

April 3, 2026

2025 Annual Non-Bias Based Policing Administrative Review - Report

Dublin Police Department

Policy & Procedure 101.02

Review Completed by: Tom Hirschy, Law Enforcement Planner



Sustainable | Connected | Resilient

**Dublin Police Department
Non-Bias-Based Patterns Administrative Review for 2025**

Introduction

The Dublin Police Department believes in the fair, impartial, and unbiased treatment of citizens regardless of sex, gender, race, age, color, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, or disability. The Dublin Police Department is sensitive to the concerns of persons from racial and ethnic groups and takes a serious stance on the protection of everyone’s liberties. The Dublin Police Department does not condone or support biased policing, and if it does occur, it will severely punish any employee who commits and/or condones biased policing. As part of the Dublin Police Department’s beliefs in fair, impartial, and unbiased treatment of citizens, the department conducts an annual administrative review to determine if any biased treatment of citizens is occurring, specifically regarding race, sex, and/or age.

This report shall serve as the documented annual administrative review in accordance with Policy & Procedure 101.02. This administrative review was conducted on citizen complaints, a sample of self-initiated suspicious person activity data and a sample of traffic stop data from 2025. The traits reviewed were sex, race, and age. The Law Enforcement Planner conducted the data collection and analysis for this period. The administrative review was conducted by the Police Department’s Executive Command Staff (Chief and the Deputy Chiefs).

City of Dublin Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement

Dublin is a community that values diversity, equity, and inclusion for all. The City of Dublin is committed to providing opportunities for residents, businesses, and visitors’ voices to be heard.

Diversity Statement

“We are a team of different and unique qualities which enable us to best serve our community.”

Equity Statement

“We acknowledge our different and unique qualities, be they advantages, disadvantages or otherwise, and we embrace fairness so that all might have an opportunity to achieve similar outcomes.”

Inclusion Statement

“We welcome and expect diversity, and we provide opportunities for all team members to contribute to the City’s success.”

<https://dublinohiousa.gov/diversity-equity-inclusion/>

Dublin Police Department Mission Statement

Dublin Police Department employees are committed to protecting life, liberty, and property. We will provide the highest level of service and work in partnership with our community to ensure public safety by focusing on the following core principles:

- Vigilant, Ethical and Impartial Enforcement of Law
- Critical Incident Preparedness and Response
- Crime Prevention, Reduction and Deterrence
- Improvement of Traffic Safety
- Community Outreach & Engagement

We will remain dedicated to service and committed to excellence, focusing on the following core values:

- Professionalism: We are members of an exceptional and highly trained law enforcement organization. Our conduct and demeanor adhere to the highest standards of personal and organizational excellence.
- Integrity: We hold ourselves accountable to the highest level of honesty, truthfulness, and ethical conduct.
- Respect: We ensure that all persons are treated with equality, dignity, and courtesy.
- Commitment: We are dedicated to our Profession, our Community, our Agency, and our Mission.

Dublin Police Department Code of Ethics

The Dublin Police Department's Code of Ethics states: "As an employee of a law enforcement agency, my fundamental obligation is to serve the citizens of the community and to uphold the mission and core values of my agency."

IACP Code of Ethics

"As a law enforcement officer, my fundamental duty is to serve the community; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the constitutional rights of all to liberty, equality and justice. I will keep my private life unsullied as an example to all and will behave in a manner that does not bring discredit to me or to my agency. I will maintain courageous calm in the face of danger, scorn or ridicule; develop self-restraint; and be constantly mindful of the welfare of others. Honest in thought and deed both in my personal and official life, I will be exemplary in obeying the law and the regulations of my department. Whatever I see or hear of a confidential nature or that is confided to me in my official capacity will be kept ever secret unless revelation is necessary in the performance of my duty. I will never act officiously or permit personal feelings, prejudices, political beliefs, aspirations, animosities or friendships to influence my decisions. With no compromise for crime and with relentless prosecution of criminals, I will enforce the law courteously and appropriately without fear or favor, malice or ill will, never employing unnecessary force or violence and never accepting gratuities. I recognize the badge of my office as a symbol of public faith, and I accept it as a public trust to be held so long as I am true to the ethics of police service. I will never engage in acts of corruption or bribery, nor will I condone such acts by other police officers. I will cooperate with all legally authorized agencies and their representatives in the pursuit of justice. I know that I alone am responsible for my own standard of professional performance and will take every reasonable opportunity to enhance and improve my level of knowledge and competence. I will constantly strive to achieve these objectives and ideals, dedicating myself before God to my chosen profession . . . law enforcement."

Police Department Policy

Policy and Procedure: 101.02 – Non-Bias Based Policing (Last Revision Date: 06/23/2025)

PURPOSE

Bias-based Policing may lead to allegations of violations of the constitutional rights of the citizens we serve, undermine legitimate law enforcement efforts, and may lead to claims of civil rights violations. Additionally, biased policing alienates the public, fosters distrust of law enforcement by the community, invites media scrutiny, invites legislative action, and judicial intervention. Law enforcement personnel should focus on a person's conduct and not consider common traits unless that trait has been associated with a specific suspect of a crime or the suspects associated with a pattern of incidents in a particular area. The purpose of this policy is to establish written procedures regarding biased policing (CALEA 1.2.9).

POLICY

All uniformed officers are expected to enforce the law, and stop and detain persons whenever there is reasonable suspicion that they have committed, are committing, or are about to commit an infraction of the law. Officers must conduct themselves in a dignified and respectful manner and any and all contact with the public will be conducted in accordance with statute and applicable case law.

DEFINITIONS

- Biased Policing: The application of police authority based on a common trait of a group. This includes but is not limited to race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, gender, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, immigration status, disability, housing status, occupation, or language fluency.
- Illegal profiling: Unequal treatment of any person including stopping, questioning, detention or arrest on the basis of their racial or ethnic characteristics, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.
- Articulable suspicion (reasonable suspicion): More than a mere hunch. Based on a set of articulable facts and circumstances that would warrant a person of average caution in believing that an offense has been committed, is being committed, or is about to be committed by a specific person. It can be based on an officer's observations, training, experience, or information received from credible outside sources.

I. Procedure

A. Prohibition against profiling (CALEA 1.2.9 A)

- Officers are prohibited from stopping, questioning, detaining, searching, seizing property, seeking asset forfeiture, or arresting anyone on the basis of any type of bias. Officers will make stops and conduct field interviews only on the basis of reasonable suspicion and shall make arrests only on the basis of probable cause.
- This policy shall not preclude officers from stopping a person to offer assistance. This policy does not prohibit stopping someone suspected of a crime based on a description that includes one or more of those identified attributes, or considering a person's apparent age when investigating curfew or liquor law violations.
- When an officer initiates contact with a person on any traffic stop or suspicious person contact, the officer SHALL include in the clearance of the contact the race (or ethnicity) and the gender of the person and the reason for the contact, e.g. clear code "A" from a "70" for speed, male white

driver. (This information SHOULD already be included on all citations in order to make the citation complete.)

- Supervisory personnel are expected to monitor officer’s activity to ensure practices are compliant with policy and that practices are lawful, constitutional, and non-discriminatory.

B. Bias-based profiling training (CALEA 1.2.9 B):

- The agency will provide initial and annual training for sworn personnel on non-bias based policing, including legal aspects, and will ensure that officers receive training in professional traffic stops. Initial training is provided for new officers during their field training program.

C. Administrative review of agency practices

- Complaints

- Any person may file a complaint with the Police Department if they feel they have been stopped or searched based on illegal profiling or subjected to improper treatment and no person shall be discouraged, intimidated, or coerced from filing such a complaint, or discriminated against because they have filed such a complaint.
- The Chief of Police or their designee will be notified as soon as practicable of any complaints of discrimination and/or violations of civil rights. These complaints will be thoroughly investigated, regardless of a formal complaint being filed, and if found, shall result in a recommendation for corrective action including, but not limited to counseling, training, punitive actions, and/or policy review and revision.

