## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mahari Bailey, et al.,	:	
Plaintiffs	:	C.A. No. 10-5952
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
City of Philadelphia, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

## PLAINTIFFS' ELEVENTH REPORT TO COURT ON STOP AND FRISK PRACTICES: FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ISSUES

## I. Introduction

This Report addresses the issue of racial disparities in the stop and frisk practices of the PPD based on a statistical analysis of stops and frisks for the first half of 2023, conducted by plaintiffs' expert, Professor David Abrams. The Report also provides our observations and recommendations on what have previously been found to be patterns of racial bias in the stop and frisk program. *See* Tenth Reports of Plaintiffs and the City. The benchmarks used in the analysis are those set forth in a revised Benchmark Memorandum agreed to by the parties in 2016, with certain changes and additions stipulated as of April 18, 2018. The benchmarks are based on those discussed and used in academic literature and in other litigation. *See*, e.g., *Floyd v. City of New York*, 959 F.Supp. 2d 540 (S.D.N.Y. 2013). The benchmarks are straightforward in terms of computation and interpretation of whether racial disparities also show patterns of racial bias.

## II. Summary of the Racial Aspects of the Stop and Frisk Data

We examined data from Q1 and Q2 2023 pedestrian stops. As in prior years, a random sample of the stops was drawn by the Philadelphia Police Department for legal

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 2 of 34

analysis for stop and frisk sufficiency by the plaintiffs and the City. *See* Plaintiffs' Eleventh Report to Court, Fourth Amendment Issues (ECF 153). In this report, we focus on an analysis of this randomly selected sample (see Table 1), but we also include a description of the full array of stops (Table 2) at the PSA-race level, to better assess the overall stop rate. (Table 5).

The sample dataset (Table 1) includes 2,098 total pedestrian stops and the full data set has 6,847. This reflects a substantial 82.4% decline in total stops relative to the second half of 2019, a development that reflects new PPD policies on quality-of-life offenses and the impact of the COVID-19 epidemic.

In the random sample, the mean detainee age is 30.7 and 86% of detainees are male, a cohort that is 3.8 years younger than that from 2019. The likelihood of being stopped rises sharply in the late teens and early 20's (Figure 1), a reflection of higher rates of criminal conduct for all races at this age. 73% of stopped pedestrians were Black, three percentage points higher than in the second half of 2019. Latinos account for 10.4% of those stopped; this is 2.7 percentage points higher than in the second half of 2019.

The data is subdivided into 65 Police Service Areas (PSA's). See Table 2 for PSAlevel summary statistics.<sup>1</sup> There were an average of 76 stops of Black pedestrians per PSA in the first half of 2023, compared with 17 White stops, and 12 of Latinos. We also compute the citywide stop rate by race per 10,000 residents of the same race: for Q1 and Q2 of 2023 this was 134 for Blacks, 64 for Whites and 37 for Latinos.

In Section III, infra, we use a regression framework to determine whether factors

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PSA 77 (the airport) is omitted because it has no residential population.

#### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 3 of 34

other than race may account for the racial disparities. The control variables include demographic, economic, and crime factors. The employment rate varies substantially across PSA's. The variation in racial composition is even greater, with the Black residential share ranging from 3% to 95% (Table 2). To account for higher crime rates among juvenile and young adult males, we control for the share of males in the 15 to 24 age range in some regression specifications. This share also varies widely, from 3 to 23 percent, with a mean of 7%. Crime rates, which vary by more than a factor of 10 across Philadelphia, can impact stop rates, and we control for them using three different measures: violent crime, property crime, and overall Part 1 crimes.

Table 3 provides a breakdown of stop, frisk, and arrest rates by race in the randomly selected sample.<sup>2</sup> Blacks account for 73% of stops, Whites for 18% and Latinos account for 9%. Minorities account for an even higher share of individuals frisked, of which 77% are Black, 10% Latino and 13% White. The Latino share of those frisked increased by 4 percentage points since the previous report. 1 in 3 stops of Blacks and Latino pedestrians result in a frisk, which is 30% higher than the 1 in 4.3 rate for Whites. There are also racial differences in arrest rates, with an arrest of a Black person occurring every 2.9 stop, while for Latinos it takes 3.2 stops and for Whites, 3.8 stops.

The number of stops varies substantially by district, with the 24th, which includes Port Richmond, with the largest number, accounting for 14.5% of the total (Figure 2). The fewest stops were in the 7<sup>th</sup> Police District, in Northeast Philadelphia, accounting for

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  For this table only, each individual may only be in one racial/ethnic category in order for the total to sum to 100 percent. Individuals who are Black and Latino are categorized as Black.

0.8% of all stops.

