METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON, DC

STOP DATA
REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2019

Glossary

- **Consent search:** A search of a person or property based upon valid consent of the individual whose person or property is being searched. The Fourth Amendment requires that consent to a search not be coerced, by explicit or implicit means, by implied threat, or covert force.

- **Contact or field contact:** Conduct by a police officer which places the officer in face-to-face communication with an individual under circumstances in which the individual is free not to respond and to leave.

- **Probable cause:** A set of facts, circumstances, or reliable information that would lead a reasonable and prudent police officer to believe that a crime has been committed, or is about to be committed, and that a certain person committed it.

- **Probable cause search:** A warrantless search of a person or vehicle based upon probable cause that is conducted under specific circumstances. To conduct a probable cause search of a vehicle, a police officer must have probable cause to believe that contraband or physical evidence of a crime is in a moveable (i.e., operable) vehicle in a public area (e.g., public space, shopping center, parking lot). To conduct a probable cause search of a person, a police officer must have probable cause to believe that the person has contraband or physical evidence of a crime on his or her person.

- **Protective pat down:** A limited protective search for concealed weapons or dangerous instruments. A pat down, also known as a frisk, consists of patting an individual's outer clothing to determine the presence of weapons and other dangerous objects. Pursuant to the Supreme Court ruling in Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), police officers have authority to conduct a limited search of a person for weapons during some stops. Reasonable suspicion for a stop does not automatically provide the basis for a pat down. For a pat down to be reasonable and constitutional under the Fourth Amendment, the preceding stop of the individual's person must be lawful and the police must have an objectively reasonable basis to believe that the individual is armed and dangerous.

- **Reasonable suspicion:** Minimal level of objective justification for making a stop. Although reasonable suspicion cannot be precisely defined, it is more than a hunch or mere speculation, but less than probable cause.

- **Records Management System:** Computer system used by MPD to collect and store required stop data as well as other law enforcement information including crimes, arrests, missing person reports, and traffic crashes.

- **Stop:** A temporary investigative detention of a person for the purpose of determining whether probable cause exists to make an arrest. A stop is a seizure of an individual's person and occurs whenever an officer uses his or her authority to compel a person to halt, remain in a certain place, or to perform an act (such as walking to a nearby location where the member can use a radio or telephone). If a person is under a reasonable impression that he or she is not free to leave the member's presence, a stop has occurred.

- **Warrant search:** A search conducted pursuant to a valid search warrant granted by a judge or magistrate based upon probable cause.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Police District Boundaries in the District of Columbia

It is the mission of the Metropolitan Police Department to safeguard the District of Columbia and protect its residents and visitors with the highest regard for the sanctity of human life. We will strive at all times to accomplish our mission with a focus on service, integrity, and fairness by upholding our city's motto **Justitia Omnibus — Justice for All**.

From **July 22nd** to **August 18th**,

MPD collected data on approximately **11,600** police stops.

80

either received a ticket or were arrested for a crime

For Every

100

Persons Stopped

60
received
a traffic ticket

20
were arrested
for a crime

20
were stopped as
part of an investigation

70% of the vehicles stopped for traffic violations were registered outside of the District

86% of all stops were resolved without a protective pat down or any type of pre-arrest search

3 out of **4** were resolved in **15** min or less

MPD seized **136** guns as a result of these stops

What is this report about?

In July 2019, to enhance data collection as part of the NEAR Act, authored by Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie, the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) launched changes to police processes and data systems to allow the collection of more data in discrete fields and enable greater data analysis of police stops. Transparency around this information is critically important to public trust.[1] This report represents just the first step in sharing the data and using it to improve policing in the District. MPD is committed to ensuring that each police stop meets its high standards for fair and constitutional policing and demonstrates respect for the individual stopped.

As you review this initial data, we ask readers to recognize there are limits to what questions can be answered with just this data set. For instance, this is based on just four weeks (July 22nd – August 18th),[2] so it may not be a representative sample. In order to provide a snapshot of the data to the public, this report is brief, but presents the major data points from the comprehensive data set, publicly available on MPD's website.

What is a police stop?

If a person is under a reasonable impression that he or she is not free to leave an officer's presence, a stop has occurred.

