

A photograph of the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office building, showcasing its modern architecture with a large, illuminated, perforated metal canopy structure.

MARICOPA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE  
Traffic Stops Quarterly Report 13  
2023 Extended Stop Indicator Use



Authors: Andrew J. Prelog, MA, PhD | David Redpath, MA | Briana Frenzel, MA, MSW  
Cara Stevens, MA | Sherry Burnette, BS | Valarie Serrano, PhD

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Purpose of the Research</i> .....	8
<b>Methods</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<i>ETSI Data and Analysis</i> .....	9
Frequency of ETSI Use by District.....	10
Use of ETSIs by Race/Ethnicity .....	14
ETSI Descriptive Statistics .....	17
Modeling Stop Length from ETSIs.....	27
Contact Conclusion and Extended Stop Indicator Use .....	29
Other Issue ETSI Comments .....	32
Body Worn Camera and Comment Analysis .....	39
<i>Limitations</i> .....	41
<i>Summary of Findings</i> .....	42
Office and District-Level differences in ETSI Use.....	43
Racial/Ethnic Differences in ETSI Use.....	43
Descriptive Statistics on ETSI Use .....	44
Contact Conclusion and ETSI Use.....	44
The Other Issue ETSI.....	45
Appropriate Use of ETSI indicators.....	45
<i>Conclusion and MCSO Response</i> .....	47
<b>Appendices:</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<i>Appendix A: Vehicle Stop Contact Form Definitions/Instructions for Extended Stop Indicators</i> .....	50
<i>Appendix B: ETSI use by Beat, Deputy, and Vehicle</i> .....	51
ETSI Use by Beat .....	51
<i>Appendix B1: ETSI Use by Beat</i> .....	52
<i>Appendix B2: Arrests by Deputy</i> .....	61
<i>Appendix B3: Driving Documentation ETSI Use by Deputy</i> .....	65
<i>Appendix B4: DUI ETSI Use by Deputy</i> .....	69
<i>Appendix B5: Language Barrier ETSI Use by Deputy</i> .....	73
<i>Appendix B6: Searches by Deputies</i> .....	77
<i>Appendix B7: Use of Technical ETSIs by Deputy</i> .....	81
<i>Appendix B8: Use of Vehicle Tow ETSIs by Deputy</i> .....	85
<i>Appendix B9: Use of Training ETSIs by Deputy</i> .....	89
<i>Appendix B10: Other Delay ETSI Use by Deputy</i> .....	93
<i>Appendix B11: Use of Technical Issue ETSIs by Vehicle</i> .....	97
<i>Appendix C: Initial BWC Review Results and Second Reviews</i> .....	99

---

Second Reviewer Coding, BWC Evidence, and Rationale for Changes:.....99

Traffic Stops Quarterly Report: District Analysis

March 2024

This study was developed and conducted by the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO) Traffic Stop Analysis Unit and Research and Reporting Unit. The developed methodology was approved by the Court Monitoring Team and Parties on January 3, 2024. This report is intended to meet the requirements of Paragraph 65 of the First Order, as Traffic Stop Quarterly Report for Quarter 1, 2024.

Principal Investigator

Andrew J. Prelog, MA, PhD

Research Analyst

[andrewprelog@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:andrewprelog@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

Co-Investigator

David Redpath, MA

Research Director

[davidredpath@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:davidredpath@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

Co-Investigator

Briana Frenzel, MA, MSW

Research Analyst

[brianafrenzel@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:brianafrenzel@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

Co-Investigator

Cara Stevens, MS

Research Analyst

[carastevens@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:carastevens@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

Co-Investigator

Sherry Burnette, BS

Data and Analytics Supervisor

[sherryburnette@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:sherryburnette@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

Co-Investigator

Valarie Serrano, PhD

Management Analyst

[valarieserrano@MCSO.Maricopa.gov](mailto:valarieserrano@MCSO.Maricopa.gov)

The Traffic Stop Analysis and Research Units would like to thank the Monitoring Team and Parties for their thoughtful feedback in the development of the methods used in this report.

---

# Executive Summary

This research examined the use of Extended Traffic Stop Indicators (ETSI), arrests and searches in the 2023 MCSO traffic stop data. Extended traffic stop indicators are used by MCSO deputies during traffic stops to identify common reasons the typical traffic stop might take longer to complete. MCSO currently employs seven ETSIs and identify when an arrest and/or search is made in the VSCF. For this research we included arrests and searches as delays during traffic stops because they extend the typical stop. The current ETSIs in the VSCF that document delays are Arrests, Driving Documentation Issues, DUI Investigations, Language Barriers, Searches, Technical Issues, Vehicle Tows, Training Stops, and Other Issue. Descriptions of these ETSIs may be found in the main body of this report<sup>1</sup>.

