

Commission on Police Practices

COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

Saturday, June 13, 2026

10:00am-1:00pm

SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

San Diego Public Utilities Department

9192 Topaz Way

San Diego, CA 92123

The link to join the meeting by computer, tablet, or smartphone at 5:00pm is:

[Microsoft Meeting Link](#)

Meeting ID: 249 073 841 400 482

Passcode: tZ9kB7fP

**Downloading the latest version of Microsoft Teams is required.*

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

The purpose of the Commission on Police Practices (CPP or Commission) is to provide independent community oversight of SDPD, directed at increasing community trust in SDPD & increasing safety for community and officers. The purpose of the Commission is also to perform independent investigations of officer-involved shootings, in-custody deaths and other significant incidents, and an unbiased evaluation of all complaints against members of SDPD and its personnel in a process that will be transparent and accountable to the community. Lastly, the Commission also evaluates the review of all SDPD policies, practices, trainings, and protocols and represents the community in making recommendations for changes.

The Commission on Police Practices (Commission) meetings will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of California Government Code Section 54953 (a), as amended by Assembly Bill 2249.

The Commission business meetings will be in person, and the meeting will be open for in-person testimony. Additionally, we are continuing to provide alternatives to in-person attendance for participating in our meetings. In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may also participate via telephone/Teams.

I. CALL TO ORDER/PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONS (Chair Ada Rodriguez)

II. ROLL CALL (Executive Assistant Alina Conde)

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT (Direct Community Engagement & Internship Programs Yasmeen Obeid)

III. DISCUSSION

A. Presentation on Pretext Stops

CPP Commissioner/Staff Presentation - CPP Chair Ada Rodriguez, Outreach Chair Armando Flores, Director of Policy Aaron Burgess, Investigator Ethan Waterman

1. Public Comment
2. Discussion

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Materials Provided:

- Pretext Stops Presentation

In-Person Public Comment on an Agenda Item: If you wish to address the Commission on an item on today's agenda, please complete and submit a speaker slip before the Commission hears the agenda item. You will be called at the time the item is heard. Each speaker must file a speaker slip with the Executive Director at the meeting at which the speaker wishes to speak indicating which item they wish to speak on. Speaker slips may not be turned in prior to the day of the meeting or after completion of in-person testimony. In-person public comment will conclude before virtual testimony begins. Each speaker who wishes to address the Commission must state who they are representing if they represent an organization or another person.

For discussion and information items each speaker may speak up to three (3) minutes, subject to the Chair's determination of the time available for meeting management purposes, in addition to any time ceded by other members of the public who are present at the meeting and have submitted a speaker slip ceding their time. These speaker slips should be submitted together at one time to the Executive Director. The Chair may also limit organized group presentations of five or more people to 15 minutes or less.

In-Person Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: You may address the Commission on any matter not listed on today's agenda. Please complete and submit a speaker slip. However, California's open meeting laws do not permit the Commission to discuss or take any action on the matter at today's meeting. At its discretion, the Commission may add the item to a future meeting agenda or refer the matter to staff or committee. Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. At the discretion of the Chair, if a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comments may be limited to a set period of time per item to appropriately manage the meeting and ensure the Commission has time to consider all the agenda items. A member of the public may only make one Non-Agenda Public Comment per meeting. In-person public comment on items not on the agenda will conclude before virtual testimony begins.

Speakers may not allocate their time to other speakers. If there are eight or more speakers on a single issue, the maximum time for the issue will be 16 minutes. The order of speaking generally will be determined on a first-come, first-served basis.

A member of the public may only provide one non-agenda comment per agenda.

We welcome all viewpoints and encourage open participation. However, to ensure everyone has a chance to be heard and that we can complete our work, we ask that speakers respect time limits and refrain from disruptive behavior. Continued disruption after warning may result in removal as permitted under state law.

Virtual Platform Public Comment to a Particular Item or Matters Not on the Agenda: When the item you would like to comment on is introduced (or it is indicated that it is time for Non-Agenda Public Comment), raise your hand by tapping on the “Raise Your Hand” button on your computer or tablet. To raise your hand in a Microsoft Teams meeting on your smartphone (iOS or Android), tap the three-dot menu, then select the "Raise Hand" option. You will be taken in the order in which you raised your hand. You may only speak once on a particular item. When it is indicated that it is your turn to speak, click the unmute prompt that will appear on your computer, tablet or Smartphone.

