

Table of Contents

Appendix A – Report Body Tables	3
A.1 Stops by Identity Group and Reason for Stop	3
A.2 Stops by Identity Group and Call-for-service	4
A.3 Stops by Identity Group and Call-for-service without Traffic Violations.....	5
A.4 Stops by Identity Group and Average Actions Taken During Stop	7
A.5 Stops by Identity Group and Actions Taken During Stop.....	9
A.6 Stops by Identity Group and Stop Result	11
Appendix B – Disparity Test Methods	12
B.1 Residential Population Benchmark Analysis Methodology	12
B.2 Discovery-rate Analysis Methodology	14
B.3 Veil of Darkness Analysis Methodology.....	16
B.4 Use of Force Analysis Methodology.....	18
Appendix C – Disparity Test Tables	20
C.1 Residential Population Benchmark Table.....	20
C.2 Discovery Rate Analysis Tables	28
C.2.1 Search Rates	28
C.2.1.1 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity	28
C.2.1.2 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	31
C.2.1.3 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability	32
C.2.2 Discovery Rates during Stops with Discretionary Searches	33
C.2.2.1 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity	33
C.2.2.2 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	36
C.2.2.3 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability	37
C.2.3 Discovery Rates during Stops with Administrative Searches	38
C.2.3.1 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity.....	38
C.2.3.2 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	41
C.2.3.3 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability	42
C.3 Veil of Darkness Analysis Table.....	43
C.4 Use of Force Analysis Table.....	46

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board or the California Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A – REPORT BODY TABLES

A.1 Stops by Identity Group and Reason for Stop

	Identity Group	Reasonable Suspicion	Traffic Violation	Other Reasons	Total
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	12745 (5.6%)	213445 (93.3%)	2600 (1.1%)	228790 (100.0%)
	Black	133216 (21.0%)	474548 (74.7%)	27328 (4.3%)	635092 (100.0%)
	Hispanic	165340 (10.7%)	1341530 (86.4%)	45615 (2.9%)	1552485 (100.0%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	7430 (4.0%)	178512 (95.4%)	1186 (0.6%)	187128 (100.0%)
	Multiracial	4878 (13.2%)	30822 (83.3%)	1315 (3.6%)	37015 (100.0%)
	Native American	1052 (12.7%)	6878 (83.2%)	341 (4.1%)	8271 (100.0%)
	Pacific Islander	2542 (12.1%)	17882 (84.8%)	668 (3.2%)	21092 (100.0%)
	White	154062 (11.7%)	1130775 (85.5%)	37364 (2.8%)	1322201 (100.0%)
Gender	Female	113332 (9.9%)	1005907 (88.0%)	24022 (2.1%)	1143261 (100.0%)
	Gender Nonconforming	716 (29.5%)	1569 (64.5%)	146 (6.0%)	2431 (100.0%)
	Male	364703 (12.8%)	2384632 (83.9%)	91883 (3.2%)	2841218 (100.0%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1450 (44.0%)	1624 (49.3%)	220 (6.7%)	3294 (100.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1064 (56.9%)	660 (35.3%)	146 (7.8%)	1870 (100.0%)
Age Group	1-9	441 (22.9%)	1269 (65.9%)	217 (11.3%)	1927 (100.0%)
	10-14	4368 (60.9%)	1439 (20.1%)	1368 (19.1%)	7175 (100.0%)
	15-17	13103 (30.5%)	25243 (58.8%)	4557 (10.6%)	42903 (100.0%)
	18-24	69981 (10.8%)	562510 (86.7%)	16421 (2.5%)	648912 (100.0%)
	25-34	158591 (12.3%)	1088380 (84.5%)	41570 (3.2%)	1288541 (100.0%)
	35-44	106857 (12.2%)	739564 (84.7%)	26401 (3.0%)	872822 (100.0%)
	45-54	74977 (12.1%)	527293 (85.3%)	16216 (2.6%)	618486 (100.0%)
	55-64	41681 (11.5%)	313780 (86.4%)	7627 (2.1%)	363088 (100.0%)
	65+	11266 (7.6%)	134914 (91.0%)	2040 (1.4%)	148220 (100.0%)

A.2 Stops by Identity Group and Call-for-service

	Identity Group	Officer-initiated Stops	Call-for-service Stops	Total
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	221848 (97.0%)	6942 (3.0%)	228790 (100.0%)
	Black	581989 (91.6%)	53103 (8.4%)	635092 (100.0%)
	Hispanic	1490329 (96.0%)	62156 (4.0%)	1552485 (100.0%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	183076 (97.8%)	4052 (2.2%)	187128 (100.0%)
	Multiracial	34584 (93.4%)	2431 (6.6%)	37015 (100.0%)
	Native American	7804 (94.4%)	467 (5.6%)	8271 (100.0%)
	Pacific Islander	19834 (94.0%)	1258 (6.0%)	21092 (100.0%)
	White	1253875 (94.8%)	68326 (5.2%)	1322201 (100.0%)
Gender	Female	1091182 (95.4%)	52079 (4.6%)	1143261 (100.0%)
	Gender Nonconforming	2036 (83.8%)	395 (16.2%)	2431 (100.0%)
	Male	2695971 (94.9%)	145247 (5.1%)	2841218 (100.0%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	2767 (84.0%)	527 (16.0%)	3294 (100.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1383 (74.0%)	487 (26.0%)	1870 (100.0%)
Age Group	1-9	1685 (87.4%)	242 (12.6%)	1927 (100.0%)
	10-14	4585 (63.9%)	2590 (36.1%)	7175 (100.0%)
	15-17	36751 (85.7%)	6152 (14.3%)	42903 (100.0%)
	18-24	623357 (96.1%)	25555 (3.9%)	648912 (100.0%)
	25-34	1221736 (94.8%)	66805 (5.2%)	1288541 (100.0%)
	35-44	825845 (94.6%)	46977 (5.4%)	872822 (100.0%)
	45-54	588511 (95.2%)	29975 (4.8%)	618486 (100.0%)
	55-64	347735 (95.8%)	15353 (4.2%)	363088 (100.0%)
	65+	143134 (96.6%)	5086 (3.4%)	148220 (100.0%)

A.3 Stops by Identity Group and Call-for-service without Traffic Violations

	Identity Group	Officer-initiated Stops	Call-for-service Stops	Total
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	9468 (61.7%)	5877 (38.3%)	15345 (100.0%)
	Black	110972 (69.1%)	49572 (30.9%)	160544 (100.0%)
	Hispanic	157731 (74.8%)	53224 (25.2%)	210955 (100.0%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	5355 (62.2%)	3261 (37.8%)	8616 (100.0%)
	Multiracial	4031 (65.1%)	2162 (34.9%)	6193 (100.0%)
	Native American	995 (71.4%)	398 (28.6%)	1393 (100.0%)
	Pacific Islander	2078 (64.7%)	1132 (35.3%)	3210 (100.0%)
	White	130808 (68.3%)	60618 (31.7%)	191426 (100.0%)
Gender	Female	91641 (66.7%)	45713 (33.3%)	137354 (100.0%)
	Gender Nonconforming	494 (57.3%)	368 (42.7%)	862 (100.0%)
	Male	327398 (71.7%)	129188 (28.3%)	456586 (100.0%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1172 (70.2%)	498 (29.8%)	1670 (100.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	733 (60.6%)	477 (39.4%)	1210 (100.0%)
Age Group	1-9	435 (66.1%)	223 (33.9%)	658 (100.0%)
	10-14	3200 (55.8%)	2536 (44.2%)	5736 (100.0%)
	15-17	11819 (66.9%)	5841 (33.1%)	17660 (100.0%)
	18-24	64698 (74.9%)	21704 (25.1%)	86402 (100.0%)
	25-34	140385 (70.1%)	59776 (29.9%)	200161 (100.0%)
	35-44	91144 (68.4%)	42114 (31.6%)	133258 (100.0%)
	45-54	64564 (70.8%)	26629 (29.2%)	91193 (100.0%)
	55-64	36073 (73.2%)	13235 (26.8%)	49308 (100.0%)

	Identity Group	Officer-initiated Stops	Call-for-service Stops	Total
	65+	9120 (68.5%)	4186 (31.5%)	13306 (100.0%)
LGBT	LGBT	6236 (61.9%)	3834 (38.1%)	10070 (100.0%)
	Non-LGBT	415202 (70.7%)	172410 (29.3%)	587612 (100.0%)
Limited English Fluency	English Fluent	402014 (70.6%)	167766 (29.4%)	569780 (100.0%)
	Limited/No English Fluency	19424 (69.6%)	8478 (30.4%)	27902 (100.0%)
Disability	Disability	15847 (42.4%)	21550 (57.6%)	37397 (100.0%)
	No Disability	405591 (72.4%)	154694 (27.6%)	560285 (100.0%)

