

TRAINING AND STOP DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO RACIAL AND ETHNIC BIAS IN OREGON LAW ENFORCEMENT

Final Report

Based on Responses from LECC Oregon Law Enforcement Survey:
Section I & Section II

October 12, 2006

Brian C. Renauer, Ph.D.

Laura Uva

Portland State University

For more information please contact:
Brian C. Renauer, Ph.D., Director
Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute
Portland State University
503-725-8090
fax 503-725-5162
renauer@pdx.edu

Purpose of Survey

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) developed and distributed a survey to Oregon law enforcement agencies in order to gain an understanding of what these agencies are currently doing to prevent racially-biased policing and to offer agencies an opportunity to request specific assistance. The survey questions focused on community outreach, training, and data collection efforts that agencies have undertaken.

Description of Survey

The Oregon Law Enforcement Survey was developed by the LECC with assistance from the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (OACP), Oregon State Sheriffs Association (OSSA), Oregon State Police (OSP), Dr. Lori Fridell of the University of South Florida, and Dr. Robin Shepherd Engel of the University of Cincinnati. The survey consisted of two sections. Section I requested information on agencies' community outreach and training addressing racial bias in policing. Section II requested information on agencies' CAD systems and collection of stop data that includes information on race/ethnicity. Stop data refers to data collected by law enforcement agencies that describe interactions between law enforcement and the public during traffic stops or other kinds of stops. Typically this data describes characteristics of the stop (reason for stop, searches, disposition), characteristics of the citizen (gender, race, age), and location of the stop. Both sections included an area for respondents to request specific assistance from the LECC. See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Methodology

On behalf of the LECC, the OACP, OSSA and OSP distributed the survey by e-mail to all 170 Oregon law enforcement agencies (133 police departments, 36 sheriff's offices, and the Oregon State Police) on February 23, 2006. The initial response deadline was March 10, 2006. The LECC promised agencies that their responses would be kept confidential and that results would be published only in the aggregate. OSP chose to grant the LECC permission to present its responses separately in this report.

The survey was re-sent by OACP and OSSA on March 22, 2006 with a reminder and a new deadline of March 30, 2006. It was re-sent again by OACP on April 5, 2006. Claudia Black, former LECC Program Manager and Associate Director of the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute at Portland State University, also called several sheriffs to remind them to respond to the survey.

LECC staff received the last survey response on June 5, 2006. The total number of law enforcement agencies that responded was **82** (59 police departments, 22 sheriff's offices, and the Oregon State Police). The survey **response rate was 48%** (82/170 total law enforcement agencies). The reader should keep in mind that the non-respondents may have been less interested in this topic than the respondents, or their limited resources may have prevented a response to the survey. The agencies that responded to the survey serve approximately 77% of the total Oregon population, thus rendering these

findings quite meaningful.¹ The table below shows the population categories that the responding law enforcement agencies serve.

City Size	Number of Respondents
City population 100,000 or more	3
City population 25,000-99,999	11
City population 10,000-24,999	15
City population 2,500-9,999	19
City population < 2,500	11
Non-Metropolitan Statistical Area county 25,000-99,999	6
Non-Metropolitan Statistical Area county <10,000-24,999	11
Metropolitan Statistical Area county. 100,000 +	2
Metropolitan Statistical Area county 25,000-99,999	2
Metropolitan Statistical Area county 10,000-24,999	2
Total	82

¹ The FBI's Crimes Known to the Police (2000) was used to determine the population coverage of the agencies that were surveyed. The total Oregon population served by the 82 agencies in the survey is 2,652,505 and the Oregon population in the 2000 census is 3,421,399.

Results Summary – Section I: Training Regarding Racially and Ethnically Biased Policing

Types of Training: The results shown in Table 1 indicate that the most common form of training received by Oregon Law Enforcement agencies on racially-biased policing is the adoption of a policy and the internal review of policies (37%). The next most common type of training was in-service training on stops and searches (29%). The third most common form of training was a more informal training occurring with roll call, briefings, or newsletters, or during field training with a Field Training Officer (28%). Approximately 24% of Oregon Law Enforcement agencies reported receiving racially-biased police training from Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST). Seven agencies (9%) reported that no training is being provided on the importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action.