Written Comment through Webform: Comment on agenda items and non-agenda public comment may also be submitted using the [webform](#). If using the webform, indicate the agenda item number you wish to submit a comment for. All webform comments are limited to 200 words. On the [webform](#), members of the public should select Commission on Police Practices (even if the public comment is for a Commission on Police Practices Committee meeting).

The public may attend a meeting when scheduled by following the attendee meeting link provided above. To view a meeting archive video, click [here](#). Video footage of each Commission meeting is posted online [here](#) within 72 hours of the conclusion of the meeting.

Comments received no later than 8am on the day of the meeting will be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices. Comments received after the deadline described above but before the item is called will be submitted into the written record for the relevant item.

Written Materials: You may alternatively submit via U.S. Mail to Attn: Office of the Commission on Police Practices, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Materials submitted via U.S. Mail must be received the business day prior to the meeting to be distributed to the Commission on Police Practices.

If you attach any documents to your comment, they will be distributed to the Commission or Committee in accordance with the deadlines described above.

Late-Arriving Materials: This paragraph relates to those documents received after the agenda is publicly noticed and during the 72 hours prior to the start of, or during, the meeting. Pursuant to the Brown Act, (California Government Code Section 54957.5(b)) late-arriving documents, related to the Commission on Police Practices’ (“CPP”) meeting agenda items, which are distributed to the legislative body prior to and/or during the CPP meeting are available for public review by appointment in the Office of the CPP located at Procopio Towers, 525 B Street, Suite 1725, San Diego, CA 92101. Appointments for public review may be made by calling (619) 533-5304 and

coordinating with CPP staff before visiting the office. Late-arriving documents may also be obtained by email request to CPP staff at commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov . Late-arriving materials received prior to the CPP meeting will also be available for review, at the CPP public meeting, by making a verbal request of CPP staff located in the CPP meeting. Late-arriving materials received during the CPP meeting will be available for reviewing the following workday at the CPP offices noted above or by email request to CPP staff.

Access for People with Disabilities: As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requests for agenda information to be made available in alternative formats, and any requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by contacting the Commission at (619) 533-5304 or commissiononpolicepractices@sandiego.gov.

Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodation required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for auxiliary aids, services, or interpreters require different lead times, ranging from five business days to two weeks. Please keep this in mind and provide as much advance notice as possible to ensure availability. The city is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly.

Commission on Police Practices

Strengthening Constitutional Policing and Equitable Enforcement

Pretext Stops - Community Briefing 2026



Why CPP Reviewed Pretext Stops

Why this issue was reviewed

- Community concerns about pretext stops and escalation
- Local data showing disparities in who gets stopped
- Research questioning the safety value of pretext stops
- The need to align enforcement with trust and constitutional policing

What informed the review

- Community testimony and CPP case reviews
- Local stop data and RIPA findings
- Peer-reviewed research and national best practices
- SDPD mission, values, and guiding principles



SDPD Mission

To maintain public safety by providing the highest quality police services to all of our communities.

Vision

The San Diego Police Department strives to advance the highest levels of public safety, trust, and professionalism by strengthening community partnership through fair and impartial policing while fostering employee enrichment and growth to ensure we remain America's Finest police department.



What is a Pretext Stop?

A pretext stop is a police contact initiated for a minor equipment or administrative issue or other low-level reason, where the primary purpose becomes investigating unrelated criminal activity.

Includes pedestrian pretext stops — stopping a person for a minor ordinance or technical violation as a pretext to investigate other matters.

Pretext stops were framed for safety, but over time they grant patrol officers broad discretion that often exceeds actual safety benefits.

Do These Stops Reflect SDPD Values?

Human Life	Protect life and opportunity
Integrity	Transparency and ethics
Partnerships	Working with community
Diversity	Valuing all backgrounds
Employee Enrichment	Supporting staff growth
Compassion	Care for people
Innovation	Leading with new ideas
Courageous Justice	Pursuing fairness

Key Question: Do stops for minor issues like expired tags or a broken taillight reflect those commitments?