Some examples of stops may include an officer:

- Stopping a car that the officer saw speeding;

- Stopping a person to investigate neighborhood package thefts;

- Stopping a person matching a suspect description from a robbery victim;

- Serving a warrant or making an arrest.

For more information or to find other terms, please see the Glossary.

The stops had a purpose and legal basis.

Sixty percent of the stops were prompted by a traffic violation; 35% of non-ticket stops were based on a call for service.

The stops included many people traveling in or through the District.

Only 30 percent of the vehicles stopped and issued tickets for traffic violations were registered in the District; 70 percent were registered in another state.

Most stops were resolved without any physical contact between the officer and the person stopped or his or her property.

Only 14 percent of stops involved a protective pat down (sometimes called a frisk) or a pre-arrest search of either a person or property.

MPD stops play a vital role in supporting Vision Zero and making our streets safe for all users.

Sixty percent of all stops result in a ticket, and 25 percent of arrests include a charge for a criminal traffic violation.

MPD stops can help remove guns from our neighborhoods.

Violent gun crime remains the city's most pressing public safety problem. MPD officers are able to remove a significant number of guns from DC streets as a result of these stops.

The stops were brief.

Three out of four were resolved in about 15 minutes. Ninety percent lasted less than 30 minutes.

What are some relevant trends in public safety in the District?

Police make stops in response to public safety demands – such as to **enforce traffic violations**, **investigate crime**, or **carry out an order from the courts**. In order to understand police stops, it is important to be aware of broader public safety trends.

Trends in Serious Crime
### (Jul 22–Aug 18, 2019 compared to 2018)

Offense		Change
Homicide	↑	8%
Sex Abuse	↓	-30%
Assault w/ Dangerous Weapon	↓	-4%
Robbery	↑	4%
Total Violent Offenses	↓	-1%
Burglary	↓	-20%
Motor Vehicle Theft	↓	-13%
Theft From Auto	↓	-16%
Theft	↑	15%
Total Property Offenses	↓	-2%
Total	↓	-2%

For the 4-week report period, when compared to the same time in 2018), downward trends in serious crime were positive. However, robberies and homicides increased during that time. Moreover, in the first eight months of 2019, the number of victims of violent crime who were shot increased 14 percent.

Traffic fatalities are down 27 percent in 2019, but they increased 29 percent from 2016 to 2018.

Distribution of Calls for Service between Police Districts
(Jul 22–Aug 18, 2019)

District	Violent Crime-Related Calls for Service	All Calls For Service
7D	25%	15%
6D	23%	17%
5D	12%	14%
4D	10%	12%
3D	13%	13%
2D	6%	15%
1D	12%	14%

■ Violent Crime-Related Calls for Service
■ All Calls For Service

During the report period, calls for service were balanced between the police districts, but calls related to violent crime were significantly higher in the Sixth and Seventh Districts.

What is new about this data?

In July 2019, MPD, in partnership with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), implemented enhanced data collection methods to enable officers to more effectively collect a variety of information about each police stop. This includes personal demographic information, the reason for the stop, and the outcome of the stop. MPD's Records Management System (RMS) also has been modified to allow information collection on stops, protective pat downs, and pre-arrest searches in discrete fields that will support data aggregation and analysis. (For definitions of these and other terms, please refer to the glossary.)

The result of these changes is comprehensive data on all MPD stops. This report is based on four weeks of data (July 22 through August 18, 2019) and is an initial snapshot based on a limited study period. In addition to the information highlighted in this report, much of the data can be further analyzed by locations, demographics, or other variables. MPD encourages members of the public to review the data and ask us questions about information not yet covered by this report. This comprehensive data set of four weeks of police stops is available on the MPD open data page. Full data for 2019 will be published in 2020 and in 6-month increments thereafter.

Why do police stop people?

Broad public safety indicators – **traffic crashes and fatalities**, **crime**, and **calls for service** – are the key drivers of stops made by MPD officers. Residents, workers, and visitors in the District all deserve a safe city.

Officers make stops for many reasons, including:

Identifying an area with frequent traffic violations and conducting stops to protect all roadway users – pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

Observing a crime.

Receiving a call for service for a crime and conducting a stop based on information from a witness or credible source describing a suspect.

Serving a search or arrest warrant at the direction of the courts.

