

Racial Profiling



Prepared by Dwight Steward ,
Ph.D., Steward Research Group
and Molly Totman, Texas Criminal
Justice Coalition (TCJC) on behalf of
ACLU of Texas, NAACP Texas,
LULAC Texas and TCJC

February 2005



Don't Mind If I Take a Look, Do Ya?

An Examination of Consent
Searches and Contraband Hit
Rates at Texas Traffic Stops

Principal Authors:

Dwight Steward, Ph.D., Steward Research Group
Molly Totman, Texas Criminal Justice Coalition

Research Assistance:

Amy Raub, Steward Research Group

Principal Editors:

Scott Henson, American Civil Liberties Union of Texas
Eva Owens, Texas Criminal Justice Coalition
King Downing, American Civil Liberties Union

Prepared for:

Texas Criminal Justice Coalition (TCJC)
American Civil Liberties Union of Texas (ACLU)
League of United Latin American Citizens of Texas (LULAC)
Texas State Conference of NAACP Branches (NAACP)

Funded through support by the Gideon Project of the Open Society Institute, Public Welfare Foundation, and the Tides Foundation.

February, 2005

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our greatest appreciation to the summer interns at the Texas Criminal Justice Coalition: David Leung and Debbie Goan for their contributions to this report. Their dedication and management of the quality and accuracy of the data entry procedures proved fundamental to this process. We are also grateful to the volunteers who assisted in this project, including Rebekah Duke, Jennifer Jeans, Holly Martin, Kenavon Carter, and Scott Angelus. Many thanks are due to Scott Henson, Will Harrell, King Downing, and Kathy Mitchell of the ACLU; Elizabeth Washington of the NAACP; and Eva Owens of TCJC for their valuable input and editorial assistance. Finally, we would like to thank the Public Welfare Foundation, the Tides Foundation, and the Open Society Institute for providing the funding to research, produce, and distribute this report.

Anyone wishing to produce all or part of this report may do so provided it is copied and distributed without financial gain and with proper credit. Copies are available online at www.criminaljusticecoalition.org, or by contacting the Texas Criminal Justice Coalition at 602 W. 7th Street, Suite 104, Austin, Texas 78701.

Don't Mind If I Take a Look, Do Ya?

An Examination of Consent Searches and Contraband Hit Rates at Texas Traffic Stops

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| Recommendations | 6 |
| Who is Getting Searched? Summary of Findings | 9 |
| Racial Disparities in Searches by Department | 10 |
| Racial Disparities in Consent Searches by Department | 24 |
| 2002 v. 2003 Racial Disparities in Searches by Department | 37 |
| Who is Found with Contraband? Summary of Findings | 42 |
| Racial Disparities in Contraband Hit Rates by Department | 43 |
| How Did Law Enforcement Agencies Comply with the Racial Profiling Law? | 45 |
| Why Collect Additional Data? | 46 |
| Appendices | |
| Appendix 1: The 2001 Racial Profiling Law (S.B. 1074) | 49 |
| Appendix 2: Defining and Measuring Racial Profiling | 50 |
| Appendix 3: Methodology | 51 |

Executive Summary

With the passage of Texas Senate Bill 1074 (S.B. 1074) in 2001, law enforcement agencies must now annually report detailed statistics concerning the race of individuals who are stopped and searched in their jurisdictions. For this study, reports from 1,060 agencies were collected, with a focus on search and contraband data. Specifically, analyses were conducted of total search figures, consent search figures, and contraband figures to determine if racial disparities existed – if so, such would indicate the targeting of certain racial groups for selective enforcement. Particular attention was given to examining potential racial disparities in consent searches, thereby eliminating from the analysis searches which may be outside of an officer's discretion. Analyses of search data – combined with contraband hit rate data – would also help gauge the efficiency and legitimacy of current police practices.

The entire dataset collected for this study includes several million police-civilian contacts representing the majority of traffic stops in Texas. This report analyzes each contributing agency's self-reported statistics, as well as the quality of the reports produced, in order to better inform policy leaders, law enforcement agencies, and community members as they address the problem and the perception of racial profiling. **This is the largest set of racial profiling data that has ever been collected and analyzed, and it is the first inter-department review of contraband data collected by Texas law enforcement agencies.**

Definitions

- “Consent search”: a search where the officer does not have any legal authority for conducting it but instead must ask the detainee for consent to search his person or vehicle. Consent searches are sometimes referred to as “high officer discretion searches” because officers have full discretion as to whether to ask for a search.
- “Contraband hit rate”: a measure of how many searches resulted in illegal items, such as drugs or weapons, being discovered for each particular race.

Goals

The goals of this report are three-fold:

- Analyze the racial distribution of total searches, consent searches, and contraband

hit rates in Texas using self-reported data submitted by police and sheriff's departments.

- Review the quality of the racial profiling data collected and reported by law enforcement agencies.
- Recommend solutions to better analyze and monitor racial profiling figures and deter ineffective law enforcement practices.

Key Findings

- (1) Texas law enforcement agencies continue to search Blacks and Latinos at higher rates than Anglos: approximately **2 out of 3** agencies reported searching Blacks and Latinos at higher rates than Anglos following a traffic stop. 66% of agencies searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos, while 69% of agencies searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos.
- (2) Of the agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates often, **7 out of 10** (71%) searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos, representing a significant disparity in treatment between Anglos and Blacks. Of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, **9 out of 10** (90%) searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos, representing a significant disparity in treatment between Anglos and Latinos.
- (3) Consent searches – performed without any legal basis to search – contributed significantly to general search disparities: approximately **3 out of 5** agencies reported consent searching Blacks and Latinos at higher rates than Anglos following a traffic stop. 61% of agencies consent searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos, while 59% of agencies consent searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos.
- (4) Of the agencies that consent searched Blacks at higher rates often, **3 out of 4** (75%) consent searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they consent searched Anglos, representing a significant disparity in treatment between Anglos and Blacks. Of the agencies that consent searched Latinos at higher rates, **3 out of 4** (74%) consent searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they consent searched Anglos, representing a significant disparity in treatment between Anglos and Latinos.

- (5) Patterns of over-searching Blacks and Latinos are consistent. Approximately **3 out of 4** agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos also searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos (75%), while **3 out of 5** agencies that consent searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos also consent searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos (61%).
- (6) Of the agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates, **51%** were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Blacks – meaning Anglos and Blacks were equally likely to be found with contraband. Of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, **58%** were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Latinos – meaning Anglos were slightly more likely than Latinos to be found with contraband.
- (7) Racial disparities in search rates appear to be growing. Approximately **3 out of 5** agencies reported searching Blacks or Latinos at higher rates in 2003 than 2002 (60%). Note: this figure includes agencies with *any* increase in rates for Blacks or Latinos from 2002 to 2003.
- (8) The vast majority of agencies provided no mitigating information or insight to explain disparate search rates between Anglos and minorities, nor did contraband hit rates suggest efficient law enforcement practices were being utilized.
- (9) Auditing of data is non-existent or unreliable. Over half of agencies did not report using any data auditing procedures or audio-video

review to ensure against human errors, technical errors, or data falsification.

- (10) Imprecision in both data quality and reporting restricts the usefulness of analysis. Ultimately, the lack of a generally accepted uniform reporting standard limited the accuracy of analysis involved for some reports filed by law enforcement agencies.

Conclusion

Initial findings show that Blacks and Latinos in Texas communities are more likely to be searched, though Anglos are equally likely or more likely to be found with contraband during searches. High minority search rates are particularly evident in the area of consent searches – where searches cannot be explained by outside factors such as probable cause or outstanding warrants. Without some explanation of mitigating factors by law enforcement agencies, this would indicate that police are not only engaging in race-based policing but are ineffectively and inefficiently utilizing law enforcement resources.

Agencies should identify and authenticate legitimate law enforcement practices that may be contributing to racial disparities in their data. Furthermore, in the absence of an explanation for disparate search and contraband rates, law enforcement leadership and policy-makers should take steps to monitor and reduce race-based policing.

Recommendations

Local Governments and the Texas Legislature Should Recognize and Address Racial Disparities

Despite departmental numbers indicating significant racial disparities, most agencies gave no indication in their reports as to what caused these disparities. Few gave explanations for the differences in treatment or identified any mitigating factors based on legitimate law enforcement practices that might have caused the racial disparities.

However, they may have been caused by other, non-raced based factors in law enforcement – in other words, racial disparities may not indicate any given department engages in racial profiling. But to make this determination, both local governments and the Texas Legislature should recognize and seek explanations for the identified inequalities. City councils, county commissioners, and police supervisors should: (1) investigate the reasons for the disparities highlighted in this report, and (2) implement policies to monitor and eliminate profiling within their agencies. Meanwhile, the Texas Legislature should amend the current law to provide for a more comprehensive, streamlined, and standardized data collection process, thereby creating a system of uniform reports that account for local traffic patterns and clarify legitimate law enforcement practices. More specifically, the Legislature should: (1) adopt uniform reporting standards, (2) require all departments to collect additional, explanatory data elements, and (3) establish an independent statewide repository for the annual reports. Additionally, the Texas Legislature should take steps to reduce the unnecessarily high search rates of Blacks and Latinos in Texas by banning consent searches. Our findings show that departments have reported significant racial disparities in consent searches, where officers may choose at their discretion to ask an individual to submit to a search.

Adopt Uniform Reporting Standards

Because agencies have never been given a clear system – or a “template” – for collecting and reporting their annual data, the nearly 1,000 racial profiling reports we received for this study varied greatly from agency to agency. For example, 23% of law enforcement agencies did not report the basic data elements required by S.B. 1074, thereby preventing agency-wide comparisons in

those instances. Likewise, 37% of departments did not break out the data elements – especially search types – by all racial categories, making racial analysis (both for those individual departments and across agencies) an impossible task. In some instances, departments counted Latinos as Anglos, while in many others, departments did not collect data on Native Americans and Asian Americans.

Lack of a clear reporting format has caused additional analysis problems. For example, several departments collapsed different sets of data together, making comparisons across departments cumbersome. In fact, some departments included written warnings, dispatched call contacts, or pedestrian stops in the same column with law-enforcement initiated traffic citation stops, while other departments varied in what they reported for searches and arrests: some excluded searches incident to arrest; others excluded arrests resulting from warrants.

In order to facilitate the most concrete comparisons of data – thus allowing for a better analysis between and within law enforcement agencies – departments should be provided with the simplest and most precise means by which to report their data. The Texas Legislature should take this step and amend the law to clearly identify and standardize reporting procedures. In return, the intent of S.B. 1074 will best be reinforced with more accurate data comparisons and analysis.

Require All Departments to Collect Additional, Explanatory Data Elements

While current data indicates racial disparities in searches by law enforcement agencies, agencies are currently collecting too few data elements to isolate specific practices that cause racial disparities. Though some agencies oppose collection of extra information, the results yielded by the analysis of specific additional data elements – in conjunction with the data elements already being collected (*see Appendix 1*) – often vindicate law enforcement agencies by giving them credit for legitimate, routine police activities (e.g., searches incident to arrest.) Consequently, it is in the best interests of both law enforcement and the public to collect supplementary information.

For instance, departments should collect data and report on each type of search separately, as different types of searches involve different levels of officer discretion. More specifically, a greater focus on **non-discretionary search data** will help law enforcement agencies understand whether disparate search rates are, in fact, a result of legitimate law enforcement practices or whether they represent racial profiling. For example, if search rates as a whole are higher for a particular racial group, but a great percentage of those searches were non-discretionary, such as probable cause searches, searches incident to arrest, or inventory searches – then the higher number of searches may be explained by legitimate, non-race based practices. Put another way, if a department does not distinguish between search types, racial disparities can be either overly inflated or obscured. Ultimately, when an officer has no choice but to search an individual or his vehicle, both the data and analysis should reflect that.

Likewise, the collection and analysis of **contraband data** in addition to basic search data is recommended and may help explain higher search rates of a particular racial group. If data for one department shows that Blacks and Latinos are searched at a higher rate than Anglos, but it also shows that contraband is found in their possession at a higher rate than for Anglos, the higher number of searches may be explained by legitimate factors (such as suspicious behavior) rather than race. More often the case, agencies with high search rates of minorities in practice tend to find contraband just as often or more frequently among Anglos.

Finally, departments should collect and analyze **non-citation data**, which includes information on stops that do not result in a citation or arrest. Currently, there are a large number of motorists who are stopped and possibly searched but are not issued a citation or arrested, and they are not included in most agency's report figures. A study released by the ACLU of Texas last year found that drug task forces do not ticket drivers at 98% of traffic stops. Without the collection of information from non-citation stops, any analysis of department-level data – including this analysis – will be missing a critical dataset of police-civilian contacts. To get the clearest and most accurate picture of what is happening at stops and to perform a more purposeful analysis of racial disparities, collection of non-citation data is essential.

Establish an Independent Statewide Repository for Reports

The Texas Legislature should mandate that agencies submit their annual reports not only to their local governing bodies, but also to an independent and neutral centralized agency. Such an agency could provide the above-mentioned standardized reporting format for consistent agency data submission. In addition, it would be in the best position to collect and maintain data on a statewide level, as well as produce an annual, statewide comparison of the data.

Having such a repository for the reports would create an additional layer of accountability for law enforcement agencies, and it would aid both law enforcement agencies, policy-makers, and the public in conducting comparisons of departmental data and addressing racial profiling issues.

Ban Consent Searches

“Consent searches” occur when an officer asks for permission to search an individual or his vehicle (i.e., to look for contraband), despite having no probable cause or legal right to do so. In Texas, reporting by local departments shows that minorities are asked for consent most often. In fact, current data shows that 2 out of 3 law enforcement agencies reported consent searching Blacks or Latinos at higher rates than Anglos following a traffic stop. Clearly, this is a substantial majority of agencies.