The purpose of the study was to describe the prevalence of delays during stops as documented by ETSIs and other Vehicle Stop Contact Form (VSCF) information and identify what types and to what extent delays impact stop length during MCSO traffic stops. Most importantly, the research sought to determine whether ETSIs continue to be used appropriately by deputies when documenting delays during traffic stops.

This research identified the use of the different ETSIs for the Office, by district, deputy, beat, and for Technical Issues, by vehicle number. We also identify the use of ETSIs by race/ethnicity. The research provides descriptive statistics for stop length for each ETSI and multiple ETSIs, used in combinations. We identify citation and warning rates for stops with ETSIs and describe the relationship between certain ETSIs that were identified in the data. The research investigated the use of the “Other Issue” ETSI and used deputy comments in the VSCF to identify traffic stop delays associated with the use of this indicator. Finally, the MCSO reviewed Body Worn Camera footage and VSCF comments from a random sample of traffic stops with documented delays to determine whether deputies were employing ETSIs appropriately. Major findings from the research were as follows:

- MCSO deputies documented delays to traffic stops during 7,332 traffic stops (39.35% of stops made in 2023).
- District 7 (Fountain Hills and County Islands) used ETSIs at the lowest rate (26.17% of traffic stops) and District 1 (Southeast Valley Cities and County Islands) used ETSIs at the highest rate with over half of their stops delayed for some reason (55.10% of traffic stops).
- The most common ETSI used for the Office and for all districts was Driving Documentation Issues.
- MCSO deputies documented delays for each ETSI at a statistically significant higher rate for Black, Hispanic, and Minority drivers than White drivers for all ETSI types with the

---

<sup>1</sup> For complete descriptions see section beginning on page 5.



exception Training Stops with Black drivers.

- During 4,948 stops (26.56% of traffic stops), deputies documented delays using one ETSI alone and during 2,384 (12.79%) traffic stops, deputies identified multiple delays impacting traffic stops.
- Stops that included a vehicle tow had the largest impact on stop length, with stops averaging almost 110 minutes when a vehicle tow was at least one documented delay during the stop. (Stops that included a vehicle tow as the only delay averaged about 53 minutes).
- Delays associated with Trainings Stops and Technical Issues had the lowest impact on stop length, with stops extended between 4 and 12 minutes when these ETSIs were used (as opposed to no delay documented).
- Traffic stops with one or more delay documented (by each ETSI) had a much higher citation rate than stops with no delays documented, while citation rates varied for stops with only one ETSI selected with certain delays associated with high citation rates (e.g., arrests and vehicle tows) and other types of delays associated with lower citation rates (e.g., DUI Investigations, Technical Issues, and Training).
- The Other Issue ETSI identified delays that could not be easily identified by other, more specific, ETSIs and identified stops that included complex circumstances that delayed traffic stops.
- Review of BWC footage and VSCF comments revealed high agreement between the use of ETSIs by deputies and BWC footage. This review confirmed that deputies use ETSI indicators appropriately.

Following the research MCSO identified several areas for further investigation and documentation that might be improved. MCSO is taking the following actions based on the findings from this research:

- Review all stops for which the Other Issues ETSI was selected but for which there was no clear description of the delay in the VSCF and send out data validations.
- Review stops and stop data for stops which have unusual stop lengths associated with ETSI use (e.g., or stops with very short stop lengths and any ETSI is selected)
- Continue new process implemented in January 2024 whereby reviews of stops where no ETSI was selected, but which exceeded 20 minutes in length occur and data validations sent out if determined to be appropriate.
- Disseminate published guidelines, or “cheat sheet”, to reinforce the proper use of ETSIs.
- Conduct internal town halls with each district explaining the results of this research, reinforce proper use of the ETSIs and work with District commanders to better understand

---

each district's unique circumstances that delay traffic stops.

- Communicate with fleet management to inspect vehicles and equipment associated with a high proportion of stops experiencing technical issues.
- Discuss findings with the MCSO Internal Review Group to determine any additional actions MCSO Patrol may take.

# Introduction

MCSO evaluates disparity in traffic stop length and outcomes for the office annually and reports the results of that analysis in the Traffic Stop Annual Report (TSAR). MCSO also analyzes individual deputy stop activity for disparity in the Traffic Stop Monthly Report (TSMR). One benchmark used in the TSAR and the TSMR is stop length. The length of stop was originally cited in the first court order as deputies had been holding Hispanic drivers for extended lengths of time during traffic stops to determine whether the driver or passengers in the vehicle were undocumented.

