

# **Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee**

## **2007 Annual Report**



**Prepared by:**

**Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute  
Hatfield School of Government  
Portland State University**

# Contents

---

<u>Executive Summary</u> .....	2
<u>Statement of Purpose</u> .....	11
<u>The Committee</u> .....	11
<u>LECC Activities in 2007</u> .....	16
LECC Public Perception Survey.....	16
Corvallis PD Stop Data Report 2002-2006 .....	35
LECC Traffic Stop Data System (TSD) .....	40
“Perspectives on Profiling” Curriculum .....	43
2008 Regional Training Plan .....	45
<u>Conclusions, Recommendations and Future Tasks</u> .....	46
<u>Appendix A: SB 2102</u> .....	48
<u>Appendix B: LECC Public Perception Survey Methodology &amp; Questions</u> .....	51
<u>Appendix C: Corvallis PD Stop Data Report 2002-2006</u> (Technical Report).....	71
<u>Appendix D: LECC Minimum Recommended Traffic Stop Data Points Form</u> .....	84
<u>Appendix E: LECC Detailed Traffic Stop Data Points Form</u> .....	85

# 2007 Annual Report of the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee

---

## ***Executive Summary:***

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) was created by Senate Bill 415 in 2001 and charged with the responsibility to obtain data on law enforcement stops, provide technical assistance in collecting and analyzing that data, and identify and disseminate information on programs, procedures and policies from communities that have forged positive working relationships between law enforcement and communities of color. Senate Bill 415 was to sunset in December 2007; however, a new bill SB 2102 was passed and signed into law in 2007. This bill makes permanent the LECC committee and transfers staffing duties from the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute at Portland State University. A copy of Senate Bill 2102 can be found in Appendix A of this report.

The LECC, in partnership with the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute and the Traffic Safety Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation, has successfully been awarded two grants from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA-2006-23772). These grants will fund the activities of the LECC until 2011. The grant program is called the "Incentive Grant Program to Prohibit Racial Profiling" under section 1906 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Federal Register, Vol. 71, No. 22, pp. 5727-5729).

The original charge of LECC was based on the legislative finding that state and local law enforcement agencies can perform their missions more effectively when all Oregonians have trust and confidence that law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals are free from inequitable and unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin, and that data collection can establish a factual foundation for measuring progress in eliminating discrimination.

The LECC recognizes that racially biased policing, whether actual or perceived, impacts relationships between communities of color and law enforcement agencies. Policing in democratic nations is based on principles of procedural justice. In other words, police are expected to be *neutral* in their decision-making, treat the citizenry with *respect*, and seek *fair* outcomes. A review of research on law enforcement-citizen relations indicates that *trust* in and *satisfaction* with police have important ramifications for crime prevention, case investigation, legitimacy of government institutions, and crime itself.

Racially-biased policing clearly violates such principles of justice, and lowers citizen trust and satisfaction with police. However, racially-biased policing and police-citizen relationships are complex and there are no simple solutions. Therefore, in order to

foster more positive relationships between law enforcement and the communities they serve, the LECC has taken a multi-pronged approach, led by two regularly convening subcommittees: Data Review and Community Relations. These two subcommittees have carried out a variety of tasks to address issues that correspond to the intent and goals of Senate Bill 2102.

The LECC has identified four issues that have structured its work: 1) Status of Stop Data Collection, Analysis, and Utilization in Oregon, 2) Public Perception of Racially Biased Policing in Oregon, 3) Identification of “Best Practices” for Community Outreach and Law Enforcement Training, and 4) Recommendations for Addressing Racially Biased Policing and Law Enforcement-Citizen Relations in the State of Oregon.

In 2007, the LECC focused on a number of tasks that correspond to all four of our core issues. The specific tasks completed by the LECC to address these issues in 2007 are the following: a survey of Oregon citizens regarding their perceptions of law enforcement and stop experiences; a five year analysis of traffic stop data trends (2002-2006) from the Corvallis PD; development of a model traffic stop data collection system; purchase and utilization of the “Perspectives on Profiling” curriculum from the Simon Wiesenthal Museum of Tolerance; and the development of a regional training plan for law enforcement officers in 2008.

The remainder of this Executive Summary reviews each issue addressed in 2007, briefly summarizes the tasks undertaken, and lists significant findings and conclusions. This summary includes a broader perspective, including information from other years and other organizations. The Executive Summary ends with our recommendations for addressing racially biased policing in Oregon based on our cumulative efforts. More detailed descriptions of the LECC committee, tasks completed in 2007, and data findings follow the Executive Summary.

## **Overview of Issue # 1: Status of Stop Data Collection, Analysis, and Utilization in Oregon**

### **Traffic Stop Data Trends**

In the 2006 LECC Annual Report we published a review of five years of traffic stop data reported by the Oregon State Police and Hillsboro Police PD from 2001 to 2005. In this year’s report we present another five year analysis of traffic stop data from the Corvallis PD from 2002 to 2006. The findings in Corvallis PD report, which are explained in more detail later, support the past data patterns from other agencies and conclusions drawn by the LECC.

The data analyzed from Oregon law enforcement agencies consistently show that minority group drivers who are stopped are *substantially more likely to experience a search* than are non-Hispanic white drivers, but the searches of white drivers more frequently yield contraband or evidence of illegal activity. For example, LECC staff analysis of data from the Oregon State Police showed that 5% of stops of Hispanic drivers in 2001-2005 resulted in a search, compared to 3.8% of African American Law Enforcement Contacts Policy Data and Review Committee

drivers and 2% of White drivers. Searches in Hillsboro showed similar relative patterns (LECC 2006 Annual Report). The Corvallis PD searched 5.3% of all drivers from 2002-2006, but 8.3% of all traffic stops of Hispanic drivers involved a search and 7% of traffic stops of African American drivers involved a search. The Portland Police Bureau, in an analysis of 68,107 stops (including pedestrian stops as well as traffic stops) in 2006, found that 6% of traffic stops resulted in a search; but African American and Hispanic/Latino drivers experienced searches at approximately a 10% rate.

Unfortunately, data collected by law enforcement agencies about the relative chances of being stopped are less informative than examining the chances of a search. The OSP, Hillsboro, Corvallis, and Portland data do exhibit some overrepresentation of minority groups in their frequency of being stopped compared to their percentage of the driving age public. However, this census estimate may not be an accurate description of the racial and ethnic composition of *drivers* in their jurisdiction. For example, drivers eligible to be stopped may include unknown proportions of out-of-state residents. This is especially true on major highways patrolled by the Oregon State Police but could also occur with travel by out-of-jurisdiction residents, such as in Portland's central business district during weekdays. Secondly, there is the possibility that racial/ethnic groupings exhibit different driving behaviors (e.g. speeding, traffic violations, vehicle code violations) that could increase the likelihood of being stopped. The traffic stop data collected by law enforcement agencies cannot assess these alternative hypotheses regarding racial/ethnic disparity in traffic stop frequency. Although we are more confident in the validity of search data than traffic stop data, LECC has discovered some data problems with the manner in which searches are recorded by OSP, Hillsboro, and Corvallis. Searches conducted subsequent to arrest, which are generally routine protocol and therefore not discretionary, are lumped together with all other search types. Given these limitations with traffic stop data collection, LECC developed a Traffic Stop Data System (see p. 40) in 2007 designed to record more accurate data on search decisions and the context of stops.

*In sum, the results from our analyses of traffic stop data in Oregon do not indicate the existence of a conscious racial/ethnic bias in law enforcement decisions to stop and search drivers and vehicles. However, this does not mean that the analysis has ruled out the existence of unconscious biases or the possibility that some individual officers may operate with biased decision-making. Given that the citizen perceptions in Oregon regarding law enforcement experiences reveal a strong split along racial/ethnic lines this issue still deserves widespread research and policy attention.*

## **Standardization of Traffic Stop Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting**

In the 2006 Annual LECC report we presented the results of a statewide survey of all law enforcement agencies in Oregon regarding the status and characteristics of their traffic stop data collection efforts (if any).

Three key findings from that survey indicated a need for better standardization of data collection systems and technical assistance regarding analysis and reporting of data that was being collected:

- In 2006, the data points that are not as commonly collected are those concerning whether a search was conducted, why a search was conducted, and the disposition following the search. Only ten police departments, three sheriff's offices and the Oregon State Police collect data on searches and the results of searches.
- In 2006, few departments that collect data prepared reports on the data, publicly or internally. This issue seems to correspond to the commonly-cited need for assistance in analysis, reporting, and bench-marking.
- In 2006, the most common reported reasons for not collecting stop data are the following: time constraints, no perceived or apparent need to collect, problems with forms, inadequate staffing, lack of technological knowledge, no valid comparison/benchmark data.

In response to these issues, LECC has developed what we call the **LECC Traffic Stop Data System (TSD)** in 2007. The system which is described in more detail later would be delivered to any interested law enforcement agency in Oregon. It contains the following components:

- **Data Collection Forms** (a minimum recommended form and a more detailed form)
- A **Microsoft Access Storage Database** set up for recording data points from either the minimum or detailed collection forms.
- A **video demonstration** of the MS Access Storage database
- A **Microsoft Excel Analysis Database** with pre-programmed formulas to analyze traffic stop data to examine racial/ethnic disparities
- A **video demonstration** of the Excel Analysis Database
- A sample **Racial Disparity Report in Microsoft PowerPoint**. The file can be used to directly paste your agency results into it
- A sample **Administrative Analysis Report in Microsoft PowerPoint**
- **Oregon 2000 Census Data** for all cities, towns, and counties to enable analysis of disparities by race/ethnicity

The system is principally geared towards agencies that are not currently collecting stop data or agencies that wish to change the way they are collecting data. However, agencies that are already collecting data will be interested in the analysis guidance part of the system. We know from experience that each agency currently collecting stop data has idiosyncratic methods for data collection and storage thus the system is malleable enough to address such needs and LECC will provide such technical assistance.

Our next goal in this technical assistance process is to conduct a focus group of law enforcement administrators to explain the system to them and brainstorm on the best approach for interesting agencies in it.

## **Overview of LECC Issue # 2: Public Perception of Racially Biased Policing in Oregon**

Prior to 2007, LECC conducted four annual statewide opinion surveys that assessed the public's views of law enforcement contacts and the prevalence of racially-biased policing. In 2005 the survey was supplemented with additional surveys of African-American and Hispanic residents of Oregon.

These surveys of Oregon residents showed that, overall, about 19% of Oregon drivers experience a traffic stop during a year, which is much higher than the national average (8.8% per year).<sup>1</sup> However, consistent with national patterns, African American and Hispanic drivers report being stopped more often than White drivers and are significantly more likely to believe that racially biased policing is common practice. For example, in the Oregon surveys 41% of African American respondents reported being stopped by police during the 12 months preceding their interview, compared to 24% of other respondents from their geographical area, and 19% of other respondents on a statewide basis (LECC, 2005, pp. 23).

The surveys indicate a sharp divide between African American drivers and other drivers regarding whether they think the differences in stop rates reflect racial profiling. For example, 73% of African American drivers who had been stopped reported that they thought the reasons given by the law enforcement officer for the stop were untrue, compared to only 18% of other drivers from the same area who had been stopped. Similarly, 41% of Hispanic drivers who had been stopped statewide felt the reason given for the stop was not the real reason (LECC, 2005, pp. 26).

African American drivers who had been stopped reported searches of themselves, passengers, or vehicles more frequently (24%) than drivers in the comparison group (13%), but the relationship between race and frequency of searches did not meet the test of statistical significance in the survey data (LECC, 2005, pp. 26).

In 2007, the LECC continued this survey effort. Our goal in designing this new survey was to replicate, as close as possible, the methodology used in the previous surveys in order to reliably explore potential changes in citizen perceptions over time.

The findings of this new survey, which are presented in more detail later in the report, provide some evidence of positive change occurring in Oregon. There were four important improvements in the experiences and perceptions of minorities in Oregon.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Contacts between Police and the Public: 2005" Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, 2007 (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cpp05.htm>)  
Law Enforcement Contacts Policy Data and Review Committee  
2007 Annual Report  
November 29, 2007

- The frequency of minority group members being stopped by the police has gone down. Hispanic drivers report the highest frequency of being stopped in the past year (31%), followed by African Americans (29%), and then the Minority category (i.e. combines Hispanic, African American, Native American, and Asian) in the random statewide survey (25%). The frequency of African American and Hispanic drivers stopped in 2007 was less than reported in 2005, particularly African American drivers (13% less frequently). The reduction in the frequency of reported stops by African American drivers in 2007 is statistically significant. Regardless of these reductions, the frequency with which minority drivers report being stopped in Oregon is still much higher than national estimates and significantly greater than White drivers.
- Attitudes of minority group members regarding the use of racial profiling by Oregon police officers are improving. There was a small reduction in the intensity of Minority (i.e. combines Hispanic, African American, Native American, and Asian), African American, and Hispanic beliefs about the frequency of racial profiling from previous survey years. These changes in opinion were statistically significant for both African American and Hispanic drivers. This finding is particularly true among the Hispanic drivers surveyed. In 2005, 28% of Hispanic drivers felt police never use racial profiling compared to 42% who felt they never use it in 2007.
- Minority drivers were more likely than past surveys to feel law enforcement officers have become fairer in the past year.
- Minority drivers in 2007 appear to view Oregon police more positively and less negatively than previous survey findings.

Despite these positive improvements regarding stop experiences and perceptions of fairness in Oregon law enforcement, *there are still significant differences between the experiences and attitudes of Minority drivers interviewed in the survey and comparison White drivers.* Although we see some improvement, these experiential and attitudinal differences across races and ethnicities should not be understated.

Providing an explanation for these improved opinions is difficult at this stage of our analysis, however LECC offers some tentative suggestions. First, around the time of the 2005 survey a number of high-profile and divisive police-citizen incidents received extensive media attention, particularly in Multnomah County. Media influence on public perceptions of police is a strong possibility, but difficult to discern. Secondly, a number of the larger police agencies in the state have been utilizing both diversity training and the “Perspectives on Profiling” curriculum (e.g. Portland, Salem, Eugene). It is possible that these trainings have had a positive influence on police-citizen encounters in the larger metropolitan areas. Thirdly, there were some slight methodological differences between the 2005 and 2007 surveys, most notably is that the 2005 survey was part of a larger public opinion survey covering multiple topics. Given that the extension survey of Hispanics and African American has only occurred twice in the survey history and both were conducted by two different survey laboratories, LECC should continue to monitor



these changes. We propose at least one additional survey effort should be carried out in 2009.

### **Overview of LECC Issue # 3: Identifying “Best Practices” for Community Outreach and Law Enforcement Training**

The 2006 Oregon Law Enforcement Survey described above was also utilized to determine the types of training programs that address issues of racial/ethnic bias in policing. The following results were found regarding the character of training in Oregon related to racial bias issues in policing:

- In 2006, there was wide variation in the types, breadth and formality of training related to racial bias that was occurring throughout the state.
- In 2006, there was no uniform consistency to the delivery and content of training that address the issues concerning racial and ethnic biases in policing.
- In 2006, twenty-five Oregon law enforcement agencies reported some training obstacles or difficulties. Overwhelmingly, the primary difficulty that was expressed was a need for more training and better training.

Based on this feedback and reviews of training curricula around the country, the LECC has identified and purchased a training curriculum that can be used for the entire state. The LECC purchased the **Perspectives on Profiling™ curriculum** designed by the Tools for Tolerance® for Law Enforcement at the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Museum of Tolerance. Perspectives on Profiling is an interactive virtual learning experience that compels users to make critical choices in testing situations. The program is designed for police managers, mid-level supervisors, training officers, and line officers. The interactive video is a cutting edge training tool that is sensitive to the challenges that face law enforcement both in reality and in the management of public perception.

The LECC has worked to develop 37 qualified trainers in Oregon who can deliver the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum. These qualified trainers represent 7 law enforcement agencies and Oregon’s Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST). A demonstration of the training was also held in July, 2007. The event trained 23 law enforcement and government officials using the Perspectives on Profiling. The attendees included four Police Chiefs, two Sheriffs, the Director of DPSST, Director of OSSA, and Portland’s FBI Special Agent in Charge. Nine police agencies were represented among the attendees. The feedback from the training was generally positive. DPSST, OSSA, and OACP have pledged to help with spreading the training. All agreed that the training is appropriate for in-service and other required training certification.