MPD officers will continue to conduct stops as we work to make DC the safest big city in the country. At the same time, MPD recognizes that police officers, with their critical role in safeguarding the city and enforcing the laws and rules of government, have a unique professional and personal responsibility to protect individual rights. MPD is committed to working to mitigate systemic and implicit bias in the exercise of this police authority.

MPD officers of all ranks are committed to promoting fair, constitutional, and unbiased policing, and each stop must meet MPD's high standards. The individual experience of each person stopped is just as important – if not more so – as the data collected. While no one wants to be stopped by police because they have committed a traffic violation or because of a police investigation, police can build trust with that person and the community by ensuring stops are procedurally just. Officers should treat each person professionally and respectfully, and provide them with clear information about the reason for the stop.

Racial Demographics of MPD Officers and DC Population

Comprehensive strategies throughout the agency – and support from community and nongovernment partners – promotes successful policing. MPD is a diverse agency that more closely resembles the demographics of the city than any other major city police department.[3] We strive to maintain this diversity by building and supporting a pool of young District residents who may be interested in a career with MPD through our Police Cadet Program and other initiatives. Our efforts to develop a department that meets high standards include rigorous hiring assessments of candidates, clear policy — which for two decades has prohibited biased policing, comprehensive early intervention programs — and employee performance reviews.

An exceptional training program gives MPD officers the knowledge and tools necessary to meet these high standards. We train officers on the importance of procedural justice and a proactive response if their colleagues are not policing appropriately.

MPD has also developed **innovative training programs** in partnerships with:

- The *University of the District of Columbia Community College*, which facilitates a training at the *National Museum of African American History and Culture* delving into critical race theory and the historical relationship between African Americans and law enforcement; and

- The *U.S. Holocaust Museum*, which teaches officers about the role police played in the Holocaust and challenges them to reflect upon their responsibilities today.

- *Georgetown University*, which facilitates a two-year training and mentoring program for new officers to discuss, reflect on, and eventually shape the future of policing.

Nevertheless, some interactions do not meet expectations. Body-worn cameras and an independent complaint process through the Office of Police Complaints (OPC) help our efforts to hold officers accountable. Members of the public can help by reporting any interactions where they are not treated with respect or an officer does not meet standards to the OPC.

What are the next steps?

Law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, academia, and public policy professionals have long examined the complex relationship between arrest rates, demographics, and socio-economic variables such as race, poverty, education, and employment. The demographic information for these stops is consistent with MPD's other publicly available data on stops and arrests: persons of color are stopped at higher rates. Seventy percent of persons stopped during the reporting period were black, while 15 percent were white. In comparison, 46 percent of the District's population is black and 37 percent is non-Hispanic white.[4]

Does this data demonstrate that stops reflect bias against specific groups? The community deserves an answer to this critically important question. It may be tempting to point to initial snapshot of data as evidence that stops are biased. However, while the new data collection is an important step forward in understanding stops, additional data and comprehensive analysis will be necessary to determine whether stops are biased.

There are many reasons why a simple comparison of demographics between those who live in DC and those who are stopped in DC cannot accurately answer the question of bias. Fundamentally, bias needs to be measured in comparison to the rate of behavior that should lead to a police stop. An appropriate measure has thus far eluded researchers, but that does not mean we do not continue to seek to develop one. We caution readers not to simply compare the demographics of persons stopped in DC with the demographics of the city's population.

> Racial bias could be a factor in generating such disparities, but a basic introductory research methods course in the social sciences would argue that other explanations may be contributing factors. For example, differences by race in the exposure to the police and/or the rates of committing offenses may also contribute to racial disparities in police stop decisions. It is well documented, for example, that due to historical differences in racial segregation, housing tenure, poverty, and other sociopolitical factors, minorities in the US are more likely to live in neighborhoods with higher rates of crime and disorder....Crude approximations of the population at risk for police contact are poor substitutes and can hide evidence of racial bias or lead to exaggerated estimates of racial bias.[5]

Researchers have previously attempted to develop accurate measures of police stops and population demographics in the District. In 2006, Lamberth Consulting published Data Collection and Benchmarking of the Bias Policing Project, an independent study of MPD traffic stops funded by the U.S. Department of Justice. In the study, researchers measured the underlying behavior of drivers by collecting data at 20 locations around the city and compared the racial and ethnic demographics of drivers to that of those stopped by MPD. They found that the proportion of black and Hispanic motorists stopped was almost exactly what would be expected based upon the race of drivers observed at the intersections. They did find, however, that black and Hispanic pedestrians were stopped at disproportionately higher rates at two intersections.