## **III. Benchmark Applications**

#### A. Stops, Census and Regression Analysis

1. <u>Census and Stop Data</u>

The question of whether race is impermissibly used as a factor in the decision to stop and frisk cannot be answered by a simple comparison of stop and frisk rates to census data. While stop and frisk rates relative to the same-race residential population vary by race in Philadelphia, there could be non-racial explanations for the disparities. The stop rates relative to census data is the appropriate starting point for a more sophisticated analyses that take into account non-racial factors. As set forth in Tables 2 and 3, the base stop share by race in comparison to the census population is as follows: Black stops=73%; Black census=44%

White stops=18%; White census=35%

Latino stops=9%; Latino census=12%

The next analysis is a cross-PSA comparison of stop rates by Black/Minority population share, as reported in Tables 4A and 4B, respectively. Each row in the tables represents a PSA (column 1) and the tables are sorted by the Black or Latino share of the population in the district, as reflected in column 2. The third column reports the share of stops that are of Black/Latino pedestrians and the fourth is the ratio of Black/Latino stops to Black/Latino population share. It is noteworthy that in all but four of the PSAs Blacks account for a higher share of stops than they do of the population (column 4); in several PSA's, they are stopped at a rate over five times their share of the population. For example, in PSA 91 (which includes Center City, west of Broad), the population is 5%

#### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 5 of 34

Black, but 76% of stops were Blacks. In PSA 12, the population is 3% Black and 57% of stops were Blacks. By contrast, in PSA 192 (Overbrook and other parts of West Philadelphia), where Blacks make up 93% of the population, the ratio of Black stops to Black population was close to a 1:1 ratio.

This trend of a very high minority stop rates in heavily White locations can be seen visually in Figure 3. If the ratio of minority stops were independent of PSA minority share, the points should form a horizontal line. The fact that the points at the left end of the figure (heavily White PSA's) have much higher Black stop ratios, reinforces the results from Table 4A.

The last two columns in Tables 4A and 4B report characteristics based on the entire census population of the PSA. Column 5 reports total stops per capita and Column 6, the violent crime rate in the PSA (violent crimes per 10,000 residents). Figure 4 displays the relationship between overall stop rate and Black population share: areas with a greater Black population share experience a higher stop rate. PSA 242 (Kensington) has a much higher stop rate per population than all others, most likely due to the opioid epidemic in that area.

#### 2. <u>Multivariate Regression Analysis</u>

Regression analysis is necessary to determine whether the violent crime rates or other differences in these PSA's explain the racial disparities. Multivariate regression analysis is more robust than a comparison of averages as it examines the relationship among multiple variables simultaneously. To determine the impact of suspect race on the likelihood of a stop or frisk, we control for factors that include the demographic makeup and the crime rate of the neighborhood.

#### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 6 of 34

First, we add data collected from the U.S. Census (through the American Communities Survey) and data on reported crimes by PSA from the Philadelphia Police Department. We begin by examining differences in overall stop rates by race in Table 5. This Table (and Tables 6, 8, 9 and 11-12) share the same format: each column in the Table reports results from a separate regression that identifies the relationship between the variables listed in the first column and the dependent variable, which is the title of the table. For example, the regression that is reported in column 2 can be written as:

(1)  $StopRate = \alpha + \beta_1 Black + \beta_2 Latino + \beta_3 Male + \beta_4 Age + \epsilon$  $StopRate = \alpha + \beta_1 Black + \beta_2 Latino + \beta_3 Male + \beta_4 Age + \epsilon$ 

*Stop Rate* is the number of stops in the sample examined per 10,000 residents of the same race in a district and *Black* is coded 0 if the detainee is White and 1 if the detainee is Black. Similarly, *Latino* is coded 1 if the detainee is Latino and zero otherwise.<sup>3</sup> Male is coded 1 for men and 0 for women. Age is the detainee's age in years. By including 4 variables in the equation, this regression can better isolate the impact of race and Latino identity on the likelihood of being stopped, even if sex or age are important factors affecting the stop rate.

The coefficient on *Black* found in column 2 is 62.79, which means that in the full dataset about 63 more Black individuals were stopped than White individuals for every 10,000 same-race residents of a PSA. To put the magnitude of this racial difference in perspective, note that the average stop rate for Whites is 64 per 10,000 same-race PSA residents. A measure of precision of the estimate – the standard error - is reported in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> If a detainee is both Black and Latino, he is counted as Black.

#### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 7 of 34

parentheses below the coefficient. The double "stars" on the standard error indicates that this result is statistically significant at better than the 1% level, or in more common language, there is less than a 1% chance that the difference in stop rates between Blacks and Whites is zero.

The core of the regressions is the need for controls by examining possible nonracial factors for the disparities. For example, if minorities tend to be younger on average, since more crime is committed by younger individuals, one might expect a higher stop rate for minorities. We control for this factor (*see* equation 1 above) and others relevant to this issue. Column 3 adds controls for the PSA racial composition and Column 4 adds the PSA employment rate and the share of the male population between age 15 and 24 years of age. After adding these controls, the coefficient on Detainee Black (66.43) is still statistically significantly different from zero and large in magnitude.

Columns 5-7 add different controls for PSA crime rates. The crime rates are based on crimes reported to the police in 2022. It is preferable to use lagged crime because current crime levels could be influenced by policing policies. In each case, a PSA with higher crime rates has more stops, but even with a control for crime rates there impact on the influence of the detainee race on the stop rate.

The final column (8) reproduces column 7, but it includes an additional econometric safeguard to control for potential differences across districts (district fixed effects). A comparison between columns 7 and 8 shows that the coefficients on Black and Latino are not significantly impacted by this addition. As noted, because regressions allow for potential correlations in the errors within a district (clustering standard errors at the district level), the regressions were run with the addition of district fixed effects, and

the results were not materially changed.

