

# DEL CARMEN CONSULTING, LLC



## Annual Contact Report

2015

The Grapevine Police Department

# **(I) Introduction**

# Opening Statement

January 11, 2016

Grapevine City Council  
P.O. Box 95104  
Grapevine, Texas 79701

Dear Distinguished Members of the City Council,

The Texas Legislature, with the intent of addressing the issue of racial profiling in policing, enacted in 2001 the Texas Racial Profiling Law. Since then, the Grapevine Police Department, in accordance with the law, has collected and reported traffic and motor vehicle-related contact data for the purpose of identifying and addressing (if necessary) areas of concern regarding racial profiling practices. In the 2009 Texas legislative session, the Racial Profiling Law was modified and additional requirements are now in place. These most recent requirements have been incorporated by the Grapevine Police Department and are also being addressed in this report.

This particular report contains three sections with information on traffic and motor vehicle-related contact data. In addition, when appropriate, documentation is also a component of this report, aiming at demonstrating the manner in which the Grapevine Police Department has complied with the Texas Racial Profiling Law. In section 1, you will find the table of contents in addition to the Texas Senate Bill (SB1074); which later became the Texas Racial Profiling Law. In addition, you will find the Texas HB 3389, which, in 2009, introduced new requirements relevant to racial profiling. Also, in this section, a list of requirements relevant to the Racial Profiling Law as established by TCOLE (Texas Commission on Law Enforcement) is included. In addition, you will find, in sections 2 and 3 documentation which demonstrates compliance by the Grapevine Police Department relevant to the requirements as established in the Texas Racial Profiling Law. That is, you will find documents relevant to the implementation of an institutional policy banning racial profiling, the incorporation of a racial profiling complaint process and the training administered to all law enforcement personnel.

The last section of this report provides statistical data relevant to contacts, made during the course of motor vehicle stops, between 1/1/15 and 12/31/15. In addition, this section contains the TCOLE Tier 1 form, which is required to be submitted to this particular organization by March 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. The data in this report has been analyzed and compared to data derived from the U.S. Census Bureau's Fair Roads Standard. The final analysis and recommendations are also included in this report. The findings in this report serve as evidence of the Grapevine Police Department's commitment to comply with the Texas Racial Profiling Law.

Sincerely,

Alex del Carmen, Ph.D.  
Del Carmen Consulting, LLC

# Table of Contents

## **Table of Contents**

### **(I) Introduction**

- a) Opening Statement
- b) Table of Contents
- c) TCOLE Guidelines
- d) The Texas Law on Racial Profiling (S.B. 1074)
- e) The Most Recent Legal Requirements (H.B. 3389)

### **(II) Responding to the Texas Racial Profiling Law**

- a) Institutional Policy on Racial Profiling
- b) Educational Campaign Relevant to the Complaint Process—  
Addressing Allegations of Racial Profiling Practices
- c) Racial Profiling Training of Law Enforcement Personnel
- d) Report on Complaints Filed Against Officers for Violating the Racial Profiling Law  
(includes outcome of investigation)
- e) Police Contact Information Table (2015)/Known Ethnicity and Race of Detained  
and TCOLE Tier 1 Form
- f) Table Depicting Baseline Comparison (2015)
- g) Fourteen-Year Data Assessment (2002-15)
- h) Analysis and Interpretation of Data (2015)

**(III) Summary**

a) Checklist

b) Contact Information

# **TCOLE GUIDELINES**

## Guidelines for Compiling and Reporting Data under Senate Bill 1074

### Background

Senate Bill 1074 of the 77<sup>th</sup> Legislature established requirements in the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure (TCCP) for law enforcement agencies. The Commission developed this document to assist agencies in complying with the statutory requirements.

The guidelines are written in the form of standards using a style developed from accreditation organizations including the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). The standards provide a description of *what* must be accomplished by an agency but allows wide latitude in determining *how* the agency will achieve compliance with each applicable standard.

Each standard is composed of two parts: the standard statement and the commentary. The *standard statement* is a declarative sentence that places a clear-cut requirement, or multiple requirements, on an agency. The commentary supports the standard statement but is not binding. The commentary can serve as a prompt, as guidance to clarify the intent of the standard, or as an example of one possible way to comply with the standard.

### Standard 1

Each law enforcement agency has a detailed written directive that:

- clearly defines acts that constitute racial profiling;
- strictly prohibits peace officers employed by the agency from engaging in racial profiling;
- implements a process by which an individual may file a complaint with the agency if the individual believes a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to the individual filing the complaint;
- provides for public education relating to the complaint process;
- requires appropriate corrective action to be taken against a peace officer employed by the agency who, after investigation, is shown to have engaged in racial profiling in violation of the agency's written racial profiling policy; and

- requires the collection of certain types of data for subsequent reporting.

### **Commentary**

Article 2.131 of the TCCP prohibits officers from engaging in racial profiling, and article 2.132 of the TCCP now requires a written policy that contains the elements listed in this standard. The article also specifically defines a law enforcement agency as it applies to this statute as an “agency of the state, or of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state, that employs peace officers who make traffic stops in the routine performance of the officers’ official duties.”

The article further defines race or ethnicity as being of “a particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American.” The statute does not limit the required policies to just these ethnic groups.

This written policy is to be adopted and implemented no later than January 1, 2002.

### **Standard 2**

Each peace officer who stops a motor vehicle for an alleged violation of a law or ordinance regulating traffic, or who stops a pedestrian for any suspected offense reports to the employing law enforcement agency information relating to the stop, to include:

- a physical description of each person detained, including gender and the person’s race or ethnicity, as stated by the person, or, if the person does not state a race or ethnicity, as determined by the officer’s best judgment;
- the traffic law or ordinance alleged to have been violated or the suspected offense;
- whether the officer conducted a search as a result of the stop and, if so, whether the person stopped consented to the search;
- whether any contraband was discovered in the course of the search, and the type of contraband discovered;
- whether probable cause to search existed, and the facts supporting the existence of that probable cause;
- whether the officer made an arrest as a result of the stop or the search, including a statement of the offense charged;
- the street address or approximate location of the stop; and
- whether the officer issued a warning or citation as a result of the stop, including a description of the warning or a statement of the violation charged.

### **Commentary**

The information required by 2.133 TCCP is used to complete the agency reporting requirements found in Article 2.134. A peace officer and an agency may be exempted from this requirement under Article 2.135 TCCP Exemption for Agencies Using Video and Audio Equipment. An agency may be exempt from this reporting requirement by applying for the funds from the Department of Public Safety for video and audio equipment and the State does not supply those funds. Section 2.135 (a)(2) states, “the governing body of the county or municipality served by the law enforcement agency, in conjunction with the law enforcement agency, certifies to the Department of Public Safety, not later than the date specified by rule by the department, that the law enforcement agency needs funds or video and audio equipment for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Subsection (a) (1) (A) and the agency does not receive from the state funds for video and audio equipment sufficient, as determined by the department, for the agency to accomplish that purpose.”

### **Standard 3**

The agency compiles the information collected under 2.132 and 2.133 and analyzes the information identified in 2.133.

### **Commentary**

Senate Bill 1074 from the 77<sup>th</sup> Session of the Texas Legislature created requirements for law enforcement agencies to gather specific information and to report it to each county or municipality served. New sections of law were added to the Code of Criminal Procedure regarding the reporting of traffic and pedestrian stops. Detained is defined as when a person stopped is not free to leave.

Article 2.134 TCCP requires the agency to compile and provide an analysis of the information collected by peace officer employed by the agency. The report is provided to the governing body of the municipality or county no later than March 1 of each year and covers the previous calendar year.

There is data collection and reporting required based on Article 2.132 CCP (tier one) and Article 2.133 CCP (tier two).

The minimum requirements for “tier one” data for traffic stops in which a citation results are:

- 1) the race or ethnicity of individual detained (race and ethnicity as defined by the bill means of “a particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American”);
- 2) whether a search was conducted, and if there was a search, whether it was a consent search or a probable cause search; and
- 3) whether there was a custody arrest.

The minimum requirements for reporting on “tier two” reports include traffic and pedestrian stops.

Tier two data include:

- 1) the detained person’s gender and race or ethnicity;
- 2) the type of law violation suspected, e.g., hazardous traffic, non-hazardous traffic, or other criminal investigation (the Texas Department of Public Safety publishes a categorization of traffic offenses into hazardous or non-hazardous);
- 3) whether a search was conducted, and if so whether it was based on consent or probable cause;
- 4) facts supporting probable cause;
- 5) the type, if any, of contraband that was collected;
- 6) disposition of the stop, e.g., arrest, ticket, warning, or release;
- 7) location of stop; and
- 8) statement of the charge, e.g., felony, misdemeanor, or traffic.

Tier one reports are made to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency an annual report of information if the agency is an agency of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state. Tier one and two reports are reported to the county or

municipality not later than March 1 for the previous calendar year beginning March 1, 2003. Tier two reports include a comparative analysis between the race and ethnicity of persons detained to see if a differential pattern of treatment can be discerned based on the disposition of stops including searches resulting from the stops. The reports also include information relating to each complaint filed with the agency alleging that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling. An agency may be exempt from the tier two reporting requirement by applying for the funds from the Department of Public Safety for video and audio equipment and the State does not supply those funds [See 2.135 (a)(2) TCCP].

Reports should include both raw numbers and percentages for each group. Caution should be exercised in interpreting the data involving percentages because of statistical distortions caused by very small numbers in any particular category, for example, if only one American Indian is stopped and searched, that stop would not provide an accurate comparison with 200 stops among Caucasians with 100 searches. In the first case, a 100% search rate would be skewed data when compared to a 50% rate for Caucasians.

#### **Standard 4**

If a law enforcement agency has video and audio capabilities in motor vehicles regularly used for traffic stops, or audio capabilities on motorcycles regularly used to make traffic stops, the agency:

- adopts standards for reviewing and retaining audio and video documentation; and
- promptly provides a copy of the recording to a peace officer who is the subject of a complaint on written request by the officer.

#### **Commentary**

The agency should have a specific review and retention policy. Article 2.132 TCCP specifically requires that the peace officer be promptly provided with a copy of the audio or video recordings if the officer is the subject of a complaint and the officer makes a written request.

#### **Standard 5**

Agencies that do not currently have video or audio equipment must examine the feasibility of installing such equipment.

