiken said that all agencies that ever provided data to the LECC should be contacted in order to find out whether they continue to collect data and if they are willing to provide that data.

Chaiken added that some agencies have staff but need technical assistance from us in order to analyze data, while some others have data but no resources to analyze it.

Law Enforcement Survey

Black suggested, and the subcommittee agreed, that all law enforcement agencies should be contacted by the LECC about their data. She requested that the subcommittee begin to formulate the wording of the questions on the survey.

Some tentative questions are the following:

- 1) Has your agency collected data on traffic stops with the data points listed in the statute?
 - If so:
 - a) When did you start collecting this data?
 - b) Do you still collect this data?
 - If not, when did you stop?
 - c) Has your agency maintained electronic databases for this data?
 - If so, would you be willing to provide that data to us if we consult with you about how we are going to make use of it?
 - d) Has your agency prepared any written reports compiling the data that you have released to the public?
 - If so, please either forward us copies or provide us with the e-mail address of the person from whom we can obtain copies.
 - e) Has your agency prepared any non-published written reports compiling the data that you would be willing to share with this committee?
 - If not:
 - a) Would you be interested in assistance with setting up a data collection process?

Chaiken explained that if an agency answers “yes” to question “e” and/or the second part of question “c,” the next step would be to contact them in order to have a discussion about what they are willing to send, considering that the LECC could tabulate it some other way or combine it with other departments before it is released. Bliss added that the statute specifies which data the LECC is and is not allowed to collect.

Feyerherm suggested that the subcommittee find out whether or not they can privately offer assistance to agencies in looking at data that they have not made public.

Fidanque suggested that the two LECC subcommittees send two separate questionnaires to the law enforcement personnel most knowledgeable about the specific subject matters. Chaiken agreed, and added that each e-mail must be something to which one person could respond. For this reason, he also suggested the LECC possibly contact agencies twice by email concerning their data. The first data review survey would include the questions listed above, and the second would include requests for more detailed information, such as data formats.

Chaiken suggested that the Community Relations Subcommittee send its questionnaire a few days before the Data Review Subcommittee in order to introduce the work of the LECC. The Community Relations Subcommittee questionnaire should include a note explaining that their survey would be followed up with a questionnaire on data collection.

Bliss suggested that the emails possibly mention that the LECC could tailor their assistance to agencies to help them in their accreditation process or maintaining their accreditation.

Fidanque suggested that Vikas Gumbhir, who is an analyst with OASIS, and somebody from the Eugene Police Department should make a presentation to the Data Review Subcommittee at one of their meetings. Chaiken said it would be helpful to have this presentation at their next meeting.

Revise Work Plan

Chaiken revised the April 23, 2002 version of the LECC Summary of Work Plan Recommendations in order to reflect the current goals of the subcommittee.

Fidanque suggested that Prins, Bliss and Black discuss the extent of their availability to assist in the work of the LECC.

Chaiken indicated that an argument that could be used for enhanced funding would be that data would be released on specific topics more frequently than if only minimal funding is provided.

The priorities with minimal funding would be to continue the contract between the CJC and Portland State University, prepare annual reports, and continue the OASIS survey without enhancing the sample.

Other Business / Open Comments from Data Review Subcommittee

Black mentioned that Kristen Ott is a newly appointed Graduate Research Assistant working approximately twelve hours per week on this project and can assist with literature reviews. She will be working through the end of this academic quarter. Chaiken said he would like her to track down reports on racial profiling that have been released nationally or in other states, focusing especially on the methods of data collection and analysis used. He offered to work with her, and give her references to reports, publications and studies that have national grants or contracts to do this kind of work, in addition to the very good ones which are already on the CJC website.

Bliss suggested that the literature review should examine ways of looking at how many miles a person had driven before they were stopped instead of how often they were stopped. This might be a fruitful approach to solving the denominator problem.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Data Review Subcommittee Meeting & Agenda Items

The subcommittee decided to schedule their next meeting on the same day as the next full LECC meeting, which will be scheduled at the upcoming LECC meeting on April 11, 2005.

Adjournment

Chaiken offered a motion to adjourn, and Feyerherm seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 11:12 a.m.