Stop length is analyzed in the TSAR and TSMR in several different ways and each analysis seeks to account for delays in the traffic stop that are considered reasonable or relevant to the deputy's law enforcement duties. Traffic stops can be delayed for many reasons and MCSO has included Extended Traffic Stop Indicators (ETSI) in the Vehicle Stop Contact Form (VSCF) to identify these delays and document when and why stops may be extended. Delays associated with arrests and searches during traffic stops are also accounted for in analyses of stop length in the TSAR and TSMR.

The Monitor's team and Parties first approved the use of five ETSIs in 2017 after identifying the most common circumstances with extended stop lengths. In March of 2021 MCSO examined the use of ETSIs during traffic stops use during 2020 traffic stops and published its findings in TSQR3.<sup>2</sup> Following this research MCSO analyzed long non-extended stops their fourth quarterly report.<sup>3</sup> The results from this research indicated the need to incorporate two additional ETSIs into the VSCF. Following the publication of TSAR 8, MCSO received comments from the Monitor's team and Parties indicating an interest in investigating ETSI use again to determine if ETSIs were still being used with fidelity and to determine the prevalence of use of each indicator.

Currently, MCSO has seven extended stop indicators available for use in the VSCF. These include:

- Driving Documentation,
- DUI Investigations,
- Language Barriers,
- Technical Issues,
- Vehicle Tows,
- Training Stops,
- and Other Delay.

---

<sup>2</sup>TSQR 3 "Extended Stop Indicator Use," was published in March of 2021 and can be accessed here: [https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6\\_f37279fd33394818bb370ab6af46820e.pdf](https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6_f37279fd33394818bb370ab6af46820e.pdf)

<sup>3</sup>TSQR 4 "Long Non-Extended Traffic Stops" was published in June of 2021 and can be accessed here: [https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6\\_011aa6a557db4b5da212fac8c72f30dd.pdf](https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6_011aa6a557db4b5da212fac8c72f30dd.pdf)



In addition to these ETSIs, this research also examined the use of driver arrest indicators and search (vehicle or person) indicators from VSCF data. The inclusion of arrests and searches were necessary because when these events occur, stops are typically extended. For this report, we include arrests and searches as “ETSIs” although they are characteristically different from the seven ETSI indicators.<sup>4</sup>

Descriptions of these indicators and their uses are provided below.<sup>5</sup>

## Arrests

Following the publication of TSQR 7 on MCSO arrest activity, MCSO identified that many driver arrests are characteristically different from one another. As a result, MCSO modified the “Driver Arrest Type” field in the VSCF to include options that more accurately capture the circumstances of the arrest. There are currently six types of arrests documented in the VSCF data.

- *Booked Arrests:* Booked arrests occur when a driver is arrested, charged with a crime, and booked into one of the seven Maricopa County jail facilities. Once arrested, defendants remain in the jail facility and have an arraignment with a judge to determine additional legal options for the defendant. These types of arrests occur with both misdemeanor and felony charges or may occur when a driver has an active warrant out of Maricopa County (as opposed to municipal warrants).
- *Cite and Release/Custodial Arrest:* Cite and Release Custodial Arrests occur when a driver is taken into custody and processed for charges related to the arrest. These arrests are common for DUI arrests when the driver is taken into custody and evidence is collected related to DUI charges (such as the collection biological samples) and questioned about their alcohol or drug consumption. Absent additional charges, drivers are released following processing at MCSO sub-stations.
- *Cite and Release/No Custodial Arrest:* Cite and Release/No Custodial Arrests are the most common arrest type effectuated by MCSO deputies. These arrests occur when the driver is charged with a misdemeanor offense and not taken into custody. In most cases, these arrests proceed like a typical traffic stop. The most common misdemeanor charge for cite and release/no custodial arrest by MCSO deputies is for criminal speed (71% of all arrests of this type were for criminal speed in 2023; N = 524). When these arrests occur, drivers must see a judge to address the citation that was issued (instead of simply paying a fine).
- *Custodial Arrest/Pending Follow-up and/or Long Form:* Custodial Arrest/Pending Follow-up and/or long form arrests occur when a driver is taken into custody while deputies collect and/or process evidence related to the suspected crime. The majority of arrests in this category are DUI arrests.

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that both arrests and searches are analyzed as stop outcomes in the TSAR and the TSMR, while the seven ETSIs, arrests, and searches are used as control variables in analyses of stop length in the TSAR and the TSMR.

<sup>5</sup>Exact verbiage used in TraCS to describe these indicators is available in Appendix A of this report.