A.4 Stops by Identity Group and Average Actions Taken During Stop

Table 3A. Stopped Individuals by Identity Group and Average Actions Taken During Stop

	Identity Group	Average Actions Taken for All Stops	Average Actions Taken During Stops with Actions
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	0.20	2.36
	Black	0.84	2.56
	Hispanic	0.51	2.53
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	0.15	2.21
	Native American	0.49	2.66
	Pacific Islander	0.47	2.64
	White	0.37	2.50
	Multiracial	0.56	2.61
Gender	Male	0.55	2.57
	Female	0.31	2.32
	Transgender Man/Boy	1.28	2.54
	Transgender Woman/Girl	1.41	2.41
	Gender Nonconforming	1.07	2.57
Age Group	1-9	0.52	2.04
	10-14	1.39	2.17
	15-17	1.06	2.40
	18-24	0.53	2.54
	25-34	0.57	2.60
	35-44	0.48	2.56
	45-54	0.38	2.42
	55-64	0.29	2.30

Table 3A. Stopped Individuals by Identity Group and Average Actions Taken During Stop

	Identity Group	Average Actions Taken for All Stops	Average Actions Taken During Stops with Actions
	65+	0.17	2.10
LGBT	Non-LGBT	0.48	2.52
	LGBT	0.96	2.63
Limited English Fluency	Limited/No English Fluency	0.48	2.53
	English Fluent	0.59	2.43
Disability	No Disability	0.47	2.52
	Disability	1.74	2.52

A.5 Stops by Identity Group and Actions Taken During Stop

	Identity Group	Searched	Handcuffed	Detained	Ordered Vehicle Exit	Total
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	9709 (4.2%)	8164 (3.6%)	10321 (4.5%)	3242 (1.4%)	228790 (100.0%)
	Black	130344 (20.5%)	89568 (14.1%)	113143 (17.8%)	49169 (7.7%)	635092 (100.0%)
	Hispanic	190167 (12.2%)	137543 (8.9%)	160710 (10.4%)	70361 (4.5%)	1552485 (100.0%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	5789 (3.1%)	5080 (2.7%)	6690 (3.6%)	2390 (1.3%)	187128 (100.0%)
	Multiracial	4841 (13.1%)	3282 (8.9%)	4637 (12.5%)	1710 (4.6%)	37015 (100.0%)
	Native American	888 (10.7%)	796 (9.6%)	779 (9.4%)	224 (2.7%)	8271 (100.0%)
	Pacific Islander	2178 (10.3%)	1841 (8.7%)	2104 (10.0%)	643 (3.0%)	21092 (100.0%)
	White	108248 (8.2%)	87698 (6.6%)	107982 (8.2%)	27568 (2.1%)	1322201 (100.0%)
Gender	Female	74168 (6.5%)	63016 (5.5%)	84691 (7.4%)	29803 (2.6%)	1143261 (100.0%)
	Gender Nonconforming	524 (21.6%)	453 (18.6%)	581 (23.9%)	284 (11.7%)	2431 (100.0%)
	Male	375797 (13.2%)	268924 (9.5%)	319628 (11.2%)	124958 (4.4%)	2841218 (100.0%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	1065 (32.3%)	948 (28.8%)	791 (24.0%)	146 (4.4%)	3294 (100.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	610 (32.6%)	631 (33.7%)	675 (36.1%)	116 (6.2%)	1870 (100.0%)
Age Group	1-9	234 (12.1%)	103 (5.3%)	273 (14.2%)	72 (3.7%)	1927 (100.0%)
	10-14	2490 (34.7%)	2167 (30.2%)	2413 (33.6%)	347 (4.8%)	7175 (100.0%)
	15-17	11431 (26.6%)	8881 (20.7%)	9909 (23.1%)	3397 (7.9%)	42903 (100.0%)
	18-24	81561 (12.6%)	55447 (8.5%)	66229 (10.2%)	37281 (5.7%)	648912 (100.0%)
	25-34	176213 (13.7%)	126824 (9.8%)	149788 (11.6%)	63785 (5.0%)	1288541 (100.0%)
	35-44	97988 (11.2%)	75087 (8.6%)	90504 (10.4%)	29336 (3.4%)	872822 (100.0%)
	45-54	5326 (8.6%)	41850 (6.8%)	54671 (8.8%)	14045 (2.3%)	618486 (100.0%)
	55-64	2359 (6.5%)	19292 (5.3%)	25908 (7.1%)	5696 (1.6%)	363088 (100.0%)
	65+	5397 (3.6%)	4321 (2.9%)	6671 (4.5%)	1348 (0.9%)	148220 (100.0%)

DRAFT REPORT – PENDING EDITING AND REVIEW This draft is a product of various subcommittees of the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. It has been provided merely for the Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board’s consideration and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of any individual RIPA Board member, the full RIPA Board or the California Department of Justice.

A.6 Stops by Identity Group and Stop Result

	Identity Group	Warning	Citation	Arrest	Total
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	51193 (22.4%)	144598 (63.2%)	21466 (9.4%)	228790 (100.0%)
	Black	172031 (27.1%)	248300 (39.1%)	90562 (14.3%)	635092 (100.0%)
	Hispanic	356582 (23.0%)	842691 (54.3%)	193688 (12.5%)	1552485 (100.0%)
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	40993 (21.9%)	127783 (68.3%)	10011 (5.3%)	187128 (100.0%)
	Multiracial	9111 (24.6%)	18872 (51.0%)	4657 (12.6%)	37015 (100.0%)
	Native American	2312 (28.0%)	4015 (48.5%)	1214 (14.7%)	8271 (100.0%)
	Pacific Islander	4847 (23.0%)	11375 (53.9%)	2729 (12.9%)	21092 (100.0%)
	White	352769 (26.7%)	722974 (54.7%)	128174 (9.7%)	1322201 (100.0%)
Gender	Female	269751 (23.6%)	655086 (57.3%)	120421 (10.5%)	1143261 (100.0%)
	Gender Nonconforming	456 (18.8%)	920 (37.8%)	425 (17.5%)	2431 (100.0%)
	Male	718542 (25.3%)	1463596 (51.5%)	330351 (11.6%)	2841218 (100.0%)
	Transgender Man/Boy	677 (20.6%)	660 (20.0%)	782 (23.7%)	3294 (100.0%)
	Transgender Woman/Girl	412 (22.0%)	346 (18.5%)	522 (27.9%)	1870 (100.0%)
Age Group	1-9	309 (16.0%)	602 (31.2%)	151 (7.8%)	1927 (100.0%)
	10-14	953 (13.3%)	652 (9.1%)	1488 (20.7%)	7175 (100.0%)
	15-17	7891 (18.4%)	15489 (36.1%)	6278 (14.6%)	42903 (100.0%)
	18-24	136494 (21.0%)	366523 (56.5%)	71623 (11.0%)	648912 (100.0%)
	25-34	314509 (24.4%)	663863 (51.5%)	157682 (12.2%)	1288541 (100.0%)
	35-44	225708 (25.9%)	456901 (52.3%)	101339 (11.6%)	872822 (100.0%)
	45-54	163986 (26.5%)	330917 (53.5%)	65890 (10.7%)	618486 (100.0%)
	55-64	95619 (26.3%)	202685 (55.8%)	36263 (10.0%)	363088 (100.0%)
	65+	44369 (29.9%)	82976 (56.0%)	11787 (8.0%)	148220 (100.0%)

APPENDIX B – DISPARITY TEST METHODS

B.1 Residential Population Comparison Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. There are a number of known limitations associated with using residential data to benchmark stop data. Residential population is a proxy for the set of people an officer observes engaging in suspicious behavior. For example, individuals may be stopped outside of their residential area (e.g. commuting to work, tourists). The rate of these “commuter” stops likely varies from agency to agency, but RIPA stop data do not include information on where stopped individuals reside to account for this issue. Additionally, agencies may concentrate their patrol efforts in certain areas and, thus, may not have an equal likelihood of encountering residents throughout all areas in their jurisdiction. There are also concerns with response bias in compiling information for residential surveys, such as the census; some groups are more difficult to count, and thus may be underestimated in official data.