- Administrative Review (CALEA 1.2.9 C):

- The agency will review traffic stops, complaints, and suspicious person contacts to ensure compliance with the law and to determine any deficiencies.
- A documented annual administrative review of data collected as a result of this directive will be conducted by a Deputy Chief and will be shared with and discussed with all supervisory personnel in a staff meeting. The Police Department will analyze data from its various records programs to ensure that racial/ethnic, sex (gender) and age characteristics are not being used in traffic enforcement and to attempt to proactively identify potential training or policy issues.
- The review of data is intended to identify patterns of conduct and will include analysis of percentages of minorities or other protected classes such as race (ethnicity), sex (gender) and age; reason(s) for contact; dispositions of the contacts; and other factors as may be identified by the administration.

Policy Review

No further review or revision of the policy and procedure is recommended.

2025 Dublin Police Department Training — Related to Non-Bias

Per the Dublin Police Department’s Professional Standards Manager, Whitney Aebker, the department’s members completed the following training in 2025.

Training Type: Curriculum
Provider: City of Dublin, OH
Version: 1.0 [Structure History](#)
Training Hours: 2 Hours 24 Minutes
Description: Technology Use Policy A.O. 9.2 Review (15 minutes)
 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion & Belonging Curriculum (40 minutes)
 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion A.O. 2.76 Review (15 minutes)
 Drug-Free Workplace Training Curriculum (60 minutes)
 Drug-Free Workplace A.O. 2.35 Review (15 minutes)
Status: Completed [View Completion Page](#)
Training Purpose:
Due Date: 10/31/2025
Certificate: [Print Certificate](#)
Expiration Date:

Curriculum

Select A Training View
 All Training
 Activated Training
 Not Activated Training
 Check to sort by due date (uncheck box to return to default view)

TITLE (CLICK ON TO SEE COURSE DESCRIPTION)	TYPE	DUE DATE	EXCUSED	STATUS
Technology Use Policy AO 9.2 (1.23.2023) Current	General	None	No	Completed
Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) A.O. 2.76 MEMO	General	None	No	Completed
Improving Diversity and Inclusion (DEI) in Your Workplace	Online Class	None	No	Completed
Drug-Free Workplace AO 2.35	General	None	No	Completed
Substance Abuse Training for Employees	Online Class	None	No	Completed

Diversity, Inclusion and Community Outreach Unit

The Diversity, Inclusion and Community Outreach Unit serves to bridge the gap between law enforcement and Dublin’s diverse communities by providing relevant resources, training, and information to officers and members of these communities. The Diversity, Inclusion and Community Outreach Unit will work to recognize and address the needs of Dublin’s diverse populations regarding safety and/or policing issues, develop resources to aid this department in working with diverse populations, provide and promote training to officers regarding cultural issues and expectations, and to provide and promote education and outreach for the community members regarding interactions with law enforcement. These populations include but are not limited to the following individuals and/or groups: racial, ethnic, LGBTQ, faith-based, elderly, impoverished and those struggling with mental health crisis. Community Liaison Officers will assist the police department with aligning its mission and goals with community expectations by conducting research, soliciting community feedback about the department, reviewing policies and procedures, and supporting the department’s efforts in community outreach & engagement.

Per Lt. Stoll, the following were training, programs, and events that officers were involved with in 2025:

Community Events & Public Engagement

- National Night Out
- Spooktacular
- Boo & Brew
- Touch-A-Truck Events
- Asian Festival

- Citizens Police Academy
- Citizen U Programs
- Drug Take-Back Initiatives
- JASCO Festival
- Department Tours
- Neighborhood Meetings & Safety Presentations

Training, Education & Preparedness

- Citywide Active Shooter / Active Threat Training
- Active Shooter Symposium
- School Safety Summit
- OSROA Conference / OSROA SRO Basic Training
- Accelerationist Anarchist Groups Training
- Legal & Liability Issues for School Resource Officers Training
- Interactive Active Shooter Incident Planning Training

Community Programs & Initiatives

- Handle With Care (HWC) Program
- Buckle Up with Brutus
- Food for Thought Pantry
- Feed the Kids Columbus
- Dublin Food Pantry Initiatives
- Fill-A-Cruiser Toy Drive
- Shop With a Hero
- Shop With a Cop
- Sandlot Skirmish Charity Softball Tournament
- Leadership Dublin Program & Presentations

Specialized Teams & Operational Programs

- Drone Team
- Technical Accident Investigation (TAI) Team
- Delaware County Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT)
- Peer Support Team

Recognition Events

- Franklin County Cops and Kids Day — First Place Police Cruiser / Display

Police Department Recruitment Activities

The Dublin Police Department maintains an Equal Employment Opportunity Recruitment and Selection Manual. The policy statement for the manual reads:

The Dublin Police Department and Northwest Regional Emergency Communications Center policy is not to discriminate against applicants based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, genetic information, pregnancy, age, ancestry, military status, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, marital status, or veteran's status concerning recruitment, hiring, training, promotion, or other terms and conditions of employment.

Accordingly, all employment decisions and promotions shall be consistent with the principle of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), and only valid qualifications will be required for promotions.

An employee who believes they have experienced unlawful discrimination is encouraged to report such discriminatory actions, conduct, or behavior through the applicable grievance procedure in their Collective Bargaining Agreement directly to their Department Head or directly to the Director of Human Resources, the Human Resource Manager, or a Human Resource Business Partner. It shall be the employee's right to choose the reporting option with which they are most comfortable. The employee's choice to report an incident directly to the Division of Human Resources shall not be blocked, restricted, or prohibited by Division or Department Heads or other supervisory personnel within the employee's Division or Department. Efforts at the Divisional or Departmental level to block, restrict, or prohibit the employee's choice to report an incident directly to Human Resources shall result in disciplinary action.

Upon receiving a report, an investigation into the alleged conduct shall be completed promptly, with a full written report recommending the appropriate action being made to the Director of Human Resources. Until the investigation is completed and the recommendations in the written report are implemented, the identities of the directly involved parties shall be kept as confidential as is reasonable under the circumstances. Following the closure of the investigation, the investigation results shall be disclosed directly to the affected parties.

Employees who report incidents of unlawful discrimination are protected from retaliatory conduct/behavior because they report such incidents. Retaliatory conduct/behavior by Division Heads, other supervisory personnel, co-workers, or other employees is unlawful and shall not be tolerated. Such retaliatory conduct/behavior shall result in severe disciplinary action.

See Dublin Police Department - Equal Employment Opportunity Recruitment and Selection Manual for further details.

Per Sergeant Kovacs, the following recruitment-related activities were conducted by Dublin Police personnel in 2025 at the following events:

- 2/5/2025 — The Ohio State University Targeted Recruiting
- 2/20/2025 — The University of Toledo Career Fair
- 5/17/2025 — The Dublin Police Department Bike Rodeo
- 11/10/2025 — The University of Dayton Targeted Recruiting
- 11/14/2025 — Tiffin University Criminal Justice Career Fair
- 11/20/2025 — The Ohio State University Targeted Recruiting

Per Human Resources Business Partner Jillian Fair, the Dublin Police Department advertised for the recruitment of open positions in 2024 with:

Internet/Websites:

- City of Dublin Website
- Governmentjobs.com
- OhioMeansJobs.com
- VeteranJobListings.org
- Recruitics.com
- Polaris Career Center
- Diversityjobs.org
- Indeed
- PoliceOne
- Security Jobs Network

- International Association of Women Police
- Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police
- National Association of Black Law Enforcement Officers, Inc.
- National Latino Peace Officers Association
- National Association of Asian American Professionals
- NENA (CT only)
- Ohio APCO (CT only)
- APCO (CT only)

Social Media:

Organizations:

- Various Ohio Basic Peace Officer Academies
- Ohio FOP #9
- FOP
- SOAR
- Tolles
- CALEA
- National Minority Report (nationalminorityupdate.com)
- Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association

- Facebook
- Instagram
- LinkedIn
- Twitter

Other:

Handshake — 52 schools, colleges and universities

Citizen Complaints

Per Administrative Support, Becky Metcalf, in 2025, two (2) citizen complaints were filed against officers alleging or inferring bias. Both complaints were investigated. One resulted in an unfounded complaint, and the other resulted in proper conduct/unfounded complaint.