- *Custodial Arrest/Released No Further Action:* Physical arrest, released with no further action (i.e. Probable cause dispelled after further investigation, decision made not to charge due to MCAO charging standards not met) or Other Agency declines to pick up on warrant.
- *Custodial Arrest/Released to Other Agency:* Custodial Arrest/Released to Other Agency arrests are arrests of drivers on warrants from another local jurisdiction.

## **Driving Documentation Issues**

ETSI for driving documentation issues are used when drivers have issues with driver's licenses, identification, registration, insurance, or license plates. These delays may be caused by drivers not having their driver's license, registration, or proof of insurance in their possession and deputies must confirm the driver's identity using information provided by the driver (e.g., Name, date of birth, address, etc.) When registration for the vehicle is absent, deputies must identify and record the VIN number from the vehicle and confirm licensing of the vehicle. When proof of insurance is not available, deputies may allow drivers to access this information on their smartphones or may confirm insurance coverage with the Arizona MVD. Delays associated with license plates are often the result of fictitious plates or license plates that have been suspended by the Arizona MVD for lacking insurance on the vehicle. In these cases, license plates are seized by the deputy. Many of the delays associated with driving documentation require deputies to manually enter driver and/or vehicle information into TraCS manually or deputies must take extra time to confirm information about the driver or vehicle. Finally, driving documentation delays occur when drivers take extra time to find and produce requested licenses, proof of insurance, and registration when deputies request these items at the beginning of the traffic stop.

## **DUI Investigations**

DUI investigations occur when deputies have reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause to suspect that a driver is under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Stops are delayed for DUI investigations because deputies must determine if it is possible the driver is under the influence and if so, conduct field sobriety tests with the driver to determine whether they are safe to drive. When a deputy selects the ETSI for a DUI, this does not necessarily mean that a DUI arrest has occurred. Rather, the stop was delayed to determine whether the driver may be under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

## **Language Barriers**

Delays related to language barriers occur when a deputy cannot communicate with drivers due to language differences or when communication with the driver is impeded by language. The most common language barrier delay occurs when the deputy and driver do not speak the same language.

---

However, language barrier delays also occur when drivers may be deaf and communication between the deputy and driver must be accomplished using writing. In other situations, language barriers may be present during the stop, but the driver and deputy may be able to communicate, only less efficiently than if both the driver and deputy speak the same language fluently. In most cases, language barriers may be overcome with the use of the audio Voiance translation service used by MCSO deputies to translate between two different languages. In some situations, a bilingual deputy may arrive at the stop and translate for the primary deputy.

## **Search**

Searches occur during traffic stops for many reasons and may be searches of drivers or vehicles. Most searches during MCSO traffic stops are searches that are incident to arrest or inventory searches for vehicle tows, these searches are non-discretionary and dictated by MCSO policy. Other searches are not dictated by MCSO policy and occur when a deputy has reason to search a person or vehicle during a stop and considered discretionary and analyzed in the search benchmark of the TSAR and TSMR process.

## **Technical Issues**

Delays caused by technical issues occur often during MCSO traffic stops when technology facilitating the deputy's duties inhibit the timely processing of the traffic stop. These delays may be caused by connectivity issues with computers, or radios. They may be caused by other equipment not functioning such as scanners for driver's licenses and vehicle registration. Deputies have documented situations where computers must be restarted or situations where printers for citations and other contact receipts are not functioning and requires the deputy to handwrite all paperwork. In previous research on ETSI use, MCSO determined that deputies would often select the technical issues ETSI when they needed to manually enter driver and vehicle information into their computers.

## **Vehicle Tow**

Delays caused by vehicle tows are prolonged. Deputies first determine whether towing the vehicle is appropriate. When a vehicle is towed deputies must produce additional paperwork (a tow receipt), conduct an inventory search of the vehicle and document valuables in the vehicle if the driver is unable to take the valuables with them. Deputies must wait for tow trucks to arrive at the scene of the traffic stop and work with tow-truck drivers to document the tow. This includes collecting driver's license information from the tow-truck driver and producing a tow receipt for the driver. Finally, in many cases, when a driver's vehicle is towed, deputies may wait with a driver until the driver is able to be picked-up by a friend or family member, or the deputy may provide the driver with a courtesy ride to their home or a different location. This is especially common

during the summer months when temperatures routinely exceed 115 degrees.

## **Training**

Delays during training stops occur for several reasons. Deputies in training are unfamiliar with many aspects of a traffic stop and often require extra time to identify required processes, forms, ARS statutes, etc. Additionally, during training stops the Field Training Officer (FTO) often provides guidance to the trainee with instructions or answering questions the trainee may have.