There is growing scientific literature on methodologies for discerning racial discrimination in policing. Ridgeway and MacDonald [6] provide a thorough review of the strengths and weakness of several benchmarks, such as population, observation, and arrest rates. Neil and Winship[7] question many of the same assumptions underlying the use of these tests and recommend against the use of simple benchmarks like a comparison to overall population demographics.

MPD's new methods of collecting data make more valid, accurate analyses possible in the District. MPD is pursuing both public and private options to support this sort of rigorous and independent research. The Department is partnering with The Lab @ DC to ensure that any independent researchers engaged do this in a transparent and scientifically valid manner, such as by sharing a pre-analysis plan to be reviewed by experts in the field and registering all analyses and results on the Open Science Framework.

This work would be of great interest to cities nationwide. The issue of bias in the criminal justice system – beginning with public interactions with law enforcement – is an area of intense scrutiny throughout the country. In order to continue building, and in some cases re-build, relationships between police and the communities they serve, police departments need not just data, but strong analysis to help define specific areas for improvement and implement appropriate solutions.

What does the data tell us?

The stop data is presented in a few broad categories:

- **All Stops**

- **Ticket Stops**, which are documented in the ticket database, with tickets for traffic-related infractions issued to vehicle drivers, bicyclists, or pedestrians.

- **Non-ticket Stops**, which are generally interactions that required some documentation in MPD's Record Management System (RMS). This includes any other police interaction where the person is not immediately free to leave, such as:
    o **Arrests;** or
    o **All other stops** that involve investigative questioning, and may include protective pat downs or pre-arrest searches.

All Stops

Outcomes

Of the approximately **11,600 stops** conducted by MPD from July 22 to August 18, 2019, **80 percent** of the individuals received a ticket or were arrested.

- **60 percent** of the stops ended with a ticket (warning or actual) for a traffic-related vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian violation.

- **20 percent** of the stops ended with an arrest for a crime.

- **20 percent** of the stops ended with investigative questioning, which may include a protective pat down and/or a pre-arrest search, but no arrest or ticket.

Duration

The average duration of all stops was **less than 15 minutes**.

- **Ticket Stops:** For stops that ended in only a ticket for a traffic, bicycle, or pedestrian infraction, the average duration was less than 11 minutes.

  o Almost all of these stops – 98 percent – were resolved in less than 30 minutes.

- **Non-Ticket Stops:** Stops that involved an arrest, search, or other type of police report, took less than 21 minutes on average.

  o The vast majority of these stops – 84 percent – were resolved in less than 30 minutes.

Table 1: Average duration of stops.

	Average Duration	Proportion completed within:	
		15 minutes	30 minutes
All Stops	14.8 minutes	76%	92%
Ticket Stops	10.7 minutes	91%	98%
Non-Ticket Stops	20.7 minutes	56%	84%

Note: The proportion completed within 30 minutes includes those stops completed within 15 minutes.

Demographics

The demographics of the persons stopped varies by stop type. It is important to note that some stops are for the purpose of arrest. For instance arrests for fugitive or release violations, which totaled 25 percent of all arrest charges, are made pursuant to a court warrant or order.

All Stops

Other*, 8%
White, 15%
Hispanic, 7%
Black, 70%

Figure 3:
Percent of all stops by race citywide.[8]

Stops Resulting in Tickets

Other*, 11%
White, 20%
Hispanic, 8%
Black, 61%

Figure 5:
Percent of ticket stops by race citywide.

Non-Ticket Stops

White, 7%   Other*, 2%
Hispanic, 5%
Black, 86%

Figure 4:
Percent of non-ticket stops by race citywide.

Other includes demographic data for Unknown, Multiple Races, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native.

Figure 6:
Percent of stops by gender citywide.