#### **Commentary**

None

#### **Standard 6**

Agencies that have video and audio recording capabilities are exempt from the reporting requirements of Article 2.134 TCCP and officers are exempt from the reporting requirements of Article 2.133 TCCP provided that:

- the equipment was in place and used during the proceeding calendar year; and
- video and audio documentation is retained for at least 90 days.

#### **Commentary**

The audio and video equipment and policy must have been in place during the previous calendar year. Audio and video documentation must be kept for at least 90 days or longer if a complaint has been filed. The documentation must be retained until the complaint is resolved. Peace officers are not exempt from the requirements under Article 2.132 TCCP.

**Standard 7**

Agencies have citation forms or other electronic media that comply with Section 543.202 of the Transportation Code.

**Commentary**

Senate Bill 1074 changed Section 543.202 of the Transportation Code requiring citations to include:

- race or ethnicity, and
- whether a search of the vehicle was conducted and whether consent for the search was obtained.

# **The Texas Law on Racial Profiling**

S.B. No. 1074

AN ACT

Relating to the prevention of racial profiling by certain peace officers.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 2, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended by adding Articles 2.131 through 2.138 to read as follows:

Art. 2.131. RACIAL PROFILING PROHIBITED. A peace officer may not engage in racial profiling.

Art. 2.132. LAW ENFORCEMENT POLICY ON RACIAL PROFILING. (a) In this article:

(1) "Law enforcement agency" means an agency of the state, or of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state, that employs peace officers who make traffic stops in the routine performance of the officers' official duties.

(2) "Race or ethnicity" means of a particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American descent.

(b) Each law enforcement agency in this state shall adopt a detailed written policy on racial profiling. The policy must:

(1) clearly define acts constituting racial profiling;

(2) strictly prohibit peace officers employed by the agency from engaging in racial profiling;

(3) implement a process by which an individual may file a complaint with the agency if the individual believes that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to the individual;

(4) provide public education relating to the agency's complaint process;

(5) require appropriate corrective action to be taken against a peace officer employed by the agency who, after an investigation, is shown to have engaged in racial profiling in violation of the agency's policy adopted under this article;

(6) require collection of information relating to traffic stops in which a citation is issued and to arrests resulting from those traffic stops, including information relating to:

(A) the race or ethnicity of the individual detained; and  
(B) whether a search was conducted and, if so, whether the person detained consented to the search; and

(7) require the agency to submit to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency an annual report of the information collected under Subdivision (6) if the agency is an agency of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state.

(c) The data collected as a result of the reporting requirements of this article shall not constitute prima facie evidence of racial profiling.

(d) On adoption of a policy under Subsection (b), a law enforcement agency shall examine the feasibility of installing video camera and transmitter-activated equipment in each agency law enforcement motor vehicle regularly used to make traffic stops and transmitter-activated equipment in each agency law enforcement motorcycle regularly used to make traffic stops. If a law enforcement agency installs video or audio equipment as provided by this subsection, the policy adopted by the agency under Subsection (b) must include standards for reviewing video and audio documentation.

(e) A report required under Subsection (b)(7) may not include identifying information about a peace officer who makes a traffic stop or about an individual who is stopped or arrested by a peace officer. This subsection does not affect the collection of information as required by a policy under Subsection (b)(6).

(f) On the commencement of an investigation by a law enforcement agency of a complaint described by Subsection (b)(3) in which a video or audio recording of the occurrence on which the complaint is based was made, the agency shall promptly provide a copy of the recording to the peace officer who is the subject of the complaint on written request by the officer.

Art. 2.133. REPORTS REQUIRED FOR TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN STOPS. (a) In this article:

(1) "Race or ethnicity" has the meaning assigned by Article 2.132(a).

(2) "Pedestrian stop" means an interaction between a peace officer and an individual who is being detained for the purpose of a criminal investigation in which the individual is not under arrest.

(b) A peace officer who stops a motor vehicle for an alleged violation of a law or ordinance regulating traffic or who stops a pedestrian for any suspected offense shall report to the law enforcement agency that employs the officer information relating to the stop, including:

(1) a physical description of each person detained as a result of the stop, including:

(A) the person's gender; and

(B) the person's race or ethnicity, as stated by the person or, if the person does not state the person's race or ethnicity, as determined by the officer to the best of the officer's ability;

(2) the traffic law or ordinance alleged to have been violated or the suspected offense;

(3) whether the officer conducted a search as a result of the stop and, if so, whether the person detained consented to the search;

(4) whether any contraband was discovered in the course of the search and the type of contraband discovered;

(5) whether probable cause to search existed and the facts supporting the existence of that probable cause;

(6) whether the officer made an arrest as a result of the stop or the search, including a statement of the offense charged;

(7) the street address or approximate location of the stop; and

(8) whether the officer issued a warning or a citation as a result of the stop, including a description of the warning or a statement of the violation charged.

Art. 2.134. COMPILATION AND ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION COLLECTED.

(a) In this article, "pedestrian stop" means an interaction between a peace officer and an individual who is being detained for the purpose of a criminal investigation in which the individual is not under arrest.

(b) A law enforcement agency shall compile and analyze the information contained in each report received by the agency under Article 2.133. Not later than March 1 of each year, each local law enforcement agency shall submit a report containing the information compiled during the previous calendar year to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency in a manner approved by the agency.

(c) A report required under Subsection (b) must include:

(1) a comparative analysis of the information compiled under Article 2.133 to:

(A) determine the prevalence of racial profiling by peace officers employed by the agency; and

(B) examine the disposition of traffic and pedestrian stops made by officers employed by the agency, including searches resulting from the stops; and

(2) information relating to each complaint filed with the agency alleging that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling.

(d) A report required under Subsection (b) may not include identifying information about a peace officer who makes a traffic or pedestrian stop or about an individual who is stopped or arrested by a peace officer. This subsection does not affect the reporting of information required under Article 2.133(b)(1).

(e) The Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education shall develop guidelines for compiling and reporting information as required by this article.

(f) The data collected as a result of the reporting requirements of this article shall not constitute prima facie evidence of racial profiling.

Art. 2.135. EXEMPTION FOR AGENCIES USING VIDEO AND AUDIO EQUIPMENT.

(a) A peace officer is exempt from the reporting requirement under Article 2.133 and a law enforcement agency is exempt from the compilation, analysis, and reporting requirements under Article 2.134 if:

(1) during the calendar year preceding the date that a report under Article 2.134 is required to be submitted:

(A) each law enforcement motor vehicle regularly used by an officer employed by the agency to make traffic and pedestrian stops is equipped with video camera and transmitter-activated equipment and each law enforcement motorcycle regularly used to make traffic and pedestrian stops is equipped with transmitter-activated equipment; and

(B) each traffic and pedestrian stop made by an officer employed by the agency that is capable of being recorded by video and audio or audio equipment, as appropriate, is recorded by using the equipment; or

(2) the governing body of the county or municipality served by the law enforcement agency, in conjunction with the law enforcement agency, certifies to the Department of Public Safety, not later than the date specified by rule by the department, that the law enforcement agency needs funds or video and audio equipment for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Subsection (a)(1)(A) and the agency does not receive from the state funds or video and audio equipment sufficient, as determined by the department, for the agency to accomplish that purpose.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by this subsection, a law enforcement agency that is exempt from the requirements under Article 2.134 shall retain the video and audio or audio documentation of each traffic and pedestrian stop for at least 90 days after the date of the stop. If a complaint is filed with the law enforcement agency alleging that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to a traffic or pedestrian stop, the agency shall retain the video and audio or audio record of the stop until final disposition of the complaint.

(c) This article does not affect the collection or reporting requirements under Article 2.132.

Art. 2.136. LIABILITY. A peace officer is not liable for damages arising from an act relating to the collection or reporting of information as required by Article 2.133 or under a policy adopted under Article 2.132.

Art. 2.137. PROVISION OF FUNDING OR EQUIPMENT. (a) The Department of Public Safety shall adopt rules for providing funds or video and audio equipment to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Article 2.135(a)(1)(A), including specifying criteria to prioritize funding or equipment provided to law enforcement agencies. The criteria may include consideration of tax effort, financial hardship, available revenue, and budget surpluses. The criteria must give priority to:

(1) law enforcement agencies that employ peace officers whose primary duty is traffic enforcement;

(2) smaller jurisdictions; and

(3) municipal and county law enforcement agencies.

(b) The Department of Public Safety shall collaborate with an institution of higher education to identify law enforcement agencies that need funds or video and audio equipment for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Article 2.135(a)(1)(A). The collaboration may include the use of a survey to assist in developing criteria to prioritize funding or equipment provided to law enforcement agencies.

(c) To receive funds or video and audio equipment from the state for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Article 2.135(a)(1)(A), the governing body of a county or municipality, in conjunction with the law enforcement agency serving the county or municipality, shall certify to the Department of Public Safety that the law enforcement agency needs funds or video and audio equipment for that purpose.

(d) On receipt of funds or video and audio equipment from the state for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Article 2.135(a)(1)(A), the governing body of a county or municipality, in conjunction with the law enforcement agency serving the county or municipality, shall certify to the Department of Public Safety that the law

enforcement agency has installed video and audio equipment as described by Article 2.135(a)(1)(A) and is using the equipment as required by Article 2.135(a)(1).

Art. 2.138. RULES. The Department of Public Safety may adopt rules to implement Articles 2.131-2.137.

SECTION 2. Chapter 3, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended by adding Article 3.05 to read as follows:

Art. 3.05. RACIAL PROFILING. In this code, "racial profiling" means a 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.

SECTION 3. Section 96.641, Education Code, is amended by adding Subsection (j) to read as follows:

(j) As part of the initial training and continuing education for police chiefs required under this section, the institute shall establish a program on racial profiling. The program must include an examination of the best practices for:

(1) monitoring peace officers' compliance with laws and internal agency policies relating to racial profiling;

(2) implementing laws and internal agency policies relating to preventing racial profiling; and

(3) analyzing and reporting collected information.

SECTION 4. Section 1701.253, Occupations Code, is amended by adding Subsection (e) to read as follows:

(e) As part of the minimum curriculum requirements, the commission shall establish a statewide comprehensive education and training program on racial profiling for officers licensed under this chapter. An officer shall complete a program established under this subsection not later than the second anniversary of the date the officer is licensed under this chapter or the date the officer applies for an intermediate proficiency certificate, whichever date is earlier.

