

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

MEETING MINUTES

June 20, 2005, 10:30 a.m.

Oregon State Library, Salem, Oregon

LECC Data Review Subcommittee

Members Present

Jan Chaiken Edwin Peterson
David Fidanque Raul Ramirez

LECC Staff Present

Claudia Black Craig Prins
Meredith (Bud) Bliss Laura Uva
Kristen Ott

LECC Data Review Subcommittee

Members Excused

William Feyerherm Greg Willeford

Guests

Roland Broussard

Welcome / Introductions

Ott is a Graduate Research Assistant at Portland State University.

Approval of Agenda

Fidanque offered a motion to approve the agenda, and Ramirez seconded the motion. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Approve Minutes of April 7, 2005 Meeting

Fidanque offered a motion to approve the minutes, and Ramirez seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Approve Tentative Work Plan

Chaiken updated the work plan and gave it to staff to type and distribute for later approval.

Budget Update

Prins stated that there is not a joint Ways and Means Committee for budget purposes this session. Rather, there are separate budget committees for the Senate and the House. The LECC was allocated a total of \$131,000 in the Criminal Justice Commission's budget for the upcoming biennium. Prins believes this is the same amount that the LECC received for the last biennium, but significantly less than the \$300,000 that the committee received initially.

Update on May 26, 2005 Meeting in Hillsboro

Ramirez described the LECC meeting in Hillsboro. He was impressed by their process of analyzing not only the data, but also the citizen complaints. They do internal briefings on the data and also release the data to the public. Black and Ramirez both spoke of how impressed they were by the strong and positive relationship between the Hispanic community and law enforcement in Washington County.

Chaiken asked staff to distribute copies of the PowerPoint presentation from that meeting to all members of the LECC.

Update on Obtaining Law Enforcement Data

Black stated that she contacted the agencies that had provided data to the LECC in the past, in order to follow up on their data collection efforts and their interest in continuing to work with the LECC.

The Oregon State Police still collects data but does not have staff to analyze it. However, they may be interested in giving it to the staff of the LECC to analyze.

The Corvallis Police Department has collected traffic stop data since 1999 or 2000, and continues to do so. They query the data and report annually to their Community Policing Forum.

The Beaverton Police Department has collected data since 2000 and continues to do so. They analyze this data at least quarterly and share it with the Chief of Police, but have not published or shared their data with the public. They are very willing to continue to work with the LECC.

The Hillsboro Police Department is happy to share their data with the LECC, and Black is waiting for a return call from the Eugene Police Department.

Chaiken asked staff to proceed to acquire data from the agencies that have offered to provide it to the LECC. Before doing this, staff should consult the statute as to what the minimum data points that must be included in every data set are, as well as what information the LECC is prohibited to collect, in order to request that the contributing agencies omit this prohibited information before submitting it to the LECC. Chaiken said that it is important to inform the contributing agencies that we will assemble their data with that of other agencies, give them feedback and release reports on the aggregate data.

OASIS Update

Bliss informed the committee that he got a notice from the University of Oregon that they are disbanding the Oregon Survey Research Laboratory (OSRL), which is the agency that conducts the OASIS survey. This disbandment will be effective at the end of June 2005, at which point they will be finished with the oversampling for the OASIS survey. The oversampling data has been gathered, and is currently being put together for analysis.

Bliss explained that the University of Oregon maintains joint ownership of OASIS data with the LECC, and that all of the OASIS data may be archived at the University of Oregon and made public as soon as it is available. Bliss stated his concern with the data becoming public before the publishing of the LECC's analysis in its report. He suggested that the committee request that the University hold that data until after January 1, 2006. That way, the LECC will have time to thoroughly analyze the data before any results are published.

The subcommittee looked at the updated OASIS document. Chaiken requested that Bliss include the percentages, by race, of people stopped. He also requested that the "neutral"

category be placed between the “positive” and “negative” categories, rather than below them.

Chaiken concluded that he and Bliss should come up with a proposal for the next subcommittee meeting as to how to approach the publication of the data and whether there should be separate publications of the data.

Bliss commented that the committee may want to consider doing only one survey next biennium, considering the limited resources that will be available, and include an oversample in that survey.

Presentations at Oregon State Sheriffs’ Association (OSSA) and Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (OACP)

Black stated that the Community Relations Subcommittee recommended attending the Executive Committee meetings of both the OSSA and OACP before sending out the survey, in order to solicit their participation, get their input on how to most effectively survey Oregon law enforcement agencies, and request that they distribute the survey on behalf of the LECC. The subcommittee agreed that they want to be viewed as a resource to these associations.

Ramirez informed the subcommittee that the OSSA Executive Board meets every three months, but the OSSA and OACP are both able to set up emergency meetings.

Law Enforcement Survey

Chaiken commented that an opening letter, in which they introduce themselves and describe what they can do for the associations, is needed for the survey. Fidanque suggested that this letter be from Peterson. If the OSSA and OACP agree to distribute the survey on behalf of the LECC, those associations could write their own introduction, and include the LECC’s letter and lists of questions as attachments.

Chaiken also suggested providing, with the survey, links to websites that offer model policies. Bliss suggested also providing information clarifying the history of the LECC.

National Literature Review of Data Reports

Chaiken explained that he had instructed Ott and Uva to review reports on data relating to professional stops that were published after 2000, since the subcommittee was already acquainted with such reports published before 2000.

Uva explained that they are compiling summaries of the reports, which include the time period covered, geographical scope, population studied, data collection methods, events studied, data analysis methods, conclusions about the nature or extent of racial profiling, whether or not Oregon was mentioned, and any other issues they deemed pertinent. The LECC Community Relations Subcommittee requested that they also include a summary of any community relations issues and/or tactics mentioned in the reports.

Chaiken stated that, based on the reviews he has received from Ott and Uva so far, the studies generally either find that there is *not* a difference in rates of stops by race, or that there is a difference but that it is justifiable by some sort of explanation. It is only in places where the disparities are enormous that a proactive effort is made to improve the situation. Many of the reports are very apologetic and are prepared by the law enforcement agencies that are collecting and analyzing the data of their own jurisdictions. These reports focus on giving a rational explanation for what the numbers show.

Chaiken also noticed some very imaginative data analysis methods. Some analysts collect information on the population that drives in a particular city, rather than merely the resident population.

Chaiken requested that Uva and Ott send him the reviews as they finish them. He stated that they should send the reviews to the LECC Data Review Subcommittee members and staff once finished.

Other Business / Open Comments from Data Review Subcommittee

Ramirez suggested that members of the committee that have limited exposure to law enforcement participate in “ride-alongs” in order to better understand and put into perspective how police contacts work. An element that must be considered, for example is that, in evening stops in rural areas, a police officer cannot tell who is driving.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Data Review Subcommittee Meeting & Agenda Items

It was decided that the next Data Review Subcommittee meeting will be held on the morning of the next LECC (full committee) meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.