In 2008, the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum will be delivered at eight locations in a regional training format throughout the state (see p. 45)

## **Overview of LECC Issue # 4: Conclusions and Recommendations for Addressing Racially Biased Policing and Law Enforcement-Citizen Relations in the State of Oregon**

The year of 2007 has been an important year for the LECC, particularly with our desire to advance technical assistance to agencies collecting or desiring to collect traffic stop data and advancing training throughout the state. We look forward to implementing our eight regional training events in 2008 and working with interested agencies on the LECC Traffic Stop Data system.

Here are some important conclusions and recommendations for 2007.

- 1) The development of LECC's Traffic Stop Data system will help foster consistency in analysis and external reporting of traffic stop data. We hope to work with interested agencies in 2008 who are already collecting traffic stop data to assist them with any analysis or reporting needs.
- 2) LECC's Traffic Stop Data system will also foster a more thorough and accurate examination of searches following a traffic stop. We hope to find at least one interested agency in 2008 willing to collect search information using the TSD approach.
- 3) Survey research of Oregon public perceptions continues to illustrate a significant gap in opinion related to fairness of Oregon law enforcement across race and ethnicity. African Americans and Hispanics in Oregon also continue to report being stopped at a significantly higher rate than Whites and at frequencies much higher than national surveys. However, there is some indication that positive opinions regarding Oregon law enforcement are increasing throughout the state.
- 4) The Perspectives on Profiling curriculum brings a needed standardization in training on racial profiling and police bias issues to the state. In 2008 we will be implementing eight regional trainings. In addition, we recommend that the Perspectives on Profiling also be used for in-service training requirements and hopefully we'll identify at least two agencies willing to have such a program.

Based on these conclusions and recommendations the proposed 2008 work plan for LECC entails the following:

- 1) Identify and train two interested agencies already collecting traffic stop data with the TSD analysis and reporting programs.
- 2) Identify and train one interested agency that already collects traffic stop data to change the way they record search information to reflect the TSD approach.
- 3) Identify and train one interested agency that is not already collecting traffic stop data to utilize the TSD system.
- 4) Carry out eight regional training sessions throughout Oregon using the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum. Seek officer feedback on the training both during training and a follow-up after training.

- 5) Identify and deliver two in-service trainings to interested agencies using the Perspective on Profiling curriculum.

# 2007 Annual Report of the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee

---

## Statement of Purpose:

“State and local law enforcement agencies can perform their missions more effectively when all Oregonians have trust and confidence that law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals are free from inequitable and unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin.... Demographic data collection can establish a factual and quantifiable foundation for measuring progress in eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin....”<sup>2</sup>

## The Committee:

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) was created by 2001 Senate Bill 415 for a period of six years, ending December 31, 2007. That sunset was lifted with the passage of SB 2102. A copy of SB 2102 can be found in Appendix A of this report.

The committee is charged with the responsibility to report annually on its efforts to:

- Solicit demographic data concerning law enforcement stops and other contacts between state and local law enforcement agencies and individuals;
- Publicize programs, procedures and policies from communities that have made progress toward eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin during law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals;
- Provide technical assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to begin collecting demographic data, including refinement of the minimum data elements as necessary for effective analysis;
- Provide technical assistance to communities and state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to engage in local efforts to involve individuals in the establishment and implementation of programs, procedures and policies that will advance the goal of the act;
- Obtain resources for independent analysis and interpretation of demographic data collected by state or local law enforcement agencies;
- Accept and analyze demographic data collected by a state or local law enforcement agency if requested by a state or local law enforcement agency and if resources are available; and

---

<sup>2</sup> 2007 Senate Bill 2102 (See Appendix A)

- Report to the public the results of analyses of demographic data.

The committee is composed of eleven members appointed by the Governor. The current members of the committee as of December, 2007 are:

Edwin Peterson, LECC Chair Senior Judge and Distinguished Jurist in Residence, Willamette University College of Law	
Todd Anderson* Tillamook County Sheriff	John Minnis* Director Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST)
Gilbert P Carrasco* Professor of Law Willamette University College of Law	Rosanne Sizer* Chief of Police Portland Police Bureau
William Feyerherm Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies Portland State University	Frank Thompson Superintendent Santiam Correctional Institution
David Fidanque Executive Director ACLU Oregon	Greg Willeford Deputy Superintendent Oregon State Police
Annabelle Jaramillo** Benton County Commissioner	

\*Appointed in 2007

\*\* Chair of the Community Relations Subcommittee

Three LECC committee members resigned their positions in 2007. We would like to extend our appreciation for the dedication of the following former committee members:

- Jan Chaiken, Consultant and former Director, U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Ron Louie, former Chief of Police, Hillsboro Police Department
- Raul Ramirez, former Marion County Sheriff

Current and former LECC staff or consultants in 2007:

- Jan Chaiken, Consultant
- Craig Prins, Executive Director, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
- Henry Reiman, Hillsboro Police Department
- Brian Renauer, Director, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University

- Mike Stafford, Public Safety Coordinator, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
- Laura Uva, Administrative Assistant, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University

## **Background:**

Efforts to address charges of racially biased policing on the part of law enforcement officers became a statutory mandate during the 69<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly in 1997. During that session, a top priority of law enforcement agencies was a revision of the statute regulating stops of citizens by police. The debate stirred by that issue resulted in House Bill 2433. That bill included several provisions intended to provide a compromise between law enforcement agencies that sought to make stops more effective and safer for officers and community groups that sought to protect the civil rights of those stopped.

HB 2433 included several provisions intended to foster the protection of the rights of citizens by requiring:

- All state and local law enforcement agencies in Oregon to adopt policies prohibiting the practice of racially biased policing.
- All law enforcement agencies to adopt means to facilitate the filing of complaints by citizens who felt that their rights had been violated, and to develop a process to resolve those complaints.
- All law enforcement agencies to report to the Asset Forfeiture Oversight Advisory Committee the number and type of complaints filed during the first year after the adoption of HB 2433.
- Initiation of data collection in an effort to move away from anecdotal information.

Implementation of HB 2433 was coordinated by a workgroup under the auspices of the Governor's Public Safety Policy and Planning Council. At its inception, this workgroup comprised over 60 members from diverse groups and backgrounds who were able to come to agreement on three basic principles:

- All law enforcement agencies should be responsible for their actions.
- No person should be subject to improper law enforcement conduct.
- Every person has the right to a fair and prompt response to a complaint.

The first action of the workgroup was the adoption of a model policy for law enforcement agencies that was distributed to all law enforcement agencies in Oregon. That policy, or one similar to it, was adopted by every Oregon law enforcement agency.

The workgroup identified three purposes for data collection: 1) to evaluate the implementation of the new stop and search law; 2) to ensure the fair and equitable implementation of the law; and 3) to increase public awareness and confidence in the application of the law.

The data collection effort itself focused on three activities. The first was a public perception survey to ascertain how the general public and two specific minority groups viewed the new law and to determine the perceived extent of racially biased policing in Oregon. The second was to collect data on the types of complaints filed against law enforcement officers. The third was to encourage the development of a full traffic stop data collection effort.

In the furtherance of those efforts, the workgroup made its report to the 1999 Legislature along with several recommendations for further work. The Legislature did not act on those recommendations at that time.

In 2001, then-Rep. Vicki Walker introduced HB 2441 which would have required law enforcement agencies to collect traffic stop data and report the data to the state. A broad spectrum of interested parties deliberated on HB 2441. These discussions ultimately resulted in the passage of SB 415, which provided for voluntary data collection by law enforcement agencies and the formation of the LECC. The bill was supported unanimously by all interested parties and passed the Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The LECC officially convened February 5, 2002 and quickly established two subcommittees: Data Review and Community Relations. During the following year, the LECC received testimony and information from a variety of sources, including communities working to address data collection and community involvement issues, entities conducting state and national surveys related to racially biased policing, and agencies working on developing law enforcement training.

The Data Review Subcommittee solicited and received data from law enforcement agencies and did some preliminary analysis of that data. Methods to merge data contributed by individual agencies into a statewide database were developed and appropriate conclusions were drawn from the combined data. However, due to the lack of data from a broader base of agencies, it was not possible to draw statistically valid inferences from the data.

The Community Relations Subcommittee, which was co-chaired by Commissioner Annabelle Jaramillo and Chief Walt Myers, focused on involving police agencies and communities in discussions on racially biased policing issues. The committee also received information on a variety of approaches to community involvement activities, worked with experts in the field, and began the process of identifying methods and information.

As with many other agencies, budget reductions and the related state employee hiring freeze hindered the Committee's efforts to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. The level of staffing at the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) was not adequate to support the work of the LECC. Thus, the LECC suspended its efforts in February 2003. The hiatus lasted until early 2005 when the CJC contracted with the Criminal Justice

Policy Research Institute (CJPRI) at Portland State University for staff support. The LECC formally began meeting again on March 2, 2005.

The LECC was scheduled to sunset on December 31, 2007. The LECC in partnership with the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission helped draft Senate Bill 2102. SB 2102 makes the LECC permanent. It removed restrictions on data that the committee may receive and analyze. SB 2102 transfers administration of the committee from the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to Portland State University (see Appendix A).

In 2006-2007, the LECC in partnership with the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute and the Traffic Safety Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation have successfully been awarded two grants from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA-2006-23772). These grants will fund the activities of the LECC until 2011. The grant program is called the "Incentive Grant Program to Prohibit Racial Profiling" under section 1906 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Federal Register, Vol. 71, No. 22, pp. 5727-5729).



# LECC Activities 2007

---

## LECC Public Perception Survey:

---

### Purpose of Survey

The LECC has participated in four public opinion surveys of Oregon drivers about their perceptions of traffic stops from 2002 to 2005. The surveys were part of the Oregon Annual Social Indicators Survey (OASIS) which included questions regarding public perceptions of law enforcement. Because the number of people of color who participated in the statewide survey was so small, a survey extension of minority community perceptions was undertaken in 2005 in an effort to draw reliable conclusions about minority attitudes toward law enforcement.

The OASIS statewide public opinion survey is no longer being conducted. LECC believes it is important to continue monitoring Oregon citizens' perceptions regarding bias in law enforcement and stop experiences. In 2007, LECC continued this survey of Oregon residents regarding perceptions of law enforcement. The results of the 2007 survey are discussed in this section. LECC'S goal in designing this new survey was to replicate, as close as possible, the methodology used in the previous surveys to reliably compare potential changes in citizen perceptions over time. The tables presented in this report involve the same questions analyzed in previous LECC reports to examine possible temporal changes in perceptions. The report also contains tables on new questions asked for the first time in 2007.

### Survey Methodology

Appendix B contains a more detailed description of the survey methodology along with the full survey questionnaire.

The 2007 survey was conducted by the Portland State University Survey Research Lab (SRL) between August 17<sup>th</sup> and September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007. A statewide sample of 1,431 Oregonians was used within the following sub-samples:

- 792 random statewide surveys from throughout the state. This random sample contained 65 persons who were identified as minorities (i.e. Hispanic, African American, Asian, Native American, or mixed).
- 211 African-Americans;
- 218 non-African-Americans geographically matched to be from the same areas of the state as the African-American sample;
- 242 persons of Hispanic ethnicity from throughout the state (32 from the random sample and 210 from the extension sampling);

- 242 non-Hispanic White persons were randomly drawn from the state-wide random sample to match the exact counties that the Hispanic respondents came from.

In the previous survey reports, only respondents who had a driver's license or are frequent drivers are included in the analysis tables, which we continue to do with the 2007 data. The total number of respondents in each table varies, as those who refused to answer a given question or stated "don't know" were not included. Table 1 shows the sample sizes for each racial/ethnic sample group who had a driver's license in 2007 and are used in the analyses presented in Tables 2 through 13.

**Table 1.** Persons with Drivers Licenses by Racial/Ethnic Sample Type, 2007

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Sample size</b>	55	681
	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Sample size</b>	164	196
	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Sample size</b>	187	187

For each key question on the survey we include three different tables. The first table compares responses of Minorities (i.e. any mention of being Hispanic, African American, American Indian, Asian, or multi-racial/ethnic) to non-Hispanic Whites from the state-wide random sample of Oregon phone numbers. The second table compares African American respondents to non-African American respondents from the same census tracts. The data for the second table comes from the African American extension sample. The third table compares the responses of all persons who identify as Hispanic from the random statewide sample and all Hispanics from the Hispanic extension sample to randomly selected non-Hispanic Whites (chosen from the random sample) from the same counties. Each table also includes data for the previous years (2002-2005 for state-wide random sample) or year (2005 for African American and Hispanic extension samples) for which the question was asked.

The tables also indicate whether the differences in responses of the two racial/ethnic groups were "statistically significant" in the previous year and in 2007. Our use of the

term statistical significance means that if we were to repeat the test many times, one can be confident of seeing similar results each time. On the other hand, the actual difference observed may be small, and therefore the “social significance” of the finding from a policy-making standpoint may be questionable. In the following tables, a single asterisk next to the *year/s* ( \* ) denotes a 95% level of confidence in the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year, and a double asterisk ( \*\* ) denotes a 99% level of confidence. Additional statistical tests were done to examine if the responses given by African Americans and Hispanics from the extension samples in 2007 are significantly different from their responses in 2005. This final statistical test allows LECC to comment on whether any positive or negative changes in opinion for these two racial/ethnic groups represent significant shifts in attitude. The results of this over time comparison of opinions are provided in the narrative descriptions of the table results.

## Survey Findings

### Frequency of Traffic Stops

All of the Minority categories in the three different samples depicted in Table 2 reported having been stopped significantly more frequently than their comparison grouping. This finding has been consistent across all the survey years. Hispanic drivers report the highest frequency of being stopped in the past year (31%), followed by African Americans (29%), and then the Minority category in the random statewide survey (25%). The frequency of African American and Hispanic drivers stopped in 2007 was less than reported in 2005, particularly African American drivers (13% less frequently). The reduction in the frequency of African American drivers being stopped in 2007 is statistically significant. The biggest change for African American drivers was the number who reported being pulled over more than once, which declined by 9%. However, the frequency of minorities being stopped in Oregon is still much higher than national averages, which in 2005 showed 8.9% of non-Hispanic White drivers, 8.1% of African American drivers, and 8.9% of Hispanic drivers had been stopped during a 12-month period. (Reference: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cpp05.htm>.)

**Table 2.** Frequency of traffic stops in previous twelve months by minority status

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005**	2007*	2002-2005	2007
<b>None</b>	73%	75%	80%	86%
<b>Once</b>	14%	16%	14%	12%
<b>Twice or more</b>	13%	9%	6%	3%
<b>African American Extension Sample</b>				
	African American Extension Sample		Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>None</b>	59%	72%	76%	84%
<b>Once</b>	20%	17%	18%	14%
<b>Twice or more</b>	21%	12%	6%	3%
<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>				
	Hispanic Extension Sample		Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>None</b>	66%	70%	81%	85%
<b>Once</b>	19%	21%	13%	13%
<b>Twice or more</b>	15%	10%	6%	2%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "In the past 12 months, how many times have you been stopped by an Oregon police officer?"

### **Attitudes about the frequency of racial profiling**

Respondents were asked "How often, if at all, do you believe Oregon police officers allow race, ethnicity, or national origin to unfairly influence their decision to stop someone - never, rarely, sometimes, often, or always?" Minorities were more than twice as likely as their comparison group to feel that racial profiling occurs "often or always". All the Minority categories in the three samples hold significantly different attitudes about the frequency of racial profiling than their matched comparison group. This is particularly true for African American drivers who tended to believe that racial profiling is common practice, with 89% of respondents reporting a belief that it occurs sometimes, often, or always, although this is a reduction of 8% from 2005. There was a small reduction in the intensity of Minority, African American, and Hispanic beliefs about the frequency of racial profiling from previous survey years. This finding is particularly true among the Hispanic drivers surveyed. In 2005, 28% of Hispanic drivers felt police never use racial profiling compared to 42% who felt they never use it in 2007. These positive changes in attitudes by African American and Hispanic drivers about the frequency of racial profiling are a statistically significant shift from their 2005 opinions. Nonetheless, there is still a significant division between the beliefs of White drivers and Minority drivers regarding the frequency of racial profiling.