Additional specification checks were run to insure the robustness of the results. Instead of using stop rate as the outcome, the number of stops was also examined. The results from these regressions were consistent with those reported. While the number of stops per PSA is large enough for the usual least squares (OLS) regression, we also made use of a negative binomial regression, which is appropriate for use with count data. Again, the results were consistent with those reported.

Table 6 is analogous to Table 5, but it uses the random sample and reports the results of a regression of the incidence of pedestrian frisks (rather than stops) on detainee race and various controls. Rather than aggregating data to the PSA-race level, the data in Table 6 is at the stop level and controls for the quarter of the year. The coefficients on Black and Latino are consistently positive and ranging from 2.9 - 10 percentage points for Black and 3.0 to 9.3 percentage points higher frisk rates for Latino. This data most likely reflects the fact that Blacks and Latinos are frisked at rates several percent higher than Whites. Since the frisk rate for Whites is 23%, Blacks and Latinos who are stopped are about 10 - 40% more likely to be frisked than Whites. However, the results lose statistical significance once the controls are applied, and we cannot rule out that the difference in frisk rate across racial groups is zero.

In sum, after controlling for the demographics of the neighborhood, age, gender, crime rates, and employment, Blacks are stopped at a significantly significant higher rate than Whites, the racially disparate stops are not explained by the most likely alternatives, and the large disparities may continue to reflect patterns of racial bias.

## B. Reasonable Suspicion for Stops and Frisks: Racial Analysis

As reported in the Plaintiffs' Eleventh Report, Fourth Amendment Analysis, the rate of pedestrian stops with reasonable suspicion has increased over the years. However, Table 7 shows that the share of stops *without reasonable suspicion* is 10% for Whites, and 14% for both Latinos and Blacks.<sup>4</sup>

The share of frisks without reasonable suspicion is higher, at 23%, an improvement of 14 percentage points over the second half of 2019, but still a rate of frisks without reasonable suspicion of almost 1 in 4. And for Fourteenth Amendment purposes, the unfounded frisk rate is highest for Blacks, at 24%, compared to 20% for Whites and 18% for Latinos.

As with stop rates and frisks, regressions allow us to understand whether the differences in unfounded stop rates are statistically significant. But unlike the regressions detailed in the previous section, these regressions do not include controls for local characteristics as the reasonable suspicion determination is based exclusively on the information gathered from the detained individual. Therefore, each column in Table 8 reports results from regressions where the dependent variable is whether there was reasonable suspicion for the stop, examining only differences arising from individual demographic characteristics. The coefficient on Detainee Black ranges between -.03 and -.037 and in all cases is statistically significant at the 1% or 5% confidence level. This reinforces the results seen in Table 7(rate of unfounded stops is 3 to 4 percentage points higher for Blacks than Whites) which means that Blacks are over 30% more likely to be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The 13% rate for stops without reasonable suspicion (about 1 in 8) is three percentage points lower than that from the second half of 2019.

### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 10 of 34

stopped without reasonable suspicion than Whites. These disparities are somewhat smaller than in the second half of 2019, though still substantial. The results for Latino detainees are similar in magnitude, ranging between -.028 and -.037, but not statistically significant.

Table 9 is similar to Table 8 and describes regressions of the rate of reasonable suspicion, but now for frisks rather than stops. The coefficient on Detainee Black ranges from -.035 to -.048 indicating a substantial difference in legally justified frisks between Blacks and Whites. Put another way, Blacks are about 20% more likely to be frisked without reasonable suspicion than Whites, although these differences are not statistically significant.<sup>5</sup> Compared to the last report, both the share of frisks lacking reasonable suspicion and the disparity between Blacks and Whites is somewhat lower. The results for Latinos go in the other direction (frisks of Latinos are more likely to have reasonable suspicion), but these differences are not statistically significant.

## C. <u>Hit-Rate Analysis</u>

An important measure of the propriety of stops and particularly of frisks is the rate at which they lead to the discovery of weapons, since frisks are permitted only where the officer reasonably believes that the suspect is armed and dangerous. Moreover, seizures of weapons are often cited as justification for a robust stop and frisk program. The rates of discovery of all contraband from frisks are reported in Table 10 where contraband is categorized as firearms, drugs, or other (e.g., small amounts of cash).

As we have documented in our Eleventh Report, Fourth Amendment Analysis,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The difference between unfounded frisks of Latinos and Whites is small and statistically insignificant.

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 11 of 34

Table 10 reports that roughly 1 in 14 pedestrian frisks yield a firearm, which is the highest rate ever found in the decade-plus of these reports. Drugs were less commonly discovered, 1 in every 24 frisks, a slightly lower rate than in the second half of 2019. As we have noted previously, frisks for drugs are prohibited, and such seizures would be justified in very few cases, e.g., where the officer credibly states that a frisk for weapons produced an immediate "plain feel" of drugs. Overall, contraband was found in about 14% of all frisks.

Table 11 is a more sophisticated approach to the firearms hit-rate analysis. The regressions report the rate of discovery of a firearm in pedestrian frisks. The results are not statistically significant, as there were under 700 frisks in the database. The full dataset is more useful, and Table 12 includes the total 2,036 frisks in Q1 and Q2 of 2023, of which 15.4% resulted in the recovery of contraband or evidence (the type is not categorized in the full data). Hit rates for Blacks are 15.8% and 12.9% for Whites, but even with the larger data set, the differences in the low rates are not statistically significant.