## **Other Delays**

The Other Delay ETSI was added to the VSCF in 2022. When a deputy determines that a traffic stop has been delayed for reasons other than what is available in the other available ETSIs, they may select the Other Delay ETSI. When they do so, the VSCF prompts the deputy to identify the delay in the comments of the VSCF. The Other Delay ETSI was added to the VSCF because MCSO identified many situations occurring during stops that were beyond the control of the deputy but would require the addition of multiple ETSIs specific to unique situations. In the research below, we identify the common delays during traffic stops which deputies identify and indicate that the stop was delayed for “other” reasons. Examples include drivers who are talkative and ask many questions, drivers taking a long time to stop when deputies initiate the stop, deputies waiting for a safe place to initiate the stop after they have made the decision to stop, waiting for traffic lights to cycle, asking drivers to move their vehicles to a safer location to process the stop and situations with animals or children in the vehicle.

## **Purpose of the Research**

This research examined the use of ETSIs in the 2023 MCSO traffic stop data. The research sought to determine whether ETSIs continue to be appropriately used by deputies to document delays during traffic stops. Researchers also reviewed the “Other Issue” ETSI comments to ascertain if a new ETSI category should be recommended. The research describes the prevalence of delays during stops as documented by ETSIs and identifies what types of delays impact stop length during MCSO traffic stops.

The organization of this report is as follows. In the next section we detail the methods used to investigate ETSI use throughout the report and describe the data used for this research. Following this, we identify ETSIs used by individual districts and disaggregate the different ETSIs and their use by District. Next, we analyze whether different racial/ethnic groups experience delays, documented by ETSIs at a different rate. We then provide tabulations of ETSI use and summary statistics for stop length for all ETSIs. Included in this analysis are all empirically observed combinations of ETSIs from stops. Finally, we present the measure of agreement between reviewers, VSCF comments and deputies’ selection of the ETSIs.

# Methods

Data for the analysis was obtained from the MCSO's Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS) database. The data include a population of traffic stops made by MCSO deputies from January 2023 through December 2023 (N = 18,633). A subset of the data used in the analysis consisted of a population of stops where at least one ETSI was used (N = 7,332). Qualitative comments from all stops with the "Other Delay" were coded into categorical values identifying the cause of the delay (N = 1,239). A random sample of 72 traffic stops with at least one ETSI was selected for review of BWC footage and comments from the VSCF form.<sup>6</sup>

Quantitative analysis of the population of traffic stops was used to describe the distribution of ETSIs and examine associations among the variables of interest. The unit of analysis was the traffic stop. The variables used in the analysis were: District number, beat number, deputy number, vehicle number, ETSI use (Yes/No), ETSI Type (Arrest, Driving Documentation, DUI, Language, Search, Technical, Tow, Training, and Other), Driver Race/Ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, and White, and non-White Minority drivers which included Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native American drivers combined), Stop Length (in minutes), and Stop Outcome (Citation, Warning, and Incidental Contact). All variables were nominal, except for stop length, which was interval-ratio. Descriptive statistics regarding ETSI frequency, rates of ETSI use, mean and median stop length, and standard deviations ETSI and non-ETSI stops are provided throughout the report. Results of Fisher's Exact Test<sup>7</sup> for associations between ETSIs and race/ethnicity are provided. Body worn camera footage and deputy comments were reviewed to evaluate the proper use of indicators by identifying when the deputy's use of an ETSI was appropriate. Two analyses were conducted to accomplish this. The first analysis included a blind review of stops where reviewers had no prior knowledge of the types of delays that occurred during the stop. The second analysis was an analysis of agreement following a second review of stops when reviewer determinations about delays were not congruent with deputy-indicated ETSIs. VSCF comments from all stops with Other Delay ETSIs were content analyzed and classified into common categories as observed in the data.

## ETSI Data and Analysis

Data for analysis included all traffic stops for the 2023 calendar year (N = 18,633). Of all traffic stops made by MCSO deputies during the study period a total of 7,332 (39.35%) involved a delay documented by at least one of the nine indicators analyzed in this report. The descriptive analysis, below, begins with an overview of the content of these cases, by district (Tables 1 and 2). Additional analyses of the frequency and percent of indicator use by Beat, Deputy, and Vehicles are excluded from the main body of the report due to space limitations but are available for review in the Appendix of this report. In the next section, use of indicators is disaggregated by the driver's

---

<sup>6</sup>The sample was proportionally stratified to ensure representation for each ETSI used by deputies. Cochran W.G. 1963. *Sampling Techniques*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

<sup>7</sup>Fisher, R.A. 1922. "On the interpretation of  $\chi^2$  from Contingency Tables, and the Calculation of P." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 85(1): 87-94.