A preliminary review of the contraband hit rates from consent searches does not indicate that these searches are proving fruitful. This suggests that consent searches not only yield high racial disparities, but that they are likely an ineffective and inefficient use of law enforcement resources.

In order to reduce unnecessarily high minority search rates, the Texas Legislature should ban consent searches in Texas. To date, New Jersey, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Hawaii have all banned consent searches statewide, and the California Highway Patrol ended the practice as part of a lawsuit settlement. Despite doubts, crime did not increase as a result of the bans: prohibiting consent searches does not impair officers' effectiveness when fighting crime; it merely **redirects their energy away from unproductive police practices and towards preventing actual crimes**. The Texas Legislature is in a position to address the problems posed by

consent searches and reduce the search rates of Blacks and Latinos in Texas.

Analyze Officer-Level Data

Departments should use officer-specific data internally as part of a comprehensive early warning system to guard against racial profiling and re-direct energies towards the most effective methods of law enforcement and drug interdiction. Especially in smaller and mid-size departments, the actions of a few officers assigned to traffic enforcement can dramatically influence department-wide statistics. Even if legitimate reasons explain disparate results (i.e., the officer's specific assignment in a particular neighborhood), such judgments can only be made in an individual – not a department-wide – context. Although S.B. 1074 does not allow for the disclosure of individual officer data in an annual report, departments can and should use this data for their own supervisory purposes. Video cameras financed under S.B. 1074 provide an excellent system for supervisors to perform oversight where disparities are unexplained or racial profiling is suspected.

Require Data Auditing

Although law enforcement agencies must collect data, there are few measures in place to ensure that this data is being collected and reported accurately. Approximately half of all agencies did not report using any data auditing procedures or audio-video review to ensure against human errors, technical errors, or data tampering.

We cannot fully rely on the conclusions of any study or report unless mechanisms are in place to reasonably and reliably guarantee that all

information is reported for each stop, that the required information is reported accurately and completely, and that the researchers provide for and account for data problems in their design, analysis, and conclusions.

A review of Texas racial profiling reports reveals a critical need for auditing mechanisms. Our research found a number of departments where totals were not properly computed or major discrepancies in reporting were evident. Significant data collection problems could have been identified and corrected if local agencies had merely compared the total number of racial profiling data entries to the total number of traffic stops to ensure they matched. University analysts and law enforcement agencies in other data-collecting states have already developed model auditing processes for departmental use. Ultimately, simple and low-cost auditing procedures can and should be put in place to ensure against human error, technical errors, and data tampering.

Enforce the Requirements of S.B. 1074

Of agencies that responded to an open records request, 23% of police and sheriff's departments did not report all basic stop and search data required by S.B. 1074, while over one-third of departments did not break out all required categories by proper racial designations. Dozens of other departments did not respond to initial or follow-up open records requests, as required by law. The Texas Legislature, local city councils, and county commissioners' courts should ensure that all local law enforcement agencies are reporting racial profiling data pursuant to current state law.

Who is Getting Searched?

Summary of Findings

| | |
|--------------|---|
| One | Approximately 2 out of 3 law enforcement agencies in Texas were more likely to search Blacks and Latinos following a traffic stop than Anglos. 66% of agencies searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos, while 69% of agencies searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos. |
| Two | Of the agencies that searched Blacks more often, 7 out of 10 (71%) searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos. Of the agencies that searched Latinos more often, 9 out of 10 (90%) searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos. |
| Three | Approximately 3 out of 5 law enforcement agencies in Texas were more likely to ask Blacks and Latinos for a consent search following a traffic stop than Anglos. 61% of agencies consent searched Blacks at higher rates than Anglos, while 59% of agencies consent searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos. |
| Four | Of the agencies that consent searched Blacks more often, 3 out of 4 (75%) consent searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they consent searched Anglos. Of the agencies that consent searched Latinos more often, 3 out of 4 (74%) consent searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they consent searched Anglos. |
| Five | Approximately 3 out of 4 agencies which reported searching Blacks at higher rates than Anglos also searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos (75%), while 3 out of 5 agencies which reported consent searching Blacks at higher rates than Anglos also consent searched Latinos at higher rates than Anglos (61%). |
| Six | Approximately 3 out of 5 agencies reported searching Blacks or Latinos at higher rates in 2003 than 2002 (60%). |

Racial Disparities in Searches by Department

Blacks and Latinos in Texas were more likely than Anglos to be searched following a traffic stop by Texas law enforcement agencies in 2003: approximately 2 out of 3 agencies searched Blacks and Latinos at higher rates than Anglos. Of the agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates, 7 out of 10 searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos. Likewise, of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, 9 out of 10 searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos.

Notes on Table 1

The relative search likelihood was calculated separately for each department by dividing the percentage of Blacks or Latinos who were searched following a traffic stop by the percentage of Anglo drivers searched following a stop. Some departments filed reports with obvious or potential inaccuracies; others submitted incomplete data or data showing that no stops or searches were conducted of a particular racial group. As such, this data was not

used for comparative analysis and has been designated with an entry of 'x'. Furthermore, we have chosen to not report the search ratio of police departments with a search ratio in excess of 3.0 until we are able to verify the validity of the underlying data.

Agencies in bold font had search rates for Blacks or Latinos at 1.5 or greater, meaning they searched Blacks or Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos.

Table 1: Alphabetical Listing of Police and Sheriff’s Departments with Relative Search Rates

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| Abernathy Police Department | >3 | 1.6 |
| Abilene Police Department | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Addison Police Department | 1.5 | 2.7 |
| Alamo Heights Police Department | (0.2) | 1.6 |
| Alba Police Department | 1.4 | >3 |
| Allen Police Department | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Alpine Police Department | >3 | (0.7) |
| †Alto Police Department | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Amarillo Police Department | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| Anderson County Sheriff’s Department | (0.6) | (0.6) |
| Andrew Police Department | x | (0.6) |
| Angleton Police Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Anson Police Department | 2.7 | 1 |
| Aransas County Sheriff’s Department | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| Arcola Police Department | (0.5) | (0.6) |
| Argyle Police Department | (0.6) | 1.4 |
| †Arlington Police Department | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Athens Police Department | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Atlanta Police Department | 1 | x |
| Aubrey Police Department | x | >3 |
| Austin County Sheriff’s Department | (0.9) | 2.1 |
| Austin Police Department | >3 | 2.3 |
| Azle Police Department | >3 | 1.4 |
| Balch Springs Police Department | 1.4 | >3 |
| †Balcones Heights Police Department | >3 | 2 |
| Bandera County Sheriff’s Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Bardwell Police Department | (0.6) | (0.9) |
| Bartlett Police Department | 1.6 | 2.7 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| †Bastrop County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Bastrop Police Department | 2.8 | (0.2) |
| †Bay City Police Department | 2.5 | 1.3 |
| Bayou Vista Police Department | 1 | 1.4 |
| Baytown Police Department | 1.7 | (0.8) |
| Bedford Police Department | x | 2.3 |
| Bee County Sheriff's Department | (0.2) | 1 |
| Beeville Police Department | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Bellaire Police Department | (0.7) | (0.8) |
| Bellmead Police Department | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Bellville Police Department | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| †Benbrook Police Department | 2 | 1.5 |
| Bexar County Constable, Pct. 3 | x | 2.7 |
| Bexar County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.9 |
| Big Sandy Police Department | (0.5) | (0.7) |
| Big Springs Police Department | 1.1 | 1 |
| Bishop Police Department | x | (0.2) |
| Blanco Police Department | >3 | 2.9 |
| Blue Mound Police Department | 1.7 | 2.9 |
| Boerne Police Department | 2.2 | (0.9) |
| Bogata Police Department | (0.8) | (0.6) |
| Borger Police Department | 2.4 | 1.1 |
| Bosque County Sheriff's Department | 2.1 | (0.6) |
| †Bowie County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.3 |
| Bowie Police Department | (0.3) | 1 |
| Brady Police Department | (0.4) | 1.7 |
| †Brazoria County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| Brazoria Police Department | >3 | 1.1 |
| Brazos County Sheriff's Department | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| Breckenridge Police Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| Brenham Police Department | (0.8) | (0.5) |
| Brewster County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.8) |
| Brookshire Police Department | 1.6 | 1 |
| Brookside Village Police Department | 1 | 1.5 |
| Brown County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.9 |
| Brownfield Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Brownsboro Police Department | (0.4) | 1.5 |
| Brownwood Police Department | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Bruceville-Eddy Police Department | 1.2 | 2.2 |
| Bryan Police Department | >3 | 3 |
| Buffalo Police Department | 1 | (0.9) |
| Burkburnett Police Department | 1.3 | (0.7) |
| Burleson County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 2.2 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Burleson Police Department | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Burnet Police Department | 2.7 | 1.5 |
| Callahan County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | x |
| Cameron Police Department | 2.2 | >3 |
| Canton Police Department | 1.1 | (0.3) |
| Canyon Police Department | (0.7) | 3 |
| Carrollton Police Department | 2 | 2.5 |
| Carthage Police Department | 1.1 | >3 |
| Cass County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 3 |
| Cedar Hill Police Department | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Cedar Park Police Department | (0.5) | (0.7) |
| [†] Celeste Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Center Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Chandler Police Department | 2 | 1.4 |
| Cherokee County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | (0.5) |
| Childress County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.5 |
| Clarksville Police Department | 1.2 | 2.3 |
| Clear Lake Shores Police Department | (0.9) | >3 |
| Cleburne Police Department | 2 | 1.7 |
| [†] Clint Police Department | 2.3 | 2.9 |
| Cochran County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Cockrell Hill Police Department | (0.9) | 1.1 |
| [†] Coffee City Police Department | (0.6) | 1.4 |
| Coleman Police Department | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| College Station Police Department | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Colleyville Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Collin County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | (0.6) |
| Collingsworth County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | x |
| [†] Collinsville Police Department | x | 1.5 |
| Colorado County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Comal County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Comanche County Sheriff's Department | x | 1 |
| Concho County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Coney City Police Department | >3 | 2.2 |
| Conroe Police Department | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Converse Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 |
| Cooke County Sheriff's Department | 2.6 | 1.4 |
| Coppell Police Department | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| [†] Copperas Cove Police Department | 2.2 | 1.2 |
| Corrigan Police Department | 1 | >3 |
| Corsicana Police Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Crandall Police Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Crane Police Department | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Crawford Police Department | x | 1.2 |
| Crosbyton Police Department | x | 1.3 |

[†] Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Crowley Police Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Cuero Police Department | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Daisetta Police Department | 1.7 | (0.7) |
| Dalhart Police Department | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Dallas County Constable, Pct. 2 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| †Dallas County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.7 |
| Dallas Police Department | 2.1 | 3 |
| Dayton Police Department | (0.5) | 1.7 |
| Deaf Smith County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.7) |
| Decatur Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Deer Park Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Del Rio Police Department | 1.3 | (0.6) |
| Denison Police Department | 1.6 | (0.7) |
| Denver City Police Department | x | 2 |
| †DeSoto Police Department | 2 | 2.6 |
| Devine Police Department | >3 | (0.4) |
| Dewitt County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Diboll Police Department | 1.8 | >3 |
| Dickinson Police Department | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Dublin Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| Dumas Police Department | 1.4 | (0.7) |
| Duncanville Police Department | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Eagle Lake Police Department | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| Eagle Pass Police Department | x | 1.8 |
| East Tawakoni Police Department | >3 | x |
| Eastland County Sheriff's Department | 1.9 | (0.8) |
| Eastland Police Department | (0.4) | (0.3) |
| Edcouch Police Department | 1.6 | (0.2) |
| Eden Police Department | (0.9) | (0.7) |
| Edinburg Police Department | 2.5 | (0.7) |
| Edna Police Department | 1.7 | 1.9 |
| Edwards County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| El Paso County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | x |
| El Paso Police Department | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Electra Police Department | x | >3 |
| Ennis Police Department | 1.6 | 3 |
| Erath County Sheriff's Department | 2.3 | 1.1 |
| Estelline Police Department | x | >3 |
| Eules Police Department | (0.9) | x |
| Fair Oaks Ranch Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| Fairfield Police Department | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Falfurrias Police Department | x | 2.7 |
| Fayette County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| Ferris Police Department | 1.5 | >3 |
| Fisher County Sheriff's Department | 2.1 | 1.2 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| Flatonia Police Department | (0.7) | 1.7 |
| Florence Police Department | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| Floresville Police Department | 2 | 2.2 |
| Flower Mound Police Department | (0.4) | 1.4 |
| Fort Bend County Sheriff's Department | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Fort Worth Police Department | 1.8 | 1 |
| Franklin County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.6) |
| Frankston Police Department | (0.8) | x |
| †Fredericksburg Police Department | 1.6 | 2.3 |
| †Freeport Police Department | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Friendswood Police Department | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Frio County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.7 |
| Friena Police Department | >3 | 2.3 |
| Frisco Police Department | 2.7 | 2.4 |
| †Fritch Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| Frost Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Gaines County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | (0.9) |
| Galveston County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | x |
| Galveston Police Department | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Ganado Police Department | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Garden Ridge Police Department | 1.4 | 3 |
| Garland Police Department | 2 | 1.4 |
| Garza County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 2.8 |
| †Georgetown Police Department | >3 | 2.9 |
| Gillespie County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1.1 |
| Gilmer Police Department | 1.1 | 2.4 |
| Glenn Heights Police Department | 2.5 | >3 |
| Goliad County Sheriff's Department | 2.9 | 1.3 |
| Gonzales Police Department | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Granbury Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| †Grand Prairie Police Department | 1.9 | 1.7 |
| Grand Saline Police Department | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Granger Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Grapeland Police Department | (0.9) | x |
| Grapevine Police Department | >3 | 2.5 |
| Greenville Police Department | 2.7 | 2.3 |
| Gregg County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | 2.8 |
| Gregory Police Department | x | 2 |
| Grimes County Sheriff's Department | 2.5 | 1.8 |
| Groesbeck Police Department | 1 | 2.4 |
| Groves Police Department | (0.5) | x |
| Guadalupe County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 1.1 |
| Gun Barrel City Police Department | (0.7) | 1.3 |
| Haltom City Police Department | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Hamilton County Sheriff's Department | x | 1 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Hamlin Police Department | >3 | 1.8 |
| Hardin County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 2.8 |
| Harker Heights Police Department | (0.7) | (0.9) |
| Harlingen Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 2 | 1.4 | (0.4) |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 3 | (0.8) | (0.6) |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 6 | (0.2) | (0.6) |
| [†] Harris County Constable, Pct. 7 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 8 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Harris County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1 |
| Harrison County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| Haskell County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Haskell Police Department | 1.3 | (0.8) |
| Hawkins Police Department | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| Hedwig Village Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| [†] Helotes Police Department | (0.5) | (0.4) |
| [†] Hemphill County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.7 |
| Hemphill Police Department | (0.3) | (0.6) |
| [†] Hempstead Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Henderson Police Department | (0.8) | x |
| Hereford Police Department | >3 | 2 |
| Hewitt Police Department | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| Hickory Creek Police Department | (0.7) | 1.6 |
| Highland Park Department of Public Safety | >3 | >3 |
| Hill Country Village Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| Hill County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.3) |
| Hillsboro Police Department | 2 | >3 |
| Hitchcock Police Department | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Hollywood Park Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| Hondo Police Department | >3 | 2 |
| Honey Grove Police Department | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| Hood County Sheriff's Department | >3 | x |
| Hopkins County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1 |
| Horizon City Police Department | x | 1.7 |
| Houston Police Department | >3 | 2.5 |
| Howard County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.2 |
| Hudspeth County Sheriff's Department | (0.3) | x |
| Hughes Springs Police Department | (0.3) | x |
| Humble Police Department | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Hunt County Sheriff's Department | (0.5) | 1.4 |
| Huntsville Police Department | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Hurst Police Department | (0.8) | 1 |
| Hutchins Police Department | 2.9 | 2.7 |
| Hutto Police Department | 1.7 | 2.7 |
| Idalou Police Department | (0.7) | (0.6) |