#### **IV.** Observations and Conclusion

We have examined the relationship of race to stop and frisk practices from multiple perspectives, following standard statistical protocols. There are several significant findings and trends. The most obvious is the very large (over 80%) decline in stops relative to the 2019 Q3 and Q4 period of the Tenth Reports. This has led as well to a reduced number of frisks. There was also an improvement in the rate of stops and frisks with reasonable suspicion, although the unfounded rate for frisks remains high at 23%.

The regression analysis shows that, as in previous years, stop rates vary

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 12 of 34

significantly depending on the race of the detainee, with Blacks and Latinos stopped at higher rates. In addition, there is continued evidence of racial disparity in stops and frisks without reasonable suspicion, with Blacks substantially more likely to be subject to a stop lacking reasonable suspicion. Some of the changes observed here, particularly the decline in stops, are likely due to the recently implemented PPD policy on quality of life stops, the PedStat program (discussed below) and, to some extent, the impact of COVID.

Following the filing of the Tenth Reports, the City agreed that there were patterns of racial bias in stops and frisks, and this Court ordered the parties to develop remedial measures that would address the racial bias patterns. The parties agreed on a pilot project in which officers who observe a person engaged in low-level, "quality of life" offenses (e.g., open liquor container, blocking a sidewalk) would not make a forcible stop or frisk; rather, they would tell the person to move on or cease the prohibited conduct, and no stop would be made unless the person refused.

We focused on stops for low level offenses, given the fact that weapons or outstanding warrants were almost never recovered in these stops, and because racial disparities were higher for this category of stops than for more serious incidents. Studies have regularly shown that the greater the discretion that officers have as to whether to intervene by stops, arrests, or use of force, the higher the rate of racial disparities. In proactive policing, an officer who responds to a call or other indication of a serious crime or of illegal use or threatened use of firearms will respond regardless of the race of the suspect, but in situations involving minor offenses, discretion to stop or just to tell the person to "move on" or cease the prohibited conduct too often results in different judgments depending on the race or other characteristics of the alleged offender.

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 13 of 34

The issue of discretion is one of the most difficult in policing; properly exercised, discretion is an important tool for responding to situations that can legitimately have different police action, but where the discretion is broad, it can be unfairly exercised along racial and other arbitrary lines. The pilot was highly successful, with thousands of "mere encounters," where suspected offenders were told to cease the conduct, and where they complied, with very isolated occasions of refusal. Following a Police Department audit showing no adverse impact on crime, the pilot became a city-wide program.

At the same time, in response to studies of car stops that showed even higher racially disparate stops (90% of which were of Black or Latino drivers) especially for equipment related violations (e.g., single light out, tinted windows, expired license or registration) as opposed to moving violations, Philadelphia City Council passed a Driving Equity Ordinance with similar restrictions for car stops, prohibiting stops for minor equipment and registration offenses, with the option of sending a warning or notice by mail.

On a joint agreement of the parties, this Court also approved the implementation of the "PedStat" program that places primary responsibility for reducing racial disparities on Commanders and other high-level supervisors and provides them with real time data via a digital dashboard regarding all stops, frisks, searches, and arrests in their areas of command. This dataset includes racial breakdowns by area population and stops, legality of the stops and frisks, hit rates for weapons, and comparisons of stops and frisks by similarly situated officers, police squads, and special crime units.

Remedying racial bias patterns is a more complex undertaking than remedying Fourth Amendment violations in stops and frisks. We can determine whether an

#### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 14 of 34

individual stop was permissible in terms of the reasonable suspicion standard, but except for the most egregious cases, we do not yet have the tools to determine whether any given stop was motivated by racial bias. Thus, we have turned to the use of large datasets to assess whether individual officers or police units are engaged in biased policing, and we seek to place the ultimate responsibility for such conduct on Commanders.

Each Police Division will be reviewed twice a year and the first set of PedStat reviews have been conducted with specific feed-back to Commanders and Captain in the respective Divisions and Districts. Ultimately, an evaluation of these measures will be used to develop a formal accountability, disciplinary, and incentive system for addressing racial disparities.

### Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 15 of 34

Based on these developments, there is some reason to believe that there is "light at the end of the stop and frisk tunnel," and that continued monitoring, discipline and training will result in substantial compliance with the substantive provisions of the Consent Decree. Plaintiffs look forward to working with the new Mayor, Cherelle Parker, and her Police Commissioner to ensure continued progress on both Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment issues.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/David Rudovsky, Esquire</u> /<u>s/Paul Messing, Esquire</u> /<u>s/ Susan Lin, Esquire</u> Kairys, Rudovsky, Messing, Feinberg & Lin, LLP 718 Arch Street, Suite 501S Philadelphia, PA 19106 (215) 925-4400

<u>/s/ Solomon Worlds</u> ACLU of Pennsylvania

<u>s/Mary Catherine Roper</u> Langer, Grogan, and Diver, PC

Counsel for Plaintiffs

# Figure 1







Figure 3



Figure 4



## 2023 Q1 & Q2 Random Sample Summary Statistics

	(1)	(2)
VARIABLES	Mean	N
Reasonable Suspicion for stop?	87%	2098
Individual Frisked	32%	2071
Reasonable Suspicion for frisk?	77%	666
Search Made	38.6%	2098
Arrest Made	33.5%	2072
Evidence or Contraband Found	12.8%	2072
Firearm Found	6.71%	2072
Drugs Found	3.8%	2072
Detainee Age	30.0	2091
Detainee Male	86%	2097
Detainee Black	73%	2048
Detainee Latino	10.4%	2098