Property Seizures

Per the Community Impact Unit, the Dublin Police Department had the following property seizures in 2025:

- \$292,830 — Forfeited/seized from a White, male, DOB: 1/12/1975 (actual seizure occurred in 2023).

Data Review

The following was a review of the data samples intended to identify patterns of conduct and included:

- A review of the sex of the self-initiated traffic stop sample and the self-initiated suspicious person contact sample.
- A review of percentages of the racial makeup of the self-initiated traffic stop sample and the suspicious person contact sample.
- A review of percentages of the ages of the self-initiated traffic stop sample and the self-initiated suspicious person contact sample.
- A review of reasons for contacts.
- A review of dispositions of the contacts.
- The police administration may identify other factors.

Administrative Issues

The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) User Manual (6/23/2025) defines the race of a person as:

- White — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.
- Black or African American — A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.
- American Indian or Alaska Native — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.
- Asian — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands, e.g., individuals who are Carolinian, Fijian, Kosraean, Melanesian, Micronesian, Northern Mariana Islander, Palauan, Papua New Guinean, Ponapean (Pohnpelan), Polynesian, Solomon Islander, Tahitian, Tarawa Islander, Tokelauan, Tongan, Trukese (Chuukese), and Yapese.
 - Note: The term "Native Hawaiian" does not include individuals who are native to the state of Hawaii simply by virtue of being born there.

The National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) defines the ethnicity of a person as:

- Hispanic — The ethnic designation of Hispanic or Latino includes persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

For data collection and administrative review, the Dublin Police Department utilized ethnicity as a race for the non-biased-based policing administrative review.

In addition to these codes and definitions, some additional codes were added for administrative review purposes:

- NL = Not Listed (not an official NIBRS race code)
- O = Other (not an official NIBRS race code, but used by officers when they encounter a person who may be of more than one race)
- U = Unknown (not an official NIBRS code, but used by officers when they are unable to determine a person's race)

Below is the list of approved race codes for traffic stops and suspicious person contacts.

Race Codes	Sex Codes
A = Asian B = Black/African American H = Hispanic I = American Indian/Alaskan Native P = Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander O = Other U = Unknown W = White	In general, the following codes were used for sex: M = Male F = Female U = Unknown

During the review, it was determined that several officers and/or communications technicians used the race code "M." Previously, "M" was used for Middle Eastern, but that code was retired in 2015. For this administrative review, any calls for service with an "M" designation in the race were subsequently moved to the "unknown" race category.

Field Contacts

In the field, officers collect information (e.g., sex, race, and age) from traffic stop contacts and suspicious person contacts in different ways.

- Officer Visual Observation and Judgment
- Driver's License or Identification Card Information
- Officer Verbal Interaction with the Contact
- Information Collected by Programs used by Dublin Police (e.g., LEADS/NCIC, OHLEG, iLincs)
- Information Provided to an Officer from NRECC

Dublin Police are sensitive to a person's sex, race, and age. As such, the information in this report was designed to provide a fact-based approach to delivering information, and there was no intent to offend any person's sex, race, or age.

Suspicious Person Contacts

The following was an administrative review of a sample set of self-initiated suspicious person contacts from 2023 through 2025. In 2025, the Dublin Police Department conducted 411 self-initiated suspicious person contacts. A sample set of 124 self-initiated suspicious-person contacts was used for this administrative review. This sample set represents 30.2% of the total self-initiated suspicious person contacts. The sample size of 124 out of 411 (30.2%) provided a 90% confidence level with a 7% margin of error.

Data Collection Criteria for Suspicious Person Data Sample

Several criteria were established to select the data sample set:

- The suspicious person contact had to have occurred between 1/1/2025 and 12/31/2025.
- The suspicious person contact had to be listed as Code 60 in the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.
- The suspicious person contact had to be self-initiated by a Dublin Police Officer.
- The suspicious person contact had to be listed in the call for service (CFS) as a Suspect, Arrest, Operator, or FIS (field interview).
- If multiple contacts were listed in a single call for service (CFS), the focus was on identifying a person matching the above criteria.
- If multiple contacts with the same involvement were listed in the call for service, the first contact listed in the Cognos query was generally used unless another contact had more complete information listed (e.g., sex, race, and age), and if it met the other listed criteria.
- If an incorrect race code was used (e.g., "M"), it was moved to the "Unknown" category.
- The Law Enforcement Planner used his professional judgment when applying these criteria to the data sample.

Sample Data Set and Percentage of Suspicious Person Contacts by Sex

Year	Male	Male %	Female	Female %	Not Listed	Not Listed %	Unknown	Unknown %	Total Sample
2025	92	74.2%	28	22.6%	2	1.6%	2	1.6%	124
2024	122	75.3%	33	20.4%	5	3.1%	2	1.2%	162
2023	106	65.0%	53	32.5%	3	1.8%	1	0.6%	163

Data Analysis: Over the three years analyzed, male suspicious person contacts ranged from 65.0% to 75.3%, and female suspicious person contacts ranged from 20.4% to 32.5%. The percentages of not listed and unknown categories remained low (at or under 3.1%) over this same period.

Sample Data Set of Suspicious Person Contacts by Race

Year	W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Total Sample
2025	67	25	9	8	1	0	0	4	10	124
2024	87	37	11	9	0	0	0	8	10	162
2023	96	33	6	13	0	0	0	9	6	163

Percentage of Suspicious Person Contacts by Race

Year	W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Total Sample
2025	54.0%	20.2%	7.3%	6.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	8.1%	124
2024	53.7%	22.8%	6.8%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	6.2%	162
2023	58.9%	20.2%	3.7%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	3.7%	163

Data Analysis: Over the three years analyzed, White suspicious person contacts ranged from 53.7% to 58.9%. Black suspicious person contacts ranged from 20.2% and 22.8%. Asian suspicious person contacts ranged from 5.6% to 8.0%. Hispanic suspicious person contacts increased from 3.7% and 7.3% (+3.6%).

Of the sample total (124), 42 suspicious-person contacts in 2025 (33.9%) were categorized as Black, Hispanic, or Asian. Four of the 42 (9.5%) resulted in a Code RM clearance. A Code RM clearance represents that an incident or offense report number was issued, which means that an official police action occurred (e.g., report taken, arrest made, property impounded, etc.). All four Code RM contacts were Black.

Sample Data Set of Suspicious Person Contacts by Age

Age Group	2025	2024	2023	2025%	2024%	2023%
0-17	10	12	30	8.1%	7.4%	18.4%
18-20	33	32	33	26.6%	19.8%	20.2%
21-29	29	41	35	23.4%	25.3%	21.5%
30-39	17	24	22	13.7%	14.8%	13.5%
40-49	12	24	18	9.7%	14.8%	11.0%
50-59	9	12	12	7.3%	7.4%	7.4%
60-69	3	3	1	2.4%	1.9%	0.6%
70-79	3	2	2	2.4%	1.2%	1.2%
80-89	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
90 and Older	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Not Listed	8	12	10	6.5%	7.4%	6.1%
Total	124	162	163	---	---	---

Data Summary: Over the three years analyzed, the top five (5) age groups were 49 and under. Note that there was one tie (0-17 and 50-59 tied at 7.4% in 2024). Based on 2025 data, people 49 or younger accounted for 81.5% of the sampled suspicious person contacts. People 18 to 29 accounted for 50.0% of the sampled suspicious person contacts.

Suspicious Person Contact Dispositions

In 2025, only 9 of the 124 (7.3%) self-initiated suspicious person contacts sampled resulted in an incident or offense report number being issued (Code RM). In 2024, that figure was 4.3%, and in 2023, that figure was 9.2%.

This represents a range from 4.3% to 9.2% over the past three years in self-initiated suspicious person contact data samples that resulted in an incident or offense report being issued (Code RM). A code RM indicates that an incident or offense report number was issued, indicating that an official police action occurred (e.g., report taken, arrest made, property impounded, etc.).