In addition to general concerns with residential population benchmarking, there are also several limitations that are unique to comparing RIPA Stop Data to American Community Survey (ACS) data. First, 2019 ACS data were not available at the time this report was written. The 2019 RIPA Stop Data demographics were instead compared to the 2018 ACS demographics. Moreover, RIPA Stop Data regulations and the ACS categorize racial/ethnic groups differently.¹ ACS data have racial/ethnic groups that are not explicitly captured by RIPA regulations. These individuals within the ACS have been collectively grouped together in an “Other” category that does not have a match in RIPA regulations. Finally, the source of race/ethnicity information for each dataset is collected differently. Race/ethnicity is recorded for RIPA based on officer’s perception while ACS respondents self-identify.

This distinction represents a key difference in objectives between the two databases. The purpose of RIPA is to eliminate racial and identity profiling, a practice that is based on how officers perceive the individuals they stop. RIPA data are intended to facilitate the implementation of policies that will achieve this purpose. On the other hand, the objective of the ACS is to provide a representation of information regarding community residents. Thus, comparisons between these datasets operate under the assumption that officers’ perceptions often agree with how an individual self identifies.

Statistical Analysis. Stop demographics for each police or sheriff’s department were compared to their primary city or county of service, respectively.² For example, the racial/ethnic distribution of individuals stopped by San Francisco Police Department was compared to the racial/ethnic distribution of San Francisco city residents in the ACS data. The one exception was for California Highway Patrol who was compared to the state population.

¹ For example, RIPA regulations explicitly include Israeli individuals in the Middle Eastern/South Asian group, but the ACS does not have an Israeli category.

² These comparisons are approximate since agency jurisdictions do not always map perfectly to the boundaries of their primary city or county of service.

The location of residents in the ACS is grouped into geographical units called Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMA). PUMAs frequently correspond to Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), areas with at least one urbanized hub and close economic ties. However, PUMAs must contain at minimum 100,000 residents, and unlike MSAs, all places in the US must be in a PUMA. Therefore, in less populated areas, PUMAs can be very large, and contain multiple economic regions and counties. In addition, PUMA boundaries are determined by the Census Bureau, and may not correspond with city boundaries. Out of the 15 agencies represented in this report, 4 of them represented cities where the corresponding PUMAs had relatively low overlap with the city boundary. These cities included Fresno, Sacramento, San Diego, and San Jose. Therefore, decisions were made regarding which PUMAs to use when compiling residential information to represent these cities. The IPUMS project maintains a compatibility page that provides a crosswalk between PUMAs and Census Bureau “places”.³ This page was used to identify which PUMAs intersect with these cities. Only PUMAs where at least 50 percent of the area’s population resided within the respective city were included in the analysis. As RIPA expands, and increasingly smaller agencies begin to participate, estimating population characteristics will become increasingly complicated.

Benchmarking using residential population data involves comparing the distribution of racial/ethnic groups stopped by law enforcement to the distribution found in the areas serviced by agencies who submitted data in 2019. However, it is important to note that California Highway Patrol submitted a majority of the records in 2019 and may skew the distribution of people stopped by police. To help address this issue, the overall ACS benchmark was calculated using a series of weights. First, the distribution of racial/ethnic groups within each agency’s approximate jurisdiction were calculated using each group’s mean proportion weighted by the person-weight variable reported in the ACS. These values were then multiplied by the number of stop records submitted by the respective agency (i.e. agency weights) and each racial/ethnic group’s values from all agencies were summed together. Each racial/ethnic group’s aggregate was then divided by the sum of all racial/ethnic aggregates in order to generate the final residential population benchmarks.

³ For more information about IPUMS, please visit their “About” page at <https://ipums.org/what-is-ipums>.

B.2 Discovery-rate Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. Discovery rate analyses avoid some of the issues associated with other methods because they do not require the stop data to be compared to external information (e.g. residential population data). However, discovery rate analysis also relies on assumptions about the behavior of individuals in different identity groups. Disparate treatment between racial/ethnic groups is identified when search and discovery rates are opposed (e.g. Black individuals have high search rates but low discovery rates).⁴ When these statistics do not move in opposite directions, it is more difficult to determine whether disparate treatment is present. It is also possible that there are observable factors that could influence an officer's decision to search someone that are not captured by RIPA Stop Data. The effectiveness in predicting the presence of contraband based on certain suspicious behaviors may also vary between racial/ethnic groups.⁵

Statistical Analysis. The discovery-rate analysis was conducted in three steps. First, linear probability models were used to test whether there were differences in search rates between White individuals and each racial/ethnic group of color independently. Second, similar analyses were used to test for differences in contraband or evidence discovery rates during stops with discretionary searches. Discretionary searches exclude those where at least one of the search bases was either incident to arrest, search warrant, or vehicle inventory. Third, similar analyses were used to test for differences in contraband or evidence discovery rates during stops with administrative search. Administrative searches only include those where at least one of the search bases was either incident to arrest, search warrant, or vehicle inventory. Each of these analyses were applied to all agencies combined, all municipal agencies combined (excluding California Highway Patrol), and for each individual agency. Both sets of analyses included the following considerations:

1. The 4 racial/ethnic groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Native American, and Pacific Islander individuals.
2. A set of high dimensional fixed effects were included in the analysis as controls, including gender, age, hour of the day, day of the week, month of the year, and the officer conducting the stop.
3. The standard errors were clustered at the officer level to better allow for unobserved correlations between stops made by the same officers.

⁴ Anwar & Fang (2006). An Alternative Test of Racial Prejudice in Motor Vehicle Searches: Theory and Evidence. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 96(1)

⁵ Simoui et al. (2017). The Problem of Infra-Marginality in Outcome Tests for Discrimination. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 11(3)

Using these criteria, we estimated the effect of an individual (i) belonging to a racial/ethnic group of color (m) on a resulting binary search or contraband/evidence discovery outcome (j) with the aforementioned controls (...) using the following specification:

$$Outcome_{j,i} = \beta_{j,0} + \beta_{j,1}m_i + \dots$$

Given the Board's interest in considering the impact that overlapping identities can have during experiences with law enforcement, the discovery-rate analysis was also repeated for two sets of intersectional comparisons: gender by race/ethnicity, disability by race/ethnicity. These analyses were similar to those conducted by race/ethnicity only, except for the following differences:

1. The 5 racial/ethnic groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include Asian, Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Native American, and Pacific Islander individuals.
2. The 3 gender groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include transgender man/boy, transgender woman/girl, and gender nonconforming.
3. The 7 disability groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include the following disabilities: deaf, blind, speech impaired, developmental, hyperactivity, other, multiple disabilities.
4. A set of high dimensional fixed effects were included in the analysis as controls, including age, hour of the day, day of the week, month of the year, and the officer conducting the stop.

B.3 Veil of Darkness Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. As with any statistical approach, VOD is dependent upon a series of assumptions. The foremost assumption is that darkness should make it more difficult for police to perceive the race/ethnicity of individuals before they stop them. While this assumption is likely to hold true generally, it may not equally apply to all stops. For example, artificial lighting (e.g. streetlights) can help officers perceive race/ethnicity in the dark and it varies from one patrol area to the next. The types of violations that officers' witness may also vary with visibility, as would be the case for having a headlight out. The propensity to commit these types of violations may be best explained by economic or other concerns (e.g. seasonality) that—depending on the area—may correlate with race/ethnicity.⁶ But even while race/ethnicity may be more difficult to perceive in the dark, officers could still use observable proxies (e.g. vehicle type, stop location) to guess the identity of drivers before stopping them. These concerns may cause drivers of some identity groups to change their own driving behavior to mitigate their perceived risk of being profiled and stopped.⁷ Finally, VOD is also an analysis best fit for vehicle stop data, but RIPA does not explicitly differentiate vehicle stops from pedestrian stops; the best proxy in RIPA data is all stops made for traffic violations.

Data collection. VOD relies on precise measures of the intertwilight period, which vary from location to location. Officers record location information using open text fields. These text fields were submitted to the Google Geolocation API to return the corresponding latitude and longitude. Given the unstructured nature of the open text fields, the API sometimes returned several potential coordinate matches for one record, including some coordinates that fell outside the state of California. For these records, their coordinates were instead replaced with those of their respective geographical areas (e.g. cities, unincorporated areas). Once geolocation data had been generated for all records, the data were analyzed using the `suncalc` package in R to calculate the following time values for each stop record:

- Sunrise
- Sunset
- Daily beginning civil twilight
- Daily end of civil twilight
- Earliest instance of morning civil twilight across the entire year
- Latest instance of morning civil twilight across the entire year
- Earliest instance of evening civil twilight across the entire year
- Latest instance of evening civil twilight across the entire year

Statistical analysis. The VOD was analyzed using linear probability models to test whether darkness (i.e. absence of daylight) impacted the race/ethnicity of individuals who were stopped by law enforcement. The analysis included the following considerations:

⁶ Ritter J. (2017). How do Police Use Race in Traffic Stops and Searches? Tests Based on Observability of Race. *J Econ. Behav. & Org.* 135.