Table includes summary statistics from 2023 Q1 & Q2 random sample, excluding observations incorrectly coded as stops.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
VARIABLES	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max	Obs
Stop of Black Pedestrian	76	58	63	6	366	65
Stop of White Pedestrian	17	10	22	0	159	65
Stop of Hispanic Pedestrian	12	3	26	0	158	65
Stops per 10,000 Black Residents	134	77	183	16	1145	65
Stops per 10,000 White Residents	64	19	110	0	501	65
Stops per 10,000 Hispanic Residents	37	26	38	0	162	65
Detainee Age	30.7	30.7	3.6	14.8	38.6	65
Detainee Male	0.86	0.85	0.06	0.66	1.00	65
PSA Population	21,740	20,113	9,009	<mark>6,940</mark>	43,886	65
PSA Black share	0.44	0.38	0.32	0.03	0.95	65
PSA White share	0.35	0.31	0.29	0.01	0.87	65
PSA Latino share	0.12	0.05	0.17	0.01	0.75	65
PSA Asian share	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.23	65
Employment Rate	0.93	0.92	0.03	0.83	0.98	65
Male population under 24	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.23	65
Violent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)	287	263	154	65	703	65
Property Crime Rate (per 10k residents)	580	508	275	251	1547	65
Drug Crime Rate (per 10k residents)	21	10	45	0	333	65
UCR Part 1 Crime Rate (per 10k residents)	759	684	340	289	1982	65

## 2023 Q1 & Q2 PSA-Level All Stops Summary Statistics

Table includes PSA-level summary statistics from 2023 Q1 & Q2 all stops, excluding PSA 77 (airport)

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 22 of 34

# Table 3

	Black	Latino	White	Total
Stops	1491	193	371	2055
Stop Share	73%	9%	18%	100%
Frisks	503	65	86	654
Frisk Share	77%	10%	13%	100%
Stops/Frisk	3.0	3.0	4.3	3.1
Searches	605	70	114	789
Stops/Search	2.5	2.8	3.3	2.6
Arrests	519	61	98	678
Stops/Arrest	2.9	3.2	3.8	3.0
Contraband or Evidence	197	28	32	257
Frisks/Contraband	2.6	2.3	2.7	2.5

## Counts by Race in Random Sample, 2023 Q1 & Q2

Note: For this table only individuals may only be in one racial/ethnic category. Black and Latino is classified as Black.

# Table 4A

PSA	PSA Black share	Black Share of Stops	Ratio of Black Stop Share to Population Share	Total Stops per 100 Residents	Violent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)
222	95%	97%	1.02	1.6	517
181	94%	98%	1.05	1.3	341
141	94%	93%	0.99	0.6	223
192	93%	96%	1.03	1.4	471
392	93%	9 <b>1%</b>	0.97	2.2	703
393	92%	98%	1.06	1.8	615
142	90%	92%	1.03	1.0	371
124	89%	97%	1.09	1.2	315
162	88%	94%	1.07	1.3	334
353	88%	94%	1.07	1.2	289
191	84%	94%	1.11	0.5	225
123	84%	93%	1.11	1.5	405
182	83%	96%	1.16	2.0	335
224	82%	93%	1.13	0.7	437
122	82%	93%	1.13	1.8	382
121	79%	69%	0.88	0.9	263
172	75%	93%	1.24	1.9	330
193	74%	96%	1.29	0.6	317
221	70%	94%	1.34	1.9	573
352	69%	81%	1.18	1.1	300
351	68%	90%	1.33	0.7	203
173	64%	81%	1.27	0.4	170
223	58%	85%	1.46	1.2	495
144	58%	79%	1.38	0.2	120
391	55%	92%	1.66	0.7	329
251	50%	49%	0.97	1.9	403
161	50%	94%	1.89	0.9	240
143	50%	85%	1.71	0.5	192
254	47%	66%	1.42	2.4	543
21	45%	58%	1.30	0.3	199
151	42%	73%	1.74	1.2	300