What the Evidence Shows

- Thousands of low-level/pretext stops → very few serious outcomes
- Racial disparities persist in stop decisions
- Most stops do NOT result in:
 - Weapons recovery
 - Serious arrests
- High volume of stops → low public safety return

Where the Disconnect Happens

- Fairness
 - Disparities in who gets stopped
- Respect
 - Stops for issues with no safety risk
- Accountability
 - Broad discretion with limited guardrails
- Community Partnership
 - Repeated pretext stops damage trust



**If There's a Legitimate Traffic
Infraction, Pretextual Stops Can
Be Used To Investigate a More
Serious Suspicion**

Why This Matters to the Community

Pretext stops can lead to **unnecessary escalation**. can leave with **fear, humiliation, cost, and mistrust**. In some cases, pretext stops have ended in **serious injury or fatal outcomes**.

Christopher Dearman

a stop for a broken brake/taillight ultimately ended in a fatal police shooting, becoming one of the clearest local examples of how a pretext stop can escalate into irreversible harm.

Nicholas Hoskins

an alleged stop-sign stop – probable cause dispute - shattered window – arrest - and later a city settlement without admission of liability.

Columbus White

officer said the system showed a “fourth waiver”; he denied being on probation/parole, was handcuffed, later released after a sergeant verified, he was not a fourth waiver.

Abdulkadir Bulgaz

What was described as a minor traffic stop that according to a lawsuit and local reporting, led to verbal abuse, seizure of license, lost work, and trauma



OCPP POLICY



BACKGROUND • METHODOLOGY • DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT. TRANSPARENT PROCESS. STRONGER COMMUNITY.

Key Concepts



Pretext Stop

An officer uses an offense, usually a low-level infraction, as excuse to stop someone with the intention to investigate unrelated criminal activity.

Patterns of Practice

Concern that wide discretion leads to **discriminatory patterns** within the San Diego Police Department.

Biased Stops

Inappropriate stops based on protected characteristics:

- Race, ethnicity, or skin color
- Religion, age, or cultural group
- Gender expression or disability

Stops Based on a Hunch

Occurs because of an officer's speculation rather than articulable facts.

PRETEXT STOPS POLICY REVIEW PROCESS



The Commission on Police Practices has undertaken a comprehensive review of SDPD's stop and detention practices, including concerns related to pretextual stops and discretionary enforcement.

Engagement & Timeline

- CPP Hearing (2024)
- CPP Hearing (June 13, 2026)
- 4 Policy Committee meetings

Phase: Feb - May 2026

Research & Experts

- 6 subject matter experts consulted
- Academic & legal literature review
- Local data & testimony analysis

Internal Deliberation

- 4 staff policy work sessions
- Commissioner/staff collaboration
- Evidence-informed draft recommendations

U.S. Constitutional Constraint



Whren v. United States (1996)

The US Supreme Court held that a traffic stop supported by probable cause to believe a traffic violation occurred, **regardless of intent**, is constitutional under the Fourth Amendment.

Impact on Discretion

While the Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches, the Whren ruling allows officers to stop a vehicle whenever probable cause for a traffic violation exists.

Pretextual Motives

This implies that **pretextual motives** to investigate other crimes are irrelevant if the traffic stop is legally justified, even when deceit is involved.

California Policy



Assembly Bill 953: Racial and Identity Profiling Act (2015)

Established California's (RIPA). Under RIPA, state and local agencies must annually report data on all stops. All stop data must be made publicly available.

Assembly Bill 2773: Pretext Stops (Effective Jan 2024)

Signed September 2022, this bill aims to limit pretext stops. It reshapes CA Vehicle Code in **§ 2806.5** by requiring officers to articulate the reason for a stop before asking other questions.

- Increase transparency in law enforcement
- De-escalate police interactions with citizens

San Diego Pretext Stop Related Policy/Procedures

There are no explicit pretext-stop restrictions located in SDPD's public policies.

SDPD Policy Manual

7.01 Traffic Enforcement: The enforcement of all traffic laws shall be administered equally and fairly, regardless of the persons involved, and based solely on the nature of the offense.

9.20 Courtesy: Members shall not make derogatory comments about or express any prejudice concerning race, religion, politics, national origin, gender (to include gender identity and expression), sexual orientation, or similar personal characteristics.