**Table 3. Perceptions of the frequency of racial profiling by minority status**

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005**	2007**	2002-2005	2007
<b>Never/Rarely</b>	33%	35%	42%	52%
<b>Sometimes</b>	38%	39%	42%	38%
<b>Often/Always</b>	29%	27%	16%	10%
<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>				
	African American Extension Sample		Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>Never/Rarely</b>	3%	11%	28%	27%
<b>Sometimes</b>	26%	24%	45%	48%
<b>Often/Always</b>	71%	66%	27%	25%
<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>				
	Hispanic Extension Sample		Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>Never/Rarely</b>	28%	42%	45%	55%
<b>Sometimes</b>	41%	32%	40%	37%
<b>Often/Always</b>	31%	27%	15%	8%

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "How often, if at all, do you believe Oregon police officers allow a person's race, ethnicity, or national origin to unfairly influence their decision to stop someone – never, rarely, sometimes, often, or always?"

## Changes in Fairness Over Time

The results in Table 4 support some of the conclusions we draw from Table 3, particularly the improved opinion of law enforcement fairness by African American drivers. For example, 50% of African American drivers in 2005 felt that law enforcement officers were less fair compared to 32% in 2007, and 4% (2005) compared to (10%) felt they were becoming more fair. These shifts in opinion by African American drivers were statistically significant. However, the perception of law enforcement fairness appears to be worsening among Hispanic drivers. More Hispanic drivers (13%) felt law enforcement was becoming less fair in 2007 than 2005 (4%). This change in opinion among Hispanic drivers was statistically significant.

**Table 4.** Change in fairness over the past year

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005	2007	2002-2005	2007
<b>More Fair</b>	NA	18%	NA	20%
<b>About the Same</b>	NA	67%	NA	74%
<b>Less Fair</b>	NA	14%	NA	7%
<b>Subgroup Analysis</b>				
	African American Extension Sample		Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>More Fair</b>	4%	10%	16%	17%
<b>About the Same</b>	46%	59%	75%	75%
<b>Less Fair</b>	50%	32%	9%	9%
<b>Subgroup Analysis</b>				
	Hispanic Extension Sample		Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2005*	2007**	2005	2007
<b>More Fair</b>	32%	29%	22%	22%
<b>About the Same</b>	64%	58%	70%	74%
<b>Less Fair</b>	4%	13%	8%	4%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "In the last twelve months, do you believe Oregon police officers overall have been more fair, less fair, or about the same in whether they allow race, ethnicity, or national origin to unfairly influence their decision to stop someone?"

## Beliefs about Oregon police officers

Minority respondents in 2007 view Oregon police more positively and less negatively than 2005, although these changes in opinion were not statistically significant. For example, there was a 9% reduction in state-wide Minorities who viewed police officers negatively in 2007 and 15% reduction in African American drivers who viewed police officers negatively. There was a 13% increase in Hispanic drivers who viewed the police positively in 2007. African American drivers held significantly more negative opinions of Oregon police than matched non-African American drivers. However, statewide Minorities and Hispanic drivers did not hold significantly different opinions of Oregon police officers than Whites in 2007, but did differ in opinions in the 2005 survey.

**Table 5.** Beliefs about Oregon police by minority status

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005**	2007	2002-2005	2007
<b>Positive</b>	55%	59%	67%	69%
<b>Neutral</b>	30%	33%	24%	24%
<b>Negative</b>	16%	7%	9%	8%
	African American Extension Sample		Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>Positive</b>	18%	26%	58%	53%
<b>Neutral</b>	39%	46%	28%	37%
<b>Negative</b>	43%	28%	14%	10%
	Hispanic Extension Sample		Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2005**	2007	2005	2007
<b>Positive</b>	52%	65%	65%	69%
<b>Neutral</b>	41%	29%	24%	22%
<b>Negative</b>	7%	7%	11%	9%

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "Overall, when you think about Oregon police officers, are your feelings generally positive, generally negative, or are they neutral?"



**Relationship between attitudes toward the police and whether or not the driver had been stopped**

Looking at opinions toward police in relation to race and whether the driver had been stopped, there appears to be a relationship between being stopped and holding less positive values of the police, but not necessarily more negative values. African American drivers were the only grouping to show a significantly lower opinion of Oregon police officers than their comparison group in 2007.

**Table 6.** Beliefs about Oregon police by minority status

	State-wide Minorities				State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites			
	2005		2007		2005		2007	
	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St
<b>Positive</b>	56%	47%	65%	43%	66%	58%	70%	59%
<b>Neutral</b>	33%	32%	28%	50%	24%	29%	23%	29%
<b>Negative</b>	12%	21%	8%	7%	10%	14%	7%	12%
	African American Extension Sample				Geo-Matched Non-African Americans			
	2005**		2007**		2005		2007	
	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St
<b>Positive</b>	25%	7%	27%	24%	57%	62%	55%	44%
<b>Neutral</b>	39%	40%	50%	38%	31%	18%	36%	47%
<b>Negative</b>	36%	53%	24%	38%	12%	20%	10%	9%
	Hispanic Extension Sample				Non-Hispanic Whites			
	2005**		2007		2005		2007	
	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St	NSt	St
<b>Positive</b>	52%	52%	67%	60%	66%	57%	70%	66%
<b>Neutral</b>	42%	39%	27%	32%	25%	29%	21%	24%
<b>Negative</b>	7%	9%	6%	9%	10%	14%	9%	10%

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

(NSt: not stopped, St: stopped).

Question: "Overall, when you think about Oregon police officers, are your feelings generally positive, generally negative, or are they neutral?"

## Believe Reason for Stop was Not Real Reason

Minorities in the state-wide survey, African Americans, and Hispanics who were stopped by police in 2007 were significantly more likely to believe the reason for the stop was not the real reason in comparison to non-Hispanic Whites and non-African Americans. Fifty-four percent of Minority drivers, 73% of African American drivers, and 37% of Hispanic drivers believed they were not told the real reason for their stop compared to roughly 10% of non-Hispanic White drivers who felt the same way.

**Table 7.** Believe reason provided for stop was different than the real reason

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005	2007**	2002-2005	2007
<b>Yes</b>	31%	54%	21%	12%
<b>No</b>	69%	46%	79%	88%
	African American Extension Sample		Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
	2005**	2007**	2005	2007
<b>Yes</b>	73%	73%	18%	13%
<b>No</b>	27%	27%	82%	87%
	Hispanic Extension Sample		Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2005	2007*	2005	2007
<b>Yes</b>	41%	37%	26%	10%
<b>No</b>	59%	63%	74%	90%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "Did you ever believe that the real reason you were stopped was different than the reason the officer gave you?"

## **Frequency of Being Searched in a Traffic Stop**

Only Minority drivers in the statewide survey report a significantly different frequency of being searched. Minority drivers in the statewide survey were more likely to be searched one or more times in 2007 (21%) than 2005 (12%). Twenty-one percent of Minority drivers who were stopped by police were searched one or more times, nine percent of African American drivers stopped were searched one or more times, and eighteen percent of Hispanic drivers stopped were searched one or more time. African American drivers were less likely to be searched in 2007 (9%) compared to 2005 (24%), although this did not represent a statistically significant change, and the frequency of searches for Hispanic drivers remained the same. Although a number of these differences do not equate to a statistically significant difference this is due to the low numbers of drivers who are stopped in the first place. The greater frequency of minority drivers being searched is consistent with traffic stop data analyzed by LECC.

The national figures for drivers' experience of searches showed similar patterns to those found in Oregon: nationally, 3.6% of non-Hispanic whites who were stopped by the police experienced a search of themselves or their vehicle, compared to 9.5% of African American drivers who had been stopped and 8.8% of Hispanic drivers who had been stopped. (Reference: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/cpp05.htm>.)

**Table 8.** Frequency of search following a traffic stop by minority status

	State-wide Minorities		State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites	
	2002-2005**	2007**	2002-2005	2007
<b>None</b>	88%	79%	94%	98%
<b>Once</b>	6%	14%	5%	1%
<b>Twice or more</b>	6%	7%	2%	1%
<b>African American Extension Sample</b>				
	2005	2007	Geo-Matched Non-African Americans	
			2005	2007
<b>None</b>	76%	91%	87%	91%
<b>Once</b>	12%	2%	7%	9%
<b>Twice or more</b>	12%	7%	6%	0%
<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>				
	2005	2007	Non-Hispanic Whites	
			2005	2007
<b>None</b>	82%	83%	93%	97%
<b>Once</b>	11%	14%	6%	0%
<b>Twice or more</b>	7%	4%	1%	3%

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "When you were stopped in the past 12 months, did the officer search you, your vehicle, or someone accompanying you?"

## Perceptions of Traffic Stop Experiences

The next grouping of tables (Table 9 through Table 12) contains new questions that were not asked in previous surveys. These questions were only asked of respondents who were stopped by police to learn whether Minorities and Whites perceive different stop experiences.

**Table 9. Officer clearly explained why you were stopped**

Statewide Minorities, African American, and Hispanic drivers expressed significantly different feelings than non-Hispanic Whites regarding the clarity of the officer's explanation for why they were stopped. African Americans were more likely to disagree (37%) that the officer was clear about why they were stopped and 14% of Hispanic respondents disagreed that the officer was clear in their explanation of the stop.

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007**</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	7%	8%
<b>Neutral</b>	21%	2%
<b>Agree</b>	71%	90%
	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007**</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	37%	6%
<b>Neutral</b>	11%	9%
<b>Agree</b>	52%	84%
	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007*</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	14%	3%
<b>Neutral</b>	12%	0%
<b>Agree</b>	74%	97%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

\*\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (99% level of confidence).

Question: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The officer clearly explained why you were stopped?"

**Table 10. Officer answered all your questions**

Minorities in the state-wide random sample expressed significantly different feeling about whether the officer answered all their questions. For example, 33% of state-wide Minorities stopped disagreed with the statement that the Officer answered all their questions as did 35% of African American drivers stopped.

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007*</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	33%	6%
<b>Neutral</b>	8%	8%
<b>Agree</b>	58%	86%
	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	35%	10%
<b>Neutral</b>	12%	17%
<b>Agree</b>	54%	73%
	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	17%	0%
<b>Neutral</b>	11%	10%
<b>Agree</b>	72%	90%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

Question: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The officer answered all of your questions?"

**Table 11. Officer was polite**

Statewide Minority, African American, and Hispanic drivers who were stopped were twice as likely (21% to 10%) as White drivers who were stopped to disagree that the officer who stopped them was polite. However, close to two-thirds of Minority drivers agree the officer who stopped them was polite.

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	21%	10%
<b>Neutral</b>	14%	11%
<b>Agree</b>	64%	79%
	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	22%	9%
<b>Neutral</b>	17%	9%
<b>Agree</b>	61%	81%
	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	21%	3%
<b>Neutral</b>	7%	7%
<b>Agree</b>	72%	90%

Question: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The officer was polite?"

**Table 12. Officer was professional**

Statewide Minority, African American, and Hispanic drivers who were stopped were also twice as likely (14%, 20%, and 11%) as White drivers who were stopped to disagree that the officer who stopped them was professional.

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	14%	7%
<b>Neutral</b>	7%	10%
<b>Agree</b>	79%	83%
	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007*</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	20%	9%
<b>Neutral</b>	22%	6%
<b>Agree</b>	59%	84%
	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	11%	0%
<b>Neutral</b>	9%	7%
<b>Agree</b>	81%	93%

\* = the difference between the two races/ethnicities for that year is statistically significant (95% level of confidence).

Question: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The officer was professional?"



**Table 13. Demographic information about the survey sample (only persons with drivers license or frequent driver)**

	<b>State-wide Minorities</b>	<b>State-wide Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Average Age</b>	45	56
<b>Male</b>	46%	39%
<b>Female</b>	55%	61%
<b>Less than High School or GED</b>	15%	3.7%
<b>High School or GED</b>	22%	23%
<b>Some College</b>	20%	26%
<b>Associates Degree</b>	11%	11%
<b>Bachelors Degree</b>	25%	24%
<b>Graduate Degree</b>	7%	16%
<b>Employed full-time</b>	56%	38%
<b>Employed part-time</b>	13%	12%
<b>Housemaker or stay-at-home parent</b>	7%	8%
<b>Disabled (not able to work)</b>	4%	5%
<b>Retired</b>	20%	35%
<b>Unemployed or looking for work</b>	0%	3%
<b>Less than \$15,000</b>	11%	8%
<b>\$15,000 to \$25,000</b>	25%	10%
<b>\$25,000 to \$50,000</b>	23%	31%
<b>\$50,000 to \$75,000</b>	17%	23%
<b>\$75,000 or more</b>	26%	28%

	<b>African American Extension Sample</b>	<b>Geo-Matched Non-African Americans</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Average Age</b>	56	48
<b>Male</b>	37%	42%
<b>Female</b>	63%	58%
<b>Less than High School or GED</b>	7%	0%
<b>High School or GED</b>	17%	13%
<b>Some College</b>	42%	22%
<b>Associates Degree</b>	12%	6%
<b>Bachelors Degree</b>	12%	33%
<b>Graduate Degree</b>	9%	26%
<b>Employed full-time</b>	34%	49%
<b>Employed part-time</b>	15%	18%
<b>Housemaker or stay-at-home parent</b>	3%	7%
<b>Disabled (not able to work)</b>	6%	4%
<b>Retired</b>	35%	16%
<b>Unemployed or looking for work</b>	7%	7%
<b>Less than \$15,000</b>	17%	8%
<b>\$15,000 to \$25,000</b>	15%	13%
<b>\$25,000 to \$50,000</b>	39%	27%
<b>\$50,000 to \$75,000</b>	13%	30%
<b>\$75,000 or more</b>	17%	22%

	<b>Hispanic Extension Sample</b>	<b>Non-Hispanic Whites</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Average Age</b>	36	57
<b>Male</b>	47%	40%
<b>Female</b>	54%	60%
<b>Less than High School or GED</b>	37%	3%
<b>High School or GED</b>	35%	23%
<b>Some College</b>	16%	27%
<b>Associates Degree</b>	5%	11%
<b>Bachelors Degree</b>	5%	21%
<b>Graduate Degree</b>	2%	13%
<b>Employed full-time</b>	57%	34%
<b>Employed part-time</b>	14%	9%
<b>Housemaker or stay-at-home parent</b>	17%	8%
<b>Disabled (not able to work)</b>	3%	8%
<b>Retired</b>	3%	38%
<b>Unemployed or looking for work</b>	6%	4%
<b>Less than \$15,000</b>	22%	11%
<b>\$15,000 to \$25,000</b>	31%	10%
<b>\$25,000 to \$50,000</b>	33%	36%
<b>\$50,000 to \$75,000</b>	8%	18%
<b>\$75,000 or more</b>	5%	25%

## **Corvallis PD Stop Data Trends 2002-2006:**

---

**Executive Summary:** (Detailed tables appear in Technical Report in Appendix C)

### **Introduction**

The Law Enforcement Contacts Committee (LECC) has completed its examination of five years worth of traffic stop data collected by the Corvallis Police Department (2002-2006), Hillsboro Police Department (2001-2005) and the Oregon State Police (2001-2005). This report focuses on the latest data submitted to the LECC by the Corvallis Police Department. The long-term dedication to the collection of stop data among these three agencies is unprecedented for Oregon and the nation too. Having five years of data from three diverse law enforcement agencies allows for better scientific precision, enables us to look at changes in stop and search behaviors over time, and provides important comparative conclusions.

This Executive Summary briefly summarizes the LECC's primary research questions when analyzing a department's traffic stop data and the results we find in the Corvallis stop data and a comparison to findings in Hillsboro and OSP. Following the Executive Summary is a more detailed Technical Report which contains more information on the study methodology and detailed tables of results.

The analyses in this research report focus on the following 6 questions:

- Are there changes over time in the percent of traffic stops attributed to any racial/ethnic group?
- Are there changes over time in the percent of searches experienced by drivers of any racial/ethnic group?
- Are any racial/ethnic groups overrepresented in traffic stops compared to their percentage of the driving population?
- Are any racial/ethnic drivers more likely to experience a search resulting from a traffic stop?
- Are there significant differences in the likelihood of racial/ethnic drivers being found with something criminal during a search resulting from a traffic stop?
- Are there any significant differences in the disposition (e.g. warning, citation, arrest) of traffic stops by race/ethnicity of drivers?

### **Results Summary**

What follows is a brief summary of the research findings in the Corvallis traffic stop data for each of the above questions. For more detailed results information please refer to the Technical Report following this review.

*Are there significant changes over time in the percent of traffic stops attributed to any racial/ethnic group (Table 1, p.74)?*

**Yes – for Hispanic and White drivers only.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ A significant *decrease* in the percentage of traffic stops from 2002-2004 to 2005-2006 involving Hispanic drivers.
- ✓ A significant *increase* in the percentage of traffic stops from 2002-2004 to 2005-2006 involving White drivers.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): The Hillsboro data from 2001-2005 also saw a significant decrease in the percentage of traffic stops involving Hispanic drivers. Neither Hillsboro nor OSP saw an increase in the percentage of traffic stops involving White drivers.