⁷ Kalinowski J., Ross S., & Ross M. (2017). Endogenous Driving behavior in Veil of Darkness Tests for Racial Profiling. Human Capital and Economic Opportunity Global Working Group.

1. Stops were limited to those occurring within either the morning or evening intertwilight periods. These periods were generated for each stop record using each respective location's earliest and latest times of civil twilight across the year.
2. Stops made between the start of civil twilight and sunrise were excluded from the morning intertwilight period while stops between sunset and the end of civil twilight were excluded from the evening intertwilight period. These short windows of time represent neither daylight nor nighttime and were removed to improve the contrast in lighting conditions between the light and dark stop groups.
3. Stops made after sunrise or before sunset were considered daylight stops while those made during nautical twilight were defined as occurring after dark.
4. Stops were limited to those made for traffic violations and those that were not initiated in response to a call for service. These criteria work to define stops that best fit the assumptions of the VOD hypothesis, which is based on officer discretion in initiating stops with motorists.
5. The four racial/ethnic groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Native American, and Pacific Islander individuals.
6. A set of high dimensional fixed effects were added to the analysis as controls, including time of the day, day of the week, month of the year, and the officer conducting the stop. Times were grouped into 15-minute intervals that began with the start of each intertwilight period (e.g. morning, evening).
7. The standard errors were clustered at the officer level to better allow for unobserved correlations between stops made by the same officers.

We estimated the effect of an individual (i) being stopped in darkness (d) on their likelihood of belonging to a racial/ethnic group of color (m) with the aforementioned controls (...) using the following specification:

$$Race/Ethnicity_{m,i} = \beta_{m,0} + \beta_{m,1}d_i + \dots$$

Each racial/ethnic group of color was independently compared to White individuals. Thus, an analysis comparing White to Black individuals, for example, would only include data for these two groups.

B.4 Use of Force Analysis Methodology

Considerations and limitations. This analysis tests for equality of outcomes in the rates of force used during stops where actions were taken. In other words, the analysis measures the propensity of officers to use force when they are already inclined to take action during the stop. This is a fundamentally different research question from an analysis measuring the likelihood of officers using force during a stop generally. This approach may help limit some of the unobserved factors that may have contributed to an officer's decision to use force (e.g. resisting arrest). However, not all of these contextual factors can be controlled for in the analysis since RIPA stop data do not collect this type of information. Thus, it is impossible to tell from the data *why* force was used; the data can only be used to show *when* force was used.

Statistical Analysis. Linear probability models were used to test whether there were differences in use-of-force rates between White individuals and each racial/ethnic group of color independently. A stop was considered to include force when at least one of the following actions were taken by officers:

- Removal from vehicle by physical contact
- Other physical or vehicle contact
- Electronic control devices
- Impact projectiles (e.g. rubber bullets)
- Canine bites and holds
- Baton or other impact weapon
- Firearm pointed at person
- Chemical spray
- Discharge of a firearm

These analyses were applied to all agencies combined, all municipal agencies combined (excluding California Highway Patrol), and for each individual agency. Both sets of analyses included the following considerations:

1. Only records where actions were taken during stop—regardless of whether they involved force—were included in the analysis.
2. The 4 racial/ethnic groups who were stopped least frequently were aggregated into a single category to increase statistical power. These groups include Middle Eastern/South Asian, Multiracial, Native American, and Pacific Islander individuals.
3. A set of high dimensional fixed effects were included in the analysis as controls, including gender, age, hour of the day, day of the week, month of the year, and the officer conducting the stop.
4. The standard errors were clustered at the officer level to better allow for unobserved correlations between stops made by the same officers.

Using these criteria, we estimated the effect of an individual (i) belonging to a racial/ethnic group of color (m) on a resulting binary use-of-force outcome (j) with the aforementioned controls (...) using the following specification:

$$Outcome_{j,i} = \beta_{j,0} + \beta_{j,1}m_i + \dots$$

APPENDIX C – DISPARITY TEST TABLES

C.1 Residential Population Comparison Table

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity							
		A	B	C	D	E	F
	Equation			A-B	C/B*100	A/B	$E(m)/E(w)^*$
Agency	Race/Ethnicity	RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	Absolute % Difference	Relative % Difference	Disparity Index	Ratio of Disparity
Overall	Asian	5.73%	12.33%	-6.59%	-53.50%	0.46	0.48
	Black	15.91%	6.61%	9.30%	140.85%	2.41	2.49
	Hispanic	38.89%	40.67%	-1.78%	-4.38%	0.96	0.99
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	4.69%	2.10%	2.59%	123.53%	2.24	2.31
	Multiracial	0.93%	3.17%	-2.24%	-70.73%	0.29	0.30
	Native American	0.21%	0.26%	-0.06%	-21.51%	0.78	0.81
	Other		0.26%				
	Pacific Islander	0.53%	0.31%	0.22%	71.33%	1.71	1.77
	White	33.12%	34.30%	-1.18%	-3.44%	0.97	
Municipal	Asian	4.89%	12.62%	-7.73%	-61.23%	0.39	0.43
	Black	22.67%	7.92%	14.76%	186.42%	2.86	3.16
	Hispanic	38.93%	42.32%	-3.39%	-8.01%	0.92	1.01
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	3.21%	1.76%	1.45%	82.42%	1.82	2.01
	Multiracial	1.06%	3.13%	-2.07%	-66.09%	0.34	0.37
	Native American	0.17%	0.19%	-0.02%	-9.44%	0.91	1.00
	Other		0.28%				
	Pacific Islander	0.51%	0.28%	0.23%	80.25%	1.80	1.99
	White	28.55%	31.49%	-2.95%	-9.35%	0.91	

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		Equation		A-B	C/B*100	A/B	E(m)/E(w)*
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	Absolute % Difference	Relative % Difference	Disparity Index	Ratio of Disparity
California Highway Patrol	Asian	6.43%	12.08%	-5.65%	-46.74%	0.53	0.53
	Black	10.24%	5.51%	4.73%	85.97%	1.86	1.84
	Hispanic	38.85%	39.29%	-0.43%	-1.10%	0.99	0.98
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	5.93%	2.38%	3.55%	148.97%	2.49	2.47
	Multiracial	0.81%	3.20%	-2.38%	-74.54%	0.25	0.25
	Native American	0.23%	0.32%	-0.09%	-27.53%	0.72	0.72
	Other		0.25%				
	Pacific Islander	0.54%	0.33%	0.21%	64.94%	1.65	1.64
	White	36.95%	36.65%	0.30%	0.82%	1.01	
Fresno PD	Asian	4.79%	10.54%	-5.75%	-54.59%	0.45	0.48
	Black	13.91%	5.80%	8.11%	139.83%	2.40	2.52
	Hispanic	50.33%	49.80%	0.53%	1.07%	1.01	1.06
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	3.41%	2.62%	0.79%	30.30%	1.30	1.37
	Multiracial	0.48%	2.53%	-2.05%	-80.90%	0.19	0.20
	Native American	0.17%	0.33%	-0.17%	-50.24%	0.50	0.52
	Other		0.22%				
	Pacific Islander	0.21%	0.09%	0.11%	122.35%	2.22	2.34
	White	26.71%	28.06%	-1.35%	-4.82%	0.95	
Long Beach PD	Asian	4.86%	12.36%	-7.50%	-60.70%	0.39	0.49
	Black	27.43%	13.15%	14.27%	108.53%	2.09	2.62