SECTION 5. Section 1701.402, Occupations Code, is amended by adding Subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) As a requirement for an intermediate proficiency certificate, an officer must complete an education and training program on racial profiling established by the commission under Section 1701.253(e).

SECTION 6. Section 543.202, Transportation Code, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 543.202. FORM OF RECORD.

(a) In this section, "race or ethnicity" means of a particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American descent.

(b) The record must be made on a form or by a data processing method acceptable to the department and must include:

(1) the name, address, physical description, including race or ethnicity, date of birth, and driver's license number of the person charged;

(2) the registration number of the vehicle involved;

(3) whether the vehicle was a commercial motor vehicle as defined by Chapter 522 or was involved in transporting hazardous materials;

(4) the person's social security number, if the person was operating a commercial motor vehicle or was the holder of a commercial driver's license or commercial driver learner's permit;

(5) the date and nature of the offense, including whether the offense was a serious traffic violation as defined by Chapter 522;

(6) whether a search of the vehicle was conducted and whether consent for the search was obtained;

(7) the plea, the judgment, and whether bail was forfeited;

(8) ~~(7)~~ the date of conviction; and

(9) ~~(8)~~ the amount of the fine or forfeiture.

SECTION 7. Not later than January 1, 2002, a law enforcement agency shall adopt and implement a policy and begin collecting information under the policy as required by Article 2.132, Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by this Act. A local law enforcement agency shall first submit information to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency as required by Article 2.132, Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by this Act, on March 1, 2003. The first submission of information shall consist of information compiled by the agency during the period beginning January 1, 2002, and ending December 31, 2002.

SECTION 8. A local law enforcement agency shall first submit information to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency as required by Article 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by this Act, on March 1, 2004. The first submission of information shall consist of information compiled by the agency during the period beginning January 1, 2003, and ending December 31, 2003.

SECTION 9. Not later than January 1, 2002:

(1) the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education shall establish an education and training program on racial profiling as required by Subsection (e), Section 1701.253, Occupations Code, as added by this Act; and

(2) the Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas shall establish a program on racial profiling as required by Subsection (j), Section 96.641, Education Code, as added by this Act.

SECTION 10. A person who on the effective date of this Act holds an intermediate proficiency certificate issued by the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education or has held a peace officer license issued by the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education for at least two years shall complete an education and training program on racial profiling established under Subsection (e), Section 1701.253, Occupations Code, as added by this Act, not later than September 1, 2003.

SECTION 11. An individual appointed or elected as a police chief before the effective date of this Act shall complete a program on racial profiling established under Subsection (j), Section 96.641, Education Code, as added by this Act, not later than September 1, 2003.

SECTION 12. This Act takes effect September 1, 200

---

President of the Senate

---

Speaker of the House

I hereby certify that S.B. No. 1074 passed the Senate on April 4, 2001, by the following vote: Yeas 28, Nays 2; May 21, 2001, Senate refused to concur in House amendments and requested appointment of Conference Committee; May 22, 2001, House granted request of the Senate; May 24, 2001, Senate adopted Conference Committee Report by a viva-voce vote.

---

Secretary of the Senate

I hereby certify that S.B. No. 1074 passed the House, with amendments, on May 15, 2001, by a non-record vote; May 22, 2001, House granted request of the Senate for appointment of Conference Committee; May 24, 2001, House adopted Conference Committee Report by a non-record vote.

---

Chief Clerk of the House

Approved:

---

Date

---

Governor

# **Most Recent Legal Requirements (H.B. 3389)**

Amend CSHB 3389 (Senate committee report) as follows:

(1) Strike the following SECTIONS of the bill:

(A) SECTION 8, adding Section 1701.164, Occupations Code (page 4, lines 61-66);

(B) SECTION 24, amending Article 2.132(b), Code of Criminal Procedure (page 8, lines 19-53);

(C) SECTION 25, amending Article 2.134(b), Code of Criminal Procedure (page 8, lines 54-64);

(D) SECTION 28, providing transition language for the amendments to Articles 2.132(b) and 2.134(b), Code of Criminal Procedure (page 9, lines 40-47).

(2) Add the following appropriately numbered SECTIONS to the bill and renumber subsequent SECTIONS of the bill accordingly:

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Article 2.132, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended by amending Subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e) and adding Subsection (g) to read as follows:

(a) In this article:

(1) "Law enforcement agency" means an agency of the state, or of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state, that employs peace officers who make motor vehicle [~~traffie~~] stops in the routine performance of the officers' official duties.

(2) "Motor vehicle stop" means an occasion in which a peace officer stops a motor vehicle for an alleged violation of a law or ordinance.

(3) "Race or ethnicity" means of a particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, [~~or~~] Native

American, or Middle Eastern descent.

(b) Each law enforcement agency in this state shall adopt a detailed written policy on racial profiling. The policy must:

- (1) clearly define acts constituting racial profiling;
- (2) strictly prohibit peace officers employed by the agency from engaging in racial profiling;
- (3) implement a process by which an individual may file a complaint with the agency if the individual believes that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to the individual;
- (4) provide public education relating to the agency's complaint process;

(5) require appropriate corrective action to be taken against a peace officer employed by the agency who, after an investigation, is shown to have engaged in racial profiling in violation of the agency's policy adopted under this article;

(6) require collection of information relating to motor vehicle [~~traffic~~] stops in which a citation is issued and to arrests made as a result of [~~resulting from~~] those [~~traffic~~] stops, including information relating to:

- (A) the race or ethnicity of the individual detained; and
- (B) whether a search was conducted and, if so, whether the individual [~~person~~] detained consented to the search; and
- (C) whether the peace officer knew the race or ethnicity of the individual detained before detaining that individual; and

(7) require the chief administrator of the agency, regardless of whether the administrator is elected, employed, or appointed, to submit [~~to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency~~] an annual report of the information collected under Subdivision (6) to:

(A) the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education; and

(B) the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency, if the agency is an agency of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state.

(d) On adoption of a policy under Subsection (b), a law enforcement agency shall examine the feasibility of installing video camera and transmitter-activated equipment in each agency law enforcement motor vehicle regularly used to make motor vehicle [~~traffic~~] stops and transmitter-activated equipment in each agency law enforcement motorcycle regularly used to make motor vehicle [~~traffic~~] stops. If a law enforcement agency installs video or audio equipment as provided by this subsection, the policy adopted by the agency under Subsection (b) must include standards for reviewing video and audio documentation.

(e) A report required under Subsection (b) (7) may not include identifying information about a peace officer who makes a motor vehicle [~~traffic~~] stop or about an individual who is stopped or arrested by a peace officer. This subsection does not affect the

collection of information as required by a policy under Subsection (b) (6).

(g) On a finding by the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education that the chief administrator of a law enforcement agency intentionally failed to submit a report required under Subsection (b) (7), the commission shall begin disciplinary procedures against the chief administrator.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Article 2.133, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended to read as follows:

Art. 2.133. REPORTS REQUIRED FOR MOTOR VEHICLE [~~TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIAN~~] STOPS. (a) In this article, "race[+

~~(1) "Race] or ethnicity" has the meaning assigned by Article 2.132(a).~~

~~(2) "Pedestrian stop" means an interaction between a peace officer and an individual who is being detained for the purpose of a criminal investigation in which the individual is not under arrest.]~~

(b) A peace officer who stops a motor vehicle for an alleged violation of a law or ordinance [~~regulating traffic or who stops a pedestrian for any suspected offense~~] shall report to the law enforcement agency that employs the officer information relating to the stop, including:

(1) a physical description of any [~~each~~] person operating the motor vehicle who is detained as a result of the stop, including:

(A) the person's gender; and

(B) the person's race or ethnicity, as stated by the person or, if the person does not state the person's race or ethnicity, as determined by the officer to the best of the officer's ability;

(2) the initial reason for the stop [~~traffic law or ordinance alleged to have been violated or the suspected offense~~];

(3) whether the officer conducted a search as a result of the stop and, if so, whether the person detained consented to the search;

(4) whether any contraband or other evidence was discovered in the course of the search and a description [~~the type~~] of the contraband or evidence [~~discovered~~];

(5) the reason for the search, including whether:

(A) any contraband or other evidence was in plain view;

(B) any probable cause or reasonable suspicion existed to perform the search; or

(C) the search was performed as a result of the towing of the motor vehicle or the arrest of any person in the motor vehicle [~~existed and the facts supporting the existence of that probable cause~~];

(6) whether the officer made an arrest as a result of the stop or the search, including a statement of whether the arrest was based on a violation of the Penal Code, a violation of a traffic law or ordinance, or an outstanding warrant and a statement of the offense charged;

(7) the street address or approximate location of the

stop; and

(8) whether the officer issued a written warning or a citation as a result of the stop [~~, including a description of the warning or a statement of the violation charged~~].

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Article 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended by amending Subsections (a) through (e) and adding Subsection (g) to read as follows:

(a) In this article:

(1) "Motor vehicle [~~, "pedestrian~~] stop" has the meaning assigned by Article 2.132(a) [~~means an interaction between a peace officer and an individual who is being detained for the purpose of a criminal investigation in which the individual is not under arrest~~].

(2) "Race or ethnicity" has the meaning assigned by Article 2.132(a).

(b) A law enforcement agency shall compile and analyze the information contained in each report received by the agency under Article 2.133. Not later than March 1 of each year, each [~~local~~] law enforcement agency shall submit a report containing the incident-based data [~~information~~] compiled during the previous calendar year to the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education and, if the law enforcement agency is a local law enforcement agency, to the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency [~~in a manner approved by the agency~~].

(c) A report required under Subsection (b) must be submitted by the chief administrator of the law enforcement agency, regardless of whether the administrator is elected, employed, or appointed, and must include:

(1) a comparative analysis of the information compiled under Article 2.133 to:

(A) evaluate and compare the number of motor vehicle stops, within the applicable jurisdiction, of persons who are recognized as racial or ethnic minorities and persons who are not recognized as racial or ethnic minorities [~~determine the prevalence of racial profiling by peace officers employed by the agency~~]; and

(B) examine the disposition of motor vehicle [~~traffic and pedestrian~~] stops made by officers employed by the agency, categorized according to the race or ethnicity of the affected persons, as appropriate, including any searches resulting from [~~the~~] stops within the applicable jurisdiction; and

(2) information relating to each complaint filed with the agency alleging that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling.