*Are there significant changes over time in the percent of searches experienced by drivers of any racial/ethnic group (Table 2, p. 75)?*

**Yes – for drivers of “some other race” only.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ A significant increase, from 2% of stops in 2002-2004 to 6.5% of stops in 2005-2006, in the likelihood that drivers coded as “some other race” would be searched during a traffic stop.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): The OSP data exhibited a significant increase in the likelihood that every racial category of drivers would be searched during a stop from 2001-2003 to 2004-2005. The Hillsboro data showed a significant decrease for African American, Hispanic, and White drivers in the likelihood that they would be searched during a stop when comparing searches from 2001-2003 to 2004-2005

*Are any racial/ethnic groups dramatically overrepresented in traffic stops compared to their percentage of the driving population (Table 1, p. 74)?*

**No.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ Racial/ethnic populations are not dramatically overrepresented in stops conducted by Corvallis Police Department when compared to their percentage of the population aged 16 and older. The largest overrepresented groups were African Americans who comprise 2.1% of all traffic stops and 1.2% of the driving age population. Drivers classified as some other race comprise 0.6% of the population, but 2.8% of drivers pulled over. White drivers comprise 84% of the driving age population and 87% of drivers pulled over.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): The same conclusion was reached in the Hillsboro and OSP data. In contrast, the Portland Police Bureau finds that 14% of their traffic stops in 2006 were of African Americans, who comprise 6% of the Portland population aged 18 and older.

*Are any racial/ethnic drivers more likely to experience a search resulting from a traffic stop? (Table 2, 4, & 5 pp. 75 & 78)*

**Yes – Hispanic and African American drivers are more likely to be searched.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ Hispanic and African American drivers are significantly more likely to be searched than Whites and all other racial/ethnic groupings combined. 8.3% of all traffic stops of Hispanic drivers involved a search and 7% of traffic stops of African American drivers involved a search.
- ✓ Asian and White drivers are significantly less likely to be searched when compared to all other racial/ethnic groupings.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): Hispanic and African American drivers were also significantly more likely to be searched in the Hillsboro and OSP data. 3.5% of Hillsboro traffic stops of African Americans involved a search and 4.8% of Hispanic drivers involved a search. 3.8% of OSP traffic stops of African Americans involved a search and 5% of Hispanic drivers involved a search.

*Are there significant differences in the likelihood of racial/ethnic drivers being found with something criminal during a search resulting from a traffic stop (Table 3, 4, 5, pp. 77 & 78)?*

**No – Searches of African American and Hispanic drivers were not more likely to yield something criminal than searches of White drivers.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ Searches of African American and Hispanic drivers were not more likely to yield something criminal than searches of White drivers.

- ✓ However, when specific criminal activities were examined the data reveal that searches of Hispanic drivers are significantly more likely to yield contraband (e.g. stolen goods) than searches of White drivers and all other racial/ethnic groupings combined.
- ✓ In addition, White drivers were significantly more likely to be found with drugs than all other racial/ethnic groupings.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): In contrast, searches of White drivers in Hillsboro and OSP revealed that they were more likely to find something criminal, especially drugs.

*Are there any significant differences in the disposition (e.g. warning, citation, arrest) of traffic stops by race/ethnicity of drivers (Table 6-11 pp. 80-83)?*

**Yes.**

The Corvallis data indicate:

- ✓ Hispanic and African American drivers who are stopped are significantly more likely to receive a warning and be arrested, but less likely to receive a citation compared to Whites and all other racial/ethnic groupings combined.

(Hillsboro/OSP comparison): This finding is similar to the Hillsboro data where we found that Hispanic drivers are more likely to receive a warning and less likely to receive citation. OSP data indicates an opposite finding; Hispanic and African American drivers were less likely to receive warning and citation.

### **What Can We Conclude**

The conclusions we can derive from the Corvallis Police Department are virtually identical to the conclusions we formed with the Hillsboro and OSP data. First, the above data trends and findings do not prove that Corvallis, as with Hillsboro and OSP, engages in racial profiling or practices biased policing, nor does the data disprove such behavior may be occurring. Secondly, the data do indicate that there are some significant differences in how racial/ethnic minorities are stopped and searched; and differences in search and disposition outcomes across race/ethnicity. The dedication of Corvallis, Hillsboro, and OSP to collect stop data, which are arguably some of the longest-running data collection efforts in the nation, should be praised. This data helps us to understand long-term changes in traffic stop behaviors and allows contrasts to be made between diverse law enforcement agencies. Without this data we would not be able to have well-rounded and better informed discussions about the concerns of biased-based policing.

We highlight below some of the consistent findings across these three diverse departments and the 5 years worth of traffic stop data they have provided LECC:

- 1) There can be significant fluctuations over time in how groupings of racial/ethnic drivers are stopped and searched.
  - a. However, it is difficult to determine whether such fluctuation is the product of a new policy, strategy, or training.
  - b. Alternatively, these changes over time could be based on changes in how officers record the race of the driver. This concern is particularly relevant to Corvallis where we find a significant increase in Native Americans who are stopped, but only in 2006. The “some other race” category is another area where coding differences may emerge and is difficult to create an accurate baseline measure for.
  - c. Another potential explanation is that changes in stops are the result of demographic changes over time.
  
- 2) The Corvallis traffic stop data confirm our finding that the most dramatic forms of overrepresentation in stop data occur in the likelihood of racial/ethnic minorities being searched (not stopped), particularly for Hispanic drivers, but African Americans also.
  - a. The Corvallis data provide the most information of any Oregon police department on the search authority of each search and who/what was searched. We hope to use this data to further our understanding of search decisions.
  
- 3) Although White drivers are less likely to be searched, they are generally more likely to be found with something criminal, especially drugs.
  - a. The issue of racial profiling was brought to national attention after it was discovered that some police departments had received training that the “common drug runner” was African American or Hispanic. The LECC finding on the race of drivers more likely to be found with drugs continues to contradict that stereotype.

### **Corvallis Compared to Other Agencies**

There are two important similarities between the Corvallis PD data and the data analyzed from OSP and Hillsboro PD that the LECC would like to emphasize. First, African American and Hispanic drivers in all three data sources are significantly more likely to be subjects of a search than White drivers. The consistency of this finding is also supported by the LECC public perceptions survey which also finds African American and Hispanic drivers report being searched at a higher frequency. Second, despite being searched more often, searches of African American and Hispanic drivers are not more likely to yield criminal evidence (e.g. drugs, alcohol, contraband, weapons) than searches of White drivers. In contrast, drugs are significantly more likely to be found during searches of White drivers across all three data sources.



## LECC Traffic Stop Data System (TSD)

---

“It’s the goal of this state that all law enforcement agencies perform their missions without inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement actions. This goal maybe achieved by providing assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies and the communities that they serve.” (SB 2102)

LECC’s 2006 survey of law enforcement agencies discovered a need among 20 agencies for technical assistance related to developing a traffic stop recording system, analysis of traffic stop data, and reporting of traffic stop data to the broader community. The LECC analysis of traffic stop data from OSP, Hillsboro PD, and Corvallis PD revealed a number of data limitations with the basic traffic stop data being collected in Oregon. These issues pointed towards a need to, 1) develop standardized procedures for collecting and analyzing basic and more complex stop data that law enforcement agencies could collect, and 2) to make the collection, storage, and analysis of stop data as simple as possible so that agencies could perform their own analyses and generate reports.

In response to these needs LECC has developed what we call the *Traffic Stop Data System (TSD)*

The system is principally geared towards agencies that are not currently collecting stop data or agencies that wish to change the way they are collecting data. However, agencies that are already collecting data will be interested in the analysis guidance part of the system. We know from experience that each agency currently collecting stop data has idiosyncratic methods for data collection and storage, thus the system is malleable enough to address such needs and LECC will provide such technical assistance.

One of the many challenges faced by local agencies interested in this topic is accessing data suitable for analysis. Agencies either do not record information on traffic stops or the data that are presently recorded may be insufficient to accurately determine whether there is racial disparity. Additionally, there is no standardization in data collection or analytic techniques in the state, making it difficult to make comparisons over time or across different regions. For these reasons the LECC has developed a model system for collecting, managing, and analyzing traffic stop data.

The *Traffic Stop Data (TSD)* system consists of a field reporting instrument, a Microsoft Access database for entering and managing records and a Microsoft Excel file that can be used to analyze and interpret data on racial disparity. Our primary goal has been the creation of a data collection system that requires a **minimal level of training** and **reduces staff burdens** regarding data entry, analysis, and report generation. A second goal was to design a system that can be used for other operational analyses and reports beyond those that pertain to bias and discrimination issues.

Below are the specific components of the Traffic Stop Data System:

- **Data Collection Form:** The reporting instrument was designed to be easily completed by law enforcement personnel in the field. There are two data collection forms presented here. The first form represents the minimum data collection points recommended by the LECC (see Appendix D). This form allows a more simple recording process for officers; however, it provides limited information on stop characteristics. The second data collection form allows for a much more thorough examination of stop characteristics and exploration of important questions regarding the context of stops (see Appendix E). These data forms can also be used for programming mobile data transfer systems or CAD systems to automate the data recording and storage process, which is the preferred method of recording traffic stops. The forms can also be used as pencil scantron forms filled out by officers. LECC is willing to scan and analyze the data submitted by any agency adopting a scantron system. Once trained and familiarized with the process of either data collection form officers should be able to complete the form in just a couple of minutes. Fields included on the form are based on recommendations from national experts in racial disparity. The additional fields in the more complex form were added to provide data for operational analyses that may prove useful to agencies. Finally, the form is designed to facilitate data entry by using numbers next to each box. Modifications to the form can be easily made to tailor the system to each agencies use. However, changing the form will require that changes be made to the accompanying database.
- **Database:** Data from the traffic stop forms can be quickly entered into a single desk-top database using Microsoft Access. Different database forms are provided for entering new records and for reviewing existing data. Fields have also been set up to reduce data entry errors, like adding incorrect dates and out of range values. Depending on an agency's needs, the database may be customized to capture additional information. The sample database provided contains over 30,000 records modified from a real dataset. These are the same records that were used in creating the analysis and presentation files detailed below. A brief video demonstration to operating the database is also available.
- **Traffic Stop Analysis System:** Once data has been entered into the Microsoft Access database it can be easily exported to Microsoft Excel for analysis. The Excel file provided above contains all of the tables, statistical tests, and graphs that an agency might need to determine whether racial disparity is present. The analyses available are those recommended by experts in this field. To use the system an agency needs to run just of few analyses using the Excel Pivottable command. The results of these analyses are then transferred into the tables on each worksheet, and the rest of the cells are filled in automatically including the text-based interpretations of the findings. In addition, a brief video demonstration of the analysis process is available.

- **Sample Racial Disparity Report:** The tables and graphs created in Microsoft Excel can easily be copied and pasted into a PowerPoint presentation template. Examples of the tables and discussion regarding findings are contained within the template.
- **Sample Administrative Analysis Report:** The data collected on traffic stops has uses beyond just racial disparity reports. For example, using this system it is possible to compare officers on the number of reports filed and the characteristics of their stops. Similarly, agencies might find it useful to track how many people are arrested each year as a result of traffic stops and the types of contraband found. Examples of these analyses are provided in this sample report.
- **Oregon 2000 Census Data:** In order to determine whether racial disparity exists, an agency must know two things; how many minorities were stopped and are minorities being stopped at rates exceeding their prevalence in the population? To answer these questions agencies need to have some kind of benchmark for comparison to their stop data. The most common benchmark used by agencies is Census data. Agencies will be provided with a detailed 2000 Census file for every town and county in Oregon.

## “Perspectives on Profiling” Curriculum

---

In 2006, the LECC conducted a survey of all Oregon law enforcement agencies. Part of the survey was used to determine the types of training programs that address issues of racial/ethnic bias in policing. The following results were found regarding the character of training in Oregon related to racial bias issues in policing:

- In 2006, there was wide variation in the types, breadth and formality of training related to racial bias that was occurring throughout the state.
- In 2006, there was no uniform consistency to the delivery and content of training that address the issues concerning racial and ethnic biases in policing.
- In 2006, twenty-five Oregon law enforcement agencies reported some training obstacles or difficulties. Overwhelmingly, the primary difficulty that was expressed was a need for more training and better training.

Based on this feedback and reviews of training curricula around the country, the LECC has identified a training curriculum that can be used for the entire state. The LECC purchased the **Perspectives on Profiling™ curriculum** designed by the Tools for Tolerance® for Law Enforcement at the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Museum.

Since 2005 Oregon law enforcement agencies and LECC members have been trained on a curriculum entitled “Perspectives on Profiling”. Perspectives on Profiling™ is an interactive virtual learning experience that compels users to make critical choices in testing situations. The program is designed for police managers, mid-level supervisors, training officers, and line officers. It is part of the Tools for Tolerance® for Law Enforcement at the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Museum of Tolerance. The interactive video is a cutting edge training tool that is sensitive to the challenges that face law enforcement both in reality and in the management of public perception.

The presentation involves real life situational choices and confronts a number of complex issues that surround the debate on biased traffic stops:

When is race an appropriate factor in a profile? What is the role of probable cause? How are statistics used and misused to predict behavior? How can intuitive powers be utilized without unintentional bias? How are racist undertones identified within a department’s culture? What can be done to avoid escalation in racially-charged stops?

LECC members who have examined different training curriculum across the country uniformly agree the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum is the best available tool on the market. In addition, Salem, Portland, and Eugene police departments had previously purchased the curriculum to use for in-service training and support its quality and utility. The LECC decided the best approach to spreading the use of the curriculum across the state would be to purchase the curriculum for the entire state. In the summer of 2007,

the LECC purchased the curriculum for the state. This purchase allows the state to train any law enforcement officer and agency with Perspectives on Profiling indefinitely. The purchase and utilization of this curriculum will address LECC's concern that there is a uniform approach to addressing issues of bias and profiling in police training. Our principal goal over the next few years is to expose as many agencies and officers throughout the state to the training using regional and in-service formats. We will also be seeking feedback from the trainees to assess their perceptions of the utility of the training for their daily work and professional development. The feedback will be utilized to improve curriculum delivery.

### **Perspectives on Profiling Trainers**

The Perspectives on Profiling curriculum is unique and requires extensive training by the Wiesenthal Museum for Tolerance to properly understand the best approaches for delivering the curriculum effectively. In June of 2007, the LECC sent 16 Oregon law enforcement, DPSST, government officials, and citizens to receive Wiesenthal's Train-the-Trainer program on Perspectives. The total number of qualified trainers for the Perspectives curriculum in the entire state is 37. These qualified trainers represent 7 law enforcement agencies and DPSST. In September 2007, 10 of these trainers gathered for a discussion regarding the best avenues for spreading this training through regional and in-service trainings throughout the state. The results of the discussion have lead to a 2008 regional training plan presented below.

### **Perspectives on Profiling Demonstration**

The LECC's first use of the curriculum occurred July 2, 2007. Law enforcement leaders, DPSST board members, and government officials were invited to partake in a training using the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum. The Wiesenthal Museum for Tolerance sent two of their best trainers, both working in California law enforcement, to deliver the curriculum. The event trained 23 law enforcement and government officials using the Perspectives on Profiling. The attendees included four Police Chiefs, two Sheriffs, the Director of DPSST, Director of OSSA, and Portland's FBI Special Agent in Charge. Nine police agencies were represented among the attendees. The feedback from the training was generally positive. DPSST, OSSA, and OACP have pledged to help with spreading the training. All agreed that the training is appropriate for in-service and other required training certification.

## 2008 Regional Training Plan

Regional training for the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum will begin in April 2008. Suzanne Isham (DPSST's Regional Training Coordinator), Lt. Henry Reiman (Hillsboro PD), and Brian Renauer (LECC staff) have worked out the following tentative schedule for regional training in 2008. All interested trainers will be meeting January 24, 2008 to work on standardization of the curriculum for six hour regional training sessions. At this meeting we will pair up two trainers who can commit to 2 of the 8 regional trainings we have planned. DPSST will work with LECC, OSSA, and OACP to advertise and promote the trainings.

A regional training session will be for one day and run from 8:00 to 15:00 with breaks and lunch. Our plan is to have a pair of trainers deliver 2 back-to-back one-day training sessions at two different, but close locations. The following table shows the tentative training months and locations for the 8 regional trainings.