[†] Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| Ingleside Police Department | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Iowa Park Police Department | 1.4 | 1 |
| Irion County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.4 |
| Irving Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| † Jacinto City Police Department | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Jacksboro Police Department | (0.4) | >3 |
| Jackson County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Jacksonville Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Jamaica Beach Police Department | >3 | x |
| Jefferson County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | 1.8 |
| Jersey Village Police Department | 1.5 | x |
| Jim Hogg County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.7 |
| Jonestown Police Department | x | (0.3) |
| Joshua Police Department | x | 1 |
| Junction Police Department | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Justin Police Department | 1.6 | >3 |
| Katy Police Department | 1.4 | x |
| Kaufman County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Kaufman Police Department | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Keller Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Kemah Police Department | 1 | 1.5 |
| Kemp Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Kent County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 2.2 |
| † Kerens Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Kermit Police Department | x | 1.5 |
| Kerr County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.9 |
| Killeen Police Department | 1.4 | (0.6) |
| Kimble County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 1.3 |
| Kinney County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.4 |
| Kirby Police Department | 1.1 | (0.5) |
| Krum Police Department | x | (0.4) |
| † Kyle Police Department | 2.3 | 2 |
| La Coste Police Department | >3 | 1.2 |
| La Feria Police Department | x | (0.1) |
| La Grange Police Department | (0.5) | (0.6) |
| La Marque Police Department | 1.8 | 2 |
| La Porte Police Department | 1 | 1 |
| La Salle County Sheriff's Department | x | 1 |
| Lackney Police Department | 1.2 | (0.1) |
| Lacy Lakeview Police Department | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Lago Vista Police Department | x | 1 |
| Laguna Vista Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| Lake Dallas Police Department | (0.5) | 1.3 |
| † Lake Jackson Police Department | x | 1.2 |
| Lake Worth Police Department | 2 | (0.8) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| Lakeport Police Department | (0.7) | 1.5 |
| [†] Lakeview Police Department | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Lakeway Police Department | 2.3 | 1.4 |
| [†] Lamar County Sheriff's Department | 1 | x |
| Lamb County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.6 |
| Lamesa Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Lampasas Police Department | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Lancaster Police Department | 1.6 | (0.7) |
| Lavaca County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.3 |
| League City Police Department | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| [†] Leander Police Department | (0.7) | 1.3 |
| [†] Leon County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | 1.1 |
| Leon Valley Police Department | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Leonard Police Department | 2.5 | x |
| Liberty County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | x |
| Liberty Police Department | (0.5) | (0.6) |
| Lindale Police Department | 1 | 1.3 |
| Linden Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| Lipscomb County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.1 |
| Little Elm Police Department | (0.5) | 1 |
| Live Oak Police Department | 2 | 1 |
| Livingston Police Department | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Llano County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.5 |
| Llano Police Department | x | (0.6) |
| Lockhart Police Department | >3 | 2.9 |
| Lockney Police Department | 1.2 | (0.1) |
| Log Cabin Police Department | 1.6 | (0.5) |
| Lone Oak Police Department | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Longview Police Department | 2.7 | 1.4 |
| Lorena Police Department | >3 | 2 |
| Lubbock County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.6 |
| Lubbock Police Department | >3 | 2.3 |
| Lufkin Police Department | 1.3 | 1 |
| Lytle Police Department | x | 1.7 |
| Mabank Police Department | 2.5 | x |
| Madison County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Madisonville Police Department | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Malakoff Police Department | (0.3) | (0.6) |
| Mansfield Police Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Manvel Police Department | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Marble Falls Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 |
| Marion Police Department | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| Marshall Police Department | 1.9 | >3 |
| Mart Police Department | 1.3 | >3 |
| Martindale Police Department | 1.3 | 1.9 |

[†] Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|--|---|---|
| Mason County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.2 |
| Mathis Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| McAllen Police Department | >3 | 1.4 |
| McGregor Police Department | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| McKinney Police Department | >3 | (0.5) |
| Meadows Place Police Department | 2.3 | 2 |
| Melissa Police Department | 1.8 | 2.9 |
| Memorial Villages Police Department | 2.4 | 1.7 |
| Menard County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Merkel Police Department | >3 | x |
| Mesquite Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| †Midland County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.4 |
| Midland Police Department | >3 | 1.7 |
| Mineral Wells Police Department | x | >3 |
| Mission Police Department | >3 | 1.1 |
| Missouri City Police Department | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| Monahans Police Department | >3 | 1 |
| Montgomery County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.9 |
| Montgomery Police Department | 1.2 | 1 |
| Morgan's Point Police Department | (0.3) | x |
| Morgan's Point Resort Police Department | 1.8 | 2.5 |
| Mount Pleasant Police Department | 1.7 | 1 |
| Mount Vernon Police Department | 1.1 | (0.7) |
| Muleshoe Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| Munday Police Department | (0.6) | 1.3 |
| Murphy Police Department | >3 | 2.7 |
| Mustang Ridge Police Department | 3 | 2.2 |
| Nacogdoches Police Department | 1.6 | (0.6) |
| Naples Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| †Nassau Bay Police Department | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| Natalia Police Department | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| Navarro County Sheriff's Department | (0.2) | (0.3) |
| Navasota Police Department | 2 | 3 |
| Nederland Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| Needville Police Department | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| †New Boston Police Department | (0.7) | 1.4 |
| New Deal Police Department | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| New Summerfield Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Nolan County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| North Richland Hills Police Department | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Nueces County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | 1.8 |
| Oak Ridge North Police Department | (0.8) | 1 |
| Odessa Police Department | 2.6 | 1.5 |
| Oldham County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.3 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Olmos Park Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| [†] Olney Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Olton Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| Orange Grove Police Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| Orange Police Department | 1 | x |
| Ore City Police Department | (0.7) | 2.1 |
| Overton Police Department | (0.9) | 1.5 |
| Ovilla Police Department | >3 | x |
| [†] Palestine Police Department | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Palm Valley Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| Palmer Police Department | 1.2 | 2.1 |
| Palmview Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| Pampa Police Department | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| Panhandle Police Department | >3 | 2.8 |
| Panola County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 2.5 |
| Pantego Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| [†] Paris Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| Parker Police Department | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Parmer County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.4 |
| Patton Village Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| [†] Pearland Police Department | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Pflugerville Police Department | 1 | 1.1 |
| Pharr Police Department | x | >3 |
| [†] Pittsburg Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Plainview Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Plano Police Department | 2.5 | >3 |
| Pleasanton Police Department | >3 | 1.7 |
| Polk County Sheriff's Department | 1 | (0.6) |
| Port Aransas Police Department | (0.8) | (0.6) |
| Port Arthur Police Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Port Isabel Police Department | 1 | (0.7) |
| Port Neches Police Department | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Portland Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Poteet Police Department | x | 2.6 |
| Potter County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Pottsboro Police Department | 2.6 | x |
| Prairie View Police Department | 1.7 | 2.1 |
| Primera Police Department | >3 | (0.7) |
| Princeton Police Department | 2.6 | 2.9 |
| Rains County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | (0.8) |
| Rancho Viejo Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| Randall County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| [†] Ranger Police Department | (0.5) | 1 |

[†] Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Reagan County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Real County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.1 |
| Refugio County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 2.4 |
| Refugio Police Department | 2.1 | 1.6 |
| Rhome Police Department | >3 | x |
| Richardson Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Richland Hills Police Department | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Richmond Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Rio Grande City Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| Rio Vista Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| River Oaks Police Department | 1.6 | (0.8) |
| Roanoke Police Department | (0.8) | (0.8) |
| Robinson Police Department | 1 | 1.4 |
| Robstown Police Department | x | >3 |
| Rockdale Police Department | 2 | 2.3 |
| †Rockport Police Department | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Rockwall Police Department | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Rogers Police Department | >3 | 1.7 |
| Roman Forest Police Department | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Ropesville Police Department | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| Rose City Police Department | 2 | >3 |
| Rosenberg Police Department | 1.7 | 2 |
| Rowlett Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Royse City Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Rusk County Sheriff's Department | (0.4) | x |
| Rusk Police Department | (0.8) | 1.5 |
| Sabinal Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| Sabine County Sheriff's Department | 1 | (0.6) |
| Saginaw Police Department | 1 | (0.6) |
| San Angelo Police Department | 2.6 | 1.6 |
| San Antonio Police Department | 2.9 | 2.2 |
| San Augustine Police Department | 2.2 | x |
| San Marcos Police Department | (0.8) | 1.5 |
| San Patricio County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | 3 |
| †San Saba County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.9) |
| San Saba Police Department | 1.1 | (0.8) |
| Sanger Police Department | 2.3 | x |
| Sansom Park Police Department | (0.8) | 1 |
| Sante Fe Police Department | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| Schertz Police Department | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Seabrook Police Department | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Seagoville Police Department | (0.5) | (0.4) |
| Sealy Police Department | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| Seminole Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Seven Points Police Department | 1.4 | (0.4) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Seymour Police Department | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| †Shamrock Police Department | 1.2 | 1 |
| Shavano Park Police Department | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Shenandoah Police Department | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Sherman Police Department | >3 | 1.3 |
| Shiner Police Department | (0.3) | (0.7) |
| Shoreacres Police Department | (0.8) | 1.6 |
| Silsbee Police Department | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Sinton Police Department | 2.1 | 2.7 |
| Snyder Police Department | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Somerville Police Department | 1.1 | >3 |
| Sour Lake Police Department | (0.6) | 1.3 |
| South Padre Island Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Southmayd Police Department | x | >3 |
| Splendora Police Department | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| Spring Valley Police Department | (0.7) | 2 |
| Spur Police Department | 2 | 2.1 |
| Stafford Police Department | 2.1 | >3 |
| Stephens County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.6 |
| Stephenville Police Department | (0.5) | (0.9) |
| Sterling County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.9) |
| Sugar Land Police Department | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Sullivan City Police Department | (0.8) | (0.2) |
| Sulphur Springs Police Department | 2 | 2 |
| †Sunset Valley Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| † Surfside Beach Police Department | 3 | (0.4) |
| Sweeny Police Department | (0.6) | >3 |
| † Taft Police Department | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Tarrant County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | (0.4) |
| Tatum Police Department | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Taylor County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.1 |
| Taylor Police Department | >3 | 2.9 |
| Teague Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Temple Police Department | >3 | 2.3 |
| Terrell Hills Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| Terry County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.9) |
| Texarkana Police Department | 2.1 | 1.3 |
| Texas City Police Department | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| Texas Department of Public Safety | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| The Colony Police Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Thompsons Police Department | 1.5 | (0.9) |
| Thorndale Police Department | x | >3 |
| Thrall Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Tolar Police Department | >3 | >3 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Tom Green County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| Tomball Police Department | 1.8 | (0.9) |
| Tool Police Department | >3 | 1.6 |
| †Travis County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Trenton Police Department | 2.2 | >3 |
| Trinidad Police Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Troy Police Department | >3 | 2.6 |
| Tulia Police Department | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Tye Police Department | 2.8 | x |
| Tyler Police Department | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| †Universal City Police Department | 1.2 | >3 |
| University Park Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Upshur County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | (0.6) |
| Valley Mills Police Department | (0.7) | x |
| Van Alstyne Police Department | 2.2 | 1.3 |
| Van Police Department | (0.6) | >3 |
| Van Zandt County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | >3 |
| †Venus Police Department | 1.7 | 2 |
| Vernon Police Department | 1 | 1.1 |
| †Victoria Police Department | 2 | 1.7 |
| †Vidor Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Waco Police Department | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| Waelder Police Department | (0.9) | 1.2 |
| Walker County Sheriff's Department | 2.6 | x |
| Waller County Sheriff's Department | (0.3) | 1.2 |
| Waller Police Department | 1.3 | 2.2 |
| †Wallis Police Department | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Ward County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Washington County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| Waskom Police Department | 1 | 2.1 |
| Watauga Department of Public Safety | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Waxahachie Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| Weatherford Police Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Webb County Sheriff's Department | >3 | x |
| Webster Police Department | 1.8 | 2.7 |
| Weimar Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 |
| West Orange Police Department | (0.5) | (0.7) |
| Westworth Police Department | (0.7) | 1.8 |
| Wharton County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | 2.1 |
| Wheeler County Sheriff's Department | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| White Settlement Police Department | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Whitewright Police Department | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| Wichita Falls Police Department | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| Williamson County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Willis Police Department | 1.2 | (0.9) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be searched than Anglos? | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be searched than Anglos? |
|---|---|---|
| Wilmer Police Department | (0.7) | >3 |
| Wilson County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.1 |
| †Windcrest Police Department | 2.2 | 2 |
| Winnsboro Police Department | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| Wise County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.4) |
| Wolfforth Police Department | (0.7) | 1.1 |
| Wood County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | (0.8) |
| Woodbranch Police Department | 2.2 | >3 |
| Woodville Police Department | 1.9 | (0.3) |
| Wylie Police Department | (0.3) | 1.9 |
| Yoakum County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.2 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

Racial Disparities in Consent Searches by Department

Blacks and Latinos in Texas were more likely than Anglos to be consent searched following a traffic stop by Texas law enforcement agencies in 2003: approximately 3 out of 5 agencies consent searched Blacks and Latinos at higher rates than Anglos. Of the agencies that consent searched Blacks at higher rates, 3 out of 4 searched Blacks at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos. Likewise, of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, 3 out of 4 searched Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos.