(d) A report required under Subsection (b) may not include identifying information about a peace officer who makes a motor vehicle [~~traffic or pedestrian~~] stop or about an individual who is stopped or arrested by a peace officer. This subsection does not affect the reporting of information required under Article 2.133(b)(1).

(e) The Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education, in accordance with Section 1701.162, Occupations Code,

shall develop guidelines for compiling and reporting information as required by this article.

(g) On a finding by the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education that the chief administrator of a law enforcement agency intentionally failed to submit a report required under Subsection (b), the commission shall begin disciplinary procedures against the chief administrator.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Article 2.135, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended to read as follows:

Art. 2.135. PARTIAL EXEMPTION FOR AGENCIES USING VIDEO AND AUDIO EQUIPMENT. (a) A peace officer is exempt from the reporting requirement under Article 2.133 and the chief administrator of a law enforcement agency, regardless of whether the administrator is elected, employed, or appointed, is exempt from the compilation, analysis, and reporting requirements under Article 2.134 if:

(1) during the calendar year preceding the date that a report under Article 2.134 is required to be submitted:

(A) each law enforcement motor vehicle regularly used by an officer employed by the agency to make motor vehicle [~~traffic and pedestrian~~] stops is equipped with video camera and transmitter-activated equipment and each law enforcement motorcycle regularly used to make motor vehicle [~~traffic and pedestrian~~] stops is equipped with transmitter-activated equipment; and

(B) each motor vehicle [~~traffic and pedestrian~~] stop made by an officer employed by the agency that is capable of being recorded by video and audio or audio equipment, as appropriate, is recorded by using the equipment; or

(2) the governing body of the county or municipality served by the law enforcement agency, in conjunction with the law enforcement agency, certifies to the Department of Public Safety, not later than the date specified by rule by the department, that the law enforcement agency needs funds or video and audio equipment for the purpose of installing video and audio equipment as described by Subsection (a)(1)(A) and the agency does not receive from the state funds or video and audio equipment sufficient, as determined by the department, for the agency to accomplish that purpose.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by this subsection, a law enforcement agency that is exempt from the requirements under Article 2.134 shall retain the video and audio or audio documentation of each motor vehicle [~~traffic and pedestrian~~] stop for at least 90 days after the date of the stop. If a complaint is filed with the law enforcement agency alleging that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to a motor vehicle [~~traffic or pedestrian~~] stop, the agency shall retain the video and audio or audio record of the stop until final disposition of the complaint.

(c) This article does not affect the collection or reporting requirements under Article 2.132.

(d) In this article, "motor vehicle stop" has the meaning assigned by Article 2.132(a).

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Chapter 2, Code of Criminal Procedure, is

amended by adding Article 2.1385 to read as follows:

Art. 2.1385. CIVIL PENALTY. (a) If the chief administrator of a local law enforcement agency intentionally fails to submit the incident-based data as required by Article 2.134, the agency is liable to the state for a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000 for each violation. The attorney general may sue to collect a civil penalty under this subsection.

(b) From money appropriated to the agency for the administration of the agency, the executive director of a state law enforcement agency that intentionally fails to submit the incident-based data as required by Article 2.134 shall remit to the comptroller the amount of \$1,000 for each violation.

(c) Money collected under this article shall be deposited in the state treasury to the credit of the general revenue fund.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Subchapter A, Chapter 102, Code of Criminal Procedure, is amended by adding Article 102.022 to read as follows:

Art. 102.022. COSTS ON CONVICTION TO FUND STATEWIDE REPOSITORY FOR DATA RELATED TO CIVIL JUSTICE. (a) In this article, "moving violation" means an offense that:

(1) involves the operation of a motor vehicle; and

(2) is classified as a moving violation by the

Department of Public Safety under Section 708.052, Transportation Code.

(b) A defendant convicted of a moving violation in a justice court, county court, county court at law, or municipal court shall pay a fee of 10 cents as a cost of court.

(c) In this article, a person is considered convicted if:

(1) a sentence is imposed on the person;

(2) the person receives community supervision,

including deferred adjudication; or

(3) the court defers final disposition of the person's

case.

(d) The clerks of the respective courts shall collect the costs described by this article. The clerk shall keep separate records of the funds collected as costs under this article and shall deposit the funds in the county or municipal treasury, as appropriate.

(e) The custodian of a county or municipal treasury shall:

(1) keep records of the amount of funds on deposit collected under this article; and

(2) send to the comptroller before the last day of the first month following each calendar quarter the funds collected under this article during the preceding quarter.

(f) A county or municipality may retain 10 percent of the funds collected under this article by an officer of the county or municipality as a collection fee if the custodian of the county or municipal treasury complies with Subsection (e).

(g) If no funds due as costs under this article are deposited in a county or municipal treasury in a calendar quarter, the custodian of the treasury shall file the report required for the quarter in the regular manner and must state that no funds were collected.

(h) The comptroller shall deposit the funds received under

this article to the credit of the Civil Justice Data Repository fund in the general revenue fund, to be used only by the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education to implement duties under Section 1701.162, Occupations Code.

(i) Funds collected under this article are subject to audit by the comptroller.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Section 102.061, Government Code, as reenacted and amended by Chapter 921 (H.B. 3167), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, is amended to conform to the amendments made to Section 102.061, Government Code, by Chapter 1053 (H.B. 2151), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, and is further amended to read as follows:

Sec. 102.061. ADDITIONAL COURT COSTS ON CONVICTION IN STATUTORY COUNTY COURT: CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. The clerk of a statutory county court shall collect fees and costs under the Code of Criminal Procedure on conviction of a defendant as follows:

- (1) a jury fee (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$20;
- (2) a fee for services of the clerk of the court (Art. 102.005, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$40;
- (3) a records management and preservation services fee (Art. 102.005, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$25;
- (4) a security fee on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.017, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;
- (5) a juvenile delinquency prevention and graffiti eradication fee (Art. 102.0171, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$50 [~~\$5~~]; [~~and~~]
- (6) a juvenile case manager fee (Art. 102.0174, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$5; and
- (7) a civil justice fee (Art. 102.022, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$0.10.

(b) Section 102.061, Government Code, as amended by Chapter 1053 (H.B. 2151), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, is repealed. Section 102.061, Government Code, as reenacted and amended by Chapter 921 (H.B. 3167), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, to reorganize and renumber that section, continues in effect as further amended by this section.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Section 102.081, Government Code, as amended by Chapter 921 (H.B. 3167), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, is amended to conform to the amendments made to Section 102.081, Government Code, by Chapter 1053 (H.B. 2151), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, and is further amended to read as follows:

Sec. 102.081. ADDITIONAL COURT COSTS ON CONVICTION IN COUNTY COURT: CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. The clerk of a county court shall collect fees and costs under the Code of Criminal Procedure on conviction of a defendant as follows:

- (1) a jury fee (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$20;
- (2) a fee for clerk of the court services (Art. 102.005, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$40;
- (3) a records management and preservation services fee

(Art. 102.005, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$25;

(4) a security fee on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.017, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(5) a juvenile delinquency prevention and graffiti eradication fee (Art. 102.0171, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$50 [~~\$5~~]; [~~and~~]

(6) a juvenile case manager fee (Art. 102.0174, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$5; and

(7) a civil justice fee (Art. 102.022, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$0.10.

(b) Section 102.081, Government Code, as amended by Chapter 1053 (H.B. 2151), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, is repealed. Section 102.081, Government Code, as amended by Chapter 921 (H.B. 3167), Acts of the 80th Legislature, Regular Session, 2007, to reorganize and renumber that section, continues in effect as further amended by this section.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Section 102.101, Government Code, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 102.101. ADDITIONAL COURT COSTS ON CONVICTION IN JUSTICE COURT: CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. A clerk of a justice court shall collect fees and costs under the Code of Criminal Procedure on conviction of a defendant as follows:

(1) a jury fee (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(2) a fee for withdrawing request for jury less than 24 hours before time of trial (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(3) a jury fee for two or more defendants tried jointly (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . one jury fee of \$3;

(4) a security fee on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.017, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$4;

(5) a fee for technology fund on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.0173, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$4;

(6) a juvenile case manager fee (Art. 102.0174, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$5;

(7) a fee on conviction of certain offenses involving issuing or passing a subsequently dishonored check (Art. 102.0071, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$30; [~~and~~]

(8) a court cost on conviction of a Class C misdemeanor in a county with a population of 3.3 million or more, if authorized by the county commissioners court (Art. 102.009, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$7; and

(9) a civil justice fee (Art. 102.022, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$0.10.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Section 102.121, Government Code, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 102.121. ADDITIONAL COURT COSTS ON CONVICTION IN MUNICIPAL COURT: CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. The clerk of a municipal court shall collect fees and costs on conviction of a defendant as follows:

(1) a jury fee (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(2) a fee for withdrawing request for jury less than 24

hours before time of trial (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(3) a jury fee for two or more defendants tried jointly (Art. 102.004, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . one jury fee of \$3;

(4) a security fee on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.017, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$3;

(5) a fee for technology fund on a misdemeanor offense (Art. 102.0172, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$4; [~~and~~]

(6) a juvenile case manager fee (Art. 102.0174, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . not to exceed \$5; and

(7) a civil justice fee (Art. 102.022, Code of Criminal Procedure) . . . \$0.10.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Subchapter D, Chapter 1701, Occupations Code, is amended by adding Section 1701.164 to read as follows:

Sec. 1701.164. COLLECTION OF CERTAIN INCIDENT-BASED DATA SUBMITTED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES. The commission shall collect and maintain incident-based data submitted to the commission under Article 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure, including incident-based data compiled by a law enforcement agency from reports received by the law enforcement agency under Article 2.133 of that code. The commission in consultation with the Department of Public Safety, the Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas, the W. W. Caruth, Jr., Police Institute at Dallas, and the Texas Police Chiefs Association shall develop guidelines for submitting in a standard format the report containing incident-based data as required by Article 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. Subsection (a), Section 1701.501, Occupations Code, is amended to read as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (d), the commission shall revoke or suspend a license, place on probation a person whose license has been suspended, or reprimand a license holder for a violation of:

(1) this chapter;

(2) the reporting requirements provided by Articles 2.132 and 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure; or

(3) a commission rule.