## PSA-Level Statistics, Black Stops 2023 Q1 & Q2

PSA-Level Statistics, Black Stops 2025 QI & Q2							
PSA	PSA Black share	Black Share of Stops	Ratio of Black Stop Share to Population Share	Total Stops per 100 Residents	Violent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)		
61	40%	61%	1.52	1.6	387		
22	38%	68%	1.77	0.3	165		
11	35%	71%	2.02	1.2	192		
261	30%	44%	1.45	1.2	377		
152	29%	57%	1.96	0.5	212		
171	27%	74%	2.74	0.8	122		
242	27%	54%	2.00	7.3	528		
262	25%	58%	2.29	1.2	295		
241	25%	54%	2.20	1.4	300		
252	24%	59%	2.42	2.0	318		
183	22%	89%	4.04	0.7	145		
93	21%	74%	3.60	0.4	139		
253	16%	42%	2.58	2.3	374		
81	16%	35%	2.14	0.2	197		
53	16%	88%	5.43	0.1	94		
23	16%	62%	3.86	0.2	166		
62	15%	63%	4.09	2.2	653		
153	14%	39%	2.76	0.6	185		
31	12%	68%	5.61	0.6	137		
71	12%	46%	3.88	0.3	77		
32	11%	42%	3.93	0.9	147		
82	10%	29%	2.81	0.2	114		
51	9%	33%	3.79	0.3	122		
92	9%	72%	8.39	1.4	511		
72	8%	24%	3.05	0.3	65		
83	7%	41%	5.44	0.2	105		
73	7%	55%	7.32	0.1	73		
63	6%	61%	9.53	1.1	403		
33	6%	41%	6.58	0.6	155		
243	6%	43%	7.10	0.9	235		
52	5%	64%	12.50	0.4	147		
91	5%	76%	15.60	0.8	174		
263	4%	39%	9.47	0.5	227		
12	3%	57%	20.5	1.2	154		

# Table 4A, continuedPSA-Level Statistics, Black Stops 2023 Q1 & Q2

# Table 4B

PSA Latino		Lating Share	Ratio of Latino	Total Stops por	Violent Crime
PSA	r SA Latino	of Stops	Stop Share to	100 Posidonto	Rate (per 10k
	Share	of Stops	<b>Population Share</b>	100 Residents	residents)
253	75%	42%	0.56	2.3	374
252	60%	28%	0.47	2.0	318
261	59%	31%	0.54	1.2	377
242	54%	23%	0.43	7.3	528
241	53%	28%	0.52	1.4	300
254	49%	27%	0.54	2.4	543
251	46%	42%	0.91	1.9	403
262	29%	15%	0.52	1.2	295
22	25%	14%	0.53	0.3	165
152	24%	9%	0.37	0.5	212
21	23%	30%	1.30	0.3	199
151	23%	5%	0.20	1.2	300
352	19%	15%	0.80	1.1	300
23	15%	16%	1.09	0.2	166
33	14%	16%	1.15	0.6	155
263	13%	27%	2.06	0.5	227
153	12%	16%	1.33	0.6	185
243	11%	13%	1.23	0.9	235
32	10%	8%	0.78	0.9	147
351	9%	6%	0.68	0.7	203
81	8%	15%	1.98	0.2	197
31	8%	8%	1.05	0.6	137
61	7%	5%	0.72	1.6	387
93	7%	3%	0.36	0.4	139
72	7%	21%	3.18	0.3	65
62	7%	5%	0.80	2.2	653
82	7%	5%	0.74	0.2	114
221	6%	3%	0.53	1.9	573
91	6%	4%	0.74	0.8	174
83	6%	4%	0.67	0.2	105
71	5%	19%	3.52	0.3	77
183	5%	2%	0.38	0.7	145

## PSA-Level Statistics, Latino Stops 2023 Q1 & Q2

# Table 4B, continued

## PSA-Level Statistics, Latino Stops 2023 Q1 & Q2

	DCAlating	Lating Chara	Ratio of Latino	Total Stops par	Violent Crime
PSA		Latino Share	Stop Share to	100 Desidents	Rate (per 10k
	snare	or stops	<b>Population Share</b>	100 Residents	residents)
173	5%	3%	0.68	0.4	170
92	5%	5%	1.05	1.4	511
63	4%	1%	0.30	1.1	403
171	4%	3%	0.68	0.8	122
223	4%	1%	0.33	1.2	495
52	4%	0%	0.00	0.4	147
51	4%	17%	4.36	0.3	122
12	4%	7%	1.76	1.2	154
11	4%	5%	1.46	1.2	192
144	3%	0%	0.00	0.2	120
391	3%	2%	0.67	0.7	329
121	3%	5%	1.55	0.9	263
73	3%	0%	0.00	0.1	73
53	3%	0%	0.00	0.1	94
161	3%	0%	0.00	0.9	240
224	3%	2%	0.73	0.7	437
192	3%	0%	0.00	1.4	471
123	3%	0%	0.00	1.5	405
143	3%	0%	0.00	0.5	192
222	2%	1%	0.57	1.6	517
122	2%	0%	0.00	1.8	382
172	2%	0%	0.00	1.9	330
124	2%	3%	1.50	1.2	315
393	2%	2%	0.86	1.8	615
353	2%	4%	2.07	1.2	289
191	2%	2%	1.39	0.5	225
193	2%	0%	0.00	0.6	317
182	1%	0%	0.00	2.0	335
392	1%	2%	1.48	2.2	703
162	1%	1%	0.58	1.3	334
181	1%	1%	0.80	1.3	341
141	1%	1%	0.79	0.6	223
142	1%	3%	3.50	1.0	371