Date	Activity	Location
January 24, 2008	Trainer Refresher Course (goal is to get all the trainers together to work on consistency and pairing up for the regional trainings)	DPSST
April 2008	Regional Training # 1: Day 1: Travel & Prep (Coos Bay) Day 2: Coos Bay Training (8:00-15:00) Day 3: Eugene Training (8:00-15:00)	Coos Bay and Eugene
May 2008	Regional Training # 2 Day 1: Travel & Prep (Pendleton) Day 2: Pendleton Training (8:00-15:00) Day 3: The Dalles Training (8:00-15:00)	Pendleton & The Dalles
June 2008	Regional Training # 3 Day 1: Travel & Prep (Klamath Falls) Day 2: Klamath Falls Training (8:00-15:00) Day 3: Grants Pass Training (8:00-15:00)	Klamath Falls & Grants Pass
June 2008	Regional Training # 4 Day 1: Travel & Prep (Bend) Day 2: Bend Training (8:00-15:00) Day 3: Jefferson County Training (8:00-15:00)	Bend & Jefferson County

## Conclusions, Recommendations and Future Tasks

---

The year of 2007 has been an important year for the LECC, particularly with our desire to advance technical assistance to agencies collecting or desiring to collect traffic stop data and advancing training throughout the state. We look forward to implementing our eight regional training events in 2008 and working with interested agencies on the LECC Traffic Stop Data system.

Here are some important conclusions and recommendations for 2007.

- 1) The development of LECC's Traffic Stop Data system will help foster consistency in analysis and external reporting of traffic stop data. We hope to work with interested agencies in 2008 who are already collecting traffic stop data to assist them with any analysis or reporting needs.
- 2) LECC's Traffic Stop Data system will also foster a more thorough and accurate examination of searches following a traffic stop. We hope to find at least one interested agency in 2008 willing to collect search information using the TSD approach.
- 3) Survey research of Oregon citizens continues to illustrate a significant gap in opinion related to fairness of Oregon law enforcement across race and ethnicity. African Americans and Hispanics in Oregon also continue to report being stopped at a significantly higher rate than Whites and at frequencies much higher than national surveys. However, there is some indication that positive opinions regarding Oregon law enforcement are increasing throughout the state.
- 4) The Perspectives on Profiling curriculum brings a needed standardization in training on racial profiling and police bias issues to the state. In 2008 we will be implementing eight regional trainings. In addition, we recommend that the Perspectives on Profiling also be used for in-service training requirements and hopefully we'll identify two agencies willing to have such a program.

Based on these conclusions and recommendations the proposed 2008 work plan for LECC entails the following:

- 1) Identify and train two interested agencies already collecting traffic stop data on the TSD analysis and reporting programs.
- 2) Identify and train one interested agency that already collects traffic stop data to change the way they record search information to reflect the TSD approach.
- 3) Identify and train one interested agency that is not already collecting traffic stop data to utilize the TSD system.

- 4) Carry out eight regional training sessions throughout Oregon using the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum. Seek officer feedback on the training both during training and a follow-up after training.
- 5) Identify and deliver two in-service trainings to interested agencies using the Perspective on Profiling curriculum.



## Appendix A: HB2102

74th OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY--2007 Regular Session  
**House Bill 2102**

Ordered printed by the Speaker pursuant to House Rule 12.00A (5). Pre-session filed (at the request of Governor Theodore R. Kulongoski for Oregon Criminal Justice Commission)

### SUMMARY

The following summary is not prepared by the sponsors of the measure and is not a part of the body thereof subject to consideration by the Legislative Assembly. It is an editor's brief statement of the essential features of the measure **as introduced**.

Makes Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee permanent. Removes restrictions on data that committee may receive and analyze.  
Transfers administration of committee from Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to Portland State University.  
Declares emergency, effective on passage.

1 **A BILL FOR AN ACT**

2 Relating to Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee; amending sections 6,  
3 and 8, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001; repealing section 11, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001;  
4 and  
5 declaring an emergency.

6 **Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:**

7 **SECTION 1. Section 11, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001, is repealed.**

8 **SECTION 2.** Section 6, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001, is amended to read:

9 **Sec. 6.** (1) There is created the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee  
10 consisting of 11 members appointed by the Governor [*on or before October 1, 2001*].

11 (2) The purpose of the committee is to receive and analyze demographic data to ensure that law  
12 enforcement agencies perform their missions without inequitable or unlawful discrimination based  
13 on race, color or national origin.

14 (3) To achieve its purpose, the committee shall collect and analyze demographic data to:

15 (a) Provide information to assist communities and state and local law enforcement agencies in  
16 evaluating the policies, training and procedures of law enforcement agencies regarding the treat  
17 ment of individuals during stops and other contacts with law enforcement;

18 (b) Inform state and local law enforcement agencies and communities about law enforcement  
19 practices; and

20 (c) Provide opportunities for communities and state and local law enforcement agencies to work  
21 together to increase public trust and confidence in law enforcement and to enhance the capacity  
22 of communities and law enforcement agencies to provide more effective public safety services.

23 (4) The committee shall:

(a) Solicit demographic data concerning law enforcement stops and other contacts between state

- 24 and local law enforcement agencies and individuals;
- 25 (b) Publicize programs, procedures and policies from communities that have made progress to
- 26 ward eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin during law enforcement
- 27 stops
- 27 and other contacts with individuals;
- 28 (c) Provide technical assistance, including refinement of the minimum data elements as neces
- 29 sary for effective analysis, to state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to begin collect-

**NOTE:** Matter in **boldfaced** type in an amended section is new; matter [*italic and bracketed*] is existing law to be omitted.

New sections are in **boldfaced** type.

**LC 373**

HB 2102

ing demographic data;

(d) Provide technical assistance to communities and state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to engage in local efforts to involve individuals in the establishment and implementation of programs, procedures and policies that will advance the goal of section 5, **chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001** [*of this 2001 Act*];

(e) Obtain resources for independent analysis and interpretation of demographic data collected by state or local law enforcement agencies;

(f) Accept and analyze demographic data collected by a state or local law enforcement agency if requested by a state or local law enforcement agency and if resources are available; and

(g) Report to the public the results of analyses of demographic data.

(5) In carrying out its purpose, the committee may [*not receive or analyze any data unless the*] **request and receive data files from participating law enforcement agencies and may analyze data** for each reported contact [*includes at least the following information:*]. **These data files should contain as many of the following items of information as are collected by the participating law enforcement agency:**

(a) The reason for the law enforcement stop or other contact;

(b) The law enforcement officer's perception of the race, color or national origin of the individual involved in the contact;

(c) The individual's gender;

(d) The individual's age;

(e) Whether a search was conducted in connection with the contact, and if so, what resulted from the search;

(f) The disposition of the law enforcement action, if any, resulting from the contact; and

(g) Additional data as recommended by the committee that state and local law enforcement agencies should collect and submit.

(6) Data received by the committee for analysis under this section may not identify a particular law enforcement officer or a particular individual whose demographic data is collected by a state or local law enforcement agency.

(7) Members of the committee shall appoint a chairperson from the members of the committee. Members of the committee are not entitled to compensation or expenses and shall serve on the committee on a volunteer basis.

(8) [*The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission*] **Portland State University** shall provide administrative support staff necessary to the performance of the functions of the committee.

[*(9) All agencies, departments and officers of this state are requested to assist the committee in the* Law Enforcement Contacts Policy Data and Review Committee

2007 Annual Report

November 29, 2007

*performance of its functions and to furnish such information and advice as the members of the committee consider necessary to perform their functions.]*

**(9) All agencies of state government, as defined in ORS 174.111, are requested to assist the committee in the performance of its duties and, to the extent permitted by laws relating to confidentiality, to furnish such information and advice as the members of the committee consider necessary to perform their duties.**

(10) The committee shall make findings and issue recommendations for action to achieve the purpose of this section. The committee shall submit a report containing its findings and recommendations to the appropriate interim legislative committees *[on or before December 1, 2002, and annually thereafter]* **annually** on or before December 1.

(11) After completion of the analysis of the data from at least two state or local law enforcement

[2] HB 2102

agencies, the committee may recommend the collection of additional data elements.

(12) This section does not prohibit a state or local law enforcement agency from collecting data in addition to the *[minimum information required]* **information listed** in subsection (5) of this section.

**SECTION 3.** Section 8, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001, is amended to read:

**Sec. 8.** *[The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission]* **Portland State University** may accept contributions of funds from the United States, its agencies, or from any other source, public or private, and agree to conditions thereon not inconsistent with the purposes of the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee.

**SECTION 4.** Section 9, chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001, is amended to read:

**Sec. 9.** All moneys received by *[the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission]* **Portland State University** under section 8, **chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001**, *[of this 2001 Act]* shall be paid into the State Treasury and deposited into the General Fund to the credit of *[the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission]* **Portland State University**. Such moneys are appropriated continuously to *[the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission]* **Portland State University** for the purposes of section 6, **chapter 687, Oregon Laws 2001** *[of this 2001 Act]*.

**SECTION 5.** **This 2007 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2007 Act takes effect on its passage.**

## **Appendix B: LECC Public Perception Survey Methodology & Questionnaire**

### **Survey Methodology**

Before conducting the survey, SRL finalized all questions with LECC, programmed the survey, and conducted pre-testing to ensure the functioning of the skip patterns and accurate recording of data. A total of 20 interviewers were then trained on conducting the survey. This involved a round-table discussion of the questions and practice calling.

Survey calling across the four primary samples was conducted in a stepwise fashion. Survey calling on the statewide random sample began on August 17<sup>th</sup> and concluded August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2007. On Monday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, we began calling both the African-American respondent extension-sample and the geographically-matched non-African-American sample. Interviews for the non-African-American sample were completed on August 22<sup>nd</sup>. We then focused on completing the random statewide survey until August 27<sup>th</sup> and then resumed calling on the African-American respondent extension-sample until surveys were completed on September 1<sup>st</sup>. Interviewing for the Hispanic respondent extension-sample began on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007 and concluded on September 12<sup>th</sup>. Once all surveys were completed, the data was reviewed and cleaned for analysis.

To prepare for the Hispanic extension-sample, the survey instrument was translated into Spanish. The translation was done by a translation company and then reviewed by four SRL bilingual interviewers to ensure that the survey was truly in the language of Spanish speakers in Oregon. We were careful throughout to ensure that the Spanish instrument remained true to the original English instrument while allowing for differences in nuance that could make a direct literal translation too awkward or unclear.

### **Sampling**

#### **Random Statewide Survey**

The random statewide survey included 792 respondents. To assure that the statewide sample would be truly representative, the goal of 784 completed surveys was broken down into targets for each of three regions. An estimated 42% of Oregon's population<sup>3</sup> live in the Portland tri-county area (Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties); therefore, 331 surveys were conducted in this region (with a goal of 329 surveys). An estimated 32% of Oregon's population live in the Willamette Valley or on the coast; therefore, 253 surveys were completed with residents in this region (with a goal of 251 surveys). Finally, given that an estimated 26% of Oregon's population resides in the Southern and Eastern regions of the state, 208 surveys were conducted with residents

---

<sup>3</sup> For all census data, the 2000 Census was used to ensure comparability; Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2. The distinct regional groupings of counties was compiled from the Oregon Population Survey (1996).

of these regions (with a goal of 204 surveys). Given the proportions of surveys completed across the regions, SRL is confident that the 792 statewide surveys are representative. Additionally, as shown in Table 1, the random statewide survey achieved adequate statewide coverage in comparison to the 2000 Census. Overall, the survey included respondents from 34 of Oregon's 36 counties. Sherman and Wheeler counties were not represented; however, these counties are small and each comprise less than 1% of Oregon's population.

**Methodology Table 1. Statewide Random Sample, by County.**

County	Statewide Random Sample		2000 Census
	Count	Percent	Percent
BAKER	5	0.6	0.5
BENTON	19	2.4	2.3
CLACKAMAS	87	11.0	9.9
CLATSOP	7	0.9	1.0
COLUMBIA	10	1.3	1.3
COOS	22	2.8	1.8
CROOK	7	0.9	0.6
CURRY	7	0.9	0.6
DESCHUTES	26	3.3	3.4
DOUGLAS	23	2.9	2.9
GILLIAM	1	0.1	0.1
GRANT	3	0.4	0.2
HARNEY	1	0.1	0.2
HOOD RIVER	2	0.3	0.6
JACKSON	28	3.5	5.3
JEFFERSON	2	0.3	0.6
JOSEPHINE	20	2.5	2.2
KLAMATH	13	1.6	1.9
LAKE	1	0.1	0.2
LANE	78	9.8	9.4
LINCOLN	16	2.0	1.3
LINN	21	2.7	3.0
MALHEUR	13	1.6	0.9
MARION	59	7.4	8.3
MORROW	2	0.3	0.3
MULTNOMAH	151	19.1	19.3
POLK	11	1.4	1.8
TILLAMOOK	3	0.4	0.7
UMATILLA	15	1.9	2.1
UNION	6	0.8	0.7
WALLOWA	3	0.4	0.2
WASCO	6	0.8	0.7
WASHINGTON	95	12.0	13.0
YAMHILL	26	3.3	2.5
DON'T KNOW	3	0.4	-
Total	792	100.0	99.9

As seen in Table 2, the random statewide sample is primarily Caucasian, which is similar to the statewide distribution of race<sup>4</sup>. Additionally, 32 respondents (4%) said that they are Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino, which is somewhat similar to the 2000 Census figure of 8%.

**Methodology Table 2.** Race of Random Statewide Sample.

Race	Statewide Survey		2000 Census
	Frequency	Percent	Percent
White/Caucasian	729	92.0	86.6
American-Indian/Alaskan Native	11	1.4	1.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	11	1.4	3.2
African-American	10	1.3	1.6
Mixed Race	3	0.4	3.1
Other	11	1.4	4.2
Don't Know	5	0.6	-
Refused	12	1.5	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

African-American and Non-African-American Geographical Match Samples

According to the 2000 U.S. Census<sup>5</sup>, African-Americans constitute only 1.6% of Oregon's population statewide, or 55,662 out of 3,421,399 residents. Additionally, African-American individuals are not spread evenly throughout the state: more than two-thirds (37,434) reside in Multnomah County, comprising 5.7% of that county's population.

Because of the geographical concentration of African-Americans in Portland, it would not be appropriate to compare their responses to the survey questions to non-African-Americans drawn from a statewide population, who have experiences with many different types of law enforcement agencies. Therefore, working with our sample provider, Marketing Systems Group (MSG)<sup>6</sup>, we purchased phone numbers for census block groups in which at least 10% of households are African-American. Using this sample, we also conducted surveys with non-African-American respondents to ensure that the two samples came from the same geographic area. This approach also ensured that the two samples were from neighborhoods with similar law enforcement and crime experiences.

Once the 218 surveys with non-African-American respondents were completed, we added a screening question to identify African-Americans to complete the survey. A

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.m-s-g.com>

total of 211 surveys were completed with African-American respondents. Overall, SRL made 10,478 phone calls, or an average of 25 phone calls per completed interview.

As seen in Table 3, the non-African-American sample is primarily Caucasian, which is similar to the statewide distribution of race (87% of Oregonians are Caucasian<sup>7</sup>).

**Methodology Table 3.** Race of Non-African-American Sample.

Race	Frequency	Percent
White/Caucasian	202	92.7
Asian-American/Pacific Islander	5	2.3
American-Indian/Alaskan Native	4	1.8
Mixed Race	2	.9
Other	5	2.3
Total	218	100.0

To determine the extent to which the two samples are geographically comparable, we compared what zip codes respondents were actually from. Table 4 provides a breakdown of zip codes, ranging from smaller to larger populations. A total of 91% of respondents in the African-American sample and 89% of the respondents in the non-African-American sample come from only four zip codes: 97211, 97212, 97217, and 97227. Therefore, the geographic distributions of the two samples are fairly comparable.