SECTION \_\_\_\_\_. (a) The requirements of Articles 2.132, 2.133, and 2.134, Code of Criminal Procedure, as amended by this Act, relating to the compilation, analysis, and submission of incident-based data apply only to information based on a motor vehicle stop occurring on or after January 1, 2010.

(b) The imposition of a cost of court under Article 102.022, Code of Criminal Procedure, as added by this Act, applies only to an offense committed on or after the effective date of this Act. An offense committed before the effective date of this Act is covered by the law in effect when the offense was committed, and the former law is continued in effect for that purpose. For purposes of this section, an offense was committed before the effective date of this Act if any element of the offense occurred before that date.

## **(II) Responding to the Law**

## Racial- or Bias-Based Profiling

### 313.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This Racial Profiling policy is adopted in compliance with the requirements of Articles 2.131 through 2.136, Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, which prohibits Texas peace officers from engaging in racial profiling.

#### 313.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

- (a) **Racial Profiling.** A 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. Racial profiling pertains to persons who are viewed as suspects or potential suspects of criminal behavior. The term is not relevant as it pertains to witnesses, complainants, persons needing assistance, or other citizen contacts.
- (b) **Race or Ethnicity.** A particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American or Middle Eastern descent.
- (c) **Acts Constituting Racial Profiling.** Acts initiating law enforcement action, such as a traffic or pedestrian stop, a detention, a search, issuance of a citation, or an arrest based solely upon an individual's race, ethnicity, or national origin or on the basis of racial or ethnic stereotypes, rather than upon the individual's behavior, information identifying the individual as having possibly engaged in criminal activity, or other lawful reasons for the law enforcement action.
- (d) **Pedestrian Stop.** An interaction between a peace officer and an individual who is being detained for the purposes of a criminal investigation in which the individual is not under arrest.
- (e) **Motor Vehicle Stop.** An occasion in which a peace officer stops a motor vehicle for an alleged violation of law or ordinance.

### 313.2 POLICY

Peace officers are strictly prohibited from engaging in racial profiling. The prohibition against racial profiling does not preclude the use of race, ethnicity, or national origin as factors in a detention decision by a peace officer. Race, ethnicity, or national origin may be legitimate factors in such a decision when used as part of a description of a suspect or witness for initiating law enforcement action.

### **313.3 RACIAL- OR BIAS-BASED PROFILING PROHIBITED**

Any person who believes that a peace officer has engaged in racial profiling with respect to that person may file a complaint with the department, and no person shall be discouraged, intimidated, or coerced from filing such a complaint, or be discriminated against because they have filed such a complaint.

The department shall accept and investigate citizen complaints alleging racial profiling by its peace officers. Such complaints shall be in writing, or the employee receiving the complaint should reduce the same to writing, and should include the time, place, and details of the incident of alleged racial profiling, the identity or description of the peace officer or officers involved, and the identity and manner of contacting the complainant.

Complaints of Racial Profiling shall be initially investigated by the accused officer's on duty supervisor. Any employee who receives a citizen complaint alleging racial profiling shall forward the complaint to the on duty supervisor. Each complaint shall be issued a separate and unique number from the log by the supervisor investigating the complaint at the time the complaint is initiated. The log will be maintained in the Uniform Operations Divisions Sergeant's office. The complaint shall be documented on the department's standard citizen complaint form. All such complaints shall be reviewed and investigated within a reasonable period of time.

In investigating a complaint alleging racial profiling, the supervisor shall seek to determine if the officer who is subject of the complaint has engaged in an act of racial profiling which initiated the complaint or a pattern of racial profiling that includes multiple acts constituting racial profiling for which there is no reasonable, credible explanation based on established police and law enforcement procedures.

In the event that a complaint of racial profiling filed by an individual involves an occurrence that was recorded on audio or video, the supervisor shall preserve the tape until the completion of the investigation. The supervisor shall upon written request of the officer, promptly provide a copy of the recording to the officer that is a subject of the complaint. The supervisor shall document the day, date and time the recording was given to the requesting officer.

The supervisor investigating a complaint of racial profiling shall forward their findings through the chain of command to the appropriate Division Commander. The Division Commander shall make a determination and clear the complaint, or forward the complaint to the office of Chief of Police with recommendations for further action.

Upon final completion of the investigation, all reports associated with that investigation shall be filed within the Office of Internal Affairs.

#### **313.3.1 CORRECTIVE ACTION**

Any peace officer who is found, after investigation, to have engaged in racial profiling shall be subject to corrective action, which may include reprimand; diversity, sensitivity or other appropriate training or counseling; suspension; termination of employment, or other appropriate.

#### **313.3.2 PUBLIC EDUCATION**

The department shall provide education to the public concerning the racial profiling complaint process. A summary of the public education efforts conducted throughout the department shall be forwarded to the Uniform Operations Division Commander for inclusion in the annual report filed with the City Council of the City of Grapevine.

### 313.3.3 REVIEW OF VIDEO AND AUDIO DOCUMENTATION STANDARDS

Each audio and video recording shall be retained for a minimum period of ninety (90) days unless a complaint is filed alleging that a peace officer of the City has engaged in racial profiling with respect to a motor vehicle or pedestrian stop, in which case the recording shall be retained until final disposition of the complaint.

In conjunction with preparation of the annual report required under Section 14.07 above, the designated supervisors shall periodically conduct reviews of a randomly-selected sampling of video and audio recordings in order to determine if patterns of racial profiling exist. Reviewing supervisors shall maintain a Racial Profiling Review Log. This log will be maintained in the Shift Commander's office along with the Racial Profiling Complaint Log. Reviewing supervisors shall document the date of review, date on the incident, officer reviewed and tape number.

In reviewing audio and video recordings, the supervisor shall seek to determine if the officer who is involved therein has engaged in a pattern of racial profiling that includes multiple acts constituting racial profiling for which there is no reasonable, credible explanation based on established police and law enforcement procedures. A single act constituting racial profiling may not be considered a pattern of racial profiling.

### **313.4 MEMBER RESPONSIBILITY**

Every member of this department shall perform his/her duties in a fair and objective manner and is responsible for promptly reporting any known instances of racial- or bias-based profiling to a supervisor.

#### 313.4.1 REASON FOR DETENTION

Officers detaining a person shall be prepared to articulate sufficient reasonable suspicion to justify a detention, independent of the individual's membership in a protected class.

To the extent that written documentation would otherwise be completed (e.g., arrest report, Field Interview (FI) card), the involved officer should include those facts giving rise to the officer's reasonable suspicion or probable cause for the detention, as applicable.

Nothing in this policy shall require any officer to document a contact that would not otherwise require reporting.

#### 313.4.2 REPORTING TRAFFIC STOPS

Any officer conducting an enforcement stop on any motor vehicle shall collect the following information relating to the stop (Tex. Code of Crim. Pro art. 2.132; Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.133):

- (a) The location of the stop
- (b) The initial reason for the stop
- (c) The physical description of the driver, including:
  1. The person's gender
  2. The person's race or ethnicity as stated by the person or as best as can be determined by the officer
- (d) Whether the officer knew the race or ethnicity of the detained person before the stop
- (e) Whether a citation or a warning was issued as a result of the stop
- (f) Whether an arrest was made and, if so, for what offense
- (g) Whether the officer conducted a search and, if so, whether the search was based on consent, probable cause or reasonable suspicion, incident to arrest, contraband or

evidence in plain view, the result of towing the vehicle for evidence or safekeeping or any other reason

- (h) Whether any contraband or evidence was discovered and whether it was in plain view
- (i) A description of any contraband or evidence located

### **313.5 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY**

Supervisors shall monitor those individuals under their command for any behavior that may conflict with the purpose of this policy and shall handle any alleged or observed violation of this policy in accordance with the Personnel Complaints Policy.

- (a) Supervisors should discuss any issues with the involved officer and his/her supervisor in a timely manner.
- (b) In instances where officers record their public contacts, supervisors should periodically review the recordings to ensure compliance with racial profiling laws (Tex. Code Crim. Pro. art. 2.132(d)) and this policy.
  - 1. Supervisors should document these periodic reviews.
  - 2. Recordings that capture a potential instance of racial- or bias-based profiling should be appropriately retained for administrative investigation purposes.
- (c) Supervisors shall initiate investigations of any actual or alleged violations of this policy.
- (d) Supervisors should ensure that no retaliatory action is taken against any member of this department who discloses information concerning racial- or bias-based profiling.

### **313.6 STATE REPORTING**

The Chief of Police shall submit to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Training (TCLEOSE) and each governing body served by this agency an annual report of the information required in Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. § 2.132(b)(6).

Further, unless exempt under Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.135, prior to March 1 of each year, the Chief of Police shall provide to TCLEOSE and to each governing body served by this agency a report containing an analysis of the information required by Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.133 (Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.134).

These reports may not include identifying information about any officer who made a motor vehicle stop or about an individual who was stopped or arrested by any officer (Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.132; Tex. Code of Crim. Pro. art. 2.134).

### **313.7 ADMINISTRATION**

Each year, the Uniform Operations Division Commander shall review the efforts of the Department to prevent racial- or bias-based profiling and submit an overview, including public concerns and complaints, to the Chief of Police. This report should not contain any identifying information regarding any specific complaint, citizen or officers. It should be reviewed by the Chief of Police to identify any changes in training or operations that should be made to improve service. Supervisors shall review the administrative

overview report and the annual report submitted to TCLOSE and the governing body and discuss the results with those they are assigned to supervise.

### **313.8 TRAINING**

All sworn members of this department will be scheduled to attend TCLEOSE-approved training on the subject of racial- and bias-based profiling.

Each member of this department undergoing initial TCLEOSE-approved training will thereafter be required to complete an approved refresher course every five years or sooner if deemed necessary, in order to keep current with changing racial issues and cultural trends.

# **Complaint Process: Informing the Public and Addressing Allegations of Racial Profiling Practices**

## **Informing the Public on the Process of Filing a Racial Profiling Complaint with the Grapevine Police Department**

The Texas Racial Profiling Law requires that police agencies provide information to the public regarding the manner in which to file a racial profiling complaint. In an effort to comply with this particular component, the Grapevine Police Department launched an educational campaign aimed at informing the public on issues relevant to the racial profiling complaint process.