	Male	Female
Non-Ticket Stops	78%	
Ticket Stops	68%	
All Stops	71%	

Location

Enforcement activities vary by police district across the city. The Second District, which covers the largest geographic area, has the largest number of ticket stops. The Sixth District, in the eastern corner of the city, has the most arrests. However, it is important to note that the services provided within a police district may affect the stop data for that police district. For example, the highest number of non-ticket stops are recorded at the Department's Youth and Family Services Division in the Sixth District, primarily for arrests on court orders. Similarly, arrests at the Central Detention Facility – the location with the second most non-ticket stops – and stops on District waterways made by the Harbor Patrol Unit are both included in the First District.

Table 2: Number of stops based on outcome (i.e., arrest, ticket, or other) by police district.

	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D
Tickets	1,195	1,603	1,288	672	768	1,126	256
Arrests	276	206	275	202	370	516	449
Other Stops	433	230	263	233	300	436	454
Total – All Stops	1,904*	2,039	1,826	1,107	1,438	2,078**	1,159

Note: These figures are subject to change due ongoing data quality audits and the inclusion of any delayed reports.

* 1D includes arrests made at the Central Detention Facility and stops made on the waterways by the Harbor Patrol Unit.

** 6D includes arrests made at the Youth and Family Services Division.

Figure 7: Percent of stops based on outcome (i.e., arrest, ticket, or other) by police district.

Time and Day

The table to the right shows the time and day of week that all stops occur. Ticket stops and non-ticket stops are most concentrated at different times and days of the week, as indicated by the darker shades of red. Ticket stops peak during the weekday morning rush hour, with a smaller spike during the evening rush hour. Non-ticket stops happen most often in the late afternoon or early evening, Monday through Saturday.

Figure 8: Heat map of the time and day of all stops.

Highest concentration of ticket stops

Highest concentration of non-ticket stops and a small spike of ticket stops

Note: Hours are numbered from 0 to 23, where 0 is equivalent to midnight and 23 to 11:00 pm.

Protective Pat Downs and Pre-Arrest Searches

The vast majority of all stops—86 percent—were resolved without a protective pat down (PPD) or any type of pre-arrest search (consent, probable cause, or warrant search) of either a person or property.

A stop may involve a protective pat down and/or more than one kind of pre-arrest search. Of the 14 percent of stops that included any type of pre-arrest search:

- **38%** included a protective pat down.

- **29%** included a consent search.

- **30%** included a probable cause search.

- **9%** included a warrant search.

PPD and/or Search, 14%

No Search/ No PPD, 86%

Figure 9: Percent of all stops with and without protective pat down and/or search.

The proportion of stops which included either a protective pat down and/or any type of pre-arrest search by each police district is outlined below. For example, 87 percent of all stops in the Fourth District are resolved without a protective pat down or pre-arrest search of person or property.

Table 3: Percent of all stops with and without protective pat down and/or search by police district.

	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D	Citywide
No Search/No PPD	90%	96%	92%	87%	83%	80%	65%	86%
PPD and/or Search	10%	4%	8%	13%	17%	20%	35%	14%

Contraband Seized

Illegal contraband was seized in 22 percent of all stops in which a protective pat down or any type of pre-arrest search was conducted. The table below outlines the contraband types and the number of stops associated with contraband seizure. Notable takeaways include:

▪ Arrests were made in 78 percent of the stops in which contraband was seized.

▪ MPD officers seized 136 guns, including nine BB or Air Soft guns, as a result of all stops.
(The total number of guns seized is based on the total number of guns seized for each Criminal Complaint Number (CCN). The figure in the table below reflects the number of stops in which the officer completing the report indicated a gun was found during the stop. The number seized is higher than the number of stops because more than one gun may be seized.

Table 4: Types of contraband seized and number of stops associated with each type.

Type of Contraband	Number of Stops Where Seized
Other Weapon	29
Drug Paraphernalia	33
Stolen Property	36
Gun	95
Other[9]	114
Narcotics	136

Different types of contraband may have been seized from a single stop.

In 45 percent of the stops with probable cause searches, some contraband was seized. For warrant searches, contraband was seized in 34 percent of the stops.

Table 5: Percent of stops with protective pat down or search resulting in contraband seized.