Notes on Table 2

The relative consent search likelihood was calculated separately for each department by dividing the percentage of Blacks or Latinos who were consent searched following a traffic stop by the percentage of Anglo drivers consent searched following a stop. Some departments filed reports with obvious or potential inaccuracies; others submitted incomplete data or data showing that no stops or consent searches were conducted of a particular racial group. As such, this data was not used for comparative

analysis and has been designated with an entry of 'x'. Furthermore, we have chosen to not report the consent search ratio of police departments with a consent search ratio in excess of 3.0 until we are able to verify the validity of the underlying data.

Agencies in bold font had search rates for Blacks or Latinos at 1.5 or greater, meaning they searched Blacks or Latinos at least 50% more frequently than they searched Anglos.

Table 2: Alphabetical Listing of Police and Sheriff’s Departments with Relative Consent Search Rates

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Consent Search Rate | Latino v. Anglo Consent Search Rate |
|--|--|---|
| | How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Abernathy Police Department | >3 | 2.2 |
| Abilene Police Department | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Addison Police Department | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| Alamo Heights Police Department | 1.8 | (0.9) |
| Alba Police Department | x | >3 |
| Allen Police Department | 1.2 | (0.6) |
| Alpine Police Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| Alvin Police Department | 2 | (0.8) |
| Amarillo Police Department | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| Anderson County Sheriff’s Department | (0.7) | (0.8) |
| Andrew Police Department | x | (0.7) |
| Angleton Police Department | 1.5 | 1 |
| Anson Police Department | >3 | (0.4) |
| Aransas County Sheriff’s Department | 2 | 1.2 |
| Arcola Police Department | (0.8) | (0.4) |
| Argyle Police Department | 1.3 | 1 |
| †Arlington Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Armstrong County Sheriff’s Department | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| Athens Police Department | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| Atlanta Police Department | (0.9) | x |
| Aubrey Police Department | x | >3 |
| Austin County Sheriff’s Department | (0.6) | 1.7 |
| Austin Police Department | >3 | 2.7 |
| Azle Police Department | x | 2.3 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Balch Springs Police Department | 2.6 | >3 |
| †Balcones Heights Police Department | >3 | 1.8 |
| †Ballinger Police Department | x | 1.5 |
| Bandera County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | (0.7) |
| Bandera Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| Bartlett Police Department | (0.4) | 1.1 |
| †Bastrop County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Bastrop Police Department | 1.8 | x |
| †Bay City Police Department | 2.7 | 1.3 |
| Bayou Vista Police Department | 1.9 | 2 |
| Baytown Police Department | 1.9 | (0.8) |
| Bedford Police Department | x | 2.3 |
| Bee County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Beeville Police Department | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Bellaire Police Department | (0.8) | (0.8) |
| Bellmead Police Department | 1.1 | 2 |
| Bellville Police Department | 1.4 | (0.2) |
| †Benbrook Police Department | >3 | 1.9 |
| Beverly Hills Department of Public Safety | >3 | 1.1 |
| Bexar County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.5 |
| Big Sandy Police Department | (0.6) | (0.4) |
| Big Springs Police Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Bishop Police Department | x | (0.2) |
| Blue Mound Police Department | x | >3 |
| Boerne Police Department | >3 | (0.9) |
| Bogata Police Department | >3 | x |
| Borger Police Department | 2.4 | (0.8) |
| Bosque County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| †Bowie County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Bowie Police Department | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| Brady Police Department | 1.5 | 1.9 |
| †Brazoria County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Brazos County Sheriff's Department | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Brenham Police Department | (0.9) | (0.8) |
| Brewster County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.9 |
| Bridge City Police Department | (0.7) | x |
| Brookshire Police Department | 2.1 | 1 |
| Brown County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.9 |
| Brownfield Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Brownsboro Police Department | (0.5) | (0.5) |
| Brownsville Police Department | x | (0.7) |
| Brownwood Police Department | 1.3 | (0.6) |
| Bruceville-Eddy Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Bryan Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Buffalo Police Department | 1 | (0.9) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Burkburnett Police Department | 1.8 | (0.3) |
| Burleson County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | x |
| Burleson Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Burnet Police Department | x | 1.2 |
| Caldwell County Sheriff's Department | (0.6) | 1.3 |
| Caldwell Police Department | (0.9) | (0.7) |
| Calhoun County Sheriff's Department | 1.9 | (0.6) |
| Cameron Police Department | 2 | 1.9 |
| Canton Police Department | 1.2 | x |
| Canyon Police Department | x | 1.3 |
| Carrollton Police Department | 1.8 | 2 |
| Carthage Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| Cass County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | >3 |
| Cedar Park Police Department | (0.4) | (0.7) |
| †Celeste Police Department | x | >3 |
| Center Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Chandler Police Department | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| Cherokee County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | (0.4) |
| Childress County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.4 |
| Clear Lake Shores Police Department | (0.9) | >3 |
| Clyde Police Department | (0.4) | 2.2 |
| Cochran County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| †Coffee City Police Department | x | >3 |
| Coleman Police Department | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| College Station Police Department | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Colleyville Police Department | (0.7) | x |
| Collin County Sheriff's Department | (0.6) | (0.4) |
| Colorado County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Comal County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Comanche County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.6 |
| Conroe Police Department | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Converse Police Department | 1 | 1.7 |
| Cooke County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | (0.4) |
| Coppell Police Department | 1.3 | >3 |
| †Copperas Cove Police Department | 2 | 1.1 |
| Corrigan Police Department | 1.1 | 2.1 |
| Corsicana Police Department | 1.1 | (0.6) |
| Coryell County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | 1.5 |
| Crandall Police Department | 2.6 | x |
| Crane Police Department | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Crawford Police Department | x | >3 |
| Crosbyton Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| Crowley Police Department | (0.8) | 1.2 |
| Cuero Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Daisetta Police Department | 1.9 | (0.8) |
| Dalhart Police Department | >3 | 1.5 |
| Dallas County Constable, Pct. 2 | 1.2 | (0.9) |
| †Dallas County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1.9 |
| Dallas Police Department | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| Dayton Police Department | (0.2) | 2.5 |
| Deaf Smith County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.5) |
| Decatur Police Department | >3 | 2 |
| Deer Park Police Department | 1 | (0.8) |
| Del Rio Police Department | 1 | (0.7) |
| Denison Police Department | (0.8) | (0.5) |
| Denver City Police Department | x | 2.1 |
| †DeSoto Police Department | 1.1 | (0.7) |
| Diboll Police Department | 1.7 | 2.6 |
| Dickinson Police Department | (0.6) | 1 |
| Dublin Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| Dumas Police Department | 1.4 | (0.7) |
| Duncanville Police Department | 1.2 | (0.9) |
| Eagle Lake Police Department | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| Early Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| East Tawakoni Police Department | >3 | x |
| Eastland County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | (0.5) |
| Edcouch Police Department | 1.6 | (0.2) |
| Eden Police Department | 1.7 | (0.6) |
| Edinburg Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Edna Police Department | 1.9 | 2.5 |
| Edwards County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.1 |
| El Paso County Sheriff's Department | 1 | x |
| El Paso Police Department | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| Elgin Police Department | 2.9 | 1.3 |
| Ellis County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | x |
| Erath County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.2 |
| Estelline Police Department | x | >3 |
| Eules Police Department | (0.8) | x |
| Fair Oaks Ranch Police Department | x | 1.3 |
| Fairfield Police Department | 1.2 | 1 |
| Falfurrias Police Department | x | 2.9 |
| Fayette County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1.2 |
| Fisher County Sheriff's Department | 2.5 | (0.6) |
| Flatonia Police Department | (0.7) | 1.1 |
| Florence Police Department | 2.7 | 1.9 |
| Floresville Police Department | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| Flower Mound Police Department | (0.8) | (0.7) |
| Fort Bend County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | 2.1 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Fort Worth Police Department | 1.5 | (0.7) |
| Franklin County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | (0.4) |
| Frankston Police Department | (0.7) | x |
| †Freeport Police Department | 1.4 | (0.5) |
| Friendswood Police Department | 1.2 | (0.1) |
| Frio County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.9 |
| Friena Police Department | 2.5 | (0.5) |
| Frisco Police Department | 1.6 | 2 |
| †Fritch Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| Gaines County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Galveston County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | x |
| Galveston Police Department | 1 | (0.6) |
| Ganado Police Department | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Garden Ridge Police Department | 2.7 | >3 |
| Garland Police Department | 2 | 1.4 |
| Garza County Sheriff's Department | 2.4 | 2.9 |
| †Georgetown Police Department | 2.7 | >3 |
| Giddings Police Department | (0.6) | 2 |
| Gilmer Police Department | (0.8) | (0.6) |
| Glenn Heights Police Department | 2.4 | >3 |
| Goliad County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2 |
| Gonzales Police Department | (0.9) | 1.1 |
| Granbury Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| †Grand Prairie Police Department | 1.6 | (0.7) |
| Grand Saline Police Department | 2.6 | (0.5) |
| Granger Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Grapeland Police Department | (0.9) | x |
| Grapevine Police Department | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| Greenville Police Department | 2.1 | (0.9) |
| Gregg County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | 2.9 |
| Gregory Police Department | x | 2.5 |
| Grimes County Sheriff's Department | 2.2 | x |
| Groesbeck Police Department | 1 | >3 |
| Groves Police Department | (0.6) | x |
| Guadalupe County Sheriff's Department | 2 | (0.9) |
| Gun Barrel City Police Department | (0.6) | 1 |
| Hamilton County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.4 |
| Hamlin Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| Hardeman County Sheriff's Department | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| Hardin County Sheriff | 1 | 2.9 |
| Harker Heights Police Department | (0.9) | (0.9) |
| Harlingen Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 2 | 1.2 | (0.5) |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 3 | (0.9) | 1.1 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|---|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 6 | (0.3) | (0.2) |
| [†] Harris County Constable, Pct. 7 | >3 | >3 |
| Harris County Constable, Pct. 8 | 1.9 | 1 |
| Harris County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Harrison County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Haskell County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Haskell Police Department | 2.5 | 1.2 |
| Hawkins Police Department | 2.2 | x |
| [†] Hemphill County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.4) |
| [†] Hempstead Police Department | 1.2 | (0.9) |
| Hereford Police Department | >3 | 1.8 |
| Hewitt Police Department | 1.3 | 2.3 |
| Hickory Creek Police Department | (0.8) | 1.7 |
| Highland Park Department of Public Safety | >3 | >3 |
| Hill Country Village Police Department | x | 1.8 |
| Hill County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.3) |
| Hillsboro Police Department | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| Holliday Police Department | x | 1.3 |
| Hondo Police Department | >3 | 2.2 |
| Honey Grove Police Department | 1.6 | 2.5 |
| Hood County Sheriff's Department | >3 | x |
| Hopkins County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Horizon City Police Department | x | 2.7 |
| Houston Police Department | >3 | 1.9 |
| Howard County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.2 |
| [†] Howe Police Department | >3 | x |
| Hughes Springs Police Department | (0.6) | x |
| Humble Police Department | (0.8) | 1.3 |
| Hunt County Sheriff's Department | (0.5) | 1.6 |
| Huntsville Police Department | 1.7 | 2 |
| Hurst Police Department | (0.7) | 1.2 |
| Hutchins Police Department | >3 | x |
| Hutto Police Department | (0.9) | >3 |
| Idalou Police Department | x | (0.4) |
| Ingleside Police Department | 2.4 | (0.7) |
| Iowa Park Police Department | x | 2.4 |
| Irving Police Department | 1 | 1.1 |
| Italy Police Department | x | >3 |
| [†] Jacinto City Police Department | (0.9) | (0.9) |
| Jacksboro Police Department | x | >3 |
| Jackson County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| Jacksonville Police Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Jasper Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| Jefferson County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.7 |