The police department made available, in the lobby area and on its web site, information relevant to filing a complaint on a racial profiling violation by a Grapevine Police officer. It is believed that through these efforts, the community has been properly informed of the new policies and the complaint processes relevant to racial profiling.

# **Racial Profiling Training**

## **Racial Profiling Training**

Since 2002, all Grapevine Police officers have been instructed, as specified in the Texas Racial Profiling Law, to adhere to all Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) training and the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas (LEMIT) requirements. To date, all sworn officers of the Grapevine Police Department have completed the TCOLE basic training on racial profiling. The main outline used to train the officers of Grapevine has been included in this report.

It is important to recognize that the Chief of the Grapevine Police Department has also met the training requirements, as specified by the Texas Racial Profiling Law, in the completion of the LEMIT program on racial profiling. The satisfactory completion of the racial profiling training by the sworn personnel of the Grapevine Police Department fulfills the training requirement as specified in the Education Code (96.641) of the Texas Racial Profiling Law.

**Racial Profiling**  
**Course Number 3256**  
**Texas Commission on Law Enforcement**  
**September 2001**

**Racial Profiling 3256**

**Instructor's Note:**

You may wish to teach this course in conjunction with Asset Forfeiture 3255 because of the related subject matter and applicability of the courses. If this course is taught in conjunction with Asset Forfeiture, you may report it under Combined Profiling and Forfeiture 3257 to reduce data entry.

**Abstract**

This instructor guide is designed to meet the educational requirement for racial profiling established by legislative mandate: 77R-SB1074.

**Target Population:** Licensed law enforcement personnel in Texas

**Prerequisites:** Experience as a law enforcement officer

**Length of Course:** A suggested instructional time of 4 hours

**Material Requirements:** Overhead projector, chalkboard and/or flip charts, video tape player, handouts, practical exercises, and demonstrations

**Instructor Qualifications:** Instructors should be very knowledgeable about traffic stop procedures and law enforcement issues

**Evaluation Process and Procedures**

An examination should be given. The instructor may decide upon the nature and content of the examination. It must, however, sufficiently demonstrate the mastery of the subject content by the student.

**Reference Materials**

Reference materials are located at the end of the course. An electronic copy of this instructor guide may be downloaded from our web site at <http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us>.

**Racial Profiling 3256**

**1.0 RACIAL PROFILING AND THE LAW**

**1.1 UNIT GOAL:** The student will be able to identify the legal aspects of racial profiling.

**1.1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to identify the legislative requirements placed upon peace officers and law enforcement agencies regarding racial profiling.**

**Racial Profiling Requirements:**

Racial profiling CCP 3.05

Racial profiling prohibited CCP 2.131

Law enforcement policy on racial profiling CCP 2.132

Reports required for traffic and pedestrian stops CCP 2.133

Liability CCP 2.136

Racial profiling education for police chiefs Education Code 96.641

Training program Occupations Code 1701.253

Training required for intermediate certificate Occupations Code 1701.402

Definition of "race or ethnicity" for form Transportation Code 543.202

A. Written departmental policies

1. Definition of what constitutes racial profiling
2. Prohibition of racial profiling
3. Complaint process
4. Public education
5. Corrective action
6. Collection of traffic-stop statistics
7. Annual reports

B. Not prima facie evidence

C. Feasibility of use of video equipment

D. Data does not identify officer

E. Copy of complaint-related video evidence to officer in question

F. Vehicle stop report

1. Physical description of detainees: gender, race or ethnicity
2. Alleged violation
3. Consent to search
4. Contraband
5. Facts supporting probable cause
6. Arrest
7. Warning or citation issued

G. Compilation and analysis of data

H. Exemption from reporting – audio/video equipment

I. Officer non-liability

## J. Funding

### K. Required training in racial profiling

1. Police chiefs
2. All holders of intermediate certificates and/or two-year-old licenses as of 09/01/2001 (training to be completed no later than 09/01/2003) – see legislation 77R-SB1074

### **1.1.2 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will become familiar with Supreme Court decisions and other court decisions involving appropriate actions in traffic stops.**

#### A. Whren v. United States, 517 U.S. 806, 116 S.Ct. 1769 (1996)

1. Motor vehicle search exemption
2. Traffic violation acceptable as pretext for further investigation
3. Selective enforcement can be challenged

#### B. Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1, 88 S.Ct. 1868 (1968)

1. Stop & Frisk doctrine
2. Stopping and briefly detaining a person
3. Frisk and pat down

#### C. Other cases

1. Pennsylvania v. Mimms, 434 U.S. 106, 98 S.Ct. 330 (1977)
2. Maryland v. Wilson, 117 S.Ct. 882 (1997)
3. Graham v. State, 119 MdApp 444, 705 A.2d 82 (1998)
4. Pryor v. State, 122 Md.App. 671 (1997) cert. denied 352 Md. 312, 721 A.2d 990 (1998)
5. Ferris v. State, 355 Md. 356, 735 A.2d 491 (1999)
6. New York v. Belton, 453 U.S. 454 (1981)

## **2.0 RACIAL PROFILING AND THE COMMUNITY**

### **2.1 UNIT GOAL: The student will be able to identify logical and social arguments against racial profiling.**

#### **2.1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to identify logical and social arguments against racial profiling.**

- A. There are appropriate reasons for unusual traffic stops (suspicious behavior, the officer's intuition, MOs, etc.), but police work must stop short of cultural stereotyping and racism
- B. Racial profiling would result in criminal arrests, but only because it would target all members of a race randomly – the minor benefits would be far outweighed by the

distrust and anger towards law enforcement by minorities and the public as a whole

- C. Racial profiling is self-fulfilling bad logic: if you believed that minorities committed more crimes, then you might look for more minority criminals, and find them in disproportionate numbers
- D. Inappropriate traffic stops generate suspicion and antagonism towards officers and make future stops more volatile – a racially-based stop today can throw suspicion on tomorrow's legitimate stop
- E. By focusing on race, you would not only be harassing innocent citizens, but overlooking criminals of all races and backgrounds – it is a waste of law enforcement resources

### **3.0 RACIAL PROFILING VERSUS REASONABLE SUSPICION**

**3.1 UNIT GOAL: The student will be able to identify the elements of both inappropriate and appropriate traffic stops.**

**3.1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to identify elements of a racially motivated traffic stop.**

- A. Most race-based complaints come from vehicle stops, often since race is used as an inappropriate substitute for drug courier profile elements
- B. "DWB" – "Driving While Black" – a nickname for the public perception that a Black person may be stopped solely because of their race (especially with the suspicion that they are a drug courier), often extended to other minority groups or activities as well ("Driving While Brown," "Flying While Black," etc.)
- C. A typical traffic stop resulting from racial profiling
  1. The vehicle is stopped on the basis of a minor or contrived traffic violation which is used as a pretext for closer inspection of the vehicle, driver, and passengers
  2. The driver and passengers are questioned about things that do not relate to the traffic violation
  3. The driver and passengers are ordered out of the vehicle
  4. The officers visually check all observable parts of the vehicle
  5. The officers proceed on the assumption that drug courier work is involved by detaining the driver and passengers by the roadside
  6. The driver is asked to consent to a vehicle search – if the driver refuses, the officers use other procedures (waiting on a canine unit, criminal record checks, license-plate checks, etc.), and intimidate the driver (with the threat of detaining him/her, obtaining a warrant, etc.)

**3.1.2 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to identify elements of a traffic stop which would constitute reasonable suspicion of drug courier activity.**

- A. Drug courier profile (adapted from a profile developed by the DEA)
  - 1. Driver is nervous or anxious beyond the ordinary anxiety and cultural communication styles
  - 2. Signs of long-term driving (driver is unshaven, has empty food containers, etc.)
  - 3. Vehicle is rented
  - 4. Driver is a young male, 20-35
  - 5. No visible luggage, even though driver is traveling
  - 6. Driver was over-reckless or over-cautious in driving and responding to signals
  - 7. Use of air fresheners
  
- B. Drug courier activity indicators by themselves are usually not sufficient to justify a stop

**3.1.3 LEARNING OBJECTIVE: The student will be able to identify elements of a traffic stop which could constitute reasonable suspicion of criminal activity.**

- A. Thinking about the totality of circumstances in a vehicle stop
  
- B. Vehicle exterior
  - 1. Non-standard repainting (esp. on a new vehicle)
  - 2. Signs of hidden cargo (heavy weight in trunk, windows do not roll down, etc.)
  - 3. Unusual license plate suggesting a switch (dirty plate, bugs on back plate, etc.)
  - 4. Unusual circumstances (pulling a camper at night, kids' bikes with no kids, etc.)
  
- C. Pre-stop indicators
  - 1. Not consistent with traffic flow
  - 2. Driver is overly cautious, or driver/passengers repeatedly look at police car
  - 3. Driver begins using a car- or cell-phone when signaled to stop
  - 4. Unusual pull-over behavior (ignores signals, hesitates, pulls onto new street, moves objects in car, etc.)
  
- D. Vehicle interior
  - 1. Rear seat or interior panels have been opened, there are tools or spare tire, etc.
  - 2. Inconsistent items (anti-theft club with a rental, unexpected luggage, etc.)

**Resources**

Proactive Field Stops Training Unit – Instructor's Guide, Maryland Police and Correctional Training Commissions, 2001. (See Appendix A.)

Web address for legislation 77R-SB1074:

<http://tlo2.tlc.state.tx.us/tlo/77r/billtext/SB01074F.htm>

# **Report on Complaints**

**Report on Complaints**

The following table contains data regarding officers that have been the subject of a complaint, during the time period of 1/1/15---12/31/15, based on allegations outlining possible violations related to the Texas Racial Profiling Law. The final disposition of the case is also included.

A check above indicates that the Grapevine Police Department has not received any complaints, on any members of its police force, for having violated the Texas Racial Profiling Law during the time period of 1/1/15 ---- 12/31/15.

