

REPORT TO THE STATE OF MARYLAND ON LAW ELIGIBLE TRAFFIC STOPS

MARYLAND JUSTICE ANALYSIS CENTER
DECEMBER 2006

Law Enforcement Traffic Stops in Maryland: A Report on the Third Year of Operation
Under TR 25-113

INTRODUCTION

In response to growing concerns about the role that race may play in traffic stops in the state of Maryland, the General Assembly passed legislation in 2001 mandating that data be collected on all law eligible traffic stops beginning with calendar year 2002. The statute required the Maryland Police Training Commission in consultation with the Maryland Justice Analysis Center to develop 1) a model format for the recording of data required in the act, 2) guidelines that each law enforcement agency may use as a management tool to evaluate data collected by its officers, 3) a standardized format that each agency shall use in reporting data to the Maryland Justice Analysis Center, and 4) a model policy on race based traffic stops that law enforcement agencies could adopt.

Working with the Police Training Commission, the Maryland Justice Analysis Center developed a model format for data recording and for data submission (see Appendix A). These model formats were developed after careful consultation with numerous law enforcement agencies across the state including all of those who were required to submit data for the 2002 calendar year. The format for data collection and submission have proven to be useful for large and medium size departments and have been adapted to a variety of forms for data collection and submission. The model reporting format for the submission of data was also developed in consultation with law enforcement agencies. It allows for multiple ways of submitting data so as to minimize the impact on law enforcement agencies that collect and submit these data without increased funding from the state. Although the statute provides that the Governor shall

provide funding for data collection and analysis of the data, neither the Maryland Justice Analysis Center nor the law enforcement agencies collecting the data have received funding for these mandated activities.

Finally, a model policy was developed working with an ad hoc committee of the Police Training Commission. This policy was approved by the Commission and promulgated to all law enforcement agencies in the state (see Appendix B for a copy of this policy). The statute set forth the types of traffic stops that were to be included in this report. Excluded from the definition of traffic stop in the statute is a check point or road block stop, a stop of multiple vehicles due to traffic accident or emergency situation, or a stop based on the use of radar, laser or vascar technology. These kinds of stops were excluded on the notion that officer discretion was not involved in a significant way in these stops and therefore it would be highly unlikely that race could play a role in the decision to stop or search in these instances.

In this report we provide aggregate data on law eligible stops for all law enforcement agencies in the state authorized to issue traffic violations. In 2005 there were 120 such agencies and all of them reported the required data. The information in this report is based solely upon the data reported by these police agencies. These data have not been audited or tested except for internal consistency purposes and therefore no judgment can be made as to the completeness of data submitted. Our strong impression, however, based on our working with the agencies who have submitted data, is that all agencies made good faith efforts to provide information on all eligible stops and have provided as complete and accurate data as they can given the time and resource constraints that the agencies operated under in the collection and submission of these

data.

The concerns that lead to the passage of this statute are frequently described under the concept of “racial profiling” -- the notion that law enforcement officers will use race as a factor in making a decision to exercise their discretion to stop and/or search a driver. In the area of traffic, this involves two primary activities, 1) the decision to stop a vehicle and 2) the actions taken by the officer after the stop, including the issuing of citations, or the requesting and conducting of searches. The statute provided for the collection of information on the stop and the action taken after the stop with special focus on searches on individuals and vehicles. In passing this legislation, the General Assembly sought to have better information about the role of race in traffic stops before they considered whether any other steps would be necessary to address the issue of possible racial profiling.

As in other states one of the major problems facing the analysis of traffic stop data is to what to compare data on stops. Specifically, one would like to know if people with similar driving behavior, but of different races, were differentially stopped. Are speeders who are speeding on similar roads at the same rate of excess of the posted limit more likely to be stopped if they are black than if they are white? Or if a driver is stopped and the driver is black is that person more likely to be searched than a white driver? The former questions are difficult if not impossible to provide precise answers to because there are no statewide comprehensive measures of driving behavior for different racial and ethnic groups. We have the results of the stops but little knowledge about the variations in driving behavior that might provide the context in which to evaluate these stops. In the literature on traffic stops and racial profiling this is sometimes referred to as

the denominator problem. That is, in calculating a rate of stops or searches what do you divide the stops or searches by? With enough resources one could collect information on variations in driving behavior by race and use those as a way to calibrate the actual stop data (for a brief description of such an effort see, M. T. Zingraff, et. al., “North Carolina Highway and Traffic Patrol Study”, The Criminologist, Vol. 25, No. 3, 2000). However, neither the police agencies or the Maryland Justice Analysis Center were provided funding to collect those kinds of data and therefore in this report we, like almost all other jurisdictions, rely upon measures of the population data to compare the stop data with. We know this introduces unknown levels of error into our findings and makes conclusions about the role of race in traffic stops difficult if not impossible.