perceived race/ethnicity and the results of Fisher’s Exact Test for racial/ethnic differences in ETSI use are presented. Next, descriptive statistics for stop length (number of observations, minimum, maximum, mean, median, standard deviation, and percent of cases above the mean) are provided for the use of each indicator, and indicators in combination with all others. This is followed by an analysis of ETSI use and stop outcome is provided for each of the nine indicators. The next section includes results from evaluating the VSCF comments from stops where deputies selected the Other Delay ETSI. Comments were iteratively coded into categories to identify common explanations for delays associated with the Other Delay ETSI.<sup>8</sup> Findings from this analysis are presented and discussed. Finally, we present the results of reviews of BWC footage and VSCF comments as a quality check on the use of ETSIs. We use Cohen’s Kappa<sup>9</sup> as a measure of agreement between (a) deputy ETSI selection and reviewers’ determinations of delays, (b) deputy ETSI selection use and VSCF comments, and (c) deputy selection and reviewer determinations of delays and VSCF comments combined.

### Frequency of ETSI Use by District

In Table 1 below, we provide an overview of ETSI use by district for each of MCSO’s districts.<sup>10</sup>District 1 had the highest rate of ETSI use when compared to other districts with over half of all traffic stops delayed by a search, arrest, or documented extended stop circumstances. In contrast, District 7 deputies, who made the most traffic stops of any MCSO district, had the lowest proportion of stops delayed by arrests, searches, or documented traffic stop delays. In total, almost 40 percent (39.35%) of stops made by MCSO deputies were documented as delayed for arrests, searches, or by the ETSI circumstances.

**Table 1:** Number of Traffic Stops and Stops with ETSIs, by District

District	Number of Stops	Number of Stops with an ETSI	Percent Stops with an ETSI
1	1,871	1,031	55.10%
2	3,574	1,933	54.09%
3	2,743	1,000	36.46%
4	2,412	776	32.17%
5	3,792	1,482	39.08%
7	4,241	1,110	26.17%
MCSO	18,633	7,332	39.35%

<sup>8</sup> Saldaña, Johnny. 2016. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

<sup>9</sup>Cohen, J. 1960. “A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales.” *Educational and Psychological Measurement* XX(1): 37-46.

<sup>10</sup>District 6 was dissolved into District 1 when the Town of Queen Creek terminated its policing contract with MCSO, creating its own municipal police force. MCSO no longer patrols the Town of Queen Creek but does make traffic stops in and around the Town of Queen Creek in “county islands” and in San Tan Mountain Regional Park.



In Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c we report delays for each ETSI and district. District 3 had the highest rate of delays associated with arrests, with 7.8 percent of stops delayed for this reason.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, District 4 made 75 arrests during traffic stops accounting for 3.11 percent of all District 4 stops in 2023. In 2023, MCSO had 1,019 traffic stops that involved the arrest of a driver. This accounted for 5.47 percent of all MCSO traffic stops.

Delays caused by issues with driving documentation occurred during nearly a quarter (24.69%) of all MCSO traffic stops made in 2023.<sup>12</sup> In Districts 1 and 2 nearly 40 percent of stops involved delays associated with driving documentation issues (39.98% and 38.14% of traffic stops, respectively). In contrast, delays caused by driving documentation issues were much less common in districts 4 and 7. In District 4, 17.7 percent of stops were delayed for driving documentation issues and in District 7 15.02 percent of stops were delayed for this reason.

Delays for DUI investigations occurred during nearly 2 percent of traffic stops. Investigations for DUIs across all districts are relatively rare, except for District 5. District 7 had the lowest proportion of stops delayed for DUI investigations with less than one percent (0.83%) of stops delayed for this reason. Just over two percent (2.08%) of stops in District 1 were delayed for DUI investigations. Delays associated with DUI investigations were most common in District 5. The high rate of delays for DUI investigations in District 5 (Lake Patrol) is due, in part, to District management of the DUI Taskforce special assignments and that the district is largely comprised of recreational areas.<sup>13</sup> Throughout the year deputies are deployed to identify impaired drivers. These taskforces are deployed during special events, holidays, and in conjunction with DUI-specific municipal police operations.

---

<sup>11</sup>Arrests by MCSO deputies during traffic stops are effectuated in different ways and depend on the circumstance(s) of the stop. Cite and release arrests occur when drivers are issued a citation for a criminal violation. The most common arrest of this type are arrests for criminal speed. In these circumstances it is unlikely that a driver is detained but are simply issued a criminal citation during the stop. Custodial arrests occur when the driver is detained and processed for the arrest. These arrests occur during DUI stops, stops with other more serious violations, or when a driver possesses a warrant. Most arrests made by MCSO deputies during traffic stops are not custodial arrests. For more information on MCSO traffic stop arrest activity see TSQR 7 available at [https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6\\_8bb2dabbd9fa4b0e8473184e32edf1f5.pdf](https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/c866a6_8bb2dabbd9fa4b0e8473184e32edf1f5.pdf).