Table 1. Types of training regarding the importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action. (note: columns do not add to sample size totals, because agencies could report multiple types of training efforts)

<i>Training Categories</i>	Police Department Participation	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Diversity/Cultural Awareness Training¹	15	6	0	21
2) DPSST Training²	14	5	1	20
3) In-service Training on Traffic Stops/Searches³	20	4	0	24
4) Informal Training⁴	15	7	1	23
5) Special/Outside Training⁵	7	1	0	8
6) Policy Adoption or Training⁶	21	9	0	30
7) No Training	3	4	0	7
8) Left Question Blank	1	0	0	1
<i># of Respondents</i>	N = 59	N = 22	N = 1	N = 82

¹ Notes: primarily in-service, includes ethics, discrimination training.

² Notes: focused on new hires.

³ Notes: includes annual accreditation training, as well as mentions of general or other in-service training.

⁴ Notes: includes field training with Field Training Officer (FTO); recruit orientation training; review and response to complaints; review and discussion during shift briefings of data collection analyses; review at roll call; training bulletins/newsletters; training video.

⁵ Notes: examples include International Associations Chiefs of Police (IACP) Training Keys; Six Minutes of Training program; Perspectives on Profiling; special training from the local District Attorney's office.

⁶ Notes: includes the adoption of policies that declare racial profiling illegal; informal training and reviews of current Oregon policies.

Breadth of Training: Table 2 shows that 53 law enforcement agencies in Oregon (65%) require some type of training on the importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action. Most agencies that require training report that the training occurs for the entire department. Table 2a also shows that most of the training is held on an annual basis.

Table 2. Is this training required and, if so, for whom and how often?

	Police Department Participation	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
<i>Training Required</i>				
Yes – Required	39	13	1	53
Not Required	5	1	0	6
<i>Who Gets Trained</i>				
Entire Department	33	10	1	44
Subset of Department¹	4	5	0	9
<i>Frequency of Training</i>				
Annual	20	9	0	29
More than Once per Year	7	2	0	9
One Time Only / Infrequent²	5	3	0	8

¹ Notes: An example would be only training of new recruits.

² Notes: This category involves what appears to be a one-time training effort (e.g. DPSST for new recruits) or very infrequent training. Whereas, “more than once” involves more frequent training, but not as formalized as an annual training.

Training Obstacles: 25 Oregon law enforcement agencies reported some training obstacles or difficulties. Overwhelmingly, the primary difficulty that was expressed by agencies was a need for more training and better training to be available to them.

Table 3. Difficulties in developing and implementing training (e.g. finding an effective curriculum or training officers)

	Police Department Participation	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
Yes – Difficulties	23	2	0	25
No Difficulties	24	10	1	35
<i>Types of Difficulties</i>				
1) Want Better / More Training	18	2	0	20
2) Training Too Expensive	2	0	0	2
3) Officers Do not See Training As Necessary	1	0	0	1
4) Need Instructors	4	0	0	4

How Could LECC Help: Law enforcement agencies were asked how the LECC could be most helpful to them. The vast majority of agencies indicated that they would like LECC to assist them in preparing and implementing appropriate, low-cost and effective training to address this issue.

Approximately 55 agencies, most of whom had never collected data, indicated a request for some sort of technical assistance from the LECC. The vast majority of these requests were for assistance in efficient and inexpensive training relative to Oregon's issues. Another common request was for the LECC to write and distribute a report outlining the results of the survey and what the next steps should be.

Conclusions - Training Regarding Racially and Ethnically Biased Policing in Oregon Law Enforcement

The survey responses represent a broad cross-section of Oregon law enforcement agencies. Roughly half of all law enforcement agencies in Oregon responded to the survey. Both the geographic coverage of the state and agency department size were well represented in the results. Almost all major departments responded to the survey, as did 61% of the Sheriff's offices. Additionally, the agencies that responded to the survey serve approximately 77% of the total Oregon population, thus rendering these findings quite meaningful.²

The results indicate that Oregon law enforcement agencies are attentive to the importance of training related to carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action. Only seven agencies (9%) reported that no training is being provided. However, there was wide variation in the types, breadth and formality of training that were reported. Thus, there does not appear to be a uniform consistency to the delivery and content of training in Oregon that address the issues surrounding racial and ethnic biases in policing.