[†] Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|---|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Jim Hogg County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.7 |
| Johnson County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.2 |
| Joshua Police Department | x | 1.9 |
| Justin Police Department | x | 1.2 |
| Katy Police Department | 1.5 | x |
| Kaufman Police Department | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Keller Police Department | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Kemah Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Kenedy Police Department | x | 1.6 |
| Kent County Sheriff's Department | 2.6 | 1.8 |
| †Kerens Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Kermit Police Department | x | 1.7 |
| Kerr County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.9 |
| Killeen Police Department | 1.6 | (0.8) |
| Kimble County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 1.3 |
| Kinney County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1 |
| Krum Police Department | x | (0.5) |
| La Coste Police Department | x | >3 |
| La Feria Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| La Grange Police Department | (0.3) | (0.4) |
| La Marque Police Department | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| La Porte Police Department | (0.7) | (0.4) |
| La Salle County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.8) |
| Lacy Lakeview Police Department | 2 | 1.5 |
| Lago Vista Police Department | x | (0.6) |
| Laguna Vista Police Department | x | (0.7) |
| Lake Dallas Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| †Lake Jackson Police Department | x | 1.6 |
| Lake Worth Police Department | 2.2 | (0.6) |
| Lakeport Police Department | (0.6) | >3 |
| †Lakeview Police Department | 1 | 1.2 |
| Lakeway Police Department | x | 1 |
| Lamar County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | x |
| Lamb County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.6 |
| Lamesa Police Department | >3 | 3 |
| Lampasas Police Department | 1.8 | 2.3 |
| Lancaster Police Department | 1.4 | >3 |
| Laredo Police Department | x | >3 |
| Lavaca County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.6 |
| League City Police Department | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| †Leander Police Department | (0.9) | (0.7) |
| †Leon County Sheriff's Department | (0.6) | (0.8) |
| Leon Valley Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 |
| Leonard Police Department | 1 | 1.9 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|---|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Liberty County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | x |
| Liberty Police Department | (0.5) | x |
| Lindale Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Linden Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| Lipscomb County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.7 |
| Little Elm Police Department | (0.3) | (0.6) |
| Live Oak Police Department | 1.9 | (0.9) |
| Livingston Police Department | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Llano County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.5 |
| Llano Police Department | x | 1.7 |
| Lockhart Police Department | 2.4 | 1 |
| Longview Police Department | 2.1 | (0.9) |
| Lorena Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Lubbock County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Lubbock Police Department | 2.4 | 1.5 |
| Lufkin Police Department | (0.9) | (0.8) |
| †Lytle Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| Mabank Police Department | >3 | x |
| Madison County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.2 |
| Madisonville Police Department | (0.8) | (0.9) |
| Magnolia Police Department | 1.3 | >3 |
| Malakoff Police Department | (0.3) | (0.4) |
| Mansfield Police Department | (0.9) | (0.9) |
| Manvel Police Department | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| Marble Falls Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Marion Police Department | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| Marshall Police Department | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| Mart Police Department | (0.9) | >3 |
| Martindale Police Department | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Mason County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.2 |
| Mathis Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| McAllen Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| McCulloch County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | (0.6) |
| McGregor Police Department | (0.5) | 1 |
| McKinney Police Department | >3 | 2.8 |
| Meadows Place Police Department | 2 | (0.5) |
| Medina County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Melissa Police Department | 2.1 | 2.5 |
| Menard County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Merkel Police Department | >3 | x |
| Mesquite Police Department | 1 | 1.5 |
| †Midland County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.3 |
| Midland Police Department | >3 | 1.8 |
| Milford Police Department | (0.3) | (0.8) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|---|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Mineral Wells Police Department | x | >3 |
| Mission Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| Missouri City Police Department | 1.3 | 2.3 |
| Monahans Police Department | (0.7) | (0.5) |
| Montgomery County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.9 |
| Montgomery Police Department | (0.8) | (0.7) |
| Mount Pleasant Police Department | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| Mount Vernon Police Department | 1.2 | (0.7) |
| Munday Police Department | x | 2.9 |
| Murphy Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Mustang Ridge Police Department | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| Nacogdoches Police Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Naples Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| †Nassau Bay Police Department | >3 | x |
| Natalia Police Department | (0.9) | 1.1 |
| Navarro County Sheriff's Department | (0.2) | (0.3) |
| Navasota Police Department | 1.7 | >3 |
| Nederland Police Department | 1.9 | x |
| †New Boston Police Department | (0.8) | 2.3 |
| New Braunfels Police Department | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| New Deal Police Department | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| New Summerfield Police Department | 2.6 | 1.8 |
| Nocona Police Department | x | 2.5 |
| Nolan County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Nolanville Police Department | >3 | 2.5 |
| North Richland Hills Police Department | 1.2 | (0.6) |
| Nueces County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Oak Point Department of Public Safety | 2.6 | (0.4) |
| Oak Ridge North Police Department | (0.5) | 1.8 |
| Odessa Police Department | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| Oldham County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.3 |
| Olmos Park Police Department | >3 | 2.4 |
| †Olney Police Department | 3 | >3 |
| Orange Grove Police Department | >3 | 1.5 |
| Orange Police Department | (0.9) | x |
| Ore City Police Department | x | >3 |
| Ovilla Police Department | >3 | x |
| †Palestine Police Department | 2 | (0.9) |
| Palm Valley Police Department | x | 2.2 |
| Palmer Police Department | 1.1 | 1.9 |
| Palmview Police Department | x | 1.4 |
| Panhandle Police Department | >3 | 1.5 |
| Panola County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Pantego Police Department | 1 | 1.8 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| †Paris Police Department | 1.3 | x |
| Parker Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| †Pearland Police Department | (0.9) | (0.8) |
| Pflugerville Police Department | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Pilot Point Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| †Pittsburg Police Department | (0.9) | (0.2) |
| Plainview Police Department | >3 | 2.9 |
| Plano Police Department | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Pleasanton Police Department | >3 | 2.3 |
| Point Comfort Police Department | x | 2.6 |
| Polk County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | (0.3) |
| Port Aransas Police Department | >3 | x |
| Port Arthur Police Department | 1.4 | 1 |
| Port Isabel Police Department | 2.6 | (0.6) |
| Port Lavaca Police Department | >3 | 1.6 |
| Port Neches Police Department | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Portland Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Poteet Police Department | x | 2.6 |
| Poth Police Department | >3 | 1 |
| Potter County Sheriff's Department | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| †Pottsboro Police Department | >3 | x |
| Prairie View Police Department | 1.8 | (0.7) |
| Primera Police Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| Princeton Police Department | 1.3 | (0.8) |
| Queen City Police Department | 1 | 2.8 |
| Rains County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | (0.7) |
| Rancho Viejo Police Department | x | 1 |
| Randall County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | (0.7) |
| Reagan County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| Real County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.1 |
| Refugio County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| Refugio Police Department | 2 | 1.6 |
| Rice Police Department | (0.6) | (0.4) |
| Richardson Police Department | 1.1 | 2.2 |
| Richland Hills Police Department | 1 | 2.3 |
| Richmond Police Department | 1 | (0.8) |
| Rio Grande City Police Department | x | (0.6) |
| Rio Vista Police Department | x | 2 |
| River Oaks Police Department | 1.7 | (0.3) |
| Roanoke Police Department | 1 | 1 |
| Robinson Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Robstown Police Department | x | >3 |
| Rockdale Police Department | 2 | 2.3 |
| †Rockport Police Department | 1.9 | 1.5 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Rockwall Police Department | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Rogers Police Department | >3 | 2.1 |
| Rollingwood Police Department | x | >3 |
| Roman Forest Police Department | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Ropesville Police Department | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| Rose City Police Department | 2.5 | >3 |
| Rosenberg Police Department | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Rowlett Police Department | (0.8) | 1.4 |
| Royse City Police Department | 1.5 | 1 |
| Rusk Police Department | (0.8) | 1 |
| Sabinal Police Department | x | 1.8 |
| Sabine County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | x |
| San Angelo Police Department | >3 | 2.6 |
| San Antonio Police Department | 2.8 | 1.1 |
| San Augustine Police Department | 2.5 | x |
| San Patricio County Sheriff's Department | 2.5 | >3 |
| †San Saba County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 |
| San Saba Police Department | 2.3 | (0.7) |
| Sanger Police Department | 2.3 | x |
| Sansom Park Police Department | (0.3) | (0.3) |
| Sante Fe Police Department | x | 1.7 |
| Schertz Police Department | 1.5 | (0.6) |
| Seabrook Police Department | 2.7 | x |
| Seagoville Police Department | (0.5) | (0.6) |
| Sealy Police Department | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Seminole Police Department | >3 | 2.4 |
| Seven Points Police Department | 1.6 | x |
| Seymour Police Department | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| †Shamrock Police Department | 1.1 | (0.7) |
| Shavano Park Police Department | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| Shenandoah Police Department | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Sherman Police Department | 2.7 | 1.4 |
| Shoreacres Police Department | 1.6 | x |
| Sinton Police Department | x | >3 |
| Snyder Police Department | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Sour Lake Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| South Padre Island Police Department | >3 | 1.7 |
| Southmayd Police Department | x | >3 |
| Spring Valley Police Department | >3 | (0.8) |
| Springtown Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Spur Police Department | x | (0.3) |
| Stafford Police Department | 1.4 | >3 |
| Stephenville Police Department | 2.3 | 1.9 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|--|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Sterling County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1 |
| Sugar Land Police Department | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| Sullivan City Police Department | (0.8) | (0.2) |
| Sulphur Springs Police Department | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| †Sunset Valley Police Department | x | 1.1 |
| † Surfside Beach Police Department | 1.6 | (0.7) |
| Sweeny Police Department | 1 | 1.2 |
| † Taft Police Department | >3 | 1.3 |
| Tarrant County Sheriff's Department | 2 | (0.3) |
| Tatum Police Department | 1.4 | 1.1 |
| Taylor County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.3 |
| Taylor Police Department | >3 | 2.4 |
| Teague Police Department | 1.3 | (0.9) |
| Temple Police Department | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| Terrell Hills Police Department | x | >3 |
| Terry County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.9) |
| Texarkana Police Department | 2 | 1.3 |
| Texas City Police Department | 1.4 | (0.9) |
| Texas Department of Public Safety | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| The Colony Police Department | x | (0.8) |
| Tolar Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Tom Green County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Tomball Police Department | 1.8 | (0.7) |
| Tool Police Department | x | 2 |
| † Travis County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Trenton Police Department | >3 | x |
| Trinidad Police Department | 1.4 | 1 |
| Troy Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Tyler Police Department | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| † Universal City Police Department | 2.3 | >3 |
| Upshur County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | (0.9) |
| Valley Mills Police Department | x | >3 |
| Van Police Department | 1 | (0.4) |
| Van Zandt County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | >3 |
| † Venus Police Department | 1.7 | 2 |
| † Victoria Police Department | 2.3 | 2.1 |
| † Vidor Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Waco Police Department | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Walker County Sheriff's Department | 2.6 | x |
| Waller Police Department | 1.3 | 2.2 |
| † Wallis Police Department | 2 | 1.2 |
| Ward County Sheriff's Department | 2 | 1.1 |
| Washington County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | (0.9) |
| Waskom Police Department | (0.9) | 2.5 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo | Latino v. Anglo |
|---|---|--|
| | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Blacks to be consent searched than Anglos? | Consent Search Rate How many times more (less) likely are Latinos to be consent searched than Anglos? |
| Watauga Department of Public Safety | 2.2 | 2 |
| Waxahachie Police Department | >3 | x |
| Weatherford Police Department | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Webb County Sheriff's Department | >3 | x |
| Webster Police Department | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Weimar Police Department | 2.4 | 1 |
| West Orange Police Department | (0.5) | x |
| Westworth Police Department | 1.1 | x |
| Wharton County Sheriff's Department | (0.4) | 1.3 |
| Wheeler County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.2 |
| White Oak Police Department | 1.6 | x |
| White Settlement Police Department | 2.2 | 1.8 |
| Wichita Falls Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Williamson County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | 1.8 |
| Willis Police Department | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Wilmer Police Department | (0.7) | >3 |
| Wilson County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.2 |
| †Windcrest Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| Winnsboro Police Department | 2 | (0.5) |
| Wood County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | (0.9) |
| Woodbranch Police Department | 2.2 | >3 |
| Woodville Police Department | 2.1 | (0.5) |
| Wylie Police Department | x | (0.6) |
| Yoakum County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.9 |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

2002 v. 2003 Racial Disparities in Searches by Department

Last year, 413 agencies responded to open records requests asking for their racial profiling data. This year, 1,060 agencies responded. We calculated the change in search rates for agencies that gave us their data for the first two years that it has been collected statewide. **Approximately 3 out of 5 law enforcement agencies reported searching Blacks or Latinos at higher rates in 2003 than 2002.**

Table 3: Alphabetical Listing of Police and Sheriff's Departments with 2002 v. 2003 Relative Search Rates