A breakdown of the nine (9) self-initiated suspicious person contacts that resulted in an incident report being filed:

- Four suspicious person contacts were categorized as Black individuals. Three were categorized as White individuals. Two were categorized as no race listed.
- Seven of the nine suspicious person contacts were male, one suspicious person contact was female, and one suspicious person contact was sex not listed
- The age range for the nine suspicious person contacts was between 19 and 70. Seven of the nine (77.8%) suspicious person contacts were aged 39 or younger.
- Five of the nine persons were arrested on an active warrant.

Incident ID	Race	Sex	Age	Description
250590114	B	M	70	Arrested for trespass; was previously warned
250800095	B	F	32	Arrested on an active warrant from another jurisdiction
251890036	NL	M	30	Detained on an application for emergency admission
251970664	W	M	19	Trespass warning issued and warned for marijuana use
252470723	W	M	37	Arrested for an active warrant from another jurisdiction
252550719	NL	NL	19	Charged for possession of drugs, paraphernalia, and alcohol
253010496	W	M	47	Arrested on an active warrant from another jurisdiction
253300126	B	M	23	Arrested on an active warrant from another jurisdiction
253510105	B	M	39	Arrested on an active warrant from another jurisdiction

Data Summary: The percentage of incident/offense numbers issued (Code RM) from self-initiated suspicious person contacts ranged from 4.3% to 9.2% over the past three years. In 2025, the predominant sex of suspicious person contacts was male, and the majority of the race of suspicious person contacts was Black.

***It is worth noting that the relative change or percentage change concept applies when values are small, which can result in large percentage changes. In contrast, when values are large, percentage changes can result in smaller percentages.

It should be noted that the percentage of self-initiated suspicious person contacts meeting the established criteria for administrative review has declined over the past several years (38.9% in 2024 and 38.7% in 2023). This is due to many contacts not meeting the established criteria because of insufficient data collection.

Individual Officer Review

On March 24, 2026, the individual officer self-initiated suspicious person contact sample data was presented to the police executive command staff during a meeting. Techniques were used to review individual officer data. The police executive command staff discussed and reviewed the collective and individual officer findings. Each officer's contacts for suspicious persons were reviewed by sex, race, and age. Practical judgment was applied in addition to the administrative review of the data. A review of the data indicated no patterns of bias-based profiling (sex, race and/or age) were detected on the part of any current individual officer with the Dublin Police Department.

Traffic Stop Contacts

The following is an administrative review of a sample set of traffic stop contacts from 2023 through 2025. In 2025, the Dublin Police conducted 11,341 self-initiated traffic stops. A sample set of 10,292 traffic stop contacts was used for this administrative review. This sample set represents 90.8% of the total traffic stops. The sample size of 10,292 out of 11,341 (90.8%) provided a 99% confidence level with a 1% margin of error.

Data Collection Criteria for Traffic Stop Person Data Sample

A few criteria were established to select the data sample set:

- The traffic stop contact had to have occurred between 1/1/2025 and 12/31/2025.
- The traffic stop had to be listed as Code 70 in the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.
- The traffic stop contact had to be self-initiated by a Dublin Police Officer.
- The traffic stop contact had to be listed in the call for service (CFS) as an Arrest, Operator, or Field Interview (FIS).
- If multiple contacts were listed in a single call for service (CFS), the focus was on determining the identification of the operator (driver) of the vehicle.
- If multiple contacts with the same involvement were listed in the call for service (e.g., three persons listed as an operator) and the operator (driver) of the vehicle could not be determined, the first contact listed in the Cognos query was generally used, unless another contact had more complete information listed (e.g., sex, race, and age).
- If an incorrect race code was used (e.g., Code "M"), it was moved to the "Unknown" category.
- For this review, Code C indicated a traffic citation was issued.
- The Law Enforcement Planner used his professional judgment when applying this criterion to the data sample.

Sample Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stop Contacts by Sex

Year	Male	Male %	Female	Female %	Not Listed	Not Listed %	Unknown	Unknown %	Total Sample
2025	6,499	63.1%	3,747	36.4%	39	0.4%	7	0.1%	10,292
2024	5,330	61.2%	3,361	38.6%	18	0.2%	6	0.1%	8,715
2023	3,813	59.4%	2,576	40.2%	23	0.4%	3	0.0%	6,415

Data Summary: Over the three years analyzed, male traffic stop contacts increased from 59.4% to 63.1% (+3.7%). Female traffic stop contacts decreased from 40.2% to 36.4% (-3.8%). Not Listed and Unknown traffic stop contacts by sex percentages remained below 1.0%.

Sample Data Set of Traffic Stop Contacts by Race

Year	W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Total Sample
2025	5,740	1,800	929	990	22	0	2	100	709	10,292
2024	5,306	1,263	754	831	25	0	2	41	493	8,715
2023	4,086	934	357	721	27	0	4	44	242	6,415

Percentage of Traffic Stop Contacts by Race

Year	W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Total Sample
2025	55.8%	17.5%	9.0%	9.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	6.9%	10,292
2024	60.9%	14.5%	8.7%	9.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	5.7%	8,715
2023	63.7%	14.6%	5.6%	11.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	3.8%	6,415

Data Summary:

Over the three years analyzed, White traffic stop contacts decreased from 63.7% to 55.8% (-7.9%). Black traffic stop contacts ranged from 14.5% to 17.5%. Asian traffic stop contacts ranged from 9.5% to 11.2%. Hispanic traffic stop contacts increased from 5.6% to 9.0% (+3.4%). The unknown race category increased from 3.8% to 6.9% (+3.1%). It should be noted that traffic stop contacts categorized as "M," which is not a race category, were added to the Unknown category. In 2025, the number of Code "M" traffic stop contacts was 128. In 2024, there were 101 "M" traffic stop contacts, and in 2023, there were 72 "M" traffic stop contacts. This shows a raw data increase of "M" traffic stop contacts from 72 in 2023 to 128 in 2025. Based on the comparative data, it was believed that moving the "M" race categories to the unknown race category may have contributed to some of the increase in the unknown category's percentage from 2023 to 2025.

2025 Sample Data Set of Traffic Stop Contacts by Sex Resulting in a Citation

Sex	Stops	Warnings	Warning %	Citations	Citation %	Other	Other %
Male	6,499	4,531	69.7%	1,690	26.0%	278	4.3%
Female	3,747	2,720	72.6%	964	25.7%	63	1.7%
Unknown	7	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%
Not Listed	39	25	64.1%	11	28.2%	3	7.7%
Total	10,292	7,279	70.7%	2,666	25.9%	347	3.4%

2023 to 2025 Percentage of Traffic Stop Contacts by Sex Resulting in a Citation

Year	Male	Female	M to F Differential	Total Average
2025	26.0%	25.7%	+0.3%	25.9%
2024	30.1%	28.5%	+1.6%	29.5%
2023	27.9%	26.1%	+1.8%	27.2%

Data Summary: In all three years analyzed, male traffic stop contacts were cited at a higher rate than female traffic stop contacts. However, the differential rate between males and females, expressed as a percentage (%), decreased over the past three years from 1.8% in 2023 to 0.3% in 2025 (-1.5%).

2025 Sample Data Set of Traffic Stop Contacts by Race Resulting in a Citation

Race	Stops	Warnings	Warning %	Citations	Citation %	Other	Other %
White	5,740	4,202	73.2%	1,422	24.8%	116	2.0%
Black	1,800	1,331	73.9%	391	21.7%	78	4.3%
Hispanic	929	473	50.9%	363	39.1%	93	10.0%
Asian	990	741	74.8%	225	22.7%	24	2.4%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	22	19	86.4%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
Not Listed	100	60	60.0%	28	28.0%	12	12.0%
Unknown	709	452	63.8%	234	33.0%	23	3.2%
Total	10,292	7,279	70.7%	2,666	25.9%	347	3.4%

2023 to 2025 Percentage of Traffic Stop Contacts by Race Resulting in a Citation

Year	W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Avg.
2025	24.8%	21.7%	39.1%	22.7%	9.1%	0.0%	50.0%	28.0%	33.0%	25.9%
2024	27.6%	25.7%	48.3%	28.5%	12.0%	0.0%	50.0%	22.0%	34.5%	29.5%
2023	26.1%	23.7%	38.7%	30.0%	14.8%	0.0%	25.0%	31.8%	34.3%	27.2%

Data Summary. In 2025, one race category was identified for further review based on a differential of >5.0% (>30.9%) between the race category and the total sample average.