9.29 Truthfulness Policy: Members shall be truthful in all matters relating to their duties.

San Diego Pretext Stop Related Policy/Procedures (Cont.)

SDPD Policy Manual

9.31 Non-Bias Based Policing: Members shall not base any enforcement action, in whole or in part, on race, color, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, disability, gender (to include gender identity and expression), lifestyle, sexual orientation, or similar personal characteristics, while conducting any law enforcement activity, including stops and detentions.

Except when engaging in the investigation of appropriate suspect-specific activity to identify a particular person or group.

Every effort shall be made by all members to prevent and report instances of discrimination or bias by fellow members using established Department complaint procedures. Members reporting instances of discrimination shall not be retaliated against.

BACKGROUND & RESEARCH



Over the course of this project, OCPP conducted a comprehensive review of pretext stop policies, stop data, oversight practices, and emerging reform efforts.

Research Activities

✓ Reviewed 50+ academic, governmental, legal, and policy sources

✓ Examined California RIPA stop data and related disparity findings

✓ Analyzed multiple federal and state legal authorities, including case law

✓ Compared policies and reform efforts across 5 major California law enforcement oversight bodies and police agencies

Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA)



Mandatory Reporting & Background

Officers in the State of California are required to complete a RIPA form every time they stop someone.

Documentation Requirements:

- Perceived demographic information of the individual stopped
- Events leading to the stop & actions taken by officers
- The final outcome of the stop

Forms are submitted to the State Attorney General, and the RIPA Board annually publishes a data analysis report.

2026 RIPA Board Report

Racial Disparities in Stops

Individuals perceived as Black were stopped **2.27X more** than expected based on population levels.

Search & Frisk Frequency

Officers most frequently searched and frisked individuals perceived as **Black or Native American** during vehicle stops.

Discovery Rates by Search Type

20.30% — Consent-only searches

26.40% — Non-discretionary searches

2026 RIPA Board Report

Statewide Complaints Overview

The RIPA Board was notified of **13,004 complaints** from 526 agencies. **17.55% (2,282)** alleged racial or identity profiling, but only **0.013% (3)** were sustained, compared to a **9.64%** sustained rate for all complaints.

San Diego Police Department (SDPD)

SDPD reported **76 total complaints**, with **13 (17%)** containing allegations of racial and identity profiling.

Recommendation: Reduce Pretextual Stops

The Board recommends reducing or eliminating pretextual stops, noting they **do not increase public safety** and have been successfully curtailed in other jurisdictions.

San Diego RIPA Data (2024)

Total Stop Overview

SDPD reported **103,463** total stops, of which **62,071** were traffic-related.

Primary Focus: Equipment & Non-Moving Violations

SDPD conducted **24,227** stops in this category.

These stops most closely align with the types of police interactions the Commission seeks to limit.

Black Individuals

3.05X More

Stopped more often than expected based on population levels.

White Individuals

15.05% Less

Stopped less often than expected based on population levels.

San Diego RIPA Data (2024)

Frisked

4.42X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

Consent to Search Property

3.36X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

Force Used Against Them

3.24X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

Parole Status Inquiry

2.31X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

Handcuffed

3.31X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

Detained Curbside/Patrol Car

1.22X More Likely

Than individuals perceived to be White.

San Diego RIPA Data (2024)



Consent Searches (Low-Level Stops)

11.57% Discovery Rate

123 recoveries from 1,063 consent searches during equipment/non-moving violation stops.



Total Department Searches

23.25% Discovery Rate

5,714 recoveries from 24,572 total searches across all 103,463 stops in 2024.



Key Finding: Ineffectiveness of Consent Searches

50% Less Likely to Recover Evidence

Consent searches during stops for equipment or non-moving violations are half as effective as standard searches in recovering contraband.

San Diego RIPA Data (2024)



Citation Disparities

At the conclusion of these stops, individuals perceived to be Black were cited at **less than half the rate** of individuals perceived to be White, Asian, Middle Eastern or South Asian, and more than one race.

Individuals perceived to be Black were cited **25% less frequently** than individuals perceived to be Hispanic/Latine(x).



Arrest Disparities

64% More Often

Individuals perceived to be Black were arrested as a result of these stops more often than individuals perceived to be White.