51	Stop Nate per 10,000 Residents							
VARIABLES	(1)	<mark>(</mark> 2)	(3)	<mark>(</mark> 4)	(5)	<mark>(</mark> 6)	(7)	(8)
Detainee Black	53.76	62.79	66.67	66.43	61.47	62.21	61.72	61.17
	(9.098)**	(8.897)**	(12.09)**	(12.51)**	(11.94)**	(12.18)**	(11.59)**	(12.39)**
Detainee Latino	19.48	28.71	-14.79	-14.87	-20.03	-19.21	-20.03	-20.65
	(6.541)**	(6.197)**	(22.39)	(22.81)	(22.71)	(22.58)	(22.70)	(22.21)
Detainee Male		5.393	15.52	12.90	21.61	17.58	31.79	56.42
		(20.12)	(21.94)	(21.56)	(29.70)	(27.78)	(30.11)	(47.02)
Detainee Age		1.401	1.394	1.370	0.561	0.681	0.593	0.670
		(0.582)*	(0.595)*	(0.674)	(0.530)	(0.539)	(0.517)	(0.527)
PSA Asian share			-72.66	-108.6	-88.10	-97.50	-51.88	-206.1
			(106.0)	(119.8)	(91.63)	(98.00)	(72.78)	(139.0)
PSA Black share			-13.15	-44.19	-49.74	-38.25	-92.41	-106.2
			(17.31)	(30.69)	(24.71)	(25.38)	(32.82)*	(59.00)
PSA Latino share			177.5	124.9	118.7	133.6	73.89	113.2
			(67.74)*	(39.89)**	(42.50)*	(44.49)**	(33.10)*	(70.25)
Male population under 24				96.51	18.65	21.98	29.85	139.0
				(121.2)	(90.15)	(98.70)	(92.95)	(166.3)
Employment Rate				-379.5	-364.9	-371.9	-296.1	-144.2
				(251.1)	(189.8)	(203.1)	(169.8)	(232.9)
UCR Part 1 Crime Rate (per 10k residents)					0.0650			
					(0.0136)**			
Property Crime Rate (per 10k residents)						0.0659		
						(0.0152)**		
Violent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)							0.217	0.302
							(0.0556)**	(0.126)*
Constant	20.34	-33.61	-50.00	318.8	289.5	298.7	224.8	42.33
	(4.902)**	(29.15)	<mark>(</mark> 27.66)	(243.2)	(181.7)	(196.6)	(159.3)	(217.4)
District Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	195	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
R-squared	0.137	0.145	0.295	0.306	0.37	0.348	0.416	0.501

# Table 5 Stop Rate per 10,000 Residents

Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

## Case 2:10-cv-05952-JP Document 154 Filed 11/19/23 Page 28 of 34

		Т	able 6					
			Frisk					
VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Detainee Black	0.10	0.060	0.032	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.032
	(0.020)**	(0.024)*	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.025)
Detainee Latino	0.093	0.053	0.034	0.034	0.036	0.036	0.035	0.030
	(0.044)*	(0.048)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.038)
Detainee Male		0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.22
		(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.029)**	(0.031)**
Detainee Age		-0.0044	-0.0042	-0.0043	-0.0044	-0.0044	-0.0044	-0.0042
		(0.00078)**	* (0.00081)**	(0.00082)**	(0.00081)**	(0.00082)**	(0.00080)**	(0.00072)**
PSA Asian share			0.57	0.49	0.48	0.47	0.52	0.31
			(0.25)*	(0.28)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.24)*	(0.32)
PSA Black share			0.19	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.14	-0.087
			(0.033)**	(0.075)*	(0.074)*	(0.072)*	(0.079)	(0.12)
PSA Latino share			0.17	0.17	0.17	0.19	0.13	-0.058
			(0.049)**	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.080)
Male population under 24				0.59	0.51	0.52	0.50	-0.044
				(0.69)	(0.61)	(0.63)	(0.60)	(0.75)
Employment Rate				0.31	0.27	0.25	0.37	-0.38
				(0.74)	(0.73)	(0.74)	(0.71)	(0.81)
UCR Part 1 Crime Rate (per 10k residents)					0.000061			
					(0.000033)			
Property Crime Rate (per 10k residents)						0.000066		
						(0.000045)		
Violent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)							0.00018	0.000086
							(0.000084)*	(0.00014)
Constant	0.23	0.21	0.077	-0.24	-0.24	-0.22	-0.31	0.58
	(0.023)**	(0.049)**	(0.055)	(0.71)	(0.69)	(0.70)	(0.68)	(0.74)
District Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	2022	2014	2014	2014	2014	2014	2014	2014
R-squared	0.008	0.049	0.057	0.059	0.061	0.06	0.061	0.078

Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Table 7

# Reasonable Suspicion by Race in Random Sample, 2023 Q1 & Q2

	Black	Latino	White	Total
Stops	1491	193	371	2055
Reasonable Suspicion	1284	166	334	1784
Share of Stops without Reasonable Suspicion	14%	14%	10%	13%
Frisks	503	65	86	654
Reasonable Suspicion	382	53	69	504
Share of Frisks without Reasonable Suspicion	24%	18%	20%	23%

Reasonable Suspicion for Stop							
VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)				
Detainee Black	-0.037	-0.035	-0.03				
	(0.013)**	(0.012)**	(0.013)*				
Detainee Latino	-0.037	-0.035	-0.028				
	-0.033	-0.033	-0.034				
Detainee Male		-0.024	-0.021				
		-0.015	-0.015				
Detainee Age			0.00079				
			-0.00079				
Constant	0.9	0.92	0.89				
	(0.012)**	(0.015)**	(0.030)**				
Observations	2048	2047	2040				
R-squared	0.002	0.003	0.003				

Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

Reasonable Suspicion for Frisk							
VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)				
Detainee Black	-0.044	-0.048	-0.035				
	-0.029	-0.029	-0.032				
Detainee Latino	0.022	0.018	0.034				
	-0.048	-0.046	-0.045				
Detainee Male		0.056	0.071				
		-0.054	-0.049				
Detainee Age			0.0028				
			-0.0015				
Constant	0.8	0.75	0.65				
	(0.028)**	(0.060)**	(0.075)**				
Observations	652	652	651				
R-squared	0.003	0.004	0.011				
Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. ** p<0.01, * p<0.05							

	Black	Latino	White	Total
Frisks	503	65	86	654
Firearm	37	5	5	47
Drugs	19	5	3	27
Any	71	12	14	97
Frisks/Firearm	14	13	17	14
Frisks/Drugs	26	13	29	24
Frisks/Any	7	5	6	7

## Contraband by Race in Random Sample, 2023 Q1 & Q2

## **Firearm Recovered**

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	<mark>(</mark> 6)	(7)	<mark>(</mark> 8)
Detainee Black	0.0068	-0.0091	-0.0046	-0.0058	-0.0062	-0.0061	-0.0056	-0.0084
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Detainee Latino	0.0024	-0.0050	-0.012	-0.011	-0.011	-0.011	-0.0099	-0.0076
	(0.023)	(0.026)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.040)
Detainee Male		0.065	0.065	0.064	0.065	0.064	0.068	0.067
		(0.0098)**	(0.0099)**	(0.012)**	(0.012)**	(0.012)**	(0.012)**	(0.012)**
Detainee Age		-0.0018	-0.0018	-0.0017	-0.0018	-0.0018	-0.0018	-0.0018
		(0.00088)	(0.00086)	(0.00083)	(0.00084)*	(0.00084)	(0.00083)*	(0.00094)
PSA Asian share			0.083	0.017	0.012	0.0082	0.041	0.58
			(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.23)	(0.34)
PSA Black share			0.0036	-0.017	-0.016	-0.011	-0.038	0.24
			(0.045)	(0.061)	(0.057)	(0.058)	(0.058)	(0.14)
PSA Latino share			0.043	0.015	0.019	0.025	-0.0044	0.059
			(0.077)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.097)
Male population under 24				0.57	0.50	0.52	0.48	0.61
				(0.39)	(0.32)	(0.34)	(0.29)	(0.37)
Employment Rate				-0.038	-0.034	-0.043	0.022	0.70
				(0.55)	(0.53)	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.86)
UCR Part 1 Crime Rate (per 10k residents)					0.000031			
					(0.000021)			
Property Crime Rate (per 10k residents)						0.000030		
						(0.000029)		
Viloent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)							0.00010	-0.000018
							(0.000052)	(0.000075)
Constant	0.082	0.082	0.067	0.076	0.052	0.063	0.0020	-0.76
	(0.015)**	(0.034)*	<b>(</b> 0.054 <b>)</b>	(0.53)	(0.51)	(0.52)	(0.50)	(0.86)
District Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	652	651	651	651	651	651	651	651
R-squared	0.004	0.014	0.015	0.020	0.022	0.021	0.023	0.055

Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05

# **Contraband Recovered**

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	<mark>(</mark> 5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Detainee Black	0.029	0.038	0.043	0.043	0.045	0.044	0.047	0.046
	(0.034)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Detainee Latino	0.029	0.037	0.063	0.063	0.068	0.066	0.071	0.074
	(0.038)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.033)*	(0.033)*
Detainee Male		-0.081	-0.077	-0.076	-0.076	-0.077	-0.074	-0.066
		(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.069)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.066)	(0.065)
Detainee Age		0.00073	0.00071	0.00066	0.00058	0.00059	0.00059	0.00037
		(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)
PSA Asian share			-0.15	-0.12	-0.10	-0.12	-0.017	0.30
			(0.29)	(0.27)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.21)	(0.22)
PSA Black share			-0.048	0.013	0.017	0.029	-0.029	0.19
			(0.059)	(0.062)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.062)	(0.13)
PSA Latino share			-0.12	-0.016	-0.0094	0.0054	-0.060	-0.17
			(0.058)	(0.11)	(0.093)	(0.098)	(0.091)	(0.098)
Male population under 24				-0.28	-0.40	-0.38	-0.42	-0.053
				(0.29)	(0.21)	(0.24)	(0.20)*	(0.34)
Employment Rate				0.75	0.76	0.72	0.91	1.63
				(0.65)	(0.57)	(0.60)	(0.54)	(0.74)*
UCR Part 1 Crime Rate (per 10k residents)					0.000080			
					(0.000038)*	ł		
Property Crime Rate (per 10k residents)						0.000078		
						(0.000048)		
Viloent Crime Rate (per 10k residents)							0.00024	0.00037
							(0.000095)*	* (0.00019)
Constant	0.15	0.19	0.24	-0.47	-0.54	-0.50	-0.68	-1.51
	(0.042)**	(0.070)*	(0.089)*	(0.60)	(0.53)	(0.56)	(0.51)	(0.72)*
District Fixed Effect	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Observations	2,040	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036
R-squared	0.003	0.007	0.010	0.012	0.016	0.014	0.019	0.037

Standard errors in parentheses clustered at district level. \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05