While the literature in this area suggests that one can use population data in the analysis -- that is to compare the number of stops of a certain race or ethnic group to the number that group represents in the population. It is recognized that this approach introduces unknown estimation problems because the rate of car ownership, the patterns of driving, and that the patterns of deployment of law enforcement may not be the same for different racial and ethnic groups. We have decided in this report not to use population as the sole basis for the analysis of stop data. In this report we use the licensed driver population in addition to total population for comparison to population based rates. We report stops relative to the Maryland population estimates and to the licensed driver population as reported to us by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

While neither of these measures differences in driving behavior, having two measures may give us some greater confidence in the findings. Neither approach accounts for differentials in driving behaviors or in the holding of valid licenses that may

occur across sub-populations. Furthermore, when we use licensed driver populations for our comparisons it means those from out of state will have to be excluded from the analysis because we do not have licensed driver population distributions for all states nor do we know the proportion of people from other states that drive through Maryland. **In short, the estimates that are provided in this and any report that we have reviewed to-date on the proportion of people stopped, must be treated with great caution.**

Until we have better measures of population driving behavior to compare the stop information with, it will be very difficult to draw conclusions about the role that race plays in traffic stops that meet the minimum requirements of science.

On the other hand, once a stop has occurred we are then in a better position to analyze the request for search. The basis to compare a search request and searches conducted is the population of those that are stopped; and for those we have relatively complete data in this report. Therefore, in analyzing searches we will be in a stronger position to draw conclusions about the role race plays in these decisions than we are in the area of stops. That said, we will present the data for stops and searches and try to be as careful in interpreting these data as possible. It is very important that readers and users of this report exercise caution when interpreting the results of the stop data for the reasons we have just noted.

The Police Executive Research Forum (2003) has developed the definitive guide for the analysis of traffic stop data. While many of their suggestions do not apply as significantly to the analysis of state-wide data as they do to the analysis of specific jurisdictions within the state (e.g., the problem of commuters through jurisdictions), in subsequent years we will continue to seek to improve the data in this report and their

analysis. However, for this our fourth report it is critical that we understand the limitations of the analysis of the stop data and the relative strength of the data concerning searches and seizures.

VARIATIONS IN STOPPING

In 2005 the agencies required to submit traffic stop data reported data on 581,690 law eligible traffic stops. These cases provide the population of traffic stops that are analyzed in this report. Tables describing all the traffic eligible stops in greater detail than we review in the body of this report can be found in Appendix C. The primary issues addressed in this report drawn from these tables are the differences in stop, search and citation activities by race and ethnicity of the driver. The basic question we seek to address is: are there differences in these law enforcement activities that appear to be associated with race and ethnicity?

Table 1 provides information on the gender and race/ethnic status of the drivers of cars stopped in law eligible stops by the primary reason for the stop (primary reason identified by the stopping officer in reference to the various titles of statutes that could be a reason for a stop). The percentages in this table suggest that the reason for stops for different gender and by race/ethnicity groups is very similar. While one can identify, usually because of relatively small numbers, some differences that appear to be substantial (e.g., the 21.78% of Asian females stopped for a title 21, subtitle 8 with smaller percentages for other male, race and ethnic groups), **overall one sees a picture of the primary initial reason for the stop being similar for men and women and for different racial and ethnic groups.** The one exception to this is in the category of

unknown stops. While these represent a small number of the stops, in 4.27% for black males, 5.31% for Hispanic males, 5.83% for black females and 6.97% for Hispanic females the reason for the stop was not recorded – these percentages are considerably decreased from 2002 suggesting that while attention to this issue, which was highlighted in our 2003 report, has occurred, minorities are disproportionately stopped for unknown reasons. **While the reasons for stops are similar across groups, the rate of being stopped is not.** As shown in Table 1 in 144,584 of the 581,690 law eligible stops the driver was a black male, and in 70,406 of the stops the driver was a black female. Combining these two (214,990) we observe that 37% of all stops were of blacks. While we observed earlier that comparing stop data to the population data is problematic, we note that the proportion of the Maryland population that is Black is estimated to be 29%. This level of disproportionality (blacks account for 37% of stops but 29% of the population) is often taken as evidence of differential stopping associated with being Black.

In Table 2 we consider the stops relative to the distribution of licensed drivers in the state. Table 2 provides information on the rate of being stopped for in-state drivers by gender and ethnicity (categories of race and ethnicity are white and non-white, primarily because the categories of race and ethnicity required in the statute and those used by the Department of Motor Vehicles are different). In this table we observe that the rate of stopping, based on the Maryland licensed driver population, between whites and non-whites differs by a factor of almost 2 for males and is 60% higher for non white females compared to white females. That is, non-whites, both male and female, are more likely to be stopped than are whites. This is true whether the vehicle registration is in

Maryland or out-of-state (recognizing that the number of incidences where the driver's residence is Maryland but the registration is out of state is relatively small and that this table assumes each stop is of a different driver). As shown in Table 2, 23.1% of non-white males with a Maryland driver's license and Maryland vehicle registration are likely to be stopped in any one year as compared to 13.41% of white males. Similarly, for non-white females the probability of being stopped is 10.21 as compared to 6.49% for white females. These results, based on the licensed driver population in the State of Maryland, more strongly suggest differential stopping of Maryland drivers by race/ethnicity and gender than did the population based data. However, both of these comparisons suggest but cannot conclusively demonstrate, that non-whites are differentially stopped for law eligible traffic offenses in the State of Maryland.