**Methodology Table 4.** A Comparison of Zip Codes, African-American and non-African-American Samples.

	Sample				Total	
	African-American		Non-African-American		Count	Percent
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
97086	0	.0	1	.5	1	.2
97223	0	.0	1	.5	1	.2
97230	1	.5	0	.0	1	.2
97201	1	.5	1	.5	2	.5
97202	1	.5	1	.5	2	.5
97206	1	.5	1	.5	2	.5
97219	0	.0	2	.9	2	.5
97236	0	.0	2	.9	2	.5
97213	1	.5	2	.9	3	.7
97220	2	.9	2	.9	4	.9

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2  
 Law Enforcement Contacts Policy Data and Review Committee  
 2007 Annual Report  
 November 29, 2007

97229	0	.0	4	1.8	4	.9
97218	4	1.9	2	.9	6	1.4
97266	1	.5	5	2.3	6	1.4
97203	7	3.3	0	.0	7	1.6
97227	16	7.6	9	4.1	25	5.8
97212	25	11.8	5	2.3	30	7.0
97217	40	19.0	43	19.7	83	19.3
97211	111	52.6	137	62.8	248	57.8
Total	211	100.0	218	100.0	429	100.0

### Hispanic Sample.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census<sup>8</sup>, Hispanic/Latino individuals constitute 8% of Oregon's population statewide, or 275,314 out of 3,421,399 residents. Unlike the African-American population in Oregon, they are much more widely dispersed throughout the state.

Previously, household surnames and geographical matching had been used to identify a sample of Hispanic residents. To ensure that the two extension-samples were identified in a similar manner, SRL was asked to change the sampling approach for the Hispanic population such that only geographical matching was used. Therefore, working with our sample provider, Marketing Systems Group (MSG)<sup>9</sup>, we purchased phone numbers for census block groups in which at least 15% of households are Hispanic.

Once we had completed the 211 surveys for the African-American extension-sample, we changed the screening question to identify Hispanic or Latino individuals to complete the survey. A total of 210 surveys were completed with Hispanic respondents, with an additional 1,155 non-Hispanic/Latino individuals screened out. SRL made a total of 16,368 phone calls, or an average of 78 phone calls per completed interview. Overall, 145 (69%) of these interviews were conducted in Spanish, and 65 (31%) were conducted in English.

As shown in Table 5, the Hispanic respondent extension-sample survey achieved adequate statewide coverage, including respondents from 19 of Oregon's 36 counties. The distribution not spanning more counties is largely due to the small sample size of 210 respondents. For comparison purposes with the Hispanic extension-sample, a random sample non-Hispanic Whites geographically matched to the numbers of Hispanics in the survey from each county was selected from the statewide random sample.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1 and PL2

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.m-s-g.com>



**Methodology Table 5. Hispanic Sample,by County.**

County	Count	Percent
BENTON	2	1.0
CLACKAMAS	4	1.9
CLATSOP	1	0.5
DESCHUTES	1	0.5
HOOD RIVER	5	2.4
JACKSON	4	1.9
JEFFERSON	9	4.3
KLAMATH	2	1.0
LANE	4	1.9
LINCOLN	2	1.0
LINN	1	0.5
MALHEUR	9	4.3
MARION	44	21.0
MORROW	5	2.4
MULTNOMAH	29	13.8
POLK	3	1.4
UMATILLA	13	6.2
WASHINGTON	49	23.3
YAMHILL	11	5.2
DON'T KNOW	12	5.7
Total	210	100

## Survey Questionnaire

### LECC Public Perceptions Survey Script

**NTRO1:** Hello. (My name is) \_\_\_\_\_, and I am calling from Portland State University on behalf of the Oregon Legislature to conduct a brief survey about police services in Oregon. I assure you I am not selling anything. May I speak with a household member who is 18 years of age or older?

IF PERSON WHO ANSWERED PHONE IS 18 OR OLDER AND REMAINS ON LINE:

**NTRO2:** This voluntary survey will take only 15 minutes and will assist the Oregon legislature to understand citizen's experiences with and their opinions of Oregon police. You do not have to answer any question you don't want to and we can stop the survey at anytime. I want to assure you that this survey is completely anonymous and confidential. Do you have time to answer a few questions?

**ELIG1:** I would first like to ask you just a few quick questions to see if your household is eligible to do the survey.

**S1:** (OVERSAMPLE TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY, OTHERWISE ASKED AT THE END)  
For demographic purposes only, would you describe yourself as any of the following: Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?

No 0  
Yes 1

\*\*\*\*\*

Don't know 8

Refused 9

**S2:** Which of the following groups best identifies you?

IWR NOTE: If R says multi-racial or mixed, say: "Please select the group that you most closely identify with".

White	1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3
Black or African-American	4
*****	
Other	7
Don't know	8---go to S2A
Refused	9---go to S2A

**S2A:** IF RESPONDENT REFUSES DURING OVERSAMPLE: It is common for people we survey to prefer not to provide their race or ethnicity. However, this survey is, in part, intended to determine whether individuals of different backgrounds have differing experiences or perceptions of the way public safety services are provided. Therefore, I do need to know the racial or ethnic group most appropriate for categorizing your answers. Would you be willing to provide this information in this special instance? As I said before, all of your responses are confidential.

White	1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3
Black or African-American	4
*****	
Other	7
Don't know	8
Refused	9

PRIOR TO REACHING QUOTA, IF R REFUSES, CONTINUE WITH SURVEY.

OVER-SAMPLE QUOTAS: DISCONTINUE SURVEY AFTER REACH QUOTAS (INELIGIBLE STATEMENT) AS FOLLOWS: IF YES, RECORD ABOVE. IF NO, VERY POLITELY DISCONTINUE WITH WORDS SUCH AS: I certainly understand your position and very much appreciate you taking the time to speak with me.

**S3: COUNTY**

What county do you live in?

Category BAKER BENTON CLACKAMAS CLATSOP COLUMBIA COOS CROOK CURRY DESCHUTES DOUGLAS GILLIAM GRANT HARNEY HOOD RIVER JACKSON JEFFERSON JOSEPHINE KLAMATH	LAKE LANE LINCOLN LINN MALHEUR MARION MORROW MULTNOMAH POLK TILLAMOOK UMATILLA UNION WALLOWA WASCO WASHINGTON YAMHILL DON'T KNOW NO ANSWER
---	---

**S4: URB\_RUR**

Do you live in an urban area, a suburban area, a rural area, or on a farm or ranch?

Category  
URBAN  
SUBURBAN  
RURAL  
FARM, RANCH  
IF VOLUNTEERED: OTHER  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
Total

**IWR NOTE:**

Urban = Would you consider where you live as part of a city with dense housing, a medium to large sized population, and traffic?

Suburban = Would you consider where you live a like small to medium sized town with a small to medium sized population, and not too much traffic?

Rural = Would you consider where you live as being distant from other homes, towns, or cities?

Farm, Ranch = Do you live on land where you raise vegetables, fruits, and/or livestock and are distant from towns and cities?

ELIG2: You are eligible to do this survey about police services provided by the state of Oregon.

INELIGIBLE: I'm sorry to have bothered you. We are only surveying people from certain areas of the state. Those are all the questions I have for you today. I appreciate your willingness to complete the survey. Thank you for your time.

**SECT1**

Now, I would like to ask you about Oregon police officers. By Oregon police officers, I am talking about Oregon state troopers, county sheriff's deputies, and city police officers, but not federal officers, such as FBI or immigration officers.

**GOODJOB1.** Overall, when you think about Oregon police officers, are your feelings generally positive, generally negative, or are they neutral?

Category  
POSITIVE  
NEGATIVE  
NEUTRAL  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
Total

**RP1**

How often, if at all, do you believe Oregon police officers allow a person's race, ethnicity, or national origin to unfairly influence their decision to stop someone – never, rarely, sometimes, often, or always?

PROBE: Based on anything you have seen, heard, or experienced about police stops based on race, ethnicity, or national origin.

PROBE: Please think about Oregon state troopers, county sheriff's deputies, and city police officers (overall / as a whole) [excluding federal officers such as FBI and immigration].

IWR NOTE: if R says "almost always" select "always"

Category  
NEVER  
RARELY  
SOMETIMES  
OFTEN  
ALWAYS  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
Total

**RP3 (ALL RESPONDENTS)**

In the last twelve months, do you believe Oregon police officers overall have been more fair, less fair, or about the same in whether they allow race, ethnicity, or national origin to unfairly influence their decision to stop someone?

PROBE: Based on anything you have seen, heard, or experienced about police stops related to race, ethnicity, or national origin.

PROBE: Please think about Oregon state troopers, county sheriff's deputies, and city police officers (overall / as a whole) [excluding federal officers such as FBI and immigration].

Category  
MORE FAIR  
LESS FAIR  
ABOUT THE SAME  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
NO ANSWER  
Total

**RP4**

How often do you think that there are situations when it is appropriate for police officers to stop a vehicle based solely on the race of the driver – never, rarely, sometimes, or frequently?

Category

NEVER  
RARELY  
SOMETIMES  
FREQUENTLY  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
NO ANSWER  
Total

**STOP1**

In the past 12 months, how many times have you been stopped by an Oregon police officer? This includes being stopped or questioned for a suspected traffic violation or a suspected crime. It does not include voluntarily contacting the police. Do not include any times you were a passenger in a car that a police officer stopped, unless you were also questioned about a possible law violation.

NOTE: STOPS WHILE WALKING, BICYCLING, OR DRIVING ANY TYPE OF MOTOR VEHICLE COUNT IN THIS QUESTION.

**ENTER EXACT NUMBER**

**0, DK, REF → SKIPTO CONTACT1**

---

**\*\*\*\*QUESTIONS FOR ONLY 1 STOP IN PAST 12 MONTHS.**

**STOP1a (IF ONLY 1 STOP)**

When you were stopped by a police officer in the past 12 months, were you driving a car, truck, van, motorcycle, or moped? This does not include a situation when you were a passenger or a bicyclist.

**NO, DK, REF SKIP TO STOP2A**

PROBE FOR VEHICLE: If you were driving any sort of motor vehicle, please count it in your response. Bicycles **do not** count.

**STOP1b (IF ONLY 1 STOP) READ OPTIONS**

Where did the traffic stop occur?

A HIGHWAY OR INTERSTATE  
A MAIN OR BUSY LOCAL ROAD OR STREET  
A RESIDENTIAL STREET  
OTHER  
REFUSED  
DON'T KNOW  
NO ANSWER  
Total

**STOP2a**

When you were stopped in the past 12 months, did the officer search you, your vehicle, or someone accompanying you? (no=0, yes=1)

**NO, DK, REF SKIP TO STOP3A**

NOTE: THIS INCLUDES ANY STOP, NOT JUST MOTOR VEHICLE STOPS  
NOTE: INCLUDE ONLY ACTUAL SEARCHES, DO NOT COUNT IF A SEARCH WAS ONLY REQUESTED (does not need to be read)

**STOP2b**

Which of the following was searched? (CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY, READ OPTIONS):

YOU OR PERSONAL BELONGINGS (e.g. purse or book bag)

YOUR VEHICLE (e.g. trunk, glove compartment)  
 SOMEONE ACCOMPANYING YOU (e.g. passenger)  
 OTHER  
 REFUSED  
 DON'T KNOW  
 NO ANSWER  
 Total

**STOP3a**

When you were stopped in the past 12 months, were you ticketed, cited, or arrested for a traffic violation or crime? (no=0, yes=1)

NOTE: THIS INCLUDES ANY STOP, NOT JUST MOTOR VEHICLE STOPS

**STOP4a**

What reason did the officer[s] give you for your stop?

*Transcribe answer*

**STOP5a**

Did you ever believe that the real reason you were stopped was different than the reason the officer gave you?

PROBE: In the last 12 months...

PROBE: Did you [ever] disagree with the reason the officer stopped you?

Category  
 YES  
 NO  
 DON'T KNOW  
 Missing  
 Total

**STOP6a.** I am now going to ask you some questions about when you were stopped by a police officer. Please answer each question using a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree.

a. The officer clearly explained why you were stopped.

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3	4    5	8	9

b. The officer answered all of your questions

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3	4    5	8	9

c. The officer was polite.

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3	4    5	8	9

d. The officer was professional.

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3	4    5	8	9

**STOP7a. (ONLY IF STOP6 D RECEIVED AN ANSWER OF 1-4)**

What could the police officer have done differently to make you feel better about your stop experience?

*Transcribe the answer*

Nothing

Don't know

Refused

**STOP8a.**

Did your stop occur in the community in which you live?

Category

YES

NO

DON'T KNOW

Missing

Total

**\*\*\*\*QUESTIONS FOR MORE THAN 1 STOP IN PAST 12 MONTHS.**

**STOP1C (IF MORE THAN 1 STOP) ENTER NUMBER OF TIMES**

Of the <STOP1> times when you were stopped by a police officer in the past 12 months, how many times were you driving a car, truck, van, motorcycle, or moped? This does not include a situation when you were a passenger or a bicyclist.

ENTER EXACT NUMBER

**NOTE: NUMBER CANNOT EXCEED THE ANSWER TO STOP1**

**0, DK, REF → SKIP TO STOP2D**

PROBE FOR VEHICLE: If you were driving any sort of motor vehicle, please count it in your response. Bicycles **do not** count.

**STOP1d READ OPTIONS; CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY**

Where did the traffic (stop/stops) occur?

A HIGHWAY OR INTERSTATE

A MAIN OR BUSY LOCAL ROAD OR STREET

A RESIDENTIAL STREET

OTHER

REFUSED

DON'T KNOW

NO ANSWER

Total

**STOP2d**

Of the <STOP1> times you have been stopped in the past 12 months, how many times did an officer actually conduct a search?

PROBE: For example, did an officer search you, your vehicle, or someone accompanying you?

NOTE: THIS INCLUDES ANY STOP, NOT JUST MOTOR VEHICLE STOPS

NOTE: INCLUDE ONLY ACTUAL SEARCHES; DO NOT COUNT IF A SEARCH WAS ONLY REQUESTED (does not need to be read)

ENTER EXACT NUMBER

**NOTE: ANSWER MUST BE EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN NUMBER OF STOPS**

0

(goes to

stop3d)

1	ONE TIME	(goes to
stop2e)		
2 OR MORE	2 OR MORE TIMES (ENTER NUMBER OF TIMES)	(goes to
stop2f)		
DON'T KNOW		(goes to
stop3d)		
REFUSED		(goes to
stop3d)		

**STOP2e (ONLY IF STOP2D WAS 1)**

Which of the following was searched? (CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY, READ OPTIONS):

YOU OR PERSONAL BELONGINGS (e.g. purse or book bag)  
 YOUR VEHICLE (e.g. trunk, glove compartment)  
 SOMEONE ACCOMPANYING YOU (e.g. passenger)  
 OTHER  
 REFUSED  
 DON'T KNOW  
 NO ANSWER  
 Total

**STOP2f (ONLY IF STOP2D WAS 2 OR MORE)**

Which of the following was searched? (CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY, READ OPTIONS):

YOU OR PERSONAL BELONGINGS (e.g. purse How many times?  
 or book bag)  
 QSTOP2H YOUR VEHICLE (e.g. trunk, glove How many times?  
 compartment)  
 QSTOP2J SOMEONE ACCOMPANYING YOU How many times?  
 (e.g. passenger)  
 QSTOP2L OTHER QSTOP2N How many times?  
 REFUSED  
 DON'T KNOW  
 NO ANSWER  
 Total

**STOP3d**

Of the <STOP1> times you have been stopped in the past 12 months, how many times were you ticketed, cited, or arrested for a traffic violation or crime?

NOTE: THIS INCLUDES ANY STOP, NOT JUST MOTOR VEHICLE STOPS

**ENTER EXACT NUMBER NOTE: ANSWER MUST BE EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN NUMBER OF STOPS**

**STOP4d**

What reason did the officer[s] give you for your **most recent** stop?  
*Transcribe answer*



**STOP5d**

Of the <STOP1> times you have been stopped in the past 12 months, did you ever believe that the real reason you were stopped was different than the reason the officer gave you?

NOTE: THIS CAN BE FOR ANY STOP THEY'VE EXPERIENCED IN PAST 12 MONTHS

PROBE: In the last 12 months...

PROBE: Did you [ever] disagree with the reason the officer stopped you?

Category  
YES  
NO  
DON'T KNOW  
Missing  
Total

**STOP6E.** I am now going to ask you some questions about the **last time** you were stopped by a police officer. Please answer each question using a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree.

E. The officer clearly explained why you were stopped.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

F. The officer answered all of your questions

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

G. The officer was polite.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

H. The officer was professional.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

**STOP7d. (ONLY IF STOP6H RECEIVED AN ANSWER OF 1-4)**

What could the police officer have done differently to make you feel better about your stop experience?

*Transcribe the answer*

Nothing  
Don't know  
Refused

**STOP8d.**

Did your **most recent** stop occur in the community in which you live?

Category  
YES  
NO  
DON'T KNOW  
Missing  
Total

**CONTACT1**

In the past 12 months, have you contacted the police voluntarily? For example, this could be because you wanted to report a crime or suspicious activity, because you were a victim, or because you wanted information.