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
	Hispanic	36.35%	40.88%	-4.54%	-11.10%	0.89	1.12
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	1.38%	0.38%	0.99%	260.29%	3.60	4.52
	Multiracial	5.64%	2.65%	2.99%	112.75%	2.13	2.67
	Native American	0.10%	0.21%	-0.11%	-53.64%	0.46	0.58
	Other		0.77%				
	Pacific Islander	1.00%	0.39%	0.62%	160.37%	2.60	3.27
	White	23.25%	29.20%	-5.95%	-20.38%	0.80	
	Asian	6.74%	13.20%	-6.46%	-48.93%	0.51	0.58
	Black	17.80%	7.80%	9.99%	128.12%	2.28	2.57
	Hispanic	48.25%	48.64%	-0.39%	-0.80%	0.99	1.12
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	2.30%	1.35%	0.96%	70.97%	1.71	1.93
Los Angeles CO SD	Multiracial	1.39%	2.44%	-1.05%	-43.10%	0.57	0.64
	Native American	0.06%	0.16%	-0.10%	-61.19%	0.39	0.44
	Other		0.31%				
	Pacific Islander	0.49%	0.21%	0.28%	136.09%	2.36	2.66
	White	22.97%	25.89%	-2.92%	-11.29%	0.89	
	Asian	3.69%	10.34%	-6.65%	-64.29%	0.36	0.52
	Black	27.29%	8.79%	18.50%	210.46%	3.10	4.52
	Hispanic	46.03%	49.25%	-3.21%	-6.53%	0.93	1.36
Los Angeles PD	Middle Eastern/South Asian	3.55%	1.49%	2.06%	138.17%	2.38	3.47

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
Oakland PD	Multiracial	0.51%	2.41%	-1.90%	-78.65%	0.21	0.31
	Native American	0.07%	0.14%	-0.08%	-54.99%	0.45	0.66
	Other		0.34%				
	Pacific Islander	0.24%	0.11%	0.14%	125.20%	2.25	3.28
	White	18.61%	27.12%	-8.51%	-31.38%	0.69	
	Asian	4.81%	14.42%	-9.62%	-66.66%	0.33	0.77
	Black	52.70%	21.57%	31.13%	144.37%	2.44	5.61
	Hispanic	24.72%	24.98%	-0.26%	-1.04%	0.99	2.27
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	2.37%	1.71%	0.66%	38.34%	1.38	3.18
	Multiracial	1.16%	5.20%	-4.04%	-77.69%	0.22	0.51
Orange CO SO	Native American	0.12%	0.32%	-0.20%	-62.50%	0.37	0.86
	Other		0.30%				
	Pacific Islander	0.73%	0.72%	0.00%	0.14%	1.00	2.30
	White	13.40%	30.77%	-17.38%	-56.47%	0.44	
	Asian	6.13%	18.49%	-12.36%	-66.83%	0.33	0.26
	Black	3.90%	1.64%	2.27%	138.68%	2.39	1.88
	Hispanic	31.50%	34.15%	-2.65%	-7.76%	0.92	0.73
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	5.32%	2.23%	3.09%	138.27%	2.38	1.88
	Multiracial	0.46%	2.79%	-2.33%	-83.36%	0.17	0.13
	Native American	1.39%	0.19%	1.19%	612.72%	7.13	5.62

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
Riverside CO SO	Other		0.25%				
	Pacific Islander	0.62%	0.33%	0.29%	88.57%	1.89	1.49
	White	50.67%	39.93%	10.74%	26.89%	1.27	
	Asian	3.29%	5.74%	-2.45%	-42.61%	0.57	0.51
	Black	10.99%	6.02%	4.97%	82.54%	1.83	1.62
	Hispanic	43.46%	49.56%	-6.10%	-12.30%	0.88	0.78
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	1.85%	0.57%	1.28%	223.88%	3.24	2.88
	Multiracial	0.89%	2.60%	-1.72%	-65.90%	0.34	0.30
	Native American	0.26%	0.42%	-0.16%	-37.21%	0.63	0.56
	Other		0.32%				
Pacific Islander	0.54%	0.33%	0.21%	64.11%	1.64	1.46	
White	38.71%	34.44%	4.28%	12.42%	1.12		
Sacramento CO SD	Asian	3.49%	12.58%	-9.08%	-72.24%	0.28	0.28
	Black	30.14%	9.75%	20.38%	208.96%	3.09	3.08
	Hispanic	16.60%	23.45%	-6.85%	-29.21%	0.71	0.70
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	2.38%	3.17%	-0.79%	-25.00%	0.75	0.75
	Multiracial	2.01%	5.37%	-3.35%	-62.45%	0.38	0.37
	Native American	0.17%	0.28%	-0.11%	-39.64%	0.60	0.60
	Other		0.18%				
Pacific Islander	0.84%	1.06%	-0.21%	-20.23%	0.80	0.79	

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
		White	44.37%	44.17%	0.20%	0.46%	1.00
Sacramento PD	Asian	5.18%	16.54%	-11.35%	-68.66%	0.31	0.34
	Black	39.60%	12.00%	27.60%	230.04%	3.30	3.60
	Hispanic	21.17%	28.65%	-7.48%	-26.12%	0.74	0.80
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	2.42%	2.98%	-0.55%	-18.64%	0.81	0.89
	Multiracial	1.41%	6.08%	-4.66%	-76.77%	0.23	0.25
	Native American	0.13%	0.12%	0.01%	9.81%	1.10	1.20
	Other		0.16%				
	Pacific Islander	0.76%	1.54%	-0.78%	-50.51%	0.49	0.54
San Bernardino CO SO	White	29.32%	31.94%	-2.62%	-8.21%	0.92	
	Asian	3.02%	6.28%	-3.27%	-51.98%	0.48	0.35
	Black	17.40%	7.85%	9.55%	121.62%	2.22	1.60
	Hispanic	37.31%	53.97%	-16.66%	-30.87%	0.69	0.50
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	1.75%	0.72%	1.03%	142.86%	2.43	1.76
	Multiracial	1.31%	2.77%	-1.46%	-52.69%	0.47	0.34
	Native American	0.27%	0.27%	-0.01%	-2.05%	0.98	0.71
	Other		0.15%				
Pacific Islander	0.43%	0.13%	0.30%	224.77%	3.25	2.35	
San Diego CO SO	White	38.51%	27.85%	10.66%	38.28%	1.38	
	Asian	3.92%	10.28%	-6.37%	-61.90%	0.38	0.32

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
	Black	8.17%	4.70%	3.47%	73.84%	1.74	1.48
	Hispanic	29.54%	33.94%	-4.40%	-12.98%	0.87	0.74
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	3.18%	1.41%	1.78%	126.06%	2.26	1.92
	Multiracial	0.59%	3.69%	-3.10%	-83.93%	0.16	0.14
	Native American	0.62%	0.38%	0.24%	62.85%	1.63	1.39
	Other		0.16%				
	Pacific Islander	0.97%	0.34%	0.63%	186.87%	2.87	2.44
	White	53.02%	45.10%	7.92%	17.57%	1.18	
	Asian	4.78%	13.41%	-8.63%	-64.36%	0.36	0.36
	Black	19.81%	6.49%	13.32%	205.33%	3.05	3.08
	Hispanic	28.58%	30.74%	-2.16%	-7.01%	0.93	0.94
	Middle Eastern/South Asian	2.59%	1.88%	0.71%	37.81%	1.38	1.39
San Diego PD	Multiracial	0.79%	3.84%	-3.04%	-79.35%	0.21	0.21
	Native American	0.19%	0.22%	-0.03%	-11.52%	0.88	0.89
	Other		0.19%				
	Pacific Islander	0.76%	0.38%	0.39%	102.23%	2.02	2.04
	White	42.49%	42.86%	-0.38%	-0.88%	0.99	
	Asian	11.54%	31.17%	-19.64%	-62.99%	0.37	0.43
San Francisco PD	Black	23.74%	4.97%	18.77%	377.53%	4.78	5.53
	Hispanic	19.11%	15.18%	3.93%	25.90%	1.26	1.46

RIPA Stop Distribution Compared to Weighted Population Distribution by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Equation Race/Ethnicity	A	B	C	D	E	F
		RIPA 2019	ACS 2018	A-B Absolute % Difference	C/B*100 Relative % Difference	A/B Disparity Index	E(m)/E(w)* Ratio of Disparity
		Middle Eastern/South Asian	7.33%	2.76%	4.57%	165.80%	2.66
Multiracial	2.44%	5.31%	-2.86%	-53.98%	0.46	0.53	
Native American	0.14%	0.05%	0.09%	200.94%	3.01	3.48	
Other		0.29%					
Pacific Islander	1.10%	0.22%	0.88%	401.40%	5.01	5.80	
White	34.60%	40.05%	-5.45%	-13.60%	0.86		
Asian	11.74%	24.93%	-13.19%	-52.91%	0.47	0.55	
Black	9.66%	3.13%	6.53%	208.71%	3.09	3.64	
Hispanic	49.35%	33.60%	15.74%	46.85%	1.47	1.73	
Middle Eastern/South Asian	3.70%	6.77%	-3.07%	-45.35%	0.55	0.64	
Multiracial	1.68%	3.80%	-2.12%	-55.75%	0.44	0.52	
Native American	0.15%	0.23%	-0.08%	-35.16%	0.65	0.76	
Other		0.14%					
Pacific Islander	0.80%	0.39%	0.41%	106.67%	2.07	2.44	
White	22.93%	27.02%	-4.09%	-15.14%	0.85		

Notes. 2019 RIPA stop data were compared to 2018 residential population data from the American Community Survey (ACS). For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.1. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. $E(m)/E(w)$; disparity index for minority group of color (m) divided by the value for White individuals (w).