In 2025, 39.1% of Hispanic traffic stop contacts resulted in a traffic citation, a differential of +13.2% above the overall average of 25.9% for traffic stop contacts by race resulting in a citation. The differential for Hispanic traffic stop contacts in 2023 was 18.8%, and in 2022, it was 16.8%.

Using 2025 data from the Dublin Police Records Management System (RMS) — Citations Module — a sample of 142 traffic citations (non-crash related) resulting in 267 charges was issued to Hispanic traffic stop contacts was analyzed and the following was found:

- 100 of the 142 citations (70.4%) contained a charge for driver’s license suspension, no operator’s license, temporary permit violation, or other similar driver’s license violation charges.
- 34 of the 142 citations (23.9%) contained a charge for a speeding violation. 26 of the 34 speeding charges had speeding data included in the RMS, and the average violation was 21 MPH over the posted speed limit.
- 34 of the 142 citations (23.9%) contained a charge for driving under the influence of alcohol/drugs.

*Note: More than one charge can be filed on a citation. Based on a review of citations for Hispanic traffic stop contacts, many of these traffic charges were considered low-discretion events that typically result in a traffic citation. This information may account for the higher citation rate for Hispanic traffic stop contacts.

In the Dublin Police Records Management System (RMS) Citation Module, there was no Hispanic race field. Information about the ethnicity of a traffic citation contact was captured in the ethnicity field. Based on a review of the CAD and RMS data, it was believed that citations were issued to Hispanic traffic stop contacts in 2025 for which the Hispanic ethnicity was not captured in the RMS citation module.

2023 to 2025 Sample Data Set of Traffic Stop Contacts and Percentage by Age

Age Group	2025	2024	2023	2025%	2024%	2023%
0-17	342	324	277	3.3%	3.7%	4.3%
18-20	946	715	553	9.2%	8.2%	8.6%
21-29	2,795	2,159	1,511	27.2%	24.8%	23.6%
30-39	2,303	1,955	1,409	22.4%	22.4%	22.0%
40-49	1,760	1,561	1,215	17.1%	17.9%	18.9%
50-59	1,109	1,059	694	10.8%	12.2%	10.8%
60-69	606	530	452	5.9%	6.1%	7.0%
70-79	267	250	180	2.6%	2.9%	2.8%
80-89	66	48	39	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
90 and Older	5	2	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Not Listed	93	112	83	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%
Total	10,292	8,715	6,415	---	---	---

2025 Sample Data Set of Traffic Stop Contacts by Age and Traffic Citation Percentage

Age	Traffic Stop Sample	Traffic Stop %	Code C Clearance Sample	Traffic Citation %
0-17	342	3.3%	82	24.0%
18-20	946	9.2%	255	27.0%
21-29	2,795	27.2%	793	28.4%
30-39	2,303	22.4%	653	28.4%
40-49	1,760	17.1%	430	24.4%
50-59	1,109	10.8%	244	22.0%
60-69	606	5.9%	126	20.8%
70-79	267	2.6%	54	20.2%
80-89	66	0.6%	10	15.2%
90 and Older	5	0.0%	1	20.0%
Not Listed	93	0.9%	18	19.4%
Total	10,292	100.0%	2,666	25.9%

Data Summary. Over the three years analyzed, the top three age ranges for traffic stop contacts were 21-29, 30-39, and 40-49. In 2025, the top age ranges for traffic stop contacts resulting in a traffic citation (Code C) expressed as a percentage (%) were 21-29, 30-39, and 18-20. Based on a review of traffic stop contacts and those resulting in a citation (Code C) by age, there were no apparent signs of bias by age group.

***It is worth noting that the relative change or percentage change concept applies when values are small, which can result in large percentage changes. In contrast, when values are large, percentage changes can result in smaller percentages.

Individual Officer Review

On March 24, 2026, the individual officer self-initiated traffic stop contact sample data and citation sample data were presented to the police executive command staff during a meeting. Techniques were used to review the individual officer data. The police executive command staff discussed and reviewed the collective and individual officer findings. Each officer's contacts for sample traffic stops and sample traffic citations were reviewed by sex, race, and age. Practical judgment was applied in addition to the administrative review of the data. A review of the data indicated no patterns of bias-based profiling (sex, race and/or age) were detected on the part of any current individual officer with the Dublin Police Department.

Response to Resistance and Subject Control

The information listed below is from the 2025 Response to Resistance and Subject Control Analysis. In Dublin, responses to resistance and subject-control incidents are rare, and small sample sizes render them mathematically unstable (Johnson, 2016).

Sex, Race, and Age of Subjects Involved in Response to Resistance and Subject Control Incidents

Incident	Sex	Race	Age	Nature of Call
25-0079	M	W	32	Stabbing
25-0384	F	W	18	Suicide Attempt
25-0538	M	W	54	Behavioral Health
25-0592	M	H	34	Traffic Stop
25-0598	M	W	32	Stabbing (part 2 of 25-0079) — Traffic Stop
25-1118	M	W	49	Disturbance/Drugs
25-1198	M	W	19	Traffic Stop & Officer in Trouble
25-1274	M	W	60	Trespassing
25-1322	F	B	17	Domestic
25-1775	M	H	24	Traffic Stop & Foot Pursuit
25-1881	M	W	16	Trespassing
25-2301	M	W	14	Suicide Attempt

In 2025, out of the twelve (12) responses to resistance and subject control incidents:

- Ten were male (83%), and two were female (17%).
- Nine were categorized as White individuals (75%), two were classified as Hispanic individuals (17%), and one was classified as a Black individual (8%).
- The age range was 14 to 60, with an average age of 31.

All twelve Responses to Resistance and Subject Control incidents were investigated/reviewed by a first-line supervisor (Sergeant or Lieutenant), a member of the department's defensive tactics team, a Deputy Chief, and the Chief of Police. In addition, an annual analysis was completed on all Responses to Resistance and Subject Control incidents. Eleven responses to resistance and subject-control incidents were found to be objectively reasonable and in accordance with department policy and procedure. In one incident, it was determined that the response to resistance and subject control policy and procedures were not followed.

Arrest Data

A sample of 579 incidents in which 608 persons were arrested and/or charged with an offense in 2025 was retrieved from the Records Management System (RMS). For clarity, an arrest module was completed when a person was arrested, summonsed, issued a criminal citation, and/or arrested for a warrant. In some instances, more than one person was arrested from a single incident. Therefore, the number of persons arrested may exceed the count of arrest incidents.

Below is a breakdown of the 2025 data sample:

Sex

Male	Female	Unknown	Not Listed	Total Sample
452	156	0	0	608
74.3%	25.7%	0.0%	0.0%	---

Race

W	B	H	A	I	P	O	NL	U	Total Sample
344	168	74	15	3	0	0	0	4	608
56.6%	27.6%	12.2%	2.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	---

Age

Persons	17 & under	18-20	21-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90 & over	Total Sample
Persons Charged	47	63	175	167	97	37	18	4	0	0	608
% of Persons Charged	7.7%	10.4%	28.8%	27.5%	16.0%	6.1%	3.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	---

For purposes of this report, two categories were identified for further review.

1. Black individuals arrested/charged.
 - A sample of 168 arrests resulting in 202 charges on/for Black individuals (male and female) in the Records Management System (RMS) was further reviewed. The top four categories for arrests/charges (of all arrest charges for Black individuals) were:
 - 72 of the 202 (35.6%) arrest charges were warrants (FTA, FTC, etc.).
 - 36 of the 202 (17.8%) arrest charges were for operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol/drugs.
 - 25 of the 202 (12.4%) arrest charges were for assault, domestic violence, felonious assault, violation of protection order, menacing, etc.
 - 12 of the 202 (5.9%) arrest charges were for theft or receiving stolen property.