Type of search or PPD where contraband was seized	% of stops with PPD or search where contraband was seized
Protective Pat Down	13%
Consent Search	11%
Probable Cause Search	45%
Warrant Search	34%

Ticket Stops

Although traffic fatalities are down 27 percent in 2019, they increased 29 percent from 2016 to 2018. The stop data demonstrates MPD's strong commitment to the District's critical Vision Zero goal to eliminate traffic fatalities.

- **60%** of all MPD stops ended with one or more traffic tickets being issued to a driver, bicyclist or pedestrian. (And as noted under non-ticket stops, **25%** of arrests included a traffic-related charge.)

- **Only 30%** of vehicles stopped for traffic violations were registered in the District; **70%** were registered in other states.


Figure 10: State of vehicle registration for all ticket stops.

70% of the vehicles stopped for traffic violations were registered outside of the District

- **Seven out of 10** tickets issued by MPD were actual tickets; **three out of 10** were warnings.

- Officers conducted **nine out of 10** traffic stops after seeing a moving violation or an equipment violation. The rest were primarily in response to a call for service or a crash.

- Approximately 9,300 tickets were issued in approximately 7,000 ticket stops, for an average of **1.3 tickets** per ticket stop.[10]

*Table 6: State of vehicle registration for ticket stops by police district.*

State of Vehicle Registration	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D	Citywide
District of Columbia	28%	27%	33%	43%	28%	29%	31%	30%
Maryland	37%	36%	34%	38%	45%	37%	31%	37%
Virginia	22%	22%	20%	9%	15%	28%	25%	21%
Other States / Unknown	13%	15%	13%	10%	12%	6%	13%	12%

Table 7: Percent of stops with ticket(s) issued by race.

Race	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D	Citywide
Black	64%	34%	49%	64%	68%	92%	93%	61%
Hispanic	6%	8%	10%	15%	14%	3%	2%	8%
White	18%	41%	25%	13%	12%	2%	3%	20%
Asian	3%	5%	3%	3%	1%	0%	0%	3%
Other	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Unknown	9%	11%	11%	4%	5%	2%	2%	7%

Other includes demographic data for Multiple Races, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native.

Unknown includes individuals who declined to provide demographic information.

Non-Ticket Stops

Non-ticket stops include all arrests, regardless of whether the interaction began as a stop for a vehicle, bicycle, or pedestrian violation. It also includes any other stops that did not begin as a traffic violation, but did not end in arrest.

Arrest Charges

During the reporting period, the majority of arrests included one of four common charge types:

- **25%** of arrests included a charge of simple assault. Simple assault charges are common in domestic / intrafamily violence incidents.

- **25%** of arrests included a charge for fugitive from justice or a release violation. These reflect charges made pursuant to a warrant or court order.

- Another **25%** of arrests included a criminal traffic charge, including arrests for impaired driving, driving more than 30 miles an hour over the speed limit, leaving after colliding, and driving without a license.

- The next most frequent charge was for weapons violations; **95%** of the weapons charges were firearms related.

These figures are based on the percentage of total charges, not the total arrests. One arrest may have included more than one of these charges as well as other criminal charges. One-third of arrests during the report period included multiple criminal charges.

Most Frequent Arrest Charges

| Charge	Percent
Simple Assault	25%
Release Violations/Fugitive	25%
Traffic Violations	25%
Weapon Violations	18%

Figure 11: Most frequent arrest charges as a percent of all charges. One arrest may have multiple charges.

Reason for the Stop

If an officer has reasonable suspicion that an individual has committed, is committing, or is about to commit any crime, the officer has the authority to stop the individual and determine whether probable cause exists to make an arrest. Officers must be able to articulate reasonable suspicion, based on the totality of the circumstances and their training and experience. Given the nature and complexity of some stops, in the MPD RMS officers may select more than one reason for non-ticket stops from the list below. For more information about the reasons for conducting a stop and the terms used below, please refer to MPD policy, General Order 304.10: Field Contacts, Stops, and Protective Pat Downs.