**Complaints Filed for Possible Violations of The Texas Racial Profiling Law**

<b>Complaint No.</b>	<b>Alleged Violation</b>			<b>Disposition of the Case</b>

**Additional Comments:**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

# **Tables Illustrating Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Contacts**

# **Tier 1 Data**

## **(I) Tier 1 Data**

### Motor Vehicle-Related Contact Information (1/1/15—12/31/15)


Race/Ethnicity*	Contacts		Searches		Consensual Searches		PC Searches		Custody Arrests	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	8,892	58	184	60	43	58	141	61	95	66
<b>African</b>	2,128	14	43	14	11	15	32	14	12	8
<b>Hispanic</b>	3,394	22	73	24	19	26	54	23	33	23
<b>Asian</b>	658	4	1	.3	0	0	1	.4	1	.7
<b>Native American</b>	14	.09	1	.3	0	0	1	.4	1	.7
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	324	2	3	1	1	1	2	.8	2	1
<b>Other</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	15,410	100	305	100	74	100	231	100	144	100

"N" represents "number" of traffic-related contacts


\* Race/Ethnicity is defined by Senate Bill 1074 as being of a "particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American or Middle Eastern".

\*\*Figure has been rounded


Tier 1 Data (Motor Vehicle Contacts in Percentages)



Tier 1 Data (Frequency of Searches)




Tier 1 Data (Arrests in Percentages)



Total Number of Instances where Officers Knew/did not Know Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Before Being Detained (1/1/15--12/31/15)

<b>Total Number of Instances where Officers <u>Knew</u> Race and Ethnicity of Individuals Before Being Detained</b>	<b>Total Number of Instances where Officers <u>Did Not Know</u> the Race and Ethnicity of Individuals Before Being Detained</b>
12	15,398

### Known Race/Ethnicity (Frequencies)



## **Tier 1 (Partial Exemption TCLEOSE Form)**

## **Partial Exemption Racial Profiling Reporting (Tier 1)**

**Department Name** Grapevine Police Department

**Agency Number** TX2201300

**Chief Administrator Name** Edward Salame

**Reporting Name** Mark Bills

**Contact Number** (817) 410-3217

**E-mail Address** mbills@grapevinetexas.gov

### **Certification to Report 2.132 (Tier 1) – Partial Exemption**

**Policy Requirements (2.132(b) CCP): Each law enforcement agency in this state shall adopt a detailed written policy on racial profiling. The policy must:**

- (1) clearly define acts constituting racial profiling;
- (2) strictly prohibit peace officers employed by the agency from engaging in racial profiling;
- (3) implement a process by which an individual may file a complaint with the agency if the individual believes that a peace officer employed by the agency has engaged in racial profiling with respect to the individual;
- (4) provide public education relating to the agency's complaint process;
- (5) require appropriate corrective action to be taken against a peace officer employed by the agency who, after an investigation, is shown to have engaged in racial profiling in violation of the agency's policy adopted under this article;
- (6) require collection of information relating to motor vehicle stops in which a citation is issued and to arrests made as a result of those stops, including information relating to:

(A) the race or ethnicity of the individual detained;

(B) whether a search was conducted and, if so, whether the individual detained consented to the search; and

(C) whether the peace officer knew the race or ethnicity of the individual detained before detaining that individual; and

(7) require the chief administrator of the agency, regardless of whether the administrator is elected, employed, or appointed, to submit an annual report of the information collected under Subdivision (6) to:

(A) the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education; and

(B) the governing body of each county or municipality served by the agency, if the agency is an agency of a county, municipality, or other political subdivision of the state.

These polices are in effect

---

Chief Administrator

Date

## **Partial Exemption Racial Profiling Reporting**

**(Tier 1)**

### **Video and Audio Equipment Exemption**

#### **Partial Exemption Claimed by (2.135(a) CCP):**

all cars regularly used for motor vehicle stops are equipped with video camera and transmitter-activated equipment and each motor stop is recorded and the recording of the stop is retained for at least 90 days after the stop.

OR

In accordance with 2.135(a)(2) the agency has requested and not received funds to install the recording equipment

I claim this exemption

---

Chief Administrator

Date

## Partial Exemption Racial Profiling Reporting (Tier 1)

(This is the TCLEOSE recommended form. The form is not mandatory. The information contained in this form, however, is mandatory. You may use your form, but all information must be provided.)

**If you claim a partial exemption you must submit a report that contains the following data or use this format to report the data.**

**Instructions: Please fill out all boxes. If zero, use 0.**

- 1. Total on lines 4, 11, 14, and 17 Must be equal**
- 2. Total on line 20 Must equal line 15**

### Number of Motor Vehicle Stops:

1. 15,266 citation only
2. 0 arrest only
3. 144 both
4. 15410 Total

### Race or Ethnicity:

5. 2,128 African
6. 658 Asian
7. 8,892 Caucasian
8. 3,394 Hispanic
9. 324 Middle Eastern
10. 14 Native American
11. 15,410 Total

**Race or Ethnicity Known Prior to Stop?**

12. 12 Yes

13. 15,398 No

14. 15,410 Total

**Search Conducted:**

15. 305 Yes

16. 15,105 No

17. 15,410 Total

**Was Search Consented?**

18. 74 Yes

19. 231 No

20. 305 Total Must Equal # 15

## **Option to submit required data by utilizing agency report**

**You must submit your report in PDF format**

### **Electronic Submission of data required by 2.132(b)(6) CCP**

(6) require collection of information relating to motor vehicle stops in which a citation is issued and to arrests made as a result of those stops, including information relating to:

(A) the race or ethnicity of the individual detained;

(B) whether a search was conducted and, if so, whether the individual detained consented to the search; and

(C) whether the peace officer knew the race or ethnicity of the individual detained before detaining that individual; and

This report meets the above requirements

---

Chief Administrator

Date

***Send entire documents electronically to this website***

**[www.tcleose.state.tx.us](http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us)**

# **Tier 1 Baseline Comparison (Fair Roads Standard)**

## **(II) Motor Vehicle-Contacts and Fair Roads Standard Comparison**


Comparison of motor vehicle-related contacts with households in DFW that have vehicle access (in percentages). (1/1/15—12/31/15)

<b>Race/Ethnicity*</b>	<b>Contacts (in percentages)</b>	<b>Households with vehicle access (in percentages)</b>
<b>Caucasian</b>	58	60
<b>African</b>	14	14
<b>Hispanic</b>	22	19
<b>Asian</b>	4	5
<b>Native American</b>	.09	N/A
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	2	N/A
<b>Other</b>	0	N/A
<b>Total</b>	100	98**

\* Race/Ethnicity are defined by Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Middle Eastern”.

\*\*Represents rounded figure

### Motor Vehicle Contacts and Households (Percentages) 2015



**Tier 1 Data**  
**(Fourteen-Year Comparative Analysis)**  
**(2002—2015)**

**(III) Fourteen-Year Tier 1 Data Comparison**

**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Contact Information  
(1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Traffic-Related Contacts (in percentages)							
	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)	(09)
<b>Caucasian</b>	75	75	77	73	74	71	70	70
<b>African</b>	7	7	6	7	8	9	8	9
<b>Hispanic</b>	15	15	13	15	15	16	17	17
<b>Asian</b>	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
<b>Native American</b>	.15	.1	.06	.06	.01	.02	.01	.07
<b>Other</b>	.9	.9	1	2	.9	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>	100**	100**	100**	100**	100**	100**	100	100

\* Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.

**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Contact Information  
(1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Motor Vehicle-Related Contacts (in percentages)					
	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
<b>Caucasian</b>	69	64	68	64	63	58
<b>African</b>	9	11	11	12	12	14
<b>Hispanic</b>	16	19	16	18	18	22
<b>Asian</b>	4	4	3	4	5	4
<b>Native American</b>	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2	.09
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	1	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Other</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	100**	100	100	100	100	100

\*Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Middle Eastern”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.



**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor-Vehicle Related Search Information (1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Search-Related Searches (in percentages)							
	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)	(09)
<b>Caucasian</b>	48	51	53	55	57	56	42	42
<b>African</b>	20	18	17	15	13	24	25	22
<b>Hispanic</b>	24	26	22	22	23	13	26	12
<b>Asian</b>	3	3	5	6	5	4	6	14
<b>Native American</b>	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	5
<b>Other</b>	2	1	2	.4	2	3	1	5
<b>Total</b>	100	100**	100**	100**	100	100	100	100

\* Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.


**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Search Information (1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Motor Vehicle-Related Searches (in percentages)					
	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
<b>Caucasian</b>	63	55	54	56	55	60
<b>African</b>	12	17	17	16	19	14
<b>Hispanic</b>	24	27	27	27	23	24
<b>Asian</b>	.5	1	1	.5	2	.3
<b>Native American</b>	.5	.2	.5	.3	.3	.3
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	0	.2	.5	.5	.3	1
<b>Other</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	100**	100**	100	100	100	100

\*Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Middle Eastern”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.

Tier 1 Searches in Percentages (2002--2015)



**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Arrest Information  
(1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Motor Vehicle-Related Arrests (in percentages)							
	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)	(09)
<b>Caucasian</b>	54	57	60	62	64	68	58	51
<b>African</b>	8	12	14	11	12	12	16	19
<b>Hispanic</b>	37	30	26	25	22	19	25	28
<b>Asian</b>	.8	1	0	1	1	1	.9	2
<b>Native American</b>	0	0	0	0	0	.3	.3	.3
<b>Other</b>	0	.6	.2	.7	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	100**	100**	100	100**	100	100	100	100

\* Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.


**Comparison of Fourteen-Year Traffic and Motor Vehicle-Related Arrest Information  
(1/1/02---12/31/15)**

Race/Ethnicity*	Motor Vehicle-Related Arrests (in percentages)					
	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
<b>Caucasian</b>	63	51	74	53	58	66
<b>African</b>	9	21	11	18	20	8
<b>Hispanic</b>	25	26	9	27	19	23
<b>Asian</b>	3	1	3	.5	2	.7
<b>Native American</b>	.8	0	.4	.5	.5	.7
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	0	.3	3	0	.5	1
<b>Other</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	100**	100**	100	100	100	100

\*Race/Ethnicity is defined by Texas Senate Bill 1074 as being of a “particular descent, including Caucasian, African, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Middle Eastern”.

\*\* Figure has been rounded.