Based on a review of a sample data set of 2025 arrest charges involving Black individuals, these charges (71.7%) were generally considered low-discretion events that typically result in an arrest. This information may account for the higher resulting arrest figures for Black individuals.

*Note: More than one charge can be filed in an arrest.

2. Hispanic individuals arrested/charged.

- A sample of 74 arrests resulting in 97 charges on/for Hispanic individuals (male and female) in the Records Management System (RMS) was further reviewed. The top three categories for arrests/charges (of all arrest charges for Hispanic individuals) were:
 - 32 of the 97 (33.0%) arrest charges were for operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
 - 19 of the 97 (19.6%) arrest charges were warrants (FTA, FTC, etc.).
 - 11 of the 97 (11.3%) arrest charges were for assault, domestic violence, felonious assault, violation of protection order, menacing, etc.

Based on a review of a sample data set of 2025 arrest charges involving Hispanic individuals, these charges (63.9%) were generally considered low-discretion events that typically result in an arrest. This information may account for the higher resulting arrest figures for Hispanic individuals.

*Note: More than one charge can be filed in an arrest.

Benchmarks

This agency has used several different methodologies in the past to review and compare bias-based policing data administratively. Agency activity data is useless without a benchmark to which it can be compared. It is imperative that the benchmark selected for comparison closely matches the behavior that would likely prompt an officer to take action to stop a citizen. "A benchmark is the percentage of a racial or gender group that one would expect to be encountered if officers were not biased (Johnson, 2016)".

The following methodologies **were NOT utilized** in this administrative review:

- 2024 Census Report on Population Estimates — Information from the U.S. Census.

One of the most readily accessible data sets for comparison is U.S. Census data. However, the Census data is generally considered inadequate because the demographic make-up of citizens who use the roadway(s) in a jurisdiction may differ from the Census data (Jones, 2011). Citizens often use their vehicles to travel to locations away from where they live (Johnson, 2016). According to "How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data" by the U.S. Department of Justice — Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (2003):

- "... most of the analyses reported show that police traffic stops are not proportional to the racial distribution of that jurisdiction's resident population."
- "Most racial profiling studies, however, include only people stopped by the police—not those who could have been stopped (but were not) because they were observed violating some law."
- "Most studies compare stopped populations versus resident populations, although a stronger comparison is with violator populations. The problem is that it is difficult to ascertain the characteristics of populations of violators, so researchers frequently use the better known, but less appropriate, resident population."

Based on the literature review and the judgment of the police executive command staff, using Census population data would not be an applicable method, as the data captures only persons residing in Dublin, not those driving to, from, and/or through the City of Dublin.

Census Population Estimates, Dublin, Ohio

Race	W	B	H	A	I	P
Census	72.8%	2.3%	3.4%	18.9%	0.1%	0.0%

<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/dublincityohio>

*Note: The Census data used was the most up-to-date available.

All Topics		Dublin city, Ohio
Population estimates, July 1, 2025, (V2025)		NA
PEOPLE		
Population		
Population estimates, July 1, 2025, (V2025)		NA
Population estimates, July 1, 2024, (V2024)		49,456
Population estimates base, April 1, 2020, (V2025)		NA
Population estimates base, April 1, 2020, (V2024)		49,315
Population, percent change - April 1, 2020 (estimates base) to July 1, 2025, (V2025)		NA
Population, percent change - April 1, 2020 (estimates base) to July 1, 2024, (V2024)		0.3%
Population, Census, April 1, 2020		49,328
Population, Census, April 1, 2010		41,751
Age and Sex		
Persons under 5 years, percent		5.5%
Persons under 18 years, percent		27.0%
Persons 65 years and over, percent		15.4%
Female persons, percent		49.5%
Race and Hispanic Origin		
White alone, percent		72.8%
Black alone, percent (a)		2.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent (a)		0.1%
Asian alone, percent (a)		18.9%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent (a)		0.0%
Two or More Races, percent		4.1%
Hispanic or Latino, percent (b)		3.4%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino, percent		72.0%

- **Traffic Sample Survey** — A sample of vehicle operators on roadways.

The Dublin Police Department attempted to collect and use traffic sample surveys on three different occasions over the past years (2003, 2009, and 2016). In 2003 and 2009, interns were trained and used; in 2016, Community Service Officers (CSO) were trained and used. A qualitative analysis was conducted after the traffic sample survey and found the following issues related to the traffic sample survey collection:

- Not all roadways in Dublin could be observed; it was challenging to sample larger roadways.
- Not all dates, days, and times could be observed; it was difficult to get a sample due to the interns' and/or CSOs' availability.
- There was a limitation on the number of observers available for the survey: date, time, and day of week availability.
- In one traffic sample survey (2009), observers lost the data collected.
- In traffic sample surveys, there were some issues related to observers not following issued guidelines/directions.
- There was a visibility limitation for observers to determine the race and sex of drivers; often, observers were in stationary vehicles, making it difficult for them to determine race and/or sex from looking at another moving vehicle.

- There were safety considerations, such as putting observers into the field to collect data; due to safety concerns, observers were placed in safe locations to avoid interfering with traffic and to keep them safe from traffic.

According to “How to correctly collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data” by the U.S. Department of Justice — Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (2003):

- “... studies with larger and more representative samples drawn from several jurisdictions using a variety of common measures and testing a number of competing hypotheses are generally preferred over studies that use small or unrepresentative samples from one jurisdiction (or part of one jurisdiction) ...”.

Based on the literature review, the department’s previous sampling attempts, and the judgment of the police executive command staff, a traffic sample survey would not be an applicable method due to its inability to capture an accurate sample of the motoring public.

- Internal Benchmarking — Compares officer data with other officer data in like assignments.

This report looks at a sample of self-initiated suspicious person activity and a sample of self-initiated traffic stop activity by members of the Dublin Police Department. This data includes activities conducted by officers assigned to uniformed patrol and specialized units (e.g., the Community Impact Unit and the Community Education Unit). It is important to note that officers assigned to patrol are separated into three different shifts and may sometimes work other shifts. Officers assigned to patrol may or may not be assigned to specific geographic districts in the city. Officers assigned to patrol also have different days off. There is a high degree of variability in assignment (section, shift, days off, and district) among the officers included in this report. The identified work purpose of patrol differs from that of other specialized units. Based on the literature review and the judgment of the police executive command staff, internal benchmarking would not be an applicable method due to variability in officer assignments, shifts, days off, and district assignments.

The following methodology was utilized in this administrative review:

The only methodology that used a benchmark selected for comparison that matched as closely as possible the behavior likely to cause an officer to take action to stop a citizen was traffic crash data. It is also believed that the traffic crash data sample would provide an appropriate sample of driver sex, race, and age to benchmark against.

- Traffic Crash Data Sample — A sample of traffic crashes (drivers cited by sex, race, and age).

Traffic Crash Data Sample

One of the best benchmark measures of poor driving behavior is involvement in a motor vehicle crash (Johnson, 2016). For this administrative review, poor driving behavior was further defined as traffic-crash-causing behavior (e.g., moving violations, equipment violations, etc.).

Using traffic crash data as a traffic stop benchmark has several advantages:

- It identifies the drivers most likely to be stopped because crashes result from moving or equipment violations.
- Officers investigating traffic crashes can verify the sex, race and age of the driver when they complete their report.
- As traffic crashes can occur almost everywhere (e.g., roadways, parking lots, driveways, etc.), they are a good sample of poor driving or poorly maintained vehicles.
- Traffic crash data comes from the citizenry that reports the crashes to the police, so no suggestion can be made that there was bias by the police in gathering the data. (Johnson, 2016)

In 2025, using the Dublin Police Department’s Records Management System (RMS), a sample set of 578 traffic crashes (out of 776 total crashes — 74.5%) was identified in which a traffic citation was issued to at least one at-fault driver and sex, race, and age information was collected. The sample size of 578 out of 776 provides a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error.