<sup>12</sup>Research on MCSO stop activity, presented in TSQR 12, identified that driving documentation was also the most common delay during traffic stops in 2022. This research is available at [https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/b6f92b\\_297d4d705ca444de9c053083bf50ec5e.pdf](https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/b6f92b_297d4d705ca444de9c053083bf50ec5e.pdf).

<sup>13</sup>Research on special assignment activity was conducted for TSQR which explains the role the DUI Taskforce plays in MCSO's patrol activity. TSQR 9 can be accessed at [https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/b6f92b\\_089d19c100b24f53a01ee1b453e40a79.pdf](https://www.mcsobio.org/files/ugd/b6f92b_089d19c100b24f53a01ee1b453e40a79.pdf).

**Table 2a: Number and Percent of ETSI Use by District and Type (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)**

District	Arrest		Driving Document		DUI	
	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops
1	127	6.79%	748	39.98%	39	2.08%
2	147	4.11%	1,363	38.14%	60	1.68%
3	214	7.80%	566	20.63%	45	1.64%
4	75	3.11%	427	17.70%	29	1.20%
5	280	7.38%	859	22.65%	152	4.01%
7	176	4.15%	637	15.02%	35	0.83%
MCSO	1,019	5.47%	4,600	24.69%	360	1.93%

In Table 2b below, we identify ETSI use for Language Barriers, Searches and Technical Issues. The Language Barrier ETSI was most common in District 2 with 4.22 percent of stops involving a delay caused by language communication issues. Districts 4 and 7 had relatively low instances of delays caused by language barriers. In District 4, only 27 stops (1.12 percent of all District 4 stops) were delayed because of language barriers. In District 7, less than one percent (0.97%) of traffic stops were delayed due to a language barrier. During all MCSO traffic stops, 442 or 2.37 percent of stops involved delays associated with language barriers.

Delays due to searches<sup>14</sup> occurred during 2.69 percent of all MCSO traffic stops. Like other types of delays, certain districts have higher rates of delays from searches. District 1 had the highest overall search rate in 2023 with 6.47 percent of traffic stops involving a search of some kind. In contrast District 4 had the lowest incidence (N = 28) and rate (1.16%) for searches when compared to other districts.

Technical issues delayed 7.46 percent of MCSO traffic stops in 2023. Delays due to technical issues were most common in District 2 (N = 364) although District 1 had the highest rate of technical delays with 11.01 percent of traffic stops delayed because of technical issues. District 4 had the lowest number and rate of technical issues of any district. In District 4 only 111 (4.65%) traffic stops involved a delay for technical issues.

<sup>14</sup> Note that these searches include both discretionary and non-discretionary searches. Non-discretionary searches are searches which are required by MCSO policy. Non-discretionary searches include searches incident to arrest, inventory searches for vehicle tows, and consent searches for courtesy rides. Discretionary searches occur when a deputy has reason to search a person or vehicle during consensual or investigative contact, but is not required by MCSO policy. Discretionary searches may include Terry Frisk, Protective Sweep, and Consent Search.

**Table 2b: Number and Percent of ETSI Use by District and Type (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)**

District	Language		Search		Technical	
	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops
1	49	2.62%	121	6.47%	206	11.01%
2	151	4.22%	135	3.78%	364	10.18%
3	60	2.19%	70	2.55%	189	6.89%
4	27	1.12%	28	1.16%	111	4.60%
5	114	3.01%	86	2.27%	323	8.52%
7	41	0.97%	61	1.44%	197	4.65%
MCSO	442	2.37%	501	2.69%	1,390	7.46%

In Table 2c below, we identify delays caused by vehicle tows, training stops, and other documented delays that cannot be readily captured by the other ETSI indicators. Delays for vehicle tows were most common in Districts 1 and 2. District 1 had 85 vehicle tows which accounted for 4.54 percent of District 1 traffic stops. In District 2, 128 traffic stops involved the tow of a vehicle (3.58% of District 2 traffic stops). In contrast District 4 had the fewest (N = 15) and lowest proportion (0.62%) of stops with vehicle tows compared to all other Districts. MCSO made vehicle tows (N = 371) during 2 percent of traffic stops conducted in 2023.