C.2 Discovery Rate Analysis Tables

C.2.1 Search Rates

C.2.1.1 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Overall	Coefficients	***-0.021 (0.001)	***0.018 (0.001)	***0.004 (0.001)	***-0.018 (0.001)
	Observations	1550991	1957293	2874686	1575707
	Adjusted R ²	0.288	0.322	0.310	0.288
Municipal	Coefficients	***-0.040 (0.002)	***0.016 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	***-0.037 (0.002)
	Observations	608682	932257	1228184	609767
	Adjusted R ²	0.265	0.272	0.277	0.261
California Highway Patrol	Coefficients	***-0.006 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	***0.004 (0.000)	***-0.004 (0.000)
	Observations	942309	1025036	1646502	965940
	Adjusted R ²	0.072	0.071	0.088	0.072
Fresno PD	Coefficients	** -0.021 (0.006)	0.007 (0.005)	0.001 (0.003)	-0.006 (0.005)
	Observations	16329	21058	39945	16058
	Adjusted R ²	0.333	0.311	0.326	0.349
Long Beach PD	Coefficients	***-0.049 (0.010)	**0.021 (0.006)	0.001 (0.006)	-0.021 (0.010)
	Observations	11390	20535	24150	12712
	Adjusted R ²	0.209	0.196	0.200	0.215
Los Angeles CO SD	Coefficients	***-0.039 (0.005)	***-0.016 (0.004)	***-0.009 (0.002)	***-0.033 (0.005)
	Observations	58483	80238	140180	53570
	Adjusted R ²	0.438	0.400	0.454	0.432
Los Angeles PD	Coefficients	***-0.023 (0.002)	***0.029 (0.002)	***0.019 (0.002)	***-0.028 (0.002)
	Observations	159001	327166	460799	163854

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
	Adjusted R ²	0.275	0.326	0.300	0.272
Oakland PD	Coefficients	**-.044 (0.014)	***0.062 (0.009)	*0.028 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.014)
	Observations	4441	16124	9299	4335
	Adjusted R ²	0.333	0.268	0.324	0.326
	Coefficients	***-.050 (0.009)	*-.021 (0.010)	***-.019 (0.005)	***-.050 (0.008)
Orange CO SO	Observations	28628	27504	41412	29463
	Adjusted R ²	0.353	0.343	0.330	0.354
	Coefficients	***-.016 (0.004)	*-.009 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.008 (0.005)
	Observations	24522	29017	47973	24664
Riverside CO SO	Adjusted R ²	0.459	0.436	0.390	0.456
	Coefficients	***-.053 (0.011)	0.007 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.006)	***-.069 (0.010)
	Observations	29169	45407	37157	30334
	Adjusted R ²	0.162	0.151	0.149	0.156
Sacramento CO SD	Coefficients	*-.021 (0.008)	***0.030 (0.007)	0.008 (0.006)	-0.007 (0.009)
	Observations	23465	46873	34338	23156
	Adjusted R ²	0.214	0.206	0.206	0.207
	Coefficients	***-.097 (0.009)	***-.027 (0.005)	***-.037 (0.003)	***-.064 (0.008)
San Bernardino CO SO	Observations	65496	88180	119578	66675
	Adjusted R ²	0.236	0.215	0.217	0.230
	Coefficients	***-.077 (0.010)	***-.028 (0.007)	***-.030 (0.005)	***-.041 (0.007)
	Observations	37025	39788	53686	37961
San Diego CO SO	Adjusted R ²	0.245	0.233	0.225	0.241
	Coefficients	***-.046 (0.005)	0.005 (0.003)	*-.008 (0.003)	***-.039 (0.005)
	Observations	88491	116644	133061	87676
	Adjusted R ²	0.154	0.137	0.138	0.152

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
San Francisco PD	Coefficients	***-0.030 (0.004)	***0.052 (0.004)	***0.014 (0.004)	***-0.035 (0.005)
	Observations	46884	59284	54585	46347
	Adjusted R ²	0.248	0.249	0.255	0.242
San Jose PD	Coefficients	***-0.062 (0.011)	**0.026 (0.009)	0.007 (0.006)	***-0.060 (0.012)
	Observations	15358	14439	32021	12962
	Adjusted R ²	0.281	0.237	0.232	0.260

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.1.2 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Male	Coefficients	***0.022 (0.001)	***0.007 (0.001)	***-0.022 (0.001)
	Observations	1335394	2045222	1232832
	Adjusted R ²	0.345	0.327	0.301
Female	Coefficients	0.002 (0.001)	***-0.004 (0.001)	***-0.013 (0.001)
	Observations	618378	825489	568162
	Adjusted R ²	0.275	0.272	0.280
Other	Coefficients	0.003 (0.027)	0.019 (0.035)	-0.016 (0.031)
	Observations	3521	3975	3503
	Adjusted R ²	0.199	0.228	0.370

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.1.3 Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Mental Health	Coefficients	0.011 (0.009)	0.020 (0.009)	*0.030 (0.012)
	Observations	19823	18144	13999
	Adjusted R ²	0.223	0.240	0.220
None	Coefficients	***0.018 (0.001)	***0.007 (0.001)	***-0.018 (0.001)
	Observations	1927645	2845918	1782274
	Adjusted R ²	0.319	0.307	0.281
Other	Coefficients	0.027 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	-0.000 (0.020)
	Observations	9825	10624	8224
	Adjusted R ²	0.247	0.241	0.315

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.2 Discovery Rates during Stops with Discretionary Searches

C.2.2.1 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Overall	Coefficients	-0.007 (0.007)	***-0.019 (0.003)	***-0.013 (0.003)	-0.011 (0.007)
	Observations	62955	144479	173982	65340
	Adjusted R ²	0.151	0.164	0.152	0.152
Municipal	Coefficients	-0.007 (0.008)	***-0.018 (0.003)	***-0.012 (0.003)	-0.012 (0.007)
	Observations	61772	143021	171573	64109
	Adjusted R ²	0.141	0.158	0.146	0.141
California Highway Patrol	Coefficients	-0.048 (0.067)	-0.001 (0.041)	-0.049 (0.024)	0.056 (0.052)
	Observations	1183	1458	2409	1231
	Adjusted R ²	0.366	0.362	0.355	0.383
Fresno PD	Coefficients	-0.058 (0.050)	-0.058 (0.032)	-0.033 (0.021)	0.085 (0.057)
	Observations	720	1272	2127	686
	Adjusted R ²	0.165	0.119	0.166	0.136
Long Beach PD	Coefficients	0.012 (0.038)	0.011 (0.014)	0.021 (0.015)	0.018 (0.031)
	Observations	1304	3100	3388	1455
	Adjusted R ²	0.112	0.073	0.081	0.112
Los Angeles CO SD	Coefficients	0.012 (0.032)	** -0.041 (0.012)	-0.019 (0.009)	-0.042 (0.024)
	Observations	3947	8847	15679	4371
	Adjusted R ²	0.142	0.149	0.145	0.153
Los Angeles PD	Coefficients	-0.004 (0.016)	-0.007 (0.006)	0.006 (0.005)	0.004 (0.013)
	Observations	10107	54587	69718	11199
	Adjusted R ²	0.202	0.186	0.159	0.194
Oakland PD	Coefficients	-0.032 (0.039)	0.023 (0.017)	0.044 (0.022)	-0.060 (0.038)
	Observations	947	4559	2187	928