VARIATIONS IN SEARCHES

In Table 3 we report the data on the percent of stops that resulted in a search. These data show that searches occur in a very small percentage of all stops. For males, the chance of a search is higher than for females in all race/ethnicity categories. The highest rate of searches was for Hispanic males (10.61%) followed by black males (7.31%), and white males (5.45%). Searches were usually of both person and property in all gender and all race/ethnicity categories. Searches for blacks were unknown in about 2.5% of the stops.

Table 4 summarizes the data on the reasons for the search for the gender and

race/ethnicity categories. In all categories the primary reasons for the search were incident to an arrest (this is most likely because in all arrests searches are conducted. Data collection procedures may have to be modified to address this issue) and unknown. The next most frequent reasons for the search were consent of the person searched, probable cause, or exigent circumstances. The reason for a search is not reported in from 2% to 9% across categories of race/ethnicity and gender. If there were data audits we would be able to understand why we this occurs.

In Table 5 we consider the outcome of searches. Here we report the data on what if anything is seized after a search by type of search. It is very clear that in the vast majority of searches nothing is reported as being seized. In searches of Asians nothing is seized in 87% of the searches; nothing is seized in 82% of the searches of blacks; in searches of Hispanics nothing is seized in 81% of the searches; and nothing is seized in 81% of the searches of whites. Where seizures do occur, there do not appear to be substantial differences across race/ethnicity groups.

In summary, the vast majority of stops do not result in a search and the vast majority of searches do not result in a seizure. Reasons for a search are similar across race/ethnic groups. Although the differences are quite small, the proportion of stops that result in a search is slightly higher for Hispanic and black males than it is for whites and other categories.

VARIATIONS IN OUTCOMES

Table 6 contains the data on the outcomes for the law eligible stops. For both gender categories and all race/ethnicity categories the most frequent outcome was the

issuance of a citation. The range in this outcome was from 40.65% for white females to 57.09% for Hispanic males. Women were slightly more likely to be given a safety repair order than males and were more likely to be given written warnings. Verbal warnings were used in from 4 to 8% of each group's stops, but more frequently to black males and females than any other identifiable category.

Data on arrests are contained in Table 7. Arrests were reported for 21,776 of the stops or approximately 4% all stops. Blacks who make up 37% of the stops account for 39% of the arrests and whites account for 57% of the arrests and 52% of the stops. There do not appear to be meaningful differences in arrests subsequent to stops for blacks and whites. Very few of the arrests are based on a search. The primary reason for the arrest is the same reason as that which prompted the stop (49% to 66% of the arrests across the categories of known gender and race/ethnicity). The number of arrests where the reason was not reported has decreased considerably since the 2002 report. The percentage of those who are arrested with a reason of "other" needs to be further explored. The outcomes for stops are very similar for various gender and race/ethnicity categories. The proportions of stops that result in an arrest are similar for blacks and whites. Formal responses (citations, SERO's and written warnings) are used similarly across the categories. There do not appear to be substantial variations in outcomes associated with race/ethnicity.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data summarized in this report and presented in detail in Appendix C cannot definitively tell us if race is a factor in law eligible traffic stops in Maryland. They do suggest that blacks are disproportionately stopped relative to their proportion of the population and of licensed drivers. However, for reasons discussed earlier, this can only be a suggestion not a conclusion. Until there are better data on the impact on these estimates of possible driving and deployment differences that are associated with race/ethnicity, we will not be able to determine how much of the variation in stopping is related to race/ethnicity and how much is due to other factors. Once a stop occurs the decisions to search, arrest, or issue other formal responses is less related to race/ethnicity. In these areas, while there are some differences noted in the report, the overall finding is that these decisions do not appear to be highly associated with the drivers race/ethnicity.

Recommendations. Working with the data included in this report has identified a problem that can be easily corrected by a change in the statute. Namely, the statute requires the use of race/ethnicity codes that are not used by the census or the Department of Motor Vehicles. The statute requires the use of the following: Asian, black, white, Hispanic, and other. The standard classification is black or African American, white, Asian, native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian, and other. Adoption of the standard categories would facilitate the use of census and DMV data in future reports.

Another issue, but not one easily remedied, is determining the completeness of

data submitted by each agency. The current statute does not require agencies to supply evidence that they have reported on all eligible stops nor does it direct the Maryland Justice Analysis Center to audit the data submitted. The General Assembly should consider additional language that will allow us to have greater confidence in the completeness of data reporting.

In addition, if we are to determine the true extent to which race or ethnicity is involved in traffic stops in Maryland, we must be able to consider the impact of differences in driving behavior and police deployment. The General Assembly should consider requesting that the Maryland Justice Analysis Center develop a plan to do this and, after approval by the Police Training Commission, implement the plan for the next reporting period.

Since data collection began in 2002, major improvements have been observed in reporting, especially in the decreases in missing data, the use of verbal warnings, and the use of “unknown” as the explanation for stops and searches. These changes most likely reflect the increased attention the collection of these data has brought to the issue of the role of race in traffic enforcement.