Traffic Crash Data Sample by Sex

2025 Traffic Stop Sample versus Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Sex

Sex	2025 Traffic Stop Sample Data	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample Data	% Differential
Male	6,499	362	
Male %	63.1%	62.6%	+0.5%
Female	3,747	216	
Female %	36.4%	37.4%	-1.0%
Not Listed	39	0	
Not Listed %	0.4%	0.0%	+0.4%
Unknown	7	0	
Unknown %	0.1%	0.0%	+0.1%
Total Sample	10,292	578	

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Stop sample by sex with the 2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver sample by sex, the percentage change in the male and female sex categories was +/- 1.0%. Due to rounding, some percentages may appear incorrect but are accurate.

*2025 Traffic Stop Sample Resulting in a Citation vs.
Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Sex*

Sex	2025 Traffic Stop Citation Issued Sample	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver Sample	% Differential
Male	1,690	362	
Male %	63.4%	62.6%	+0.8%
Female	964	216	
Female %	36.2%	37.4%	-1.2%
Not Listed	11	0	
Not Listed %	0.4%	0.0%	+0.4%
Unknown	1	0	
Unknown %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Sample	2,666	578	

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Citation Issued sample by sex with the 2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver sample by sex, the percentage change in the male and female sex categories was +/- 1.2%.

Traffic Crash Data Sample by Race

2025 Traffic Stop Sample versus Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Race

Race	2025 Traffic Stop Sample Data	2025 Traffic Stop Sample %	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample Data	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample %	% Differential
White	5,740	55.8%	348	60.2%	-4.4%
Black	1,800	17.5%	74	12.8%	+4.7%
Hispanic	929	9.0%	39	6.7%	+2.3%
Asian	990	9.6%	39	6.7%	+2.9%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	22	0.2%	1	0.2%	0.0%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	10	1.7%	-1.7%
Other	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Not Listed	100	1.0%	45	7.8%	-6.8%
Unknown	709	6.9%	22	3.8%	+3.1%
Total Sample	10,292	---	578	---	---

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Stop sample by race with the 2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver sample by race, the percentage change in the four major race categories (White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian) was +/- 4.7%. Due to rounding, some percentages may appear incorrect but are accurate.

*2025 Traffic Stop Sample Resulting in a Citation vs.
Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Race*

Race	2025 Traffic Stop Citation Issued Sample	2025 Traffic Stop Sample %	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample Data	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample %	% Differential
White	1,422	53.3%	348	60.2%	-6.9%
Black	391	14.7%	74	12.8%	+1.9%
Hispanic	363	13.6%	39	6.7%	+6.9%
Asian	225	8.4%	39	6.7%	+1.7%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	0.1%	1	0.2%	-0.1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	10	1.7%	-1.7%
Other	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Not Listed	28	1.1%	45	7.8%	-6.7%
Unknown	234	8.8%	22	3.8%	+5.0%
Total Sample	2,666	---	578	---	---

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Stop Citation Issued sample by race with the 2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver sample by race, the percentage change in the four major race categories (White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian) was +/- 6.9% or less. Due to rounding, some percentages may appear incorrect but are accurate.

Traffic Crash Data Sample by Age

2025 Traffic Stop Sample versus Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Age

Age Group	2025 Traffic Stop Sample Data	2025 Traffic Stop %	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample Data	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample %	% Differential
17 & under	342	3.3%	48	8.3%	-5.0%
18-20	946	9.2%	51	8.8%	0.4%
21-29	2,795	27.2%	179	31.0%	-3.8%
30-39	2,303	22.4%	105	18.2%	4.2%
40-49	1,760	17.1%	67	11.6%	5.5%
50-59	1,109	10.8%	50	8.7%	2.1%
60-69	606	5.9%	43	7.4%	-1.6%
70-79	267	2.6%	23	4.0%	-1.4%
80-89	66	0.6%	10	1.7%	-1.1%
90 & over	5	0.0%	2	0.3%	-0.3%
Not Listed	93	0.9%	0	0.0%	0.9%
Total Sample	10,292	100.0%	578	---	---

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Stop sample by age with the 2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Driver sample by age, the percentage change among the age groups was +/- 5.5%.

2024 Traffic Stop Sample versus Traffic Crash Sample Data Set (Citation Issued) by Age

Age Group	2025 Traffic Stop Citation Issued Sample	2025 Traffic Stop %	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample Data	2025 Traffic Crash At-Fault Drivers Sample %	% Differential
17 & under	82	3.1%	48	8.3%	-5.2%
18-20	255	9.6%	51	8.8%	0.7%
21-29	793	29.7%	179	31.0%	-1.2%
30-39	653	24.5%	105	18.2%	6.3%
40-49	430	16.1%	67	11.6%	4.5%
50-59	244	9.2%	50	8.7%	0.5%
60-69	126	4.7%	43	7.4%	-2.7%
70-79	54	2.0%	23	4.0%	-2.0%
80-89	10	0.4%	10	1.7%	-1.4%
90 & over	1	0.0%	2	0.3%	-0.3%
Not Listed	18	0.7%	0	0.0%	0.7%
Total Sample	2,666	3.1%	578	---	---

Data Summary: When comparing the 2025 Traffic Stop Citation Issued sample by age with the 2025 Traffic Stop Contacts Resulting in a Citation sample by age, the percentage change among the age groups was +/- 6.3%.

Conclusion(s)

Based on this administrative review, no patterns of conduct were detected, indicating that the Dublin Police Department or any of its police officers inappropriately used sex, race, or age characteristics during self-initiated traffic enforcement or self-initiated suspicious person contacts. It is important to note that numbers alone can only support inferences and do not necessarily reveal the underlying motivations for specific actions (Jones, 2011). The challenge for any police agency is to determine the causes or sources of disparity, when and if possible. In this report, the professional judgment of the police department's executive command staff was also part of this review.

Based upon this administrative review, the following recommendations are as follows:

- A significant number of officer-initiated suspicious person contacts could not be analyzed (287 out of 411 — 69.8%). This was due to several factors: name type not being captured (e.g., OPER, SUSP, etc.), race data not being captured, sex data not being captured, age data not being captured, and/or name data not being captured. A recommendation is for supervisors to review with patrol and traffic officers, and communication technicians, the importance and necessity of collecting this type of information on self-initiated suspicious person calls for service.
- A significant number of officer-initiated traffic stop contacts could not be analyzed (1,049 out of 11,341 — 9.2%). This was due to several factors: name type not being captured (e.g., OPER, SUSP, etc.), race data not being captured, incorrect race data collected, sex data not being captured, age data not being captured, and name data not being captured. A recommendation is for supervisors to review with patrol and traffic officers, and communication technicians, the importance and necessity of collecting this type of information for self-initiated traffic stop calls for service.
 - Several racial code clearances of "M" continued to occur in 2025 (128 Code M in 2025) despite that race category being retired in 2015. A recommendation is for supervisors to review the correct sex and race codes (and their definitions) for traffic stops and suspicious person calls for service involving patrol and traffic officers, as well as communications technicians, and to emphasize the importance of collecting accurate information.
- The capturing of "Ethnicity" on the citation is essential for this analysis.
 - Supervisors should encourage officers to collect ethnicity on the citation when practical. This specifically applies to Hispanic drivers and would be captured under race on the citation.
 - The capturing of "Ethnicity" in the citation module in the Records Management System (RMS) should be reviewed with records staff.
- Although the numbers appeared higher for some sex, racial, and/or age categories than the total sample average, it may be too soon to determine if this is an issue or just a statistical anomaly that may correct itself. These categories will be examined again in future annual reports to help determine whether this is a trend, an issue, or neither.

The results of this administrative review were consistent with previous non-biased policing administrative reviews. Because some categories have smaller numbers, some percentages may appear more prominent and disproportionate. After thoroughly reviewing all the sample data, complaints, and police department practices, this report concluded that there is no evidence that the Dublin Police Department as an agency

collectively or that any individual Dublin Police Officers were targeting traffic stops or self-initiated suspicious person contacts based on an individual's sex, race, and/or age. No further review is necessary.