PROBE FOR DEFINITION OF POLICE: By police officers, I am talking about state troopers, sheriff's deputies, and city police officers, but not federal officers, such as FBI or immigration officers.

Category  
YES  
NO SKIP > SAFETY1  
REFUSED SKIP > SAFETY1  
DON'T KNOW SKIP > SAFETY1  
Total

**CONTACT2 (IF YES TO CONTACT1):**

Regarding your most recent VOLUNTARY police contact, please indicate your agreement with the following statements on a scale ranging from 1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree.

a. An officer came right away or scheduled an appointment.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

b. The officer explained what action they would take in response or that none was necessary.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

c. The officer answered all of your questions.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

d. The police were polite.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

e. The police were helpful.

Strongly disagree      Strongly Agree      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

**SAFETY1 READ OPTIONS**

How serious of a problem is crime in your neighborhood or surrounding area? Please use a scale ranging from 1 being Not a problem at all to 5 being A serious problem.

Not a problem at all      A serious problem      Refused      Don't know  
1      2      3      4      5      8      9

**SAFETY2 READ OPTIONS**

Overall, how safe do you feel being alone outside in your neighborhood or surrounding area during the day? Please use a scale ranging from 1 being Very Unsafe to 5 being Very Safe.

Very Unsafe	Very Safe	Refused	Don't know
1    2	3    4	5	8    9

**SAFETY3 READ OPTIONS**

Overall, how safe do you feel being alone outside in your neighborhood or surrounding area **at night**? Please use a scale ranging from 1 being Very Unsafe to 5 being Very Safe.

Very Unsafe	Very Safe	Refused	Don't know
1    2	3    4	5	8    9

**GOVERNMENT1**

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree.

a. My local government represents my interests

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3    4    5		8	9

b. My local government cares about where I live and tries to make it a better place to live in

Strongly disagree	Strongly Agree	Refused	Don't know
1    2    3    4    5		8	9

**LICENSE1**

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your driving habits. Do you currently have a drivers' license? (do not read options)

Category  
 YES  
 NO – SKIP TO DRIVE 1  
 LICENSE CURRENTLY SUSPENDED (if volunteered) – SKIP TO DRIVE 1  
 Don't Know – SKIP TO DRIVE 1  
 Refused – SKIP TO DRIVE 1  
 Total

**LICENSE2**

For how many years have you been a licensed driver?

ENTER EXACT NUMBER OF YEARS, 0-80 0 = LESS THAN ONE YEAR 80 = 80 YEARS OR MORE 97 REFUSED 98 DON'T KNOW 99 NO ANSWER

**DRIVE1**

Have you driven a car, truck, van, motorcycle, or moped at all in the past 12 months?

Category  
 YES  
 NO – SKIP TO DEMO  
 Don't Know – SKIP TO DEMO  
 Refused – SKIP TO DEMO  
 Missing  
 Total

**DRIVE2**

On average, how many miles do you drive each week in Oregon?

ENTER EXACT NUMBER OF MILES

0 --> R DRIVES TOO INFREQUENTLY TO GIVE A WEEKLY ESTIMATE

996 --> 996 OR MORE MILES EACH WEEK

997 REFUSED

998 DON'T KNOW

999 NO ANSWER

**DRIVE3**

How would you describe your overall driving record regarding traffic citations and accidents? (READ CATEGORIES)

- Category
- POOR
- FAIR
- GOOD
- VERY GOOD
- PERFECT
- REFUSED
- Don't know
- Missing
- Total

PROBE: Refer to your entire lifespan of driving.

**CAR1**

Thinking about the condition or level of repair of the /vehicle you drive most often, would you say it is kept in poor, fair, good, very good, excellent condition?

PROBE: Please think about noise, exhaust, scratches and chips in the paint job, and whether the lights and turn signals are kept working.

PROBE FOR WHY WE ARE ASKING THIS: We are just trying to understand the relationship between types of cars and traffic stops.

- Category
- POOR
- FAIR
- GOOD
- VERY GOOD
- EXCELLENT
- REFUSED
- Don't know
- Missing
- Total

**CAR2**

Does the (/vehicle) have any after-market improvements, such as tinted windows, special wheels, custom paint, or a special stereo system?

PROBE FOR WHY WE ARE ASKING THIS: We are just trying to understand the relationship between types of cars and traffic stops.

- Category
- YES

NO  
 REFUSED  
 DON'T KNOW  
 NO ANSWER  
 Missing  
 Total

**DEMO: The following questions are for demographic purposes only.**

**AGE**

May I please have your age? PLEASE ENTER EXACT AGE 18-96 96 = 96 OR OLDER

**SEX**

Record R's gender, as observed. If you can't tell, ask:

"Because the quality of phone connections sometimes makes it difficult to tell, I have to ask you your gender. Are you male or female?"

Category  
 MALE  
 FEMALE  
 NO ANSWER  
 Total

**EDUC**

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Read options if necessary

Elementary or less	01	
Some high school, without diploma	02	
High school graduate or GED	03	
Associates Degree or Technical Degree (i.e. AA or AS)	04	
Some college, but no degree	05	
Bachelors Degree (i.e. BA, AB, BS)	06	
Some graduate study, but no degree		07
Graduate or professional degree (MS, MA, PhD, law, med)	08	
*****		
Other	77	
Don't know	88	
Refused	99	

**EMPLOY**

What is your current employment status?

Are you...

[Read Options]

Employed full-time	0
Employed part-time	1
Homemaker or stay at home parent	2
Disabled (not able to work)	3
Retired	4

Unemployed (not looking for work)	5
Looking for work	6
*****	
Other	7
Don't know	8
Refused	9

**SCHOOL**

Are you currently enrolled in school or a student on summer break?

No

Yes

\*\*\*\*\*

Don't know

Refused

**INCOME**

I'm now going to read a list of income ranges. Please stop me when I reach the category that describes your estimated total annual household income in 2006.

Less than \$15,000

\$15,000 to less than \$25,000

\$25,000 to less than \$35,000

\$35,000 to less than \$50,000

\$50,000 to less than \$75,000

\$75,000 to less than \$100,000

\$100,000 or more

Don't Know

Refused

**ENDING1:** That completes the survey. Do you have any questions or comments about the survey?

**ENDING3:** On behalf of the Oregon Legislature, I'd like to thank you for your time. Good-bye.

**SPECIAL STUDY INFORMATION:**

**If R wants contact information they may call any of the following:**

If you have any questions about this survey, you may contact the principal investigator, Dr. Brian Renauer of Portland State University, at 503-725-8090.

If you have questions about the validity of the study or the Survey Research Lab you may call Dr. Debi Elliott, the Director of the Survey Research Laboratory at Portland State University, at 503-725-5198 or visit the Survey Research Lab website at [www.srl.pdx.edu](http://www.srl.pdx.edu).

If you have concerns or questions about your rights as a research subject and your privacy protections, please contact the PSU Human Subjects Research Review Committee, at 503-725-4288 or 1-877-480-4400.

**Purpose:**

The results of this survey will be used by the Law Enforcement Contacts and Data Review Committee to improve police services in the state of Oregon. Therefore, your opinions are important. The survey sponsors are the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Law Enforcement Contacts and Data Review Committee, and Portland State University. The survey is funded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. For more information, please visit the Law Enforcement Contacts and Data Review Committee (LECC) website at <http://www.cjpri.ccj.pdx.edu>. The Law Enforcement Contacts and Data Review Committee is a legislatively sanctioned committee.

**IWR NOTE:** If R becomes upset about survey content matter and wants assistance with an issue they may have with law enforcement, they may call the Oregon ACLU in Portland at 503-227-3186.

**IWR NOTE2:** If R asks how their phone number was obtained, say:  
Your phone number was randomly selected by computer from all the telephone numbers in Oregon and I do not know your name. Your responses will be anonymous and will be used in combination with the answers from all the other people participating in this study. If there are questions that you would prefer not to answer, just say so, and we will skip to the next question.

**REFUSAL CONVERSION:**

**General Refusal:**

The results of this survey will be used by the Law Enforcement Contacts and Data Review Committee to help improve police services in the state of Oregon. Therefore, your opinions are important. The survey is completely confidential, anonymous, and voluntary and takes about 15 minutes to complete.

Can we ask you some questions now or would there be a more convenient time?

# Appendix C: Corvallis PD Stop Data Trends 2002-2006: Technical Report

## Technical Report: Analysis of Corvallis Police Department Stop Data 2002-2006

### **Introduction:**

This study analyzes the characteristics of traffic stops and searches for the Corvallis Police Department from 2002 to 2006. The Corvallis stop data represents the diverse patrol functions of a police department for a small sized urban/suburban area. Throughout the report comparisons are made between the Corvallis results and results reported in our previous five year analysis of stop data from the Hillsboro Police Department and Oregon State Police (OSP) from 2001 to 2005.

### **Methodology:**

Data on all traffic stops and searches conducted by Corvallis was provided to LECC for analysis on February 15, 2007. The data did contain a few months from 2001 when they started data collection and the first month of 2007. To make this analysis more comparable to the OSP and Hillsboro study, only the five full calendar years of data (2002-2006) were analyzed. The original data also contained information on pedestrian stops (N = 2522), which comprised 4% of the total recorded stops. Pedestrian stops are excluded from this analysis. In contrast to Hillsboro and OSP all of the traffic stop data for Corvallis was recorded on a scantron form by officers rather than through a dispatch or on-board computer. Corvallis also had their officers record significantly more information about stop and search characteristics, which we hope to analyze in a subsequent report. This report examines the same stop data characteristics reviewed in the Hillsboro and OSP report.

*Corvallis Data:* Corvallis sent an Access data base file, which was opened up into SPSS for cleaning. There were a total of 52,262 traffic stops recorded in the data sent from Corvallis from January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2006. There were no missing data for the race of the driver. In contrast to OSP and Hillsboro, the data fields on the Corvallis scantron were not mutually exclusive, which required some coding decisions to create variables that were comparable to OSP and Hillsboro. For example, any stop could contain multiple search types that were recorded; a single stop could involve a driver search, vehicle search, and a consent search. This report defines a search during a traffic stop as occurring if any of the following codes were reported: a driver search, vehicle search, consent, plain view, weapon pat down, or incident to arrest search. Traffic stops that had only an inventory search completed were not counted as searches. Corvallis also recorded multiple dispositions occurring for a traffic stop. Thus, some traffic stops listed a citation, warning, and arrest occurred. In these situations dispositions were ranked according to most serious from Arrest (most serious), Citation, Warning, to No Action (least serious). The most serious disposition recorded for a traffic stop was used as the disposition for these analyses. Corvallis officers often recorded multiple search results for each traffic stop. Rather than determining the seriousness of search results each search result (weapons, drugs, alcohol, contraband) was left as is.



*Baseline Analysis:* To assess whether any particular racial/ethnic group is overrepresented in traffic stops for Corvallis, the percentage of the population that is aged 16 and older in Census data for Corvallis in 2000 is used as the baseline for overrepresentation. Thus, if the percentage of stops attributed to a racial/ethnic group exceeds their population that is aged 16 and older, that racial grouping is considered overrepresented in traffic stops. A second baseline using the percentage of the total population in 2000 is also included for comparison. Using the percentage of the population that is aged 16 and older is considered to be a more accurate representation of the population that is at risk for being pulled over by police. This baseline measure is by no means a perfect comparison measure because not everyone who is 16 and older actually drives and population distributions may have changed by 2005, but this baseline measure is comparable to many other studies including the Portland Police Bureau's recent reports. Data acquired from the Census 2000 Summary File 1 (PCT12H to PCT12N) at the place level (Corvallis) is used for the Corvallis PD baseline.

*Significance Testing:* Tables 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 use statistical significance testing to examine whether racial/ethnic differences or differences over time are meaningful or due to chance. Separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) were used to examine whether the mean for each racial group of being stopped, searched, finding something, or a certain disposition significantly differs from all other racial groups combined or compared to only White drivers. A significant difference equals a mean difference with a probability of  $< .05$ .

*Tables and Analyses:*

Table 1. Corvallis PD 2002-2006 Traffic Stops (p. 74)

Table 2. Corvallis 2002-2006 Searches (p. 75)

Table 3. Corvallis 2002-2006 Results of Searches (p. 77)

Table 4. Likelihood of Being Searched and Finding Something in a Search (Corvallis 2002-2006)  
(p. 78)

Table 5. Likelihood of Being Searched and Finding Something in a Search – African American, Hispanic and White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006) (p. 78)

Table 6. Corvallis 2002-2006 Dispositions of Stops (p. 80)

Table 7. Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a stop by race/ethnicity (Corvallis 2002-2006) (p. 80)

Table 8. Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a stop – African American, Hispanic, and White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006) (p. 81)

Table 9. Corvallis 2002-2006 Dispositions of Searches (p. 82)

Table 10. Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a *search* by race/ethnicity (Corvallis 2002-2006) (p. 82)

Table 11. Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a *search* by race/ethnicity – African American and Hispanic to White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006) (p. 83)

**Table 1. Corvallis PD 2002-2006 Traffic Stops**

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Other	White	Total
<b>Stops 2002-2004</b>	923	637	1502	22	857	26375	30316
% of all stops	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	
% Corvallis Population aged 16 & older <sup>a</sup>	7.5%	1.2%	5.7%	0.8%	0.6%	84.3%	
% of Corvallis Population <sup>a</sup>	6.5%	1.1%	5.9%	0.7%	0.5%	85.3%	
<b>Stops 2005-2006</b>	612	456	677	374	604	19223	21946
% of all stops	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>87.6%</b>	
% Corvallis Population aged 16 & older <sup>a</sup>	7.5%	1.2%	5.7%	0.8%	0.6%	84.3%	
% of Corvallis Population <sup>a</sup>	6.5%	1.1%	5.9%	0.7%	0.5%	85.3%	
Change in % of stops from 2001-2003 to 2004-2005	-6.7%	0.0%	-38.0%**	1600.0%**	0.0%	0.7%*	
<b>Total Stops 2002-2006</b>	1535	1093	2179	396	1461	45598	52262
% of all stops	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>.8%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>87.2%</b>	
% Corvallis Population aged 16 & older <sup>a</sup>	7.5%	1.2%	5.7%	0.8%	0.6%	84.3%	
% of Corvallis Population <sup>a</sup>	6.5%	1.1%	5.9%	0.7%	0.5%	85.3%	

<sup>a</sup> Census 2000 Summary File 1 Table PCT12H to PCT12N (Corvallis) at place level used for population estimates.

\* Difference in % of stops between 2002-2004 and 2005-2006 is significant at  $p < .05$ .

\*\* Difference in % of stops between 2002-2004 and 2005-2006 is significant at  $p < .01$ .

### Summary of Traffic Stops (Corvallis)

Table 1 presents stop data from the Corvallis PD during 2002 to 2006 respectively. There were some significant changes over time in the percentage of stops for each racial/ethnic category comparing 2002-2004 to 2005-2006. The biggest change over time occurred for Native Americans, who went from 0.1% to 1.7% of all stops, however this appears to be more of a recording change or update to the scantron that occurred in 2006. For example, over 95% of stops with Native American drivers occurred in 2006. Hispanic drivers represented 5% of all stops in 2002-2004, which significantly dropped to 3.1% of all stops in 2005-2006. The percentage of stops involving White drivers experienced a small, but significant increase.

To assess whether any particular racial/ethnic group is overrepresented in traffic stops for Corvallis, the percentage of the population that is aged 16 and older in 2000 is used as the

baseline for overrepresentation (the % of total population is also included for comparison). Table 1 shows that racial/ethnic populations *are not dramatically overrepresented* in stops conducted by Corvallis when compared to their percentage of the population aged 16 and older. The largest overrepresentation between traffic stops and population distribution was for drivers categorized as “some other race”, African American, and White drivers. The census calculation for some other race adds together Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders and the census category of some other race, which combined comprise 0.6% of the driving age population in Corvallis. However, 2.8% of drivers pulled over in Corvallis were categorized as some other race. This raises an important question as to how race is being interpreted and coded in the Corvallis stop data collection. African Americans comprise 1.2% of the Corvallis population and 2.1% of all drivers pulled over from 2002-2006. White drivers comprise 84% of the driving age population and represent 87% of all traffic stops.