Twenty-five (31%) of the respondent agencies stated that they have difficulties in providing such training, and there was a commonly expressed need for the availability of more and better training. The survey results reinforce the need for the LECC to continue to work with DPSST incorporating lessons and scenarios related to racially biased policing into DPSST training. A number of training options with consistent themes should be developed to target the greatest number of agencies and officers (i.e. in-service, videos, DPSST scenarios).

In sum, the results indicate a need for consistent, effective, and low-cost training programs to address the issue of biased-based policing regarding stops and post-stop decisions.

² The FBI's Crimes Known to the Police 2000 was used to determine the population coverage of the agencies that were surveyed. The total Oregon population served by the 82 agencies in the survey is 2,652,505 and the Oregon population in the 2000 census is 3,421,399.

Results Summary – Section II: Stop Data Collection

History of Stop Data Collection: The data in Table 4 shows that 22 police departments, 5 sheriff’s offices and the Oregon State Police have collected stop data. Thus, 34% of respondents indicate they have collected stop data. The majority of police departments and sheriff’s offices that have collected stop data started collecting the data in 2001. Table 5 reports that 17 police departments, 4 sheriff’s offices and the Oregon State Police still collect stop data. Most agencies that listed a date that they stopped collecting data had stopped in 2002. Some of the reasons listed for discontinuing collection of stop data include:

- Time constraints
- No perceived or apparent need to collect
- Problems with forms
- Inadequate staffing
- Inadequate ability
- No valid comparison/benchmark data

Table 4. Collection of Stop Data

	Police Departments	Sheriff’s Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - collected	22	5	1	28
2) Never collected	33	15	0	48
3) Question Blank	4	2	0	6

Table 5. Current Status of Stop Data Collection

	Police Departments	Sheriff’s Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - still collecting	17	4	1	22
2) Not currently collecting	4	1	0	5
3) Question Blank	1	0	0	1

Characteristics of Stop Data Collection Systems: Survey results indicate that the majority of agencies that are collecting stop data do so for both vehicle and pedestrian stops (Table 6), and most of the agencies collecting stop data collect many of the data points mandated by ORS 131.005 (Table 7). The data points that are not as commonly collected are those concerning whether a search was conducted and the disposition following the search. Only ten police departments, three sheriff's offices and the Oregon State Police collect data on the results of searches. Table 8 shows that most of the agencies collecting stop data record some form of geographic reference for the stop location. The most common geographic reference utilized is a street address. The most common form of data entry reported (Table 9) is manual entry of the stop information into a patrol car computer or other computer (eight police departments and two sheriff's offices). Written and scantron forms are used by eight law enforcement agencies and five agencies verbally provide stop information to dispatch. Most law enforcement agencies maintain their data in an electronic database (Table 10) and only five agencies have made any changes to their collection form (Table 11).

Table 6. Types of Stops for which Data is Collected

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Officer-initiated vehicle stops	18	4	1	23
2) Officer-initiated pedestrian stops	15	3	1	19
3) Calls for service	7	0	0	7
4) Other	2	0	0	2

Table 7. Types of Data Points Collected

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) The reason for the law enforcement stop or other contact	15	5	1	21
2) The law enforcement officer's perception of the race, color or national origin of the individual involved in the contact	18	4	1	23
3) The stopped individual's gender	19	5	1	25
4) The stopped individual's age	18	4	1	23
5) Whether a search was conducted in connection with the contact	12	3	1	16
6) If a search was conducted, the disposition of the search	10	3	1	13
7) The disposition of the law enforcement action, if any, resulting from the contact (e.g. arrest, warning, citation)	18	5	1	24
8) Other	3	0	1	4

Table 8. Use of Location Identifiers

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Beat or Patrol Area	6	1	0	7
2) Street address	11	3	1	15
3) Geocode (X Y coordinates)	4	1	0	5
4) Block	6	0	0	6
5) Rural route	0	0	0	0
6) Zip code	0	0	0	0
7) Other	2	1	1	4

Table 9. Types of Data Entry

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Scantron form	3	0	0	3
2) Written form	4	1	0	5
3) Manually recorded in patrol car computer or other computer	8	2	0	10
4) Verbally given to dispatch	3	1	1	5
Other	3	2	0	5