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate | | | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2003? | Were Blacks more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2003? | Were Latinos more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? |
| Addison Police Department | 1.6 | 1.5 | NO | (0.9) | 2.7 | YES |
| Alamo Heights Police Department | >3 | (0.2) | NO | 2.8 | 1.6 | NO |
| Allen Police Department | 1.7 | 1.2 | NO | 2.2 | 2.5 | YES |
| Angleton Police Department | 1.5 | 1.5 | NO | 1.2 | 1.3 | YES |
| Anson Police Department | (0.6) | 2.7 | YES | (0.9) | 1 | YES |
| Aransas County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 2.5 | YES | (0.7) | 1.6 | YES |
| Argyle Police Department | (0.9) | (0.6) | NO | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Arlington Police Department | 1 | 1.6 | YES | 1 | 1.6 | YES |
| Athens Police Department | 1.1 | 1.6 | YES | 1.2 | 1.5 | YES |
| Austin Police Department | 2.3 | >3 | YES | 2.2 | 2.3 | YES |
| Balch Springs Police Department | (0.8) | 1.4 | YES | 1.6 | >3 | YES |
| Balcones Heights Police Department | (0.9) | >3 | YES | (0.8) | 2 | YES |
| Bandera County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1.1 | YES | 1.1 | (0.9) | NO |
| Bastrop County Sheriff's Department | 1.7 | 1.5 | NO | 1.8 | 1.3 | NO |
| Bastrop Police Department | 1.4 | 2.8 | YES | 1.1 | (0.2) | NO |
| Baytown Police Department | 1.4 | 1.7 | YES | (0.9) | (0.8) | NO |
| Bellaire Police Department | 2.2 | (0.7) | NO | 1.6 | (0.8) | NO |
| Benbrook Police Department | 1.4 | 2 | YES | 1.5 | 1.5 | NO |
| Bexar County Sheriff's Department | >3 | >3 | NO | >3 | 1.9 | NO |
| Big Springs Police Department | (0.8) | 1.1 | YES | (0.9) | 1 | YES |
| Blue Mound Police Department | 1.4 | 1.7 | YES | 1.6 | 2.9 | YES |
| Boerne Police Department | 2.2 | 2.2 | NO | 2.6 | (0.9) | NO |
| Borger Police Department | 1.3 | 2.4 | YES | 1.1 | 1.1 | NO |
| Bowie County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1 | YES | x | 1.3 | NO |
| Brazos County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 2.2 | YES | 1.6 | 1.6 | NO |
| Brenham Police Department | 1.3 | (0.8) | NO | 2.1 | (0.5) | NO |
| Brookshire Police Department | 2 | 1.6 | NO | (0.7) | 1 | YES |
| Brownsboro Police Department | (0.5) | (0.4) | NO | 1.2 | 1.5 | YES |
| Bryan Police Department | >3 | >3 | NO | >3 | 3 | NO |
| Buffalo Police Department | (0.4) | 1 | YES | 2.6 | (0.9) | NO |
| Burkburnett Police Department | 1 | 1.3 | YES | 1 | (0.7) | NO |
| Burleson Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 | YES | 1.3 | 1.1 | NO |

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate | | | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2003? | Were Blacks more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2003? | Were Latinos more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? |
| Burnet Police Department | x | 2.7 | NO | 1.5 | 1.5 | NO |
| Callahan County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.9) | NO | 2.7 | x | YES |
| Canton Police Department | 1.3 | 1.1 | NO | (0.8) | (0.3) | NO |
| Canyon Police Department | 1.1 | (0.7) | NO | 1.3 | 3 | YES |
| Cedar Park Police Department | 1.1 | (0.5) | NO | 1.3 | (0.7) | NO |
| Cherokee County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.4 | YES | (0.3) | (0.5) | YES |
| Childress County Sheriff's Department | x | x | NO | 2.3 | 2.5 | YES |
| Clear Lake Shores Police Department | 2 | (0.9) | NO | >3 | >3 | NO |
| Cleburne Police Department | 2.2 | 2 | NO | 2.2 | 1.7 | NO |
| Coffee City Police Department | x | (0.6) | NO | x | 1.4 | NO |
| College Station Police Department | 2.1 | 2.1 | NO | 2.3 | 1.5 | NO |
| Conroe Police Department | 1.9 | 1.2 | NO | (0.9) | 1.1 | YES |
| Converse Police Department | (0.9) | (0.9) | NO | (0.9) | 1.3 | YES |
| Coppell Police Department | 1.9 | 2.9 | YES | 1.1 | 2.8 | YES |
| Copperas Cove Police Department | 1.6 | 2.2 | YES | 1.4 | 1.2 | NO |
| Corsicana Police Department | 1.2 | 1.4 | YES | (0.9) | (0.9) | NO |
| Dallas County Sheriff's Department | 1.3 | 1.4 | YES | 1.8 | 1.7 | NO |
| Dallas Police Department | 1.8 | 2.1 | YES | 3 | 3 | NO |
| Dayton Police Department | >3 | (0.5) | NO | >3 | 1.7 | NO |
| Deaf Smith County Sheriff's Department | x | x | NO | 1.3 | (0.7) | NO |
| Del Rio Police Department | x | 1.3 | NO | (0.8) | (0.6) | NO |
| Denison Police Department | 1.6 | 1.6 | NO | (0.7) | (0.7) | NO |
| Denver City Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.3 | 2 | YES |
| Dickinson Police Department | (0.9) | 1.1 | YES | (0.4) | 1.1 | YES |
| Dublin Police Department | 1.2 | 0 | NO | 1.6 | (0.8) | NO |
| Dumas Police Department | x | 1.4 | NO | >3 | (0.7) | NO |
| Duncanville Police Department | 1.5 | 1.8 | YES | 2 | 1.8 | NO |
| Eagle Lake Police Department | 1.7 | 1.9 | YES | 1.4 | 1.5 | YES |
| Eagle Pass Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.1 | 1.8 | YES |
| Eastland Police Department | 2.4 | (0.4) | NO | 1.7 | (0.3) | NO |
| Eden Police Department | 1 | (0.9) | NO | 1.1 | (0.7) | NO |
| Edna Police Department | 1.4 | 1.7 | YES | 1.2 | 1.9 | YES |
| El Paso Police Department | 1.8 | 2.9 | YES | 1.2 | 1.5 | YES |
| Erath County Sheriff's Department | x | 2.3 | NO | 2.3 | 1.1 | NO |
| Eules Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) | NO | 1.9 | x | YES |
| Fair Oaks Ranch Police Department | >3 | x | NO | x | 1.1 | NO |
| Floresville Police Department | 1.8 | 2 | YES | 1.8 | 2.2 | YES |
| Flower Mound Police Department | (0.2) | (0.4) | YES | (0.6) | 1.4 | YES |
| Fort Worth Police Department | 1.8 | 1.8 | NO | 1 | 1 | NO |
| Fredericksburg Police Department | 1.3 | 1.6 | YES | 2 | 2.3 | YES |
| Galveston Police Department | 1.6 | 1.3 | NO | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Garden Ridge Police Department | (0.7) | 1.4 | YES | >3 | 3 | NO |
| Garland Police Department | 1.4 | 2 | YES | 1.2 | 1.4 | YES |
| Georgetown Police Department | 2.5 | >3 | YES | 2.6 | 2.9 | YES |

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate | | | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2003? | Were Blacks more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2003? | Were Latinos more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? |
| Granbury Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.6 | 2.2 | YES |
| Grand Prairie Police Department | 1.8 | 1.9 | YES | 1.7 | 1.7 | NO |
| Grand Saline Police Department | x | 1.8 | NO | 1 | 1.2 | YES |
| Grapevine Police Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 2.6 | 2.5 | NO |
| Greenville Police Department | 2.7 | 2.7 | NO | 2.3 | 2.3 | NO |
| Gregory Police Department | 1.8 | x | NO | 1.2 | 2 | YES |
| Grimes County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | 2.5 | YES | >3 | 1.8 | NO |
| Haltom City Police Department | (0.7) | 1.1 | YES | 1.3 | 1.3 | NO |
| Harlingen Police Department | (0.2) | >3 | YES | 1.5 | >3 | YES |
| Harris County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 1.3 | NO | 1.4 | 1 | NO |
| Haskell County Sheriff's Department | x | x | NO | 1 | >3 | YES |
| Hawkins Police Department | x | 1.4 | NO | x | 2.1 | NO |
| Helotes Police Department | x | (0.5) | NO | 1 | (0.4) | NO |
| Hemphill Police Department | (0.9) | (0.3) | NO | (0.3) | (0.6) | YES |
| Hill Country Village Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.9 | 1.4 | NO |
| Hill County Sheriff's Department | 2.7 | x | NO | 2.4 | (0.3) | NO |
| Hillsboro Police Department | x | 2 | NO | x | >3 | NO |
| Hollywood Park Police Department | >3 | x | NO | 2.6 | 2.2 | NO |
| Hood County Sheriff's Department | x | >3 | NO | 1.2 | x | NO |
| Hopkins County Sheriff's Department | 1.9 | 1.5 | NO | (0.9) | 1 | YES |
| Horizon City Police Department | 1.1 | x | NO | (0.7) | 1.7 | YES |
| Houston Police Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 2.4 | 2.5 | YES |
| Hunt County Sheriff's Department | (0.6) | (0.5) | NO | x | 1.4 | NO |
| Huntsville Police Department | 2.1 | 1.5 | NO | >3 | 1.8 | NO |
| Hurst Police Department | 1 | (0.8) | NO | 1 | 1 | NO |
| Idalou Police Department | >3 | (0.7) | NO | 1.3 | (0.6) | NO |
| Ingleside Police Department | (0.9) | 1.6 | YES | 1.8 | 1.1 | NO |
| Irving Police Department | 1 | 1.1 | YES | 1.2 | 1.2 | NO |
| Jacksboro Police Department | (0.7) | (0.4) | NO | 2.1 | >3 | YES |
| Jackson County Sheriff's Department | 2.2 | 1.5 | NO | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Jamaica Beach Police Department | 2.6 | >3 | YES | x | x | NO |
| Jersey Village Police Department | >3 | 1.5 | NO | >3 | x | NO |
| Kaufman County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 1.6 | YES | (0.8) | (0.9) | YES |
| Kaufman Police Department | 1.6 | 1.5 | NO | 1.5 | 1.5 | NO |
| Kerens Police Department | 1.8 | >3 | YES | 1.2 | >3 | YES |
| Kirby Police Department | 1.6 | 1.1 | NO | (0.8) | (0.5) | NO |
| Kyle Police Department | 1.2 | 2.3 | YES | 1.4 | 2 | YES |
| La Feria Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.4 | (0.1) | NO |
| La Grange Police Department | 1.4 | (0.5) | NO | 1.2 | (0.6) | NO |
| La Porte Police Department | (0.5) | 1 | YES | (0.5) | 1 | YES |
| Lago Vista Police Department | 2.6 | x | NO | 2 | 1 | NO |
| Lakeview Police Department | 1.1 | 1.1 | NO | 1.1 | 1.3 | YES |
| Lakeway Police Department | 2.3 | 2.3 | NO | 2.8 | 1.4 | NO |
| Lamesa Police Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 1 | >3 | YES |

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate | | | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2003? | Were Blacks more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2003? | Were Latinos more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? |
| Lancaster Police Department | (0.9) | 1.6 | YES | 1.2 | (0.7) | NO |
| Lavaca County Sheriff's Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 1.6 | 1.3 | NO |
| League City Police Department | 1.3 | 1.7 | YES | 1.9 | 1.5 | NO |
| Leander Police Department | 1.6 | (0.7) | NO | 1 | 1.3 | YES |
| Liberty County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.7) | NO | 1.5 | x | NO |
| Live Oak Police Department | (0.9) | 2 | YES | 1.4 | 1 | NO |
| Livingston Police Department | 1.6 | 1.2 | NO | 1.6 | 1.2 | NO |
| Longview Police Department | 2.3 | 2.7 | YES | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Lubbock County Sheriff's Department | 1.6 | >3 | YES | (0.9) | 1.6 | YES |
| Lubbock Police Department | 2.9 | >3 | YES | 2.2 | 2.3 | YES |
| Madisonville Police Department | (0.9) | 1.3 | YES | >3 | 1.1 | NO |
| Marble Falls Police Department | 2.2 | (0.9) | NO | 1.1 | 1.3 | YES |
| McAllen Police Department | x | >3 | NO | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Meadows Place Police Department | 1.5 | 2.3 | YES | (0.8) | 2 | YES |
| Memorial Villages Police Department | 2 | 2.4 | YES | 1.8 | 1.7 | NO |
| Midland County Sheriff's Department | 1.9 | >3 | YES | 2.1 | 1.4 | NO |
| Midland Police Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 2.1 | 1.7 | NO |
| Montgomery County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1 | NO | 1.4 | 1.9 | YES |
| Morgan's Point Police Department | 2.6 | (0.3) | NO | 2.4 | x | NO |
| Mount Pleasant Police Department | 1.3 | 1.7 | YES | (0.9) | 1 | YES |
| Nacogdoches Police Department | 1.6 | 1.6 | NO | 1.1 | (0.6) | NO |
| Nassau Bay Police Department | x | 1.3 | NO | >3 | 1.7 | NO |
| Navasota Police Department | 1.7 | 2 | YES | 1.5 | 3 | YES |
| Needville Police Department | (0.3) | 1.6 | YES | 1 | 1.1 | YES |
| Nueces County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.9) | NO | 1.4 | 1.8 | YES |
| Palmer Police Department | (0.8) | 1.2 | YES | 1.7 | 2.1 | YES |
| Panola County Sheriff's Department | 1.2 | 1.4 | YES | 1 | 2.5 | YES |
| Pflugerville Police Department | 1.1 | 1 | NO | 1.4 | 1.1 | NO |
| Plano Police Department | 2 | 2.5 | YES | 2.3 | >3 | YES |
| Polk County Sheriff's Department | (0.8) | 1 | YES | 1.1 | (0.6) | NO |
| Port Aransas Police Department | >3 | (0.8) | NO | 1.2 | (0.6) | NO |
| Port Arthur Police Department | 1.2 | 1.4 | YES | (0.8) | (0.9) | YES |
| Port Neches Police Department | 1 | 1.4 | YES | 1.3 | 1.3 | NO |
| Portland Police Department | 1.5 | >3 | YES | 1.5 | 2.1 | YES |
| Prairie View Police Department | 2 | 1.7 | NO | >3 | 2.1 | NO |
| Rancho Viejo Police Department | x | x | NO | 1.1 | (0.9) | NO |
| Randall County Sheriff's Department | x | 1.6 | NO | 1.5 | 1.1 | NO |
| Richardson Police Department | 1.1 | 1.4 | YES | 1.2 | 1.6 | YES |
| River Oaks Police Department | (0.5) | 1.6 | YES | 1.2 | (0.8) | NO |
| Roanoke Police Department | (0.7) | (0.8) | YES | (0.7) | (0.8) | YES |
| Rockport Police Department | 2 | 1.8 | NO | 1.3 | 1.5 | YES |
| Rosenberg Police Department | >3 | 1.7 | NO | 2.9 | 2 | NO |
| Rowlett Police Department | 1.3 | 1.5 | YES | 1.4 | 1.4 | NO |
| Sabinal Police Department | 1.7 | x | NO | (0.9) | (0.9) | NO |