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
	Adjusted R ²	0.179	0.157	0.205	0.122
Orange CO SO	Coefficients	0.036 (0.043)	** -0.096 (0.028)	*** -0.055 (0.012)	-0.023 (0.032)
	Observations	3952	4121	6639	3976
	Adjusted R ²	0.099	0.112	0.121	0.104
	Coefficients	0.102 (0.123)	-0.001 (0.031)	-0.005 (0.022)	-0.012 (0.039)
Riverside CO SO	Observations	729	959	1654	801
	Adjusted R ²	0.183	0.261	0.136	0.124
	Coefficients	0.013 (0.023)	** -0.037 (0.010)	** -0.032 (0.010)	-0.002 (0.022)
Sacramento CO SD	Observations	4688	8049	6292	4827
	Adjusted R ²	0.107	0.106	0.107	0.106
	Coefficients	-0.011 (0.026)	-0.031 (0.012)	-0.015 (0.014)	-0.010 (0.026)
Sacramento PD	Observations	4288	11789	7005	4302
	Adjusted R ²	0.065	0.083	0.083	0.062
	Coefficients	0.027 (0.021)	*** -0.024 (0.005)	-0.009 (0.005)	-0.031 (0.012)
San Bernardino CO SO	Observations	14933	21222	27537	15285
	Adjusted R ²	0.128	0.123	0.122	0.128
	Coefficients	-0.066 (0.045)	-0.049 (0.019)	-0.007 (0.013)	-0.004 (0.028)
San Diego CO SO	Observations	4091	4695	6156	4287
	Adjusted R ²	0.063	0.052	0.071	0.064
	Coefficients	-0.005 (0.025)	0.016 (0.016)	-0.010 (0.012)	-0.008 (0.036)
San Diego PD	Observations	6576	10297	11346	6530
	Adjusted R ²	0.079	0.085	0.071	0.074
	Coefficients	-0.008 (0.024)	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.001 (0.015)	-0.008 (0.024)
San Francisco PD	Observations	3017	6568	4859	3208
	Adjusted R ²	0.138	0.207	0.182	0.140

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
San Jose PD	Coefficients	-0.048 (0.023)	-0.005 (0.019)	-0.039 (0.014)	-0.034 (0.037)
	Observations	2473	2956	6986	2254
	Adjusted R ²	0.153	0.121	0.102	0.141

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.2.2 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Male	Coefficients	***-0.017 (0.004)	***-0.011 (0.003)	-0.009 (0.006)
	Observations	122579	149263	56156
	Adjusted R ²	0.161	0.147	0.143
Female	Coefficients	***-0.034 (0.008)	**-.022 (0.007)	-0.010 (0.015)
	Observations	21300	24010	13465
	Adjusted R ²	0.199	0.207	0.193
Other	Coefficients	0.074 (0.069)	-0.036 (0.075)	-0.180 (0.094)
	Observations	600	709	407
	Adjusted R ²	0.062	0.144	0.022

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.2.3 Discretionary-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Mental Health	Coefficients	-0.003 (0.012)	0.020 (0.014)	-0.022 (0.020)
	Observations	5790	5217	3905
	Adjusted R ²	0.023	0.092	0.083
None	Coefficients	***-0.022 (0.004)	***-0.016 (0.003)	-0.008 (0.006)
	Observations	137102	167073	65130
	Adjusted R ²	0.169	0.155	0.157
Other	Coefficients	0.070 (0.053)	-0.034 (0.050)	-0.078 (0.079)
	Observations	1587	1692	993
	Adjusted R ²	0.097	0.153	-0.101

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.3 Discovery Rates during Stops with Administrative Searches

C.2.3.1 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Overall	Coefficients	-0.008 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.004)	***-0.013 (0.003)	***-0.029 (0.006)
	Observations	54769	93824	124074	56370
	Adjusted R ²	0.175	0.157	0.173	0.169
Municipal	Coefficients	-0.000 (0.009)	-0.009 (0.004)	***-0.015 (0.004)	***-0.033 (0.008)
	Observations	43918	80686	98157	45252
	Adjusted R ²	0.153	0.146	0.146	0.149
California Highway Patrol	Coefficients	** -0.029 (0.008)	0.000 (0.007)	* -0.011 (0.004)	-0.012 (0.009)
	Observations	10851	13138	25917	11118
	Adjusted R ²	0.165	0.161	0.164	0.163
Fresno PD	Coefficients	-0.094 (0.049)	0.017 (0.030)	-0.007 (0.021)	-0.021 (0.070)
	Observations	651	1040	1855	644
	Adjusted R ²	0.200	0.147	0.154	0.209
Long Beach PD	Coefficients	*0.289 (0.087)	0.025 (0.031)	0.047 (0.030)	0.060 (0.066)
	Observations	579	1296	1447	655
	Adjusted R ²	0.243	0.039	0.099	0.221
Los Angeles CO SD	Coefficients	-0.084 (0.042)	***-0.074 (0.015)	-0.028 (0.012)	-0.031 (0.035)
	Observations	2783	5917	9373	3089
	Adjusted R ²	0.078	0.112	0.097	0.077
Los Angeles PD	Coefficients	-0.003 (0.018)	-0.008 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.006)	-0.012 (0.015)
	Observations	9545	25112	35011	10106
	Adjusted R ²	0.173	0.179	0.170	0.171
Oakland PD	Coefficients	-0.103 (0.053)	-0.041 (0.024)	-0.056 (0.029)	*-0.192 (0.060)
	Observations	750	3906	2072	745

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
	Adjusted R ²	0.107	0.141	0.148	0.192
Orange CO SO	Coefficients	-0.080 (0.077)	-0.138 (0.073)	-0.041 (0.035)	-0.048 (0.110)
	Observations	700	737	1116	704
	Adjusted R ²	0.177	0.161	0.157	0.156
	Coefficients	0.251 (0.229)	-0.002 (0.058)	-0.012 (0.027)	0.051 (0.086)
Riverside CO SO	Observations	613	741	1307	622
	Adjusted R ²	0.172	0.174	0.133	0.182
	Coefficients	0.044 (0.035)	-0.011 (0.013)	0.005 (0.014)	-0.016 (0.023)
Sacramento CO SD	Observations	3107	4773	3991	3215
	Adjusted R ²	0.158	0.121	0.118	0.128
	Coefficients	*0.110 (0.040)	-0.020 (0.018)	-0.030 (0.020)	*-0.095 (0.034)
Sacramento PD	Observations	1759	3569	2624	1754
	Adjusted R ²	0.139	0.122	0.135	0.098
	Coefficients	0.104 (0.045)	** -0.048 (0.012)	** -0.037 (0.009)	-0.052 (0.024)
San Bernardino CO SO	Observations	6109	8620	11300	6351
	Adjusted R ²	0.149	0.152	0.142	0.136
	Coefficients	-0.055 (0.057)	-0.030 (0.027)	** -0.058 (0.017)	* -0.088 (0.031)
San Diego CO SO	Observations	2302	2744	3660	2417
	Adjusted R ²	0.162	0.138	0.154	0.163
	Coefficients	-0.004 (0.018)	*0.030 (0.010)	-0.007 (0.008)	-0.010 (0.016)
San Diego PD	Observations	10524	14836	16417	10622
	Adjusted R ²	0.104	0.093	0.096	0.108
	Coefficients	*-0.071 (0.027)	0.005 (0.015)	0.013 (0.019)	-0.049 (0.030)
San Francisco PD	Observations	2883	5553	4282	2889
	Adjusted R ²	0.188	0.147	0.191	0.152

Regression Statistics for Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
San Jose PD	Coefficients	-0.042 (0.033)	0.049 (0.027)	-0.018 (0.021)	-0.045 (0.046)
	Observations	1613	1842	3702	1439
	Adjusted R ²	0.144	0.115	0.088	0.139

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.3.2 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Male	Coefficients	-0.004 (0.004)	***-0.013 (0.003)	-0.013 (0.006)
	Observations	70275	97435	45577
	Adjusted R ²	0.151	0.168	0.168
Female	Coefficients	-0.008 (0.008)	***-0.025 (0.007)	*-0.033 (0.011)
	Observations	22967	26052	15454
	Adjusted R ²	0.203	0.218	0.212
Other	Coefficients	0.074 (0.255)	0.102 (0.126)	-0.048 (0.076)
	Observations	582	587	341
	Adjusted R ²	-1.664	-0.701	-28.715

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.2.3.3 Administrative-search Discovery Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability

Regression Statistics for Search Rates by Race/Ethnicity and Disability				
Gender	Statistic	Black	Hispanic	Other
Mental Health	Coefficients	**0.059 (0.017)	0.015 (0.017)	0.018 (0.026)
	Observations	4149	3921	2812
	Adjusted R ²	0.080	0.202	0.112
None	Coefficients	-0.005 (0.004)	***-0.013 (0.003)	** -0.018 (0.005)
	Observations	88374	118779	57710
	Adjusted R ²	0.160	0.176	0.180
Other	Coefficients	0.106 (0.069)	0.039 (0.065)	-0.067 (0.141)
	Observations	1301	1374	850
	Adjusted R ²	0.087	0.009	-2.401

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.2. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.3 Veil of Darkness Analysis Table