Table 10. Maintenance in Electronic Database

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - Electronically	13	4	1	18
2) Not electronically	5	2	0	7
3) Question Blank	2	0	0	2

Table 11. Changes to Data Collection

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - Changed form	4	0	1	5
2) No – Not changed form	14	4	0	18
3) Question Blank	4	1	0	5

\Stop Data Reports: Eleven agencies, which is less than half of the agencies that reported stop data collection, have prepared a written public report on their data (Table 12). Slightly fewer agencies stated that they have prepared a non-published internal report on their stop data collection (Table 13).

Table 12. Written Public Reports on Stop Data

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - Prepared report for public	9	1	1	11
2) No – Did not prepare report for public	11	5	0	16
3) Question Blank	2	0	0	2

Table 13. Non-published Internal Reports on Stop Data

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - Prepared non-published report	5	1	1	7
2) No – Did not prepare non-published report	14	4	0	18
3) Question Blank	2	0	0	2

Assistance in Stop Data Collection: Table 14 shows that roughly 30% of respondents requested some sort of assistance with stop data collection. The assistance needs are evenly varied. Twenty-two agencies need help with setting up a collection system, 15 need analysis assistance, 15 need assistance with performing internal analyses, and 25 report the need for some other form of assistance. Most other requests for assistance were for the dissemination of information on the efforts of other Oregon agencies in regards to data collection and analysis as well as community outreach. Several agencies also requested that the LECC develop protocols for data collection and analysis, and provide information on benchmarks. Two agencies requested that the LECC organize a forum or regional meeting to brainstorm next steps in relation to data collection/analysis and community relations. A clear statewide guideline/standard for data collection/analysis was also requested by two agencies. Other requests included compilation of Oregon law enforcement agencies' data in the aggregate, a best practices resource manual, and distribution of the results of this survey.

Table 14. Areas Where Assistance Was Requested

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Assistance setting up a data collection system	16	6	0	22
2) Assistance analyzing the collected data in the aggregate	11	4	0	15
3) Assistance performing internal analyses	10	5	0	15
4) Other	18	6	1	25

Status of CAD systems: Only eleven agencies reported that they do not use a CAD system (Table 15). Most of the CAD systems in use, 58 of 63, have the capacity to generate reports. Table 15 also shows that 23 agencies are anticipating upgrading their CAD system in the foreseeable future.

Table 15. CAD Systems

	Police Departments	Sheriff's Offices	Oregon State Police	Total Oregon Law Enforcement
1) Yes - Use CAD	43	19	1	63
2) No - Do not use CAD	10	1	0	11
3) Question blank	6	2	0	8
Does the system have the ability to generate reports?	41 Yes 4 No	16 Yes 1 No	Yes	58 Yes 5 No
Does your agency anticipate upgrading or changing it in the foreseeable future?	18 Yes 26 No	5 Yes 10 No	No	23 Yes 37 No
Does your agency have plans to obtain a CAD system in the foreseeable future?	1 Yes 11 No	1 Yes 4 No		2 Yes 15 No

Conclusions – Stop Data Collection in Oregon Law Enforcement

The survey represents a broad cross-section of Oregon law enforcement agencies. Roughly half of all law enforcement agencies in Oregon responded to the survey. Both the geographic coverage of the state and agency department size were well represented in the results. Almost all major departments responded to the survey as did 61% of the Sheriff's offices. Additionally, the agencies that responded to the survey serve approximately 77% of the total Oregon population, thus rendering these findings quite meaningful.³

Approximately one third of all law enforcement agencies in Oregon collect stop data. Most of these agencies began collecting stop data around 2001, and most of these agencies continue to collect data today.

Almost all of the agencies that collect stop data reported the collection of all the data points mandated in ORS 131.005. The mandated data points that are not as commonly collected are those concerning whether a search was conducted and the disposition following the search. This finding is of concern because the stop data that we have analyzed indicates that the likelihood of a search and

³ The FBI's Crimes Known to the Police (2000) was used to determine the population coverage of the agencies that were surveyed. The total Oregon population served by the 82 agencies in the survey is 2,652,505 and the Oregon population in the 2000 census is 3,421,399.

finding something in a search are important points where racial/ethnic disparities are often found.

