

Racial Justice Oversight Committee - Data Subcommittee
Record of Action for November 22, 2025

Attendance:

Committee Members present:

(In-Person) Jeff Landau (Public Defender); Shannon Ortland (Office of Ed); Patrice Guillory (Probation)

(Virtual) Gilbert Salinas (Health Dept); Cheryl Sudduth (non-subcommittee member)

Absent: Chala Bonner (ACCE; Subcommittee Chair), Matt Malone (Superior Court), Simon Oconnell (DA); Melvin Willis (ACCE);

Staff Members present:

Peter Kim, Emaan Ahmed (ORESJ)

Public Members present:

Jill Ray (District 2); Shanise (District 4)

Roll Call Attendance/Introductions

Subcommittee Chair Chala Bonner is on sabbatical through Dec 2025. Interim Subcommittee Chair Patrice Guillory convened the meeting at 3:04 PM. Quorum was not met. (___ arrived at 3:___, achieving quorum).

Public Comment on any item under the jurisdiction of the Committee and not on this agenda (speakers may be limited to two (2) minutes).

None

1. RECEIVE and APPROVE the Record of Action for the October 22, 2025 meeting of the Racial Justice Oversight Body Data Subcommittee, with any necessary corrections.

Public Comment:

No comment.

No vote because lack of quorum. Will move this item to next meeting, along with approval of Records of Action from July and September meetings.

2. HEAR member updates on data acquisition efforts.

Attachment with link to all of data reports discussed from last meeting.

Adalberto Garibay: The data manager is still out so no updates from Sheriff's Office.

Jeff Landau: Addressed that certain inconsistencies and errors from page 19 of 202 of the draft report that was attached to last meeting (table of “numbers # of arrests by race and ethnicity, 2012-2020 is incorrect), the correct numbers appear page 14 of 202.

Open Justice/DOJ report includes definitions that LE use to categorize and count crimes, which informs what’s tracked and reported.

I.e.: Reported crimes/offenses versus “cleared by arrest” definition

Garibay: Are the crimes reported by the public? If so, may not be accurate to what the actual crime charged is.

Landau: My understanding is that these are crimes that were reported by law enforcement to the FBI based on whatever criteria or definitions they use.

Also, cannot provide any individual income data due to legal restrictions to privacy and confidentiality laws; but can possibly use being assigned a PD as a proxy for low income or indigent status.

Raised again that at end of last quarterly full RJOB meeting, there was interest in seeing the last RJ Task Force report on what data is collected and available, to use as a frame of reference to compare our current status and assess progress.

Shannon Ortland: Will look for archived data on expulsion, suspension, IEP counts and other disciplinary actions from previous years to use as a reference point for trends and progress/decline. Will consider looking at the youth in jails, by school district; and a State of CA dashboard (since 2017) that maps each school district, LEA; and can look at Data Quest as a resource. Can show this group how to use it, or can build a graph of whatever data points is requested.

Patrice: Add to the next agenda an opportunity to walk thru this dashboard together. Data on social circumstances and how it informs LE outcomes is fairly available. The CC Health Atlas is a good example of a possible source.

Jeff: can be helpful to community members on how to navigate sites and access the information.

Public Comment:

No comment

No action required so no vote was taken.

3. DETERMINE next steps for the subcommittee’s Sheriff’s Quarterly Report recommendations.

Garibay: have not shared the current progress of recs, because not finalized and feels premature; also, current data manager is out so unable to follow up and share. Also unable to collect an update on the progress of dashboard.

Also want to remind this group that collecting data only on the Sheriff is limiting because it does not give a full County perspective. And does not provide the whole scope that the BOS is asking for because it would not include the police depts.

Patrice: This also means that there is no relevant local point of comparison to use to hold up Sheriff data against to determine trends.

Jill: There are two ask here: what kind of data can we collect countywide from other departments police depts, and what can the Sheriff collect for its report? For local LE's, who agreed in the past that they are open to sharing, they just need to know who will collect the data and where it will be housed.

Jeff:

Next steps: so this version is closed and no longer receiving further edits and ready to share with the Sheriff Dept, and then continue to further refine based on Sheriff's response and feedback on what is possible, and provide a progress update to the full RJOB body in February quarterly meeting.

Public Comment:

None.

4. DISCUSS logistics and objectives of a data walk for the subcommittee.

Patrice: Considering the changes and updates to legislation and protocols that dictate juvenile and adult CL processes since the RJTF report and recs, it requires that we separate youth and adult data collection processes.

- *Law Enforcement disparities (adult and juvenile arrest rates)*
- *Juvenile justice disparities (who's most likely to be referred to probation, detained prior to adjudication, and assigned to solitary).*
- *CJ disparities: charges and enhancements; who's assigned to Pre-Trial; and jury selection*

Suggests that we use these to inform how we narrow and refine our scope of what data we try to collect.

Jeff: Agrees that this is a good starting point and makes sense given these recs informed the BOS decision to create the RJOB, and that these are our mandate.

Patrice: Pre-trial Services are primarily delivered by Probation, and Detention Pre-Trial are delivered by Sheriff.

Jeff: Much of the data, including the local PD data, that was in the RJTF report was collected (by RDA) from the DOJ website.

Shannon: Can we pull the publicly available data into a dashboard that allows us to see what's available and what's not?

Jill: Identifying what data is available is one thing, but collecting and storing and analyzing is another.

Patrice: Can staff look at Appendix B of RJTF report and map out the data points that were presented as a list, along with the source (dept that collects it and the actual source), and then present to this group to inform the next discussion.

Staff: Yes, we can produce that list. We will then turn back to the subcommittee for the further collection of current and updated data.

Patrice: Understood, and recognized that capacity is thin across all partner,s and if BOS will require further data, then resources will be required to support those efforts.

5. REVIEW Santa Barbara County's data sharing agreements.

Patrice: Provided summary review of what was presented last year and shared the MOU that is used in SB County across the system partners that regulates.

Next Steps: All subcommittee members read the MOU as a way to inspire further discussion.

6. DETERMINE the subcommittee updates that the full body chair will present during the December 15th, 2025 Equity Committee Meeting.

Staff: Equity Committee requires an annual report from RJOB. Will collect

Data acquisition progress:

Jeff will prepare some points for Patrice by Tue 12/2. Also inviting all subcommittee members to email staff any thoughts by 12/2 (copy Patrice). Patrice will submit to staff by Thu 12/4 to share with Co-Chair McDonnell that same day, for her to synthesize into a single report that is due to staff by Wed 12/10 to upload the agenda to Legistar.

7. DISCUSS any general updates from subcommittee members or ORESJ staff.

Staff: On behalf of CEF, solicited volunteers for the Town Halls.

Jeff: Can do Feb 12 at RYSE (systems partner at one World Café tables for data)

Patrice: Can do

8. REVIEW and ASSIGN actions items from today's meeting.

Ran out of time. Did not do.

The next meeting is currently scheduled for December 17th, 2025.

Adjourned at 4:59 PM.