| Law Enforcement Agency | Black v. Anglo Search Rate | | | Latino v. Anglo Search Rate | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Blacks to be searched in 2003? | Were Blacks more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2002? | How many times more (less) likely were Latinos to be searched in 2003? | Were Latinos more likely to be searched in 2003 than 2002? |
| Saginaw Police Department | 2.2 | 1 | NO | 1 | (0.6) | NO |
| San Angelo Police Department | >3 | 2.6 | NO | 1.5 | 1.6 | YES |
| San Antonio Police Department | 2.4 | 2.9 | YES | 2.1 | 2.2 | YES |
| San Marcos Police Department | 1.6 | (0.8) | NO | 1.2 | 1.5 | YES |
| San Patricio County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.8 | YES | x | 3 | NO |
| Sansom Park Police Department | (0.3) | (0.8) | YES | (0.7) | 1 | YES |
| Schertz Police Department | 1.5 | 1.6 | YES | 1.1 | 1.5 | YES |
| Seagoville Police Department | 1.2 | (0.5) | NO | 1.6 | (0.4) | NO |
| Seymour Police Department | 1.4 | 2.3 | YES | 1.5 | 1.3 | NO |
| Shavano Park Police Department | 2.9 | 1.8 | NO | x | 1.3 | NO |
| Shenandoah Police Department | 1.9 | 1.4 | NO | 2.5 | 1.5 | NO |
| Sherman Police Department | 2.6 | >3 | YES | 1.4 | 1.3 | NO |
| Sinton Police Department | x | 2.1 | NO | 1.5 | 2.7 | YES |
| Stafford Police Department | 1 | 2.1 | YES | >3 | >3 | NO |
| Sterling County Sheriff's Department | 2.9 | >3 | YES | (0.9) | (0.9) | NO |
| Sugar Land Police Department | 1 | 1.3 | YES | 1.6 | 1.3 | NO |
| Sulphur Springs Police Department | 3 | 2 | NO | 2.1 | 2 | NO |
| Sweeny Police Department | 1.2 | (0.6) | NO | (0.9) | >3 | YES |
| Terrell Hills Police Department | >3 | x | NO | 1.1 | 1.1 | NO |
| Terry County Sheriff's Department | >3 | >3 | NO | 1.6 | (0.9) | NO |
| Texarkana Police Department | 2.2 | 2.1 | NO | 2.6 | 1.3 | NO |
| Thompsons Police Department | (0.7) | 1.5 | YES | (0.5) | (0.9) | YES |
| Tool Police Department | x | >3 | NO | 1.9 | 1.6 | NO |
| Travis County Sheriff's Department | 1.8 | 1.5 | NO | 1.8 | 1.5 | NO |
| Tulia Police Department | 2.6 | 1.4 | NO | 1.6 | 1.1 | NO |
| Tyler Police Department | 1.9 | 2.6 | YES | 1 | 2.4 | YES |
| Universal City Police Department | 2.4 | 1.2 | NO | x | >3 | NO |
| University Park Police Department | 1.5 | >3 | YES | >3 | >3 | NO |
| Walker County Sheriff's Department | (0.7) | 2.6 | YES | (0.6) | x | NO |
| Weatherford Police Department | 1.6 | 1.5 | NO | 1.7 | 1.3 | NO |
| Westworth Police Department | 1 | (0.7) | NO | 2.6 | 1.8 | NO |
| Wharton County Sheriff's Department | 2.5 | (0.7) | NO | 2.2 | 2.1 | NO |
| Wichita Falls Police Department | 1.8 | 2.1 | YES | 1.9 | 1.8 | NO |
| Williamson County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.4 | NO | 1.4 | 1.6 | YES |
| Wilson County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | >3 | YES | (0.8) | 1.1 | YES |
| Winnsboro Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 | YES | 1.7 | 1.4 | NO |
| Wise County Sheriff's Department | >3 | >3 | NO | (0.8) | (0.4) | NO |
| Wylie Police Department | (0.9) | (0.3) | NO | 1.2 | 1.9 | YES |

Who is Found with Contraband?

Summary of Findings

One

High search rates did not correspond to a greater likelihood of finding drugs. Of the agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates, 51% were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Blacks – meaning Anglos and Blacks were equally likely to be found with contraband. Of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, 58% were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Latinos – meaning Anglos were slightly more likely than Latinos to be found with contraband.

Racial Disparities in Contraband Hit Rates by Department

Anglos in Texas were more equally likely or more likely than Blacks and Latinos to be found with contraband during a search by Texas law enforcement agencies in 2003: of the agencies that searched Blacks at higher rates, 51% were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Blacks. Of the agencies that searched Latinos at higher rates, 58% were likely to find contraband in the possession of Anglos at higher rates than Latinos.

Notes on Table 4

The relative contraband hit rate was calculated separately for each department by dividing the percentage of Blacks or Latinos who were found with contraband during a search by the percentage of Anglo drivers found with contraband during a search. Some departments filed reports with obvious or potential inaccuracies; others submitted incomplete data or data showing

that no searches were conducted or contraband found on a particular racial group. As such, this data was not used for comparative analysis and has been designated with an entry of 'x'. Furthermore, we have chosen to not report the hit rate of police departments with a hit rate in excess of 3.0 until we are able to verify the validity of the underlying data.

Table 4: Alphabetical Listing of Police and Sheriff’s Departments with Relative Contraband Hit Rates

| Law Enforcement Agency | Anglo v. Black Hit Rates | Anglo v. Latino Hit Rates |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely are Anglos to be found with contraband than Blacks during a search? | How many times more (less) likely are Anglos to be found with contraband than Latinos during a search? |
| Amarillo Police Department | 1 | 1.3 |
| †Austin County Sheriff's Department | 2.5 | (0.5) |
| Austin Police Department | (0.8) | (0.9) |
| Azle Police Department | 1.5 | 1.9 |
| †Balcones Heights Police Department | 2 | 1.5 |
| †Benbrook Police Department | 1.1 | 1 |
| †Brazoria County Sheriff's Department | >3 | 1.7 |
| Brazos County Sheriff's Department | >3 | (0.9) |
| Celeste Police Department | (0.9) | 2.6 |
| Childress County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.3) |
| †Coffee City Police Department | (0.6) | x |
| Conroe Police Department | (0.3) | (0.5) |
| Cooke County Sheriff's Department | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Crawford Police Department | x | 1.2 |
| †Dallas County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| †DeSoto Police Department | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Diboll Police Department | (0.9) | 1.8 |
| Edinburg Police Department | (0.2) | (0.4) |
| Falfurrias Police Department | x | (0.9) |
| †Fort Worth Police Department | 1.1 | 1 |
| Franklin County Sheriff's Department | 1.4 | 2.6 |
| †Freeport Police Department | 2.3 | 1 |
| Frona Police Department | (0.4) | (0.7) |
| †Georgetown Police Department | 1 | 1.2 |
| †Grand Prairie Police Department | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Haltom City Police Department | 1.4 | 1.9 |
| †Hemphill County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.6) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

| Law Enforcement Agency | Anglo v. Black Hit Rates | Anglo v. Latino Hit Rates |
|---|---|--|
| | How many times more (less) likely are Anglos to be found with contraband than Blacks during a search? | How many times more (less) likely are Anglos to be found with contraband than Latinos during a search? |
| Huntsville Police Department | (0.7) | 1.7 |
| Jefferson County Sheriff's Department | 1.1 | 2.2 |
| Junction Police Department | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Katy Police Department | 1 | x |
| Kaufman County Sheriff's Department | (0.9) | 1.4 |
| Kaufman Police Department | 1.9 | (0.9) |
| †Kyle Police Department | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Lake Dallas Police Department | x | 1.5 |
| †Lake Jackson Police Department | 1.1 | (0.9) |
| Lavaca County Sheriff's Department | 1 | 1.4 |
| Linden Police Department | 1.7 | x |
| Live Oak Police Department | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Livingston Police Department | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| Lockhart Police Department | 2 | 1.5 |
| Mabank Police Department | (0.9) | X |
| Marble Falls Police Department | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| McAllen Police Department | >3 | >3 |
| †Montgomery County Sheriff's Department | (0.2) | (0.3) |
| Murphy Police Department | (0.9) | 2.1 |
| †Palestine Police Department | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| †Pearland Police Department | 2 | 2.9 |
| †Rockport Police Department | 1.3 | 1 |
| San Antonio Police Department | (0.9) | 1.2 |
| †Sunset Valley Police Department | x | 1 |
| Surfside Beach Police Department | (0.8) | (0.3) |
| †Taft Police Department | (0.6) | 2.1 |
| Tarrant County Sheriff's Department | (0.6) | (0.4) |
| Texas Department of Public Safety | (0.8) | >3 |
| †The Colony Police Department | 1.5 | (0.6) |
| Tom Green County Sheriff's Department | 2.8 | 1.1 |
| Trenton Police Department | x | 1.3 |
| †Universal City Police Department | >3 | 1.3 |
| †Victoria Police Department | (0.9) | 1 |
| Waco Police Department | 1 | 1.1 |
| Waller County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.4) |
| Yoakum County Sheriff's Department | x | (0.7) |

† Agency combined traffic and pedestrian data

How Did Law Enforcement Agencies Comply with the Racial Profiling Law?

Half of law enforcement agencies (48%) did not comply with the basic reporting requirements of S.B. 1074:

- **Approximately 37% of departments did not report all required stop, search, and arrest data.** 4 departments did not report on citation stops. 92 departments did not report on arrests. 87 departments did not report on searches, while 84 departments did not report on consent searches.
- **Approximately 23% of departments did not break out their data by race.** 216 departments did not report data on Latinos or included Latinos with Anglos. 307 departments did not report data on Asian Americans or Native Americans.

A significant number of law enforcement agencies appeared to make a concerted effort to provide data and/or analysis above the minimum reporting requirements of SB 1074:

- **Approximately 45% of departments reported some additional, Tier 2 data elements, regardless of their exemption from having to do so for using audio/visual equipment in their vehicles.**
- **Approximately 47% of departments reported using some sort of internal auditing procedures in the data collection and/or data reporting process.**
- **Approximately 65% of departments reported data on the complaint processes available and/or the number of racial profiling complaints the department received.**

Notes on methodology:

1. Internal data auditing efforts reported by police and sheriff's departments include 'internal spot-checking,' 'internal supervision,' 'internal comparison of racial profiling data with ticket data,' and 'outside/hired auditing.'

Why Collect Additional Data?

Departments that choose to collect only Tier 1 data fail to capture and report a significant part of police-civilian interactions – and potential racial disparities – in a given jurisdiction. Law enforcement agencies should collect additional, explanatory data elements and report that data separately in order to have a better informed analysis of racial profiling.

Why Should Departments Collect Data on Non-discretionary Searches?

Searches and search rates play a large role in the debate on racial profiling. Collecting data only on the total number of searches or consent searches by race can hide or unnecessarily inflate disparities. It would benefit the community, local governing bodies, and law enforcement agencies to collect and report data on different types of searches separately. More specifically, a greater focus on non-discretionary search data will help law enforcement agencies understand whether disparate search rates are, in fact, a result of legitimate law enforcement practices or whether they represent racial profiling.

The San Antonio Police Department provides an excellent case study on how reporting different searches separately can ameliorate concerns with certain disparities.

In San Antonio, Black motorists are searched 26.7% of the time, Latinos are searched 20% of the time, and Anglos are searched only 9.3% of the time. This would indicate that Blacks and Latinos are, respectively, *nearly three* (2.9) times and *more than two* (2.2) times more likely than Anglos to be searched. This significant disparity warrants further explanation, which is partially provided by examining a detailed breakdown of search data. Since the San Antonio Police Department separated out different types of searches, the cause for the disparity in Latino search rates can be better understood. Searches of Latinos more often are a result of arrests, inventory searches, or probable cause searches – searches where officers have reduced or no discretion over whether to conduct a search. If these searches are excluded from examination and the focus instead is on officer-discretion (consent search) situations, then the figures reveal that the disparity in search rates for Latinos is much less: they are *just slightly* (1.1 times) more likely than Anglos to be (discretionarily) searched following a police stop.

Figures in the following table indicate that while Latinos are searched at higher rates than Anglos overall, many of these searches are not based on officer discretion and therefore may not necessarily be attributed to race-based policing.

| San Antonio Police Department | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Percentage of Searches Compared to Stops | Discretionary Search Rates (Consent) | Non-Discretionary Search Rates (Probable Cause, Incident to Arrest, Inventory) |
| Blacks | 26.7% were searched | 4.7% | 21.9% |
| | 2.9 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 2.8 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 2.9 times more likely than Anglos to be searched |
| Latinos | 20.0% were searched | 1.9% | 18.1% |
| | 2.2 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 1.1 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 2.4 times more likely than Anglos to be searched |
| Anglos | 9.3% were searched | 1.7% | 7.6% |

Why Should Departments Collect Data on Contraband?