Another important consideration from the results of this survey is that few of the departments that collect data have prepared reports on the data, publicly or internally. This issue seems to correspond to the commonly-cited need for assistance in analysis, reporting, and bench-marking.

Appendix A: Responding Agencies

Agency Name	Population Served	Population Category
Albany PD	41,070	Cit 25,000-49,999
Amity PD	2,199	Cit < 2,500
Ashland PD	20,054	Cit 10,000-24,999
Astoria PD	9,817	Cit 2,500-9,999
Aumsville PD	3,783	Cit 2,500-9,999
Aurora PD	1,435	Cit < 2,500
Baker County	6,882	Non-MSA co. < 10,000
Beaverton PD	76,848	Cit 50,000-99,999
Bend PD	52,038	Cit 50,000-99,999
Benton County	20,085	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Canby PD	13,478	Cit 10,000-24,999
Carlton PD	2,235	Cit < 2,500
Clatskanie PD	2,218	Cit < 2,500
Clatsop County	13,242	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Coos County	27,665	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Coquille PD	4,190	Cit 2,500-9,999
Corvallis PD	49,518	Cit 25,000-49,999
Cottage Grove PD	8,718	Cit 2,500-9,999
Curry County	13,801	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Dallas PD	13,242	Cit 10,000-24,999
Deschutes County	49,866	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Douglas County	60,359	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Eugene PD	138,166	Cit 100,000-249,999
Fairview PD	8,272	Cit 2,500-9,999
Gearhart PD	999	Cit < 2,500
Gervais PD	2,789	Cit < 2,500
Gilliam County	1,167	Non-MSA co. < 10,000
Gladstone PD	12,126	Cit 10,000-24,999
Gresham PD	90,916	Cit 50,000-99,999
Hillsboro PD	70,905	Cit 50,000-99,999
Hines PD	1,636	Cit < 2,500
Hood River PD	5,845	Cit 2,500-9,999
Hubbard PD	3,263	Cit < 2,500
Independence PD	6,818	Cit 2,500-9,999
Jefferson County	13,145	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Josephine County	52,740	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Keizer PD	32,983	Cit 25,000-49,999
Klamath County	44,331	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Klamath Falls PD	19,480	Cit 10,000-24,999
La Grande PD	12,358	Cit 10,000-24,999
Lake Oswego PD	37,396	Cit 25,000-49,999
Lane County	101,595	MSA co. 100,000 +
Lincoln County	24,059	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Linn County	46,377	Non-MSA co. 25,000-99,999
Marion County	87,571	MSA co. 25,000-99,999

Medford PD	63,686	Cit 50,000-99,999
Molalla PD	6,335	Cit 2,500-9,999
Monmouth PD	8,524	Cit 2,500-9,999
Morrow County	6,770	Non-MSA co. < 10,000
Mt. Angel PD	3,901	Cit 2,500-9,999
Multnomah County	20,394	MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Newberg-Dundee PD	18,785	Cit 10,000-24,999
North Bend PD	9,550	Cit 2,500-9,999
Ontario PD	11,008	Cit 10,000-24,999
Oregon City PD	26,442	Cit 25,000-49,999
Oregon State Police	300	Non-MSA co. < 10,000
Pendleton PD	16,384	Cit 10,000-24,999
Polk County	18,078	MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Port of Portland PD	711	Cit < 2,500
Portland PB	531,239	Cit 500,000-999,999
Redmond PD	13,490	Cit 10,000-24,999
Reedsport PD	4,388	Cit 2,500-9,999
Roseburg PD	20,027	Cit 10,000-24,999
Salem PD	138,487	Cit 100,000-249,999
Stayton PD	7,596	Cit 2,500-9,999
Sutherlin PD	6,679	Cit 2,500-9,999
Sweet Home PD	8,038	Cit 2,500-9,999
Talent PD	6,121	Cit 2,500-9,999
Tigard PD	41,942	Cit 25,000-49,999
Tillamook County	17,209	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Tillamook PD	4,381	Cit 2,500-9,999
Toledo PD	3,493	Cit 2,500-9,999
Troutdale PD	14,488	Cit 10,000-24,999
Tualatin PD	24,198	Cit 10,000-24,999
Turner PD	1,979	Cit < 2,500
Vernonia PD	2,918	Cit < 2,500
Wasco County	11,668	Non-MSA co. 10,000-24,999
Washington County	192,398	MSA co. 100,000 +
West Linn PD	22,949	Cit 10,000-24,999
Winston PD	4,623	Cit 2,500-9,999
Woodburn PD	20,880	Cit 10,000-24,999
Yamhill County	34,766	MSA co. 25,000-99,999