Policy Recommendations for Strengthening Constitutional Policing Promoting Equitable Enforcement



Safety-First Standard

Limit stops for low-level equipment and administrative violations to prioritize community safety.



Documented Justification

Restrict traffic stops to their original safety purpose; require formal justification for any expansion.



Enforcement Restrictions

Restrict consent searches and investigatory questioning arising from low-level enforcement contacts.



Anti-Bias Philosophy

Adopt and integrate an anti-bias policing philosophy into all department policies and procedures.

1) Limit Initiation of Stops for Low-Level Violations Through a Safety-First Enforcement Standard

Safety-First Framework

The San Diego Police Department should adopt a safety-first enforcement framework that limits the initiation of traffic stops for low-level equipment and administrative violations that do not present an immediate threat to public safety.

Prohibited Sole Bases for Stops:

- A. Window tint violations
- B. Expired registration (< 1 year)
- C. Missing front plate (if rear is visible)
- D. Minor plate illumination deficiencies
- E. Single non-functioning taillight
- F. Objects from rearview mirror
- G. Minor bumper equipment violations

Public Safety Threshold & Exceptions

Threshold: Stops limited to violations materially interfering with roadway safety or vehicle identification.

Serious Crime: Officers may stop if they possess specific info indicating involvement in a serious violent felony.

Alternative Enforcement & Review

Alternatives: Warnings, correction notices, mailed notices, or city service referrals to achieve compliance.

Periodic Review: The Dept. shall review stop data, demographic disparities, and outcomes to ensure alignment with public safety goals.

2) Limit Traffic Stops to Original Public Safety Purpose & Require Justification for Expansion

The SDPD should establish clear limitations on stop scope and duration to ensure enforcement remains connected to the original basis unless additional facts justify expansion.

Mission Limitation Requirement

Scope and duration must be limited to the observed violation and safety inquiries. Expansion requires new, specific, articulable facts. Hunches are insufficient.

Transparency & Documentation

Officers must communicate the stop reason early. Any expansion must be documented with specific facts creating reasonable suspicion or probable cause.

Prohibited Factors & Restrictions

- **Generalized Factors:** No reliance on high-crime area, manner of dress, or homelessness.
- **Supervisory Review:** Periodic review of reports and footage to ensure mission-limitation compliance.

3) Restrict Consent Searches, Questioning & Field Interviews in Low-Level Contacts

The SDPD recognizes that these interactions during traffic stops can be perceived as coercive. Practices must be narrowly tailored, documented, and supported by legitimate investigative needs.

Consent Search & Voluntariness

Limitations: No requests during Recommendation One stops. For others, requires objective basis.

Protections: Must advise that consent is voluntary/refusable. Recorded on body-cam.

Questioning & Field Interviews

Questioning: Limited to stop purpose (ID, licensing, safety) unless reasonable suspicion exists.

Field Interviews: Prohibited for low-level violations without specific support for separate detention.

Data Collection & Continuous Analysis

The Department shall track and periodically analyze search requests, outcomes, field interviews, and stop-expansion rates. This data identifies disparities, evaluates policy effectiveness, and informs future decisions to ensure equitable policing.

4) Adopt a Philosophy of Anti-Bias Policing and Integrate It Into Department Policy and Procedure

To combat implicit bias, establish principles of procedural justice. To prevent explicit bias establish equitable, impartial, and discrimination-free policing as a foundational principle. Public trust is advanced when decisions are based on objective, articulable facts.

Codification & Standard

Objective Decision-Making:

Enforcement based on facts, not protected characteristics.

Accountability & Review

Supervisory Review:

Review stops and searches for indicators of bias or disparate treatment.

Analysis & Evaluation

Data Collection:

Periodic review of use-of-force and arrest data to identify disparities.

Continuous Improvement & Integration

Training: Include implicit bias and procedural justice in all recruit and in-service programs.

Impact Assessment: Evaluate potential equity impacts prior to significant initiatives.

Transparency: Publicly communicate philosophy through community engagement and reporting.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ENGAGEMENT



PUBLIC COMMENT

We welcome your feedback and participation.



OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION ON POLICE PRACTICES

ACCOUNTABILITY IS PUBLIC SAFETY