% of non-ticket stops mentioning the following reasons for the stop:	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D	Citywide
Call for service	35%	51%	43%	51%	36%	26%	25%	35%
Individual's actions[11]	14%	16%	15%	12%	22%	17%	19%	17%
Traffic violation	6%	9%	8%	8%	10%	29%	16%	14%
Suspicion of criminal activity (self-initiated)	16%	13%	10%	11%	9%	7%	19%	12%
Be On The Lookout (BOLO)	20%	11%	13%	10%	12%	8%	7%	11%
Information obtained from law enforcement sources	6%	5%	9%	6%	12%	10%	7%	8%
Warrant/court order	10%	1%	4%	8%	7%	8%	14%	8%
Information obtained from witnesses or informants	8%	7%	7%	4%	7%	3%	4%	5%
Individual's characteristics[12]	2%	2%	3%	4%	7%	5%	6%	4%
Prior knowledge	7%	2%	2%	6%	4%	5%	4%	4%
Demeanor during a field contact	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Response to crash	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Observed a weapon	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%

Demographics

The racial demographics of non-ticket stops vary by police district. As noted earlier, certain police districts, including the First and Sixth Districts, contain centralized processing locations where larger numbers of arrests (primarily due to court warrants and orders) may occur.

Race	1D	2D	3D	4D	5D	6D	7D	Citywide
Black	79%	62%	80%	74%	90%	97%	98%	86%
Hispanic	4%	10%	9%	19%	4%	1%	0%	5%
White	15%	21%	8%	5%	3%	1%	1%	6%
Other*	2%	7%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%

*Unknown, Multiple Races, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native combined correspond to 2% of total non-ticket stops.

Endnotes

1. As part of its commitment to transparency and accountability, MPD makes police policies available to the public on the MPD website, and has been making more data available online over the past three years. The open data sets on the MPD website include arrests, hate crimes, and police contacts and stops.

2. There is a time lag for data on some traffic stops. Some traffic tickets are still handwritten, delivered to the DMV, and then entered into data systems by DMV contractors. The current estimate is that approximately 25 percent of traffic tickets are handwritten, and most, but not all, of the handwritten tickets issued during the reporting period have already been entered into DMV's data system and included in this report.

3. As of September 3, 2019, MPD's sworn members were 51 percent black, 35 percent white, 10 percent Hispanic, 4 percent Asian, and less than 1 percent other races, compared to a city population that is 46 percent black, 37 percent non-Hispanic or Latino white, 11 percent Hispanic or Latino, 4 percent Asian, and 2 percent all other races.

4. U.S. Census Bureau, District of Columbia QuickFacts, July 1, 2018, https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/DC.

5. Methods for Assessing Racially Biased Policing, by Greg Ridgeway and John MacDonald. NYU Press, 2010, pages 2-3.

6. Ibid.

7. Methodological Challenges and Opportunities in Testing for Racial Discrimination in Policing, by Roland Neil and Christopher Winship. Annual Review of Criminology, Vol 2, 2019 Pp 73-98.

8. Racial and ethnic demographic categories are based on those used by the United States Census. Ticket stop data includes two stops in which the subject identified their gender by the non-binary designation, X.

9. Some of the items identified as "Other" range from open containers of alcohol to ammunition.

10. Officers may issue multiple tickets during traffic stops because they are required by District law to ask drivers for proof of insurance. If the driver cannot provide proof of insurance, District law requires officers to issue two separate tickets: one is a $30 ticket for failure to show proof of insurance and the other is a $500 ticket for the vehicle owner permitting or operating without proper insurance. These two tickets are in addition to the underlying violation(s) for which an officer stopped the vehicle. Moreover, officers may issue multiple tickets for egregious violations.

11. Individual's Actions: An individual may be fleeing from an actual or possible crime scene, hiding, discarding possible items of evidence, be in the area of a known offense soon after its commission or in an area known for the type of criminal activity on which the suspicion is based, or be in an area during a time of day during which criminal activity of the kind suspected might usually occur (e.g., a late hour when it would be unusual for individuals to be in a certain area). (MPD General Order 304.10 Field Contacts, Stops, and Protective Pat Downs)

12. Individual's Characteristics: An individual may generally fit the description of an individual wanted for a known offense. The individual may seem to be suffering from a recent injury related to a known offense, fatigued from running, overly nervous, under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or other factors may exist that tie the individual to an offense. (MPD General Order 304.10 Field Contacts, Stops, and Protective Pat Downs)

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

STOP DATA REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2019