Appendix B: LECC Law Enforcement Survey: Section I & Section II



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Criminal Justice Commission

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 350

Salem, OR 97301-2524

(503) 986-6494

FAX (503) 986-4574

February 23, 2006

Dear Colleagues,

As chair of the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC), I am writing to request your assistance in developing an understanding of law enforcement efforts that address fairness and neutrality in Oregon policing. In recent years the potential for racial bias in policing has become a concern, both in Oregon and nationally. This issue is complex and often controversial and contentious for both law enforcement and citizens.

Our committee takes these concerns seriously and wishes to focus on the positive ways in which law enforcement agencies work to create a fair and unbiased police force. For example, a number of law enforcement agencies have established special policies, training programs, community outreach, and data collection to ensure policing is carried out in a fair and neutral fashion. We wish to learn more about such ongoing efforts, using the attached survey, so that these ideas can be shared amongst the law enforcement community.

We also recognize that there may be roadblocks that make it difficult for law enforcement agencies to initiate such efforts, and learning about such impediments will be helpful. The results of this survey, in conjunction with other materials received, will be used in the aggregate only. In other words, no individual agencies will be identified in any of our reports based upon the information being collected here. Protecting the confidentiality of your agency is very important to us.

Members of the LECC have met with representatives from the Oregon State Sheriffs Association (OSSA), the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (OACP) and the Oregon State Police (OSP). The leadership of these organizations agrees that the sharing of ideas and/or impediments regarding policies, trainings, outreach, and data collection efforts to address fair and neutral policing can be of great benefit to the law enforcement community. For example, law enforcement agencies in Oregon that are in the process of applying for and/or receiving state or national accreditation must demonstrate efforts to prevent bias based policing. Responses to this survey will help the LECC become a

resource for you by providing information and technical assistance in policy development, training programs, community outreach, and data collections, as well as in implementing such efforts. It is the mission of the LECC, which was established by Oregon statute in 2001, to be such a resource for the law enforcement community. The LECC is staffed by the Criminal Justice Commission and the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute at Portland State University. Additional information about the committee can be found at

http://www.ocjc.state.or.us/Racial_Profiling/LECPDRC.HTM.

The LECC has collaborated with the law enforcement associations in developing and distributing the attached survey. Each law enforcement agency in the state is receiving this survey requesting an update on current policies and practices. I understand the tremendous time and resource constraints you face, but hope that you can put forth the effort to promptly complete and return the survey. As I mentioned earlier, the results of this survey, in conjunction with other materials received, will be used in the aggregate only (no individual agencies will be identified in any of our reports based upon the data being collected here). Your confidentiality is strictly guarded.

We have developed two sets of questions: one pertains to community outreach, policies and training, and the other addresses data collection and analysis with the understanding that, in larger agencies, different staff may be involved in community outreach and data collection. I have attached a copy of the survey for your review.

Here is what we are requesting that you do:

- Please assign the appropriate staff who can fill out each section of the survey. (If you will be filling it out yourself, please email or mail the completed survey to Laura Uva at the address listed below.)
- Please email Laura Uva, LECC Administrative Assistant, at uva@pdx.edu with the names, phone numbers and email addresses of those individuals whom you have assigned to complete the surveys.
- Laura will send the survey to the designated staff and will be available for assistance.

If you have any questions please contact Claudia Black, LECC Program Manager, at 503-961-2349 or claudiab@pdx.edu.

Thank you in advance for your participation; we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Edwin J. Peterson" followed by a flourish.

Edwin J. Peterson, Chair
Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee

Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee

Section I: Community Relations

Name of Agency:

Name of Respondent:

Title:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

1. Please describe any partnerships, outreach efforts, and/or programs your agency has that strengthen your relationships with minority populations in your community, e.g. African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American.