No other potential training issues were identified. This administrative review included, but was not limited to, analyzing data from the record management system (RMS) and the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system, analyzing data on sex, race, age, reason(s) for contact, dispositions of the contacts, and other factors. In most cases, Cognos was used to query the data from RMS and CAD.

Upon review and approval by the Police Executive Command Staff, this report will be forwarded to the Chief of Police, the Police Executive Command Staff, and the Professional Standards Manager for inclusion in annual in-service training. In addition, this information will be discussed at a 2026 management staff meeting.

The next section of this report will contain future policy considerations.

Future Considerations and/or Recommendations

The following are future considerations for the Dublin Police Department as it transitions to a new CAD and RMS system(s).

1) Changes in Race/Ethnicity

On June 3, 2023, the Law Enforcement Planner attended an online seminar on "Equity and Law Enforcement Data Collection, Use, and Transparency," which indicated that the federal government may implement the standard below as soon as the summer of 2024. According to the seminar presenters, this will require software vendors to make these changes so that police agencies are in compliance.

CSOTUS Proposed Updates

Proposed Minimum

What is your race or ethnicity?
Select all that apply.

- White
- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Other data collection changes may occur in the future. There was a discussion about standardizing call-for-service (CAD) data, citation definitions, arrest definitions, and related data. This effort aims to achieve greater standardization in data definitions and collection. Also, they suggested building crosswalks between state codes and NIBRS codes. No implementation plans have been developed yet.

Under the oversight of the National Academy of Sciences and the Executive Office of the President's Office of Science & Technology Policy, the Criminal Justice Statistics Interagency Working Group used the deliberations from that meeting and associated recommendations to submit a report to President Biden entitled "Equity and Law Enforcement Data Collection, Use, and Transparency." Per the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the report to the President sheds light on the status of policing data nationwide and recommends five actions to advance data on the full range of law enforcement activities. The data includes information on calls for service, searches, stops, frisks, arrests, complaints, law enforcement demographics, and civil asset forfeiture.

"This report to the President of the United States is a groundbreaking effort, aided by experts within and outside the federal government, to assess current data collection, use, and transparency practices with respect to law enforcement activities," notes Dr. Alex Piquero, BJS Director. "With a keen focus on

expanding the collection and reporting of disaggregated data, support for the roadmap outlined in the report will help ensure the use of the data to advance effective, accountable policing across the country. The American people deserve nothing less.”

On March 28, 2024, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) published the results of its review of Statistical Policy Directive No. 15 (SPD 15). It issued updated standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting race/ethnicity data across federal agencies.

Table 1. Revised Definitions for Minimum Race/Ethnicity Reporting Categories in 2024 SPD 15

Minimum Race/Ethnicity Reporting Category	Definition
American Indian or Alaska Native	Individuals with origins in any of the original peoples of North, Central, and South America, including, for example, Navajo Nation, Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of Montana, Native Village of Barrow Inupiat Traditional Government, Nome Eskimo Community, Aztec, and Maya.
Asian	Individuals with origins in any of the original peoples of Central or East Asia, Southeast Asia, or South Asia, including, for example, Chinese, Asian Indian, Filipino, Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese.
Black or African American	Individuals with origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa, including, for example, African American, Jamaican, Haitian, Nigerian, Ethiopian, and Somali.
Hispanic or Latino	Includes individuals of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Salvadoran, Cuban, Dominican, Guatemalan, and other Central or South American or Spanish culture or origin.
Middle Eastern or North African	Individuals with origins in any of the original peoples of the Middle East or North Africa, including, for example, Lebanese, Iranian, Egyptian, Syrian, Iraqi, and Israeli.
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Individuals with origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands, including, for example, Native Hawaiian, Samoan, Chamorro, Tongan, Fijian, and Marshallese.
White	Individuals with origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, including, for example, English, German, Irish, Italian, Polish, and Scottish.

It is recommended that the Dublin Police adopt these new race/ethnicity definitions and begin using them upon transition to a new CAD and RMS.

2) Sex versus Gender

According to an article from Medical News Today titled “What’s the difference between Sex and gender?” People often use the terms “sex” and “gender” interchangeably, but this is incorrect. Sex refers to biological and physical differences, while gender is how people identify.

- Sex refers to the physical differences between people who are male, female, or intersex. A person’s sex is typically assigned at birth based on physiological characteristics, including genitalia and chromosome composition. This assigned sex is called a person’s “natal sex.”
- Gender, on the other hand, involves how a person identifies. Unlike natal sex, gender is not binary. Instead, gender is a broad spectrum. A person may identify at any point along this spectrum or entirely outside it.

Although CALEA uses the term gender, the Dublin Police Department has chosen to use the term sex. A review of CAD and RMS indicated that sex was used and not gender.

3) Diminishing Returns on Analysis

It is recommended that, in 2027, when analyzing 2026 data, the police department continue to use a more heuristic approach and examine suspicious-person and traffic-stop data samples only by sex, race, and age. It is recommended that breaking the data down further would overcomplicate the analysis, both collectively and individually. In addition, it creates a scope-control situation, keeping the level of analysis within practical limits.

Resources

- Criminal Justice Statistics Interagency Working Group of the National Science and Technology Council (2023). "Equity and Law Enforcement Data Collection, Use, and Transparency"
- Johnson, Richard R. *8 Tips for Writing Bias Based-Based Policing Reports*. (2016) https://www.llrmi.com/articles/legal_update/2016_johnson_biasedbasedreports/
- Johnson, Richard R. *Bias-Based Policing Reports Are Failing the Police and the Community*. (2016) https://www.iadlest.org/Portals/0/Files/Documents/DDACTS/Docs/HVE/Research_Brief_Biased-Based-Policing-Reports_September-2016.pdf?ver=2020-01-06-090439-527
- Jones, Brian R. *Bias-Based Policing in Vermont*. (2011) <https://lawreview.vermontlaw.edu/?s=bias>
- U.S. Department of Justice. *A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data Collection Systems*. (2000) <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=184768>
- U.S. Department of Justice — Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. *How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data* (2003) <https://cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/Publications/cops-p044-pub.pdf>
- What's the difference between Sex and gender?* Medical News Today. <https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/232363#gender>

Other Resources Reviewed but Not Cited in this Report

- Baumgartner, Frank, Epp, Derek, and Shoub, Kelsey. *Suspect Citizens*. (2018). https://www.amazon.com/Suspect-Citizens-Million-Traffic-Policing/dp/1108454046/ref=sr_1_11?dchild=1&keywords=bias+policing&qid=1614980334&s=b ooks&sr=1-11
- Eberhardt, Jennifer. *Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice That Shapes What We See, Think, and Do*. (2019). Viking Press
- Fridell, Lunney, Diamond, Kubu, Scott, and Laing. *Racially Biased Policing: A Principled Response*. (2001). https://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free_Online_Documents/Racially-Biased_Policing/racially%20biased%20policing%20-%20a%20principled%20response%202001.pdf
- Goncalves, Felipe and Mello, Steven. *A Few Bad Apples? Racial Bias in Policing*. (2021). <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/aer.20181607>
- IACP. *Bias-Free Policing*. (2020). <https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2020-06/Bias-Free%20Policing%20January%202020.pdf>
- Johnson, Richard. *Bias Based Policing: Best Practices - Workbook*. (2016). Dolan Consulting Group, L.L.C.
- Lofstram, Hayes, Martin, Premkumar, and Gumbs. *Racial Discrimination in Law Enforcement Stops*. (2021). <https://www.ppic.org/?show-pdf=true&docraptor=true&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ppic.org%2Fpublication%2Fracial-disparities-in-law-enforcement-stops%2F>

Luh, Elizabeth. *Not so black and white: uncovering racial bias through systematically misreported trooper reports*. (2022). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3357063

MacDonald, John and Greg Ridgeway. *Methods for Assessing Racially Biased Policing*. (2010). https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reprints/2011/RAND_RP1427.pdf