Tier 1 Arrests in Percentages (2002--2015)



# **Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

## Analysis

In 2001, the Texas legislature passed Senate Bill 1074 which became the Texas Racial Profiling Law. That is, the law came into effect on January 1, 2002 and required all police departments in Texas, to collect traffic-related data and report this information to their local governing authority by March 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. In 2009, the racial profiling law was modified to include the collection and reporting of all motor vehicle related contacts where a citation was issued or arrest made. In addition, the modification to the law further requires that all police officers indicate whether or not they knew the race or ethnicity of the individual before detaining them. Further, it is required that agencies report motor vehicle related data to their local governing authority and to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) by March 1st of each year. The purpose in collecting and presenting this information is to determine if police officers in a particular municipality are engaging in the practice of racially profiling minority motorists.

The Texas Racial Profiling Law also requires police departments to interpret motor vehicle-related data. Even though most researchers would probably agree with the fact that it is within the confines of good practice for police departments to be accountable to the citizenry while carrying a transparent image before the community, it is very difficult to determine if individual police officers are engaging in racial profiling, from a review and analysis of aggregate/institutional data. In other words, it is challenging for a reputable researcher to identify specific “individual” racist behavior from aggregate-level “institutional” data on traffic or motor vehicle-related contacts.

As stated previously, in 2009, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 3389, which modified the existing Racial Profiling Law by adding new requirements; this took effect on January 1st, 2010. These most recent changes include, but are not exclusive of, the re-definition of a contact to include motor vehicles where a citation was issued or an arrest made. In addition, it requires police officers to indicate if they knew the race or ethnicity of the individual before detaining them. Also, the more recent law requires adding "middle eastern" to the racial and ethnic category and submitting the annual data report to TCOLE before March 1st of each year. I am pleased to inform you that these additional requirements have been addressed, since 2009, by the Grapevine Police Department as it is demonstrated throughout this report.

In an effort to comply with The Texas Racial Profiling Law, the Grapevine Police Department commissioned the analysis of its 2015 motor vehicle contact data. Thus, three different types of data analyses were performed. The first of these involved a careful evaluation of the 2015 motor vehicle-related data. This particular analysis measured, as required by the law, the number and percentage of Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, Native Americans, Middle Easterners and individuals belonging to the “other” category, that came in contact with the police in the course of a motor vehicle related contact, and were either issued a citation or arrested. Further, the analysis included information relevant to the number and percentage of searches (table 1) while indicating the type of search performed (i.e., consensual or probable cause). Also, the data analysis included the number and percentage of individuals who, after they came in contact with the police for a motor vehicle-related reason, were arrested.

The additional data analysis performed was based on a comparison of the 2015 motor vehicle contact data with a specific baseline. When reviewing this particular analysis, it should be noted that there is disagreement, in the literature, regarding the appropriate baseline to be used when analyzing motor vehicle-related contact information. Of the baseline measures available, the Grapevine Police Department opted to adopt, as a baseline measure, the Fair Roads Standard. This particular baseline is based on data obtained through the U.S. Census Bureau (2010) relevant to the number of households that have access to vehicles while controlling for the race and ethnicity of the heads of households.

It is clear that census data presents challenges to any effort made at establishing a fair and accurate racial profiling analysis. That is, census data contains information on all residents of a particular community, regardless of the fact they may or may not be among the driving population. Further, census data, when used as a baseline of comparison, presents the challenge that it captures information related to city residents only. Thus, excluding individuals who may have come in contact with the Grapevine Police Department in 2015 but live outside city limits. In some cases, the percentage of the population that comes in contact with the police but lives outside city limits represents a substantial volume of all motor vehicle-related contacts made in a given year.

Since 2002, several civil rights groups in Texas expressed their desire and made recommendations to the effect that all police departments should rely, in their data analysis, on the Fair Roads Standard. This source contains census data specific to the number of “households” that have access to vehicles. Thus, proposing to compare “households” (which may have multiple residents and only a few vehicles) with “contacts” (an individual-based count). This, in essence, constitutes a comparison that may result in ecological fallacy. Despite this, the Grapevine Police Department made a decision that it would use this form of comparison (i.e., census data relevant to households with vehicles) in an attempt to demonstrate its “good will” and “transparency” before the community. Thus, the Fair Roads Standard data obtained and used in this study is specifically relevant to the Dallas Fort Worth (DFW) Metroplex.

The final analysis was conducted while using the 2002--2009 traffic data and the 2010—2015 motor-vehicle related data. Specifically, all traffic-related contacts made in 2009 were compared to similar figures reported in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. Similarly, motor vehicle contact data was compared while using data from 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. There is no question that the comparison of fourteen years of traffic/motor vehicle contact data highlight areas of consistency with regards to traffic and motor vehicle-related contacts. That is, the fourteen-year comparison has the potential of revealing indicators that a possible trend of traffic and motor vehicle-based contacts with regards to members of a specific minority group, may in fact, develop.

#### Tier 1 (2015) Motor Vehicle-Related Contact Analysis

When analyzing the Tier 1 data collected in 2015, it was evident that most motor vehicle-related contacts were made with Caucasian drivers. This was followed by Hispanic and African American drivers. With respect to searches, most of them were performed on Caucasian drivers. This was followed by Hispanics and African Americans. It is important to note that the arrest

data revealed that Caucasian drivers were arrested the most in motor vehicle-related contacts; this was followed by Hispanics and African Americans.

### Fair Roads Standard Analysis

The data analysis of motor vehicle contacts to the census data relevant to the number of “households” in the DFW who indicated, in the 2010 census, that they had access to vehicles, produced interesting findings. Specifically, the percentage of individuals of Hispanic descent that came in contact with the police was higher than the percentage of Hispanic households in DFW that claimed, in the 2010 census, to have access to vehicles. With respect to Caucasians, African Americans and Asians, the same or a lower percentage of contacts were detected. That is, the percentage of Caucasian, African American and Asian drivers that came in contact with the police in 2015 was the same or lower than the percentage of Caucasian, African American and Asian households in DFW with access to vehicles.

### Fourteen-Year Comparison

The fourteen-year comparison (02-15) of traffic and motor vehicle related-contact data showed some similarities. As illustrated in table 3, the percentage of drivers (from different racial/ethnic groups) that came in contact with the Grapevine Police in 2015 was similar to the percentage of drivers, from the same racial/ethnic groups that came in contact with the Grapevine Police Department from 2002 to 2014. However, a few differences were noted. When comparing 2015 to the previous years, there was an increase in percentage of contacts among African American and Hispanic drivers. A decrease in percentage was detected among Caucasians and Asians.

It is clear that commonalities in the data existed, when analyzing the search-related contacts for all fourteen years. A decrease in percentage was noted among African Americans and Asians; the opposite was true for Caucasians and Hispanics. When considering the arrests made, the data revealed that the percentage of arrests increased among Caucasians and Hispanics while a decrease in percentage was evident among African Americans. It should be noted that the 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 data should be analyzed while considering that since January 1<sup>st</sup> of 2010, a contact was re-defined by the law; thus, making it statistically challenging to compare traffic contacts (collected and reported from 2002-2009) with motor vehicle contacts (collected and reported since 2010).

### Summary of Findings

The comparison of motor vehicle contacts showed that the Grapevine Police Department came in contact (in motor vehicle-related incidents) with the same or a smaller percentage of Caucasian, African American and Asian drivers than the percentage that resided in DFW and had access to vehicles. Further, the data suggested that the percentage of Hispanic drivers that came in contact with the police in 2015 was higher than the percentage of Hispanic households in DFW with access to vehicles. In addition, the data showed that in a large number of instances, officers did not know the race or ethnicity of individuals before detaining them, when compared to instances where officers knew the race/ethnicity of individuals before they were detained.

An examination of the fourteen-year traffic and motor vehicle-related contact data suggested that the Grapevine Police Department has been, for the most part, consistent in the racial/ethnic composition of motorists it comes in contact with during a given year. The consistency of contacts for the past fourteen years is in place despite the fact the city demographics may have changed, thus, increasing the number of subjects likely to come in contact with the police.

While considering the findings made in this analysis, it is recommended that the Grapevine Police Department should continue to collect and evaluate additional information on motor vehicle contact data (i.e., reason for probable cause searches, contraband detected) which may prove to be useful when determining the nature of the contacts police officers are making with all individuals; particularly with Hispanics. Although this additional data may not be required by state law, it is likely to provide insights regarding the nature and outcome of all motor vehicle contacts made with the public.

As part of this effort, the Grapevine Police Department is also encouraged to:

- 1) Perform an independent search analysis on the search data collected in the first quarter of 2016.
- 2) Commission data audits in 2016 in order to assess data integrity; that is, to ensure that the data collected is consistent with the data being reported.

The Grapevine Police Department complied with recommendations made last year, in a similar report, regarding data audits and training. In sum, the information and analysis provided in this report serves as evidence that the Grapevine Police Department has, once again, complied with the Texas Racial Profiling Law.

# **(III) Summary**

# Checklist

## Checklist

The following requirements **were** met by the Grapevine Police Department in accordance with The Texas Racial Profiling Law:

- Clearly defined act or actions that constitute racial profiling
- Statement indicating prohibition of any peace officer employed by the Grapevine Police Department from engaging in racial profiling
- Implement a process by which an individual may file a complaint regarding racial profiling violations
- Provide public education related to the complaint process
- Implement disciplinary guidelines for officer found in violation of the Texas Racial Profiling Law
- Collect data (Tier 1) that includes information on
  - a) Race and ethnicity of individual detained
  - b) Whether a search was conducted
  - c) If there was a search, whether it was a consent search or a probable cause search
  - d) Whether a custody arrest took place
- Indicate total number of officers who knew and did not know, the race/ethnicity of individuals before being detained.
- Produce an annual report on police contacts (Tier 1) and present this to local governing body and TCOLE by March 1, 2016.
- Adopt a policy, if video/audio equipment is installed, on standards for reviewing video and audio documentation

# Contact Information

## **Contact Information**

For additional questions regarding the information presented in this report, please contact:

Del Carmen Consulting, LLC

817.681.7840

[www.texasracialprofiling.com](http://www.texasracialprofiling.com)

[www.delcarmenconsulting.com](http://www.delcarmenconsulting.com)

Disclaimer: The author of this report, Alejandro del Carmen/del Carmen Consulting, LLC, is not liable for any omissions or errors committed in the acquisition, analysis, or creation of this report. Further, Dr. del Carmen/del Carmen Consulting is not responsible for the inappropriate use and distribution of information contained in this report. Further, no liability shall be incurred as a result of any harm that may be caused to individuals and/or organizations as a result of the information contained in this report.