**Table 2.** Corvallis 2002-2006 Searches

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Other	White	Total
<b>Searches 2002-2004</b>	36	39	118	0	17	1376	1586
Stops 2002-2004	923	637	1502	22	857	26375	30316
% of stops searched	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>
<b>Searches 2005-2006</b>	19	37	62	22	39	983	1162
Stops 2005-2006	612	456	677	374	604	19223	21946
% of stops searched	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
Change in % of searches from 2002-2004 to 2005-2006	-20.5%	32.8%	16.5%	NA	225.0%**	-1.9%	1.9%
<b>Searches 2002-2006</b>	55	76	180	22	56	2359	2748
Total Stops 2002-2006	1535	1093	2179	396	1461	45598	52262
% of stops searched	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>

\* Difference in % of searches between 2002-2004 and 2005-2006 is significant at  $p < .05$ .

\*\* Difference in % of searches between 2002-2004 and 2005-2006 is significant at  $p < .01$ .

### Summary of Searches (Corvallis)

Table 2 presents all searches (non-inventory) conducted by Corvallis PD from 2002 to 2006. The racial/ethnic group most likely to be searched was Hispanic drivers; 8.3% of all traffic stops of Hispanic drivers involved a search, which was followed by African American drivers (7.0% of all traffic stops). There were some changes in the likelihood of being searched over time by racial/ethnic category, but most of the changes were not significant. The percent of searched drivers that were coded as “some other race” significantly increased from 2% of all stops in

2002-2004 to 6.5% of all stops in 2005-2006. Both African American and Hispanic drivers were more likely to be searched in 2005-2006 compared to 2002-2004, but the change was not significant.

The search data findings reported here are comparable to both OSP and Corvallis, where Hispanic drivers are the most likely racial/ethnic group to be searched, although racial/ethnic differences in the likelihood of being searched are not as large in Corvallis. Both Hispanic and African American drivers are close to one and one-half times more likely to be searched as White drivers in Corvallis.

**Table 3. Corvallis 2002-2006 Results of Searches**

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White	Total
Total Searches 2002-2006	55	76	180	56	2359	2726
Found something	5	14	49	15	619	702
% of searches something found	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>25.8%</b>
Weapons found	0	0	4	2	76	82
% of searches weapons found	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>
Drugs found	1	7	10	11	306	335
% of searches drugs found	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>
Alcohol found	3	3	14	2	143	165
% of searches alcohol found	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>
Contraband found	1	7	37	9	302	356
% of searches contraband found	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>13.1%</b>

**Summary of Search Outcomes**

Table 3 presents the outcomes of all searches (non-inventory) conducted by the Corvallis PD from 2002 to 2006. Hispanic drivers (or their vehicles, passengers), followed by drivers who are some other race, and White drives are the most likely to be found with something in a search. A quarter of all Corvallis searches yield weapons, drugs, alcohol, or contraband.

**Table 4.** Likelihood of Being Searched and Finding Something in a Search (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
Search	Less likely to be searched*	More likely to be searched	More likely to be searched	Less likely to be searched	Less likely to be searched
Found Something	Less likely to be found with something	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences
Weapons	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences
Drugs	Less likely to be found with drugs	No differences	Less likely to be found with drugs	No differences	More likely to be found with drugs
Alcohol	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences
Contraband	Less likely to be found with contraband	No differences	More likely to be found with contraband	No differences	No differences

\* : The comparison group for all of the cells in this table is to all other races/ethnicities combined. Thus, this cell states that Asians *compared to all other races/ethnicities* are less likely to be searched.

Note: Separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) were used to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for each racial group significantly differs from all other racial groups combined. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05. Native Americans are excluded from this analysis because of their low numbers in the sample.

**Table 5.** Likelihood of Being Searched and Finding Something in a Search – African American, Hispanic and White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	African Americans compared to Whites	Hispanics compared to Whites
Search	More likely to be searched than Whites	More likely to be searched than Whites
Found Something	No differences	No differences
Weapons	No differences	No differences
Drugs	No differences	Less likely to be found with drugs than Whites
Alcohol	No differences	No differences
Contraband	No differences	More likely to be found with contraband than Whites

Note: Separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) were used to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for African American and Hispanics significantly differs from Whites. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05.

### **Summary of Search Likelihood and Likelihood of Finding Something**

Table 4 presents the results of statistical tests that examine whether the differences across races/ethnicities in the likelihood of being searched and finding something are large enough to be considered meaningful and not due to chance. Similar to OSP and Hillsboro, *Asian and White drivers are significantly less likely to be searched* in Corvallis when compared to all other racial/ethnic groupings, whereas *Hispanic and African American drivers are significantly more likely to be searched* in Corvallis when compared to all other racial/ethnic groupings.

Despite these differences in the likelihood of experiencing a search *there are no significant differences in the likelihood of the search yielding any weapons, drugs, alcohol, and contraband*. This finding contrasts with the OSP and Hillsboro data where we found that White drivers are significantly more likely to be found with something during a search when compared to all other racial/ethnic groupings. There are some significant racial/ethnic differences in the likelihood of finding certain specific illegal items. For example, White drivers in Corvallis are significantly more likely to be found with drugs (same as OSP and Hillsboro) and Hispanic drivers are more likely to be found with contraband, but less likely to be found with drugs than other racial/ethnic categories.

Table 5 only examines whether African Americans compared to Whites and Hispanics compared to Whites exhibit differences in search likelihood and likelihood of finding something in a search. This separate “one-on-one” comparison of these racial groupings was done for both policy and empirical concerns. The most common public perception and policy concern with biased-based policing is generally oriented toward Hispanic and African American experiences compared with Whites. The comparisons done in Table 4, which combine all racial groups and contrast them to a focal comparison group, may mask important difference in treatment that may appear in one-one-one comparisons.

The conclusions we can derive from Table 5 are virtually the same as Table 4. African American and Hispanic drivers are more likely to be searched when individually compared to White drivers. Searches of African American drivers compared to Whites are no more or less likely to result in something criminal found. Searches of Hispanic drivers compared to Whites are more likely to result in contraband being found, but White drivers are more likely to be found with drugs when compared to Hispanics.



**Table 6.** Corvallis 2002-2006 Dispositions of Stops

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White	Total
Total Stops 2002-2006	1535	1093	2179	1461	45598	51866
No Action	7	8	31	5	287	338
% of stops no action taken	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>
Warning	579	442	863	438	16828	19150
% of stops warning given	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>40.4%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>
Citation	907	587	1157	976	26806	30433
% of stops citation given	<b>59.1%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>53.1%</b>	<b>66.8%</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>58.7%</b>
Custody Arrest	41	56	127	42	1662	1928
% of stops custody arrest	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
Field Interrogation	1	0	1	0	15	17
% of stops custody arrest	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

**Table 7.** Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a stop by race/ethnicity (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
No Action	No differences*	No differences	More likely to have no action taken	No differences	No differences
Warning	No differences	More likely to receive a warning	More likely to receive a warning	Less likely to receive a warning	No differences
Citation	No differences	Less likely to receive a citation	Less likely to receive a citation	More likely to receive a citation	No differences
Custody Arrest	Less likely to be arrested	More likely to be arrested	More likely to be arrested	No differences	Less likely to be arrested

\* : The comparison group for all of the cells in this table is to all other races/ethnicities combined. Thus, this cell states that there are no differences between Asians *compared to all other races/ethnicities* in their likelihood of having no action resulting from a stop.

Note: Used separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for each racial group significantly differs

from all other racial groups combined. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05. Native Americans are excluded from this analysis because of their low numbers.

**Table 8.** Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a stop – African American, Hispanic, and White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	African Americans compared to Whites		Hispanics compared to Whites
No Action	No differences		More likely to have no action taken than Whites
Warning	More likely to receive a warning than Whites		More likely to receive a warning than Whites
Citation	Less likely to receive a citation than Whites		Less likely to receive a citation than Whites
Custody Arrest	More likely to be arrested than Whites		More likely to be arrested than Whites

Note: Used separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for African American and Hispanics significantly differs from Whites. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05.

### Summary of Disposition Outcomes for Stops

Table 6 presents the disposition outcomes of all traffic stops conducted by the Corvallis PD from 2002 to 2006 and Tables 7 and 8 shows whether differences across races/ethnicities are statistically significant.

African Americans and Hispanics are significantly more likely to be warned and arrested, and significantly less likely to receive a citation compared to all other driver categories and compared to White drivers.

**Table 9.** Corvallis 2002-2006 Dispositions of Searches

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White	Total
Total Searches 2002-2006	55	76	180	56	2359	2726
No Action	1	3	0	1	27	32
% of searches no action taken	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
Warning	16	13	36	14	622	701
% of searches warning given	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>
Citation	11	20	48	14	538	631
% of searches citation given	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>22.8%</b>	<b>23.1%</b>
Custody Arrest	27	40	95	27	1168	1357
% of searches custody arrest	<b>49.1%</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>48.2%</b>	<b>49.5%</b>	<b>49.8%</b>
Field Interrogation	0	0	1	0	4	5
% of searches custody arrest	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

**Table 10.** Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a search by race/ethnicity (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	Asian	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
No Action	No differences*	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences
Warning	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences	More likely to receive a warning
Citation	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences
Custody Arrest	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences	No differences

\* : The comparison group for all of the cells in this table is to all other races/ethnicities combined. Thus, this cell states that there are no differences between Asians *compared to all other races/ethnicities* in their likelihood of having no action resulting from a search.

Note: Used separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for each racial group significantly differs from all other racial groups combined. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05. Native Americans are excluded from this analysis because of their low numbers.

**Table 11.** Likelihood of different dispositions resulting from a search by race/ethnicity – African American and Hispanic to White Comparison Only (Corvallis 2002-2006)

	African Americans compared to Whites		Hispanics compared to Whites
No Action	No differences		No differences
Warning	No differences		No differences
Citation	No differences		No differences
Custody Arrest	No differences		No differences

Used separate independent samples T-tests (equal variances assumed) to examine whether the mean of being searched and finding something for African American and Hispanics significantly differs from Whites. Significance equals a mean difference with a probability of < .05.

### Summary of Disposition Outcomes for Searches

Table 9 reports the disposition outcomes of all traffic searches conducted by OSP and Corvallis PD from 2002 to 2006 and Tables 10 and 11 show whether differences across races/ethnicities and direct comparisons with White drivers are statistically significant. Table 10 reveals there is only one statistically significant difference in dispositions following searches across racial/ethnic groupings. White drivers who are searched are significantly more likely to receive a warning. However, when White drivers are directly compared to African Americans and Hispanics there are no differences in their likelihood of receiving a warning.

# Appendix D: LECC Minimum Recommended Traffic Stop Data Points Form

<b>Traffic Stop Reporting Form</b>		FORM # <b>005896</b>
<b>STOP INFORMATION</b>		
DATE OF STOP (MM/DD/YY)  / /		
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP (✓ ONE - 1 <sup>ST</sup> VIOLATION/ACTION THAT BROUGHT VEHICLE TO YOUR ATTENTION)		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Major Moving Violation (Speeding ≥ 10mph, running red light, DUI, reckless driving) <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Minor Moving Violation <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Equipment Violation <input type="checkbox"/> 4 License Violation <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Other Reason		
MOST SERIOUS ACTION TAKEN WITH DRIVER (✓ ONE)		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 None <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Warning <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Citation <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Arrested →		
<b>VEHICLE/DRIVER INFORMATION</b>		
DRIVER AGE (✓ ONE)		DRIVER GENDER (✓ ONE)
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <16 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 16 to 24 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 25+		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Male <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Female
DRIVER RACE/ETHNICITY (✓ ONE - BASED ON VISUAL OBSERVATION)		
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 White <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Black/AA <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Hispanic <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Asian <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Am. Indian/Alaskan <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Other		
<b>SEARCHES</b> (exclude incident to arrest searches and vehicle inventories)		
WAS ANY SEARCH PERFORMED BASED ON CONSENT, PROBABLE CAUSE, PLAIN VIEW, OR A WEAPON "PAT DOWN"?  <input type="checkbox"/> 0 No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Yes →  <b>STOP</b>	INITIAL AUTHORITY FOR SEARCH (✓ ONE)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Consent <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Probable Cause <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Plain View <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Weapon "pat"	
	CONTRABAND FOUND AS RESULT OF SEARCH? <input type="checkbox"/> 0 No <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Yes →	CONTRABAND FOUND DURING THIS SEARCH (✓ ALL THAT APPLY) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Stolen Property <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Weapon(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Currency <input type="checkbox"/> Other

## Appendix D: LECC Detailed Traffic Stop Data Points Form

OFFICER/DEPUTY ID #	<b>Traffic Stop Reporting Form</b>	FORM # <b>005896</b>	
<b>STOP INFORMATION</b>			
ROAD TYPE (✓ ONE – 1 <sup>ST</sup> LOCATION WHERE VEHICLE OBSERVED)		DATE OF STOP (MM/DD/YY)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Interstate   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Highway   3 <input type="checkbox"/> City Street   4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other		/   /   :	
PRECINCT (✓ ONE – 1 <sup>ST</sup> PRECINCT WHERE VEHICLE OBSERVED)			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> North   2 <input type="checkbox"/> South   3 <input type="checkbox"/> East   4 <input type="checkbox"/> West   5 <input type="checkbox"/> Downtown   6 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Location			
INITIAL REASON FOR STOP (✓ ONE – 1 <sup>ST</sup> VIOLATION/ACTION THAT BROUGHT VEHICLE TO YOUR ATTENTION)			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Major Moving Violation (Speeding ≥ 10mph, running red light, DUI, reckless driving)			
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Moving Violation   3 <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Violation   4 <input type="checkbox"/> License Violation   5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other Reason			
MOST SERIOUS ACTION TAKEN WITH DRIVER (✓ ONE)		REASON FOR ARREST (✓ ALL THAT APPLY)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> None   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Warning   3 <input type="checkbox"/> Citation   4 <input type="checkbox"/> Arrested →		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Offense <input type="checkbox"/> Contraband <input type="checkbox"/> Warrant <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
DURATION OF STOP (✓ ONE – INCLUDE ANY TIME SPENT ON SEARCH)			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> 0-15 min   2 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-30 min   3 <input type="checkbox"/> 31-45 min   4 <input type="checkbox"/> 46+ minutes			
<b>VEHICLE/DRIVER INFORMATION</b>			
VEHICLE REGISTRATION (✓ ONE)		VEHICLE OCCUPANTS (✓ ONE)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Instate   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Out of State		0 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver only <input type="checkbox"/> Driver and _____ Passengers	
DRIVER AGE (✓ ONE)		DRIVER GENDER (✓ ONE)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> <16   2 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 to 24   3 <input type="checkbox"/> 25+		1 <input type="checkbox"/> Male   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
DRIVER RESIDENCY (✓ ONE)		1 <input type="checkbox"/> City Resident   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Resident	
DRIVER RACE/ETHNICITY (✓ ONE - BASED ON VISUAL OBSERVATION)			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> White   2 <input type="checkbox"/> Black/AA   3 <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic   4 <input type="checkbox"/> Asian   5 <input type="checkbox"/> Am. Indian/Alaskan   6 <input type="checkbox"/> Other			
<b>SEARCHES (exclude incident to arrest searches and vehicle inventories)</b>			
WAS ANY SEARCH PERFORMED BASED ON CONSENT, PROBABLE CAUSE, PLAIN VIEW, OR A WEAPON "PAT DOWN"?  ↓ 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No   1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →  <b>STOP</b>	INITIAL AUTHORITY FOR SEARCH (✓ ONE)	WHO/WHAT WAS SEARCHED BASED ON THIS AUTHORITY (✓ ONE)	
	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Consent	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver	4 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver & Vehicle
	2 <input type="checkbox"/> Probable Cause	2 <input type="checkbox"/> Passenger/s	5 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver & Passenger/s
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Plain View	3 <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle	6 <input type="checkbox"/> Passenger & Vehicle
4 <input type="checkbox"/> Weapon "pat"	7 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver, Pass., & Veh.		
↓ 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	CONTRABAND FOUND DURING THIS SEARCH (✓ ALL THAT APPLY)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	CONTRABAND FOUND AS RESULT OF SEARCH?	<input type="checkbox"/> Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Stolen Property	
↓ 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	<input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Weapon(s)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	ARREST MADE BASED ON RESULTS OF SEARCH?	<input type="checkbox"/> Currency <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
↓ 0 <input type="checkbox"/> No	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	WHO WAS ARRESTED BASED ON RESULTS OF THIS SEARCH (✓ ONE)	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes →	1 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver	2 <input type="checkbox"/> Passenger/s   5 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver & Passenger/s	