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Overall	Coefficients	0.002 (0.002)	*-0.005 (0.002)	***-0.014 (0.002)	***-0.008 (0.002)
	Observations	218322	267228	409109	223788
	Adjusted R2	0.145	0.349	0.230	0.133
Municipal	Coefficients	0.006 (0.005)	***-0.015 (0.004)	*-0.010 (0.004)	-0.004 (0.005)
	Observations	55468	93609	133377	55846
	Adjusted R2	0.185	0.412	0.272	0.192
California Highway Patrol	Coefficients	0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.003)	***-0.016 (0.002)	**-.008 (0.002)
	Observations	162854	173619	275732	167942
	Adjusted R2	0.125	0.154	0.191	0.114
Fresno PD	Coefficients	0.017 (0.023)	0.039 (0.022)	0.044 (0.020)	0.036 (0.017)
	Observations	2341	2906	5957	2308
	Adjusted R2	0.111	0.134	0.083	0.038
Long Beach PD	Coefficients	0.023 (0.026)	-0.029 (0.030)	-0.032 (0.022)	0.016 (0.024)
	Observations	1480	2507	3191	1665
	Adjusted R2	0.139	0.203	0.122	0.507
Los Angeles CO SD	Coefficients	0.002 (0.013)	-0.012 (0.012)	-0.016 (0.011)	-0.025 (0.012)
	Observations	7129	9472	16804	6398
	Adjusted R2	0.386	0.310	0.211	0.257
Los Angeles PD	Coefficients	0.003 (0.009)	**-.022 (0.006)	**-.016 (0.005)	-0.020 (0.010)
	Observations	15101	39865	59920	15908
	Adjusted R2	0.104	0.432	0.224	0.139
Oakland PD	Coefficients	-0.058 (0.076)	-0.033 (0.040)	0.021 (0.055)	-0.078 (0.091)
	Observations	291	1019	684	302
	Adjusted R2	0.117	0.117	0.154	0.016

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Orange CO SO	Coefficients	0.005 (0.019)	-0.015 (0.012)	-0.028 (0.028)	-0.008 (0.028)
	Observations	2585	2516	3622	2706
	Adjusted R2	0.037	0.099	0.109	0.143
Riverside CO SO	Coefficients	0.013 (0.013)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.020 (0.015)
	Observations	2943	3533	5760	2996
	Adjusted R2	0.062	0.244	0.174	0.076
Sacramento CO SD	Coefficients	-0.019 (0.019)	** -0.084 (0.023)	-0.055 (0.025)	0.006 (0.020)
	Observations	2239	3860	3266	2363
	Adjusted R2	0.128	0.143	0.143	0.121
Sacramento PD	Coefficients	0.033 (0.021)	-0.018 (0.016)	-0.026 (0.017)	0.004 (0.021)
	Observations	2685	6044	4473	2716
	Adjusted R2	0.049	0.169	0.109	0.120
San Bernardino CO SO	Coefficients	0.009 (0.011)	-0.005 (0.015)	0.017 (0.015)	0.008 (0.012)
	Observations	5160	6668	9493	5230
	Adjusted R2	0.149	0.198	0.177	0.098
San Diego CO SO	Coefficients	-0.029 (0.018)	0.010 (0.022)	0.008 (0.021)	0.019 (0.016)
	Observations	2534	2666	4042	2570
	Adjusted R2	0.078	0.169	0.237	0.053
San Diego PD	Coefficients	0.029 (0.015)	0.005 (0.017)	0.026 (0.017)	0.011 (0.014)
	Observations	4570	5626	7742	4351
	Adjusted R2	0.138	0.310	0.220	0.104
San Francisco PD	Coefficients	0.008 (0.017)	-0.006 (0.017)	-0.034 (0.018)	0.011 (0.018)
	Observations	5284	5871	5511	5349
	Adjusted R2	0.067	0.243	0.153	0.209
San Jose PD	Coefficients	-0.033 (0.045)	-0.036 (0.049)	-0.036 (0.029)	0.023 (0.042)

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
	Observations	1126	1056	2912	984
	Adjusted R2	0.214	0.183	0.157	0.228

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.3. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.

C.4 Use of Force Analysis Table

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity					
Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Overall	Coefficients	**0.005 (0.002)	***0.011 (0.001)	***0.006 (0.001)	***0.006 (0.002)
	Observations	212530	400011	507568	219112
	Adjusted R2	0.308	0.246	0.232	0.306
Municipal	Coefficients	**0.006 (0.002)	***0.011 (0.001)	***0.007 (0.001)	**0.006 (0.002)
	Observations	187930	369824	450199	193815
	Adjusted R2	0.321	0.253	0.242	0.319
California Highway Patrol	Coefficients	0.001 (0.004)	***0.013 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.002)	0.007 (0.004)
	Observations	24600	30187	57369	25297
	Adjusted R2	0.108	0.123	0.103	0.113
Fresno PD	Coefficients	-0.007 (0.008)	0.010 (0.005)	0.009 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.010)
	Observations	4234	6694	11827	4099
	Adjusted R2	0.100	0.090	0.092	0.094
Long Beach PD	Coefficients	-0.002 (0.010)	***0.026 (0.006)	**0.022 (0.007)	0.031 (0.014)
	Observations	3591	7537	8254	4002
	Adjusted R2	0.174	0.124	0.130	0.139
Los Angeles CO SD	Coefficients	0.006 (0.012)	***0.016 (0.004)	***0.012 (0.003)	0.013 (0.007)
	Observations	12474	26419	43592	13698
	Adjusted R2	0.694	0.525	0.485	0.708
Los Angeles PD	Coefficients	0.000 (0.003)	**0.005 (0.001)	*0.003 (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)
	Observations	40339	130420	174442	42911
	Adjusted R2	0.155	0.097	0.095	0.135
Oakland PD	Coefficients	0.015 (0.013)	**0.024 (0.006)	**0.030 (0.010)	-0.005 (0.014)
	Observations	2102	10048	5146	2058
	Adjusted R2	0.065	0.093	0.113	0.048

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
Orange CO SO	Coefficients	-0.005 (0.016)	0.011 (0.011)	-0.009 (0.004)	0.016 (0.013)
	Observations	6490	6803	10743	6533
	Adjusted R2	0.370	0.355	0.367	0.369
Riverside CO SO	Coefficients	-0.008 (0.035)	0.002 (0.012)	0.004 (0.006)	0.001 (0.016)
	Observations	1996	2623	4357	2107
	Adjusted R2	0.221	0.156	0.117	0.193
Sacramento CO SD	Coefficients	0.011 (0.009)	0.008 (0.004)	0.003 (0.005)	0.011 (0.007)
	Observations	15468	24392	19810	16037
	Adjusted R2	0.079	0.073	0.078	0.077
Sacramento PD	Coefficients	*0.028 (0.011)	***0.022 (0.006)	0.016 (0.007)	0.003 (0.012)
	Observations	10476	24017	15999	10518
	Adjusted R2	0.272	0.266	0.255	0.272
San Bernardino CO SO	Coefficients	0.019 (0.010)	***0.014 (0.003)	***0.011 (0.002)	-0.009 (0.006)
	Observations	27818	39909	52261	28716
	Adjusted R2	0.389	0.362	0.354	0.393
San Diego CO SO	Coefficients	0.011 (0.009)	0.004 (0.005)	0.007 (0.004)	0.013 (0.007)
	Observations	10420	12241	16091	10843
	Adjusted R2	0.189	0.168	0.167	0.185
San Diego PD	Coefficients	0.000 (0.005)	**0.009 (0.003)	*0.006 (0.002)	0.011 (0.006)
	Observations	31623	45787	50751	31691
	Adjusted R2	0.183	0.177	0.169	0.189
San Francisco PD	Coefficients	-0.001 (0.005)	**0.009 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.003)	0.004 (0.005)
	Observations	14804	25791	20693	14943
	Adjusted R2	0.458	0.305	0.372	0.370
San Jose PD	Coefficients	0.007 (0.008)	*0.019 (0.007)	0.010 (0.005)	0.025 (0.011)

Regression Statistics for Veil of Darkness by Race/Ethnicity

Agency	Statistic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
	Observations	6095	7143	16233	5659
	Adjusted R2	0.164	0.137	0.134	0.141

Notes. For a full description of the methodology, please see Appendix B.4. “Overall” refers to all agencies combined while “Municipal” excludes California Highway Patrol. Asterisks represent level of significance for adjusted p values using false discovery rates: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.01; * p < 0.05. Coefficients; estimate (standard error). Observations represent the number of stops analyzed by the statistical model.