2. Please describe any training your agency offers or participates in that includes the importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action.

a) Is this training required and, if so, for whom and how often?

b) How does your agency determine the effectiveness of these training programs?

c) Have there been any difficulties in developing and implementing such training, e.g. finding an effective curriculum or training officers?

3. What could the LECC do that would be most helpful to your organization?

4. Any additional comments are welcome:

Thank you for participating in this survey. We appreciate your time and effort.

Please send the completed survey to Laura Uva at uva@pdx.edu by March 10, 2006. If you prefer to send a hard copy, our mailing address is: Laura Uva, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University, PO Box 751-JUST, Portland, OR 97207-0751.

Questions may be directed to: Claudia Black at claudiab@pdx.edu or 503-961-2349.

Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee

Section II: Stop Data Collection and Analysis

Name of Agency:

Name of Respondent:

Title:

Address:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

1. Does your agency currently collect, or has it ever collected, race and ethnicity data on traffic or other types of stops? Yes___ No___

2. If your agency has not been collecting stop data, what kind of assistance in data collection and analysis would help you in setting up a data collection process? (Please mark as many as apply.)

a) Assistance setting up a data collection system ___

b) Assistance analyzing the data you collect in the aggregate ___

c) Assistance with performing internal analyses ___

d) Other _____

3. Does your agency have a CAD system? Yes ___No ___

If so,

a) Does the system have the ability to generate reports? Yes ___No ___

b) Does your agency anticipate upgrading or changing it in the foreseeable future?
Yes___ No___

If not,

c) Does your agency have plans to obtain one in the foreseeable future? Yes___
No___

NOTE: If you answered "No" to Question 1, please skip to Question 14.

If you answered "Yes" to Question 1, please continue with the survey.

4. When did you start collecting data? _____

5. Are you still collecting data? Yes ___ No ___

a) If not, when did you stop? _____

b) If not, why did you stop? _____

6. Have you changed your data collection form? Yes ___ No ___ If so, how? _____

7. Has your agency collected data on traffic stops that include the following data points listed in ORS 131.005?

- a) The reason for the law enforcement stop or other contact: Yes ___ No ___
- b) The law enforcement officer's perception of the race, color or national origin of the individual involved in the contact: Yes ___ No ___
- c) The individual's gender: Yes ___ No ___
- d) The individual's age: Yes ___ No ___
- e) Whether a search was conducted in connection with the contact: Yes ___ No ___
- f) If a search was conducted, what resulted from the search: Yes ___ No ___
- g) The disposition of the law enforcement action, if any, resulting from the contact (e.g. arrest, warning, citation): Yes ___ No ___
- h) Other _____

8. Under what type of circumstances do you collect data? (Please check all that apply.)

- a) Officer-initiated vehicle stops ___
- b) Officer-initiated pedestrian stops ___
- c) Calls for service ___
- d) Other (please specify) ___

9. Do you use a location identifier for your stop data? Yes ___ No ___

If so, what is used?

- a) Beat ___
- b) Street address ___
- c) Geocode (X Y coordinates) ___
- d) Block ___
- e) Rural route ___
- f) Zip code ___
- g) Other _____

10. Please describe the method your agency employs(ed) to collect data on traffic and pedestrian stops:

- a) Scantron form___
- b) Written form_____
- c) Manually recorded in patrol car computer or other computer ___
- d) Verbally given to dispatch____
- e) Other_____

11. Does your agency maintain the stop data electronically? Yes ___ No ___

12. Has your agency prepared any written reports for the public that present the stop data that you have collected? Yes ___No ___

13. Has your agency prepared any non-published, written reports on the stop data?
Yes___ No___

14. What could the LECC do that would be most helpful to your organization?

15. Any additional comments are welcome:

Thank you for participating in this survey. We appreciate your time and effort.

Please send the completed survey to Laura Uva at uva@pdx.edu by March 10, 2006. If you prefer to send a hard copy, our mailing address is: Laura Uva, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University, PO Box 751-JUST, Portland, OR 97207-0751.

Questions may be directed to: Claudia Black at claudiab@pdx.edu or 503-961-2349.