When contraband “hit rate” data is included in racial profiling reports, it allows a more detailed and fruitful analysis of search rate disparities for different races. For instance, data may show that one racial group is searched more often than another, yet within that dataset, the former racial group has higher contraband hit rates. That might indicate the disparity is more based on effective and legitimate law enforcement practices (i.e.,

detecting suspicious behavior, etc.) instead of on race. However, if one racial group is systematically subjected to searches which are not productive, that could serve as a red flag warranting further investigation by law enforcement supervisors.

In San Antonio, for example, data reveals that Blacks and Latinos are nearly equally as likely as Anglos to be found with contraband.

San Antonio Police Department

| San Antonio Police Department | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | Contraband Hit Rates from Traffic Searches |
| Blacks | 18.6% were found with contraband |
| | 1.1 times more likely than Anglos to be found with contraband |
| Latinos | 14.4% were found with contraband |
| | 0.9 times more likely than Anglos to be found with contraband |
| Anglos | 16.7% were found with contraband |

These figures are important when recalling from the table above that Blacks and Latinos in San Antonio are consistently searched at higher rates than Anglos, despite the fact that contraband hit rates are almost equal across racial groups. Presently, there’s not enough information available to tell for sure what this data means.

But, if departments were to go a step further and collect/analyze more specific data on contraband – such as whether the contraband was discovered during a discretionary consent search, or during a legally-based probable cause or inventory search – the data may prove that legally-required searches are producing more contraband, thus explaining higher totals of contraband for certain races in certain instances. On the other hand, departments that are engaging in a higher number of consent searches of minorities but are finding contraband on them at lower rates than Anglos during such searches need to curb their discretionary search practices.

Data provided by the Tarrant County Sheriff’s Department is an example of how collecting more specific contraband-search data can both mask greater disparities and ameliorate concerns about them.

In Tarrant County, Black motorists are asked for consent to a search in *twice* (2.0 times) as many instances as whites, while Latinos are *far less likely* (0.3 times) than Anglos to be asked for consent following a stop. However, during consent searches, Blacks are *nearly equally* (1.1 times) as likely as Anglos to be found with contraband, while Latinos are *nearly two* (1.7) times more likely than Anglos to be found with contraband.

Figures in the table on the next page indicate that while Blacks are asked for consent at higher rates than Anglos overall, many of these searches are not yielding illegal goods or evidence – a disparity which should be looked into. However, Latinos, who are asked for consent at rates much lower than Anglos, don’t seem to be targeted as frequently. They are being found with contraband at higher rates during consent searches.

Tarrant County Sheriff's Department

| | Percentage of Consent Searches Compared to Stops | Contraband Hit Rates From Consent Searches |
|---------|--|---|
| Blacks | 3.6% were searched | 42.9% |
| | 2.0 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 1.0 times more likely than Anglos to be found with contraband |
| Latinos | 0.6% were searched | 75.0% |
| | 0.3 times more likely than Anglos to be searched | 1.7 times more likely than Anglos to be found with contraband |
| Anglos | 1.8% were searched | 44.4% |

Why Should Departments Collect Data on All Traffic Stops?

A substantial majority of departments are not collecting data on all traffic stops, but only on stops that result in issuance of a traffic citation or arrest. In other words, most departments are not capturing data on motorists who are stopped (and possibly searched) but given only a warning or merely released. A study released by the ACLU of Texas last year found that drug task forces do not ticket drivers at 98% of traffic stops. Without the collection of information from non-citation stops, any analysis of department-level data will be missing a critical dataset of police-civilian contacts.

However, some departments both large (such as San Antonio, Austin, and Tarrant County), and small (such as Decatur and Seminole) are choosing to collect data on all traffic stops their officers make, including those where motorists are released without a citation or ticket. Because stops that result in a release without a ticket represent a significant subset of the total police-civilian contacts for a city, departments should collect information on these occurrences to provide the clearest and most accurate picture of law enforcement-initiated police-civilian contacts.

In Austin, Blacks make up 18% of those who were stopped and then released without a citation or being arrested. However they make up only 10% of the population (using up-to-date population data). On the other hand, Anglos make up 52% of those who were stopped and then released without a ticket or arrest, while they make up an almost equal 53% of the population (using up-to-

date population data). In other words, Blacks are being pulled over and released at rates greater than their proportion in the population.

In Houston, similar patterns emerge: Blacks make up 41% of those who were stopped and then released without a traffic citation or arrest; however, they only make up 25% of the total population (using up-to-date population data). On the other hand, Anglos make up 27% of those who were stopped and then released without a ticket or arrest, while they make up 31% of the population (using up-to-date population data).

Such significant disparities indicate that, at a minimum, these release rate statistics should be comprehensively collected and closely monitored. If a high number of minority motorists are stopped by law enforcement officers without being ticketed, that should serve as a red flag indicating racial profiling, especially if one group of people is more likely to be pulled over without actually having committed any ticketable offense. But additionally – and more fundamentally – collecting and analyzing this data over time, as well as investigating reasons for any disparities, provides a basis for fulfilling the spirit and the letter of Texas' racial profiling law.

Traffic safety should dictate who is pulled over, and so-called "pretext stops" should be discouraged. Ultimately, we want to prevent officers from looking for an excuse to stop certain motorists, either because they are hoping to obtain probable cause for a search in plain view, or because they seek to create an opportunity to ask for consent.

Appendix 1: The 2001 Racial Profiling Data Collection Law (S.B. 1074)

Since January 1, 2002, each Texas law enforcement agency that regularly engages in traffic stops has been required to annually collect data on the race of the individuals they stop and search. As of 2003, departments have been required to report these annual findings to their respective local governing bodies – usually the city council or the county commissioner’s court – by March 1st of the following year. This report contains data collected by Texas departments in 2003 and reported to local governing bodies by March, 2004.

As noted, the Texas legislature divided the data collection process into two phases. In 2002, the first year of data collection, every law enforcement agency was required to collect at least Tier I data. Tier I requires data collection only for traffic stops which result in a ticket or arrest. This tier includes the following data elements:

- **the motorist’s race/ethnicity (Caucasian, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American);**
- **whether a search was conducted; and**
- **if a search was conducted, whether the person detained consented to the search.**

After 2002, departments have been required to collect the more in-depth Tier 2 data – unless they installed audio-visual (AV) equipment in their police vehicles, or unless they applied for funding to receive such equipment (regardless of whether they actually received that funding). If exempt, law enforcement agencies must collect and report on only the Tier I data elements. However, non-exempt departments must report all Tier 2 elements, which include data on every traffic and pedestrian stop. The following data elements

must be compiled for these stops under Tier 2 requirements:

- **the individual’s gender;**
- **the individual’s race or ethnicity;**
- **the traffic law or ordinance alleged to have been violated or the suspected offense;**
- **whether the officer conducted a search;**
- **if a search was conducted, whether the person detained consented to the search;**
- **whether contraband was found during the search and the type of contraband found;**
- **whether probable cause existed to conduct the search and the specific facts supporting probable cause;**
- **whether the officer made an arrest, including a statement of the offense charged;**
- **the street address or approximate location of the stop; and**
- **whether the officer issued a warning or a citation, including description of the warning or a statement of the violation charged**

Law enforcement agencies required to collect Tier 2 data are also required to conduct a comparative analysis of the data to “determine the prevalence of racial profiling,” and to include this comparative analysis in their annual report. Our findings indicate that the majority of departments either installed A/V equipment or at least applied for funding for A/V equipment and thus are indefinitely exempt from Tier 2 data reporting requirements.

Appendix 2: Defining and Measuring Racial Profiling

Recently there has been more public scrutiny of discretionary decisions in traffic enforcement, including police decisions to stop and search motorists – and, more specifically, a police officer’s discretionary decision to ask a motorist for consent to search his vehicle. Because traffic stops are the most frequent source of contact between individuals and the police, these interactions dramatically shape how individuals perceive law enforcement as a whole. Furthermore, because claims of racial profiling have commonly been based on anecdotal accounts, systematic data collection of police contacts with drivers allows departments to address the perception – as well as the reality – of racial profiling.

Departments in many states are now required to collect data on the race of the individuals they stop and search, either because of legislative mandates, executive orders, or as the result of litigation. In Texas, the Legislature not only mandated racial data collection but also strongly defined “racial profiling”: “any law enforcement initiated action based on an individual’s race, ethnicity, or national origin rather than on the individual’s behavior or on information identifying the individual as having engaged in criminal activity.” In other words, **law enforcement agencies in Texas may not legally use race or ethnicity as any factor in selecting whom to stop and search**, but they may use race or ethnicity to determine whether a person matches a specific description of a suspect for a particular

crime. It is important to distinguish this statutory definition in Texas from other definitions offered. Some states have defined racial profiling as law enforcement action based *solely* on race; this more narrow definition allows a police officer to take into account a multitude of factors – including an individual’s race – when making the discretionary decision to stop or search that individual or his vehicle.

In Texas, as across the nation, the goals of collecting accurate racial profiling data are to inform a larger debate on whether racial profiling exists in a given community, and to provide police supervisors with tools to stop it. Data analysis can successfully provide a “bird’s eye view” of data across a department while also allowing departments to be compared with one another. Likewise, department-wide totals may be a useful measurement for community leaders to judge progress toward equitable traffic enforcement. However, aggregate statistics alone cannot prove or disprove racial profiling – but more importantly, they can mask individual racial profiling practices by a few officers which could tarnish the reputation of the entire department. In order for data collection to actually diminish racial profiling, supervisors must take the next step and analyze officer-specific data – in conjunction with video review of individual stops – to address specific profiling concerns, while also encouraging and following through on complaints made against individual officers or the department as a whole.

Appendix 3: Methodology

The Context and Parameters of this Study

As it currently stands, S.B. 1074 does not require any independent agency to analyze law enforcement reports, nor does it mandate a uniform standard for reporting required Tier 1 or Tier 2 data. Due to this critical absence of standard reporting and analysis, the Steward Research Group was commissioned to analyze the data contained in agencies' annual reports to determine whether racial disparities existed in searches and contraband hit rates across Texas. All told, data from 1,060 agencies was analyzed. This dataset includes several million police-civilian contacts representing the majority of traffic stops in Texas. It is the largest dataset of racial profiling data that has ever been collected and analyzed.

As with many examinations of disparity, determining the existence of racial profiling is a complex endeavor. In some communities, law enforcement officials have expressed frustration because they believe disparities in traffic stops and searches are the result of legitimate law enforcement activities in high crime neighborhoods. On the other hand, many community members believe that traffic stops and searches based on race or ethnicity, rather than on individual behavior, are regular occurrences in many departments. In addition to providing an assessment of racial disparities in search rates, this study also offers recommendations to improve future data collection. Ultimately, additional data collection will be necessary to truly determine the existence of racial profiling and the role that race plays in law enforcement decisions.

Limitations

1. Not all law enforcement agencies are included in this report. Some agencies chose not to respond to our open records request, while others submitted data that was incomplete. This is discussed further in the section *How Did Law Enforcement Agencies Comply with the Racial Profiling Law?* on page 45.
2. Pursuant to the mandate of S.B. 1074, most law enforcement agencies only collected and reported data on the traffic stops where a ticket was issued or an arrest resulted. However, there was significant inconsistency in how these departments represented the figures. Many departments used the term

“police contacts” when they actually intended to signify police traffic stops that resulted in a citation or arrest. As a result of this inconsistency, it was not possible to determine with complete accuracy whether a department was collecting data on all stops or only those traffic stops resulting in an arrest or citation.

Other inconsistencies in the reported data involve departments that included written warnings, dispatched call contacts, or pedestrian stops in the same column with law-enforcement initiated traffic citation stops, as well as departments that varied in what they reported for searches and arrests: some excluded searches incident to arrest; others excluded arrests resulting from warrants.

Database construction methodology

Using a sample of Texas law enforcement agency racial profiling reports, we assembled a database containing data for the 1,060 departments that responded to an open records request.

Our approach:

Step 1: Collect racial profiling reports from Texas police and sheriff's departments. We obtained these reports from open records requests sent to over 1,100 Texas police and sheriff's departments listed in the TCLEOSE (Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education) member's database. More than 1,000 agencies responded.

Step 2: Review each report and assemble an electronic database of racial profiling data. For each report reviewed, we collected and electronically inputted data on traffic stops, searches, contraband seizures, data auditing processes used by each law enforcement agency, complaint processes available to citizens, and the availability of audio-visual equipment in vehicles. We used multiphase data entry and error-checking procedures to increase the accuracy of the electronic data collected.

Step 3: Measure relative search rates and contraband hit rates by race. We calculated the relative search likelihood and relative consent search likelihood separately for each department by dividing the percentage of Blacks or Latinos who were (consent) searched following a traffic

stop by the percentage of Anglo drivers (consent) searched following a stop. Similarly, we calculated the contraband hit rates separately for each department by dividing the percentage of Blacks or Latinos who were found with contraband during a search by the percentage of Anglo drivers found with contraband during a search.

Notes on law enforcement agency sample

The law enforcement agencies comprising the sample for this report are sufficiently representative of the universe of police and sheriffs' departments in Texas to warrant statistical analysis. The sample includes most of

cities and counties in Texas, both urban and rural. Agencies that were not included in this report include the following:

- agencies that did not respond to the open records requests submitted;
- agencies that did not respond with requested data;
- agencies that had no data to report for 2003;
- agencies that reported datasets encompassing more or less than 12 months of information;
- agencies that were discretionarily exempted due to insufficient staffing or high production costs; and
- agencies that issued less than 150 citations throughout the course of 2003.

For more information on departmental reporting, please see "Agencies that Did Not Report All Required Data," available at www.criminaljusticecoaliton.org.