Delays from training were most common in District 2 where 427 stops involved training. This accounted for 11.95 percent of traffic stops in District 2. District 7 had the fewest number of training stops with 18 stops involving delays related to training (0.42% of stops). Overall, 5.68 percent of MCSO traffic stops involved training.

**Table 2c: Number and Percent of ETSI Use by District and Type (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)**

District	Tow		Training		Other Delay	
	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops	N ETSI	Percent of All Stops
1	85	4.54%	171	9.14%	218	11.65%
2	128	3.58%	427	11.95%	235	6.58%
3	44	1.60%	157	5.72%	155	5.65%
4	15	0.62%	221	9.16%	106	4.39%
5	49	1.29%	64	1.69%	303	7.99%
7	50	1.18%	18	0.42%	257	6.06%
MCSO	371	1.99%	1,058	5.68%	1,274	6.84%

Finally, MCSO deputies selected the Other Delay ETSI during 6.84 percent of traffic stops. District

1 used this ETSI at the highest rate (11.65%) when compared to other districts, While in District 4 deputies selected this ETSI during only 4.39 percent of stops. Note that when deputies select the Other Delay ETSI, they are prompted in the VSCF to identify the delay in the comment field in the VSCF. An analysis of these comments is available in the “Other Delays ETSI Comments” section below.

## Use of ETSIs by Race/Ethnicity

Tables 3a-3b provide the overall use of ETSIs by race/ethnicity for all stops during the study period. Fischer’s Exact Test probability values are provided for differences in ETSI use for Hispanic, Black, and Minority drivers, with White drivers as the comparison group. The Exact Test is used to determine the empirical association between categorical variables (e.g., race/ethnicity and ETSI use). Differences in ETSI use are notable for each ETSI type at the  $p < 0.05$  level.<sup>15</sup>

Statistically significant differences in arrest, search, and all other ETSIs used were present for all but one comparison. There was no statistically significant difference between Black and White drivers when the stop involved training.

White drivers were arrested during 4.36 percent of stops whereas Black, Hispanic, and Minority drivers were arrested at rates above 7 percent. Black drivers were arrested during 7.69 percent of stops; Hispanic drivers were arrested during 7.37 percent of stops; and Minority drivers as a group were arrested during 7.31 percent of stops.

Black, Hispanic, and Minority drivers experienced delays related to driving documentation at about double the rate of White drivers. White drivers experienced delays due to driving documentation issues during 18.71 percent of stops. In contrast, Black drivers experienced driving documentation delay during 37.82 percent of Stops. Hispanic drivers experienced delays associated with driving documentation issues during 35.61 percent of MCSO traffic stops. Finally, Minority drivers, as a group, experienced delays with driving documentation issues during 34.61 percent of traffic stops.

Stops with DUI investigations occurred during 1.45 percent of stops of White drivers. In contrast, 2.37 percent of traffic stops of Black drivers involved a DUI investigation. Hispanic drivers experienced a DUI investigation during 2.90 percent of the time. Finally, Minority drivers, as a group, experienced delays associated with DUI investigations during 2.73 percent of traffic stops.

Hispanic drivers were impacted by language barriers more than any other racial/ethnic group. While only 16 drivers (0.1%) White drivers experienced delays due to a language barrier, 379 traffic stops of Hispanic drivers (8.09% of stops) were delayed due to language barriers. Language

---

<sup>15</sup>Reported p-values can be interpreted as the probability there is a relationship between race/ethnicity and ETSI use when no relationship exists. P-values do not demonstrate that the differences in ETSI use are caused by the race/ethnicity of the driver, only that the observed difference are greater than chance.

barriers occurred during 12 stops of Black drivers (0.77%). Minority drivers as a group experienced delays due to language barriers during 6.08 percent of stops.

Delays associated with searches differed for all groups when compared to White drivers. White drivers experienced searches during 1.38 percent of traffic stops. In contrast, Black drivers experienced searches during 3.14 percent of traffic stops, While Hispanic drivers experienced searches during 5.68 percent of traffic stops. Finally, Minority drivers, as a group, experienced delays associated with searches during 4.87 percent of traffic stops.

Delays associated with technical issues during traffic stops impacted all racial/ethnic groups and there were statistically significant differences between Black, Hispanic, and Minority drivers when compared to White drivers. White drivers were delayed by technical issues during 775 traffic stops accounting for 6.66 percent of traffic stops of White drivers. Black drivers were delayed for technical issues during 8.78% of traffic stops. Hispanic drivers experienced delays associated with technical issues during 8.97 percent of their traffic stops. Finally, Minority drivers as a group experienced delays from technical issues during 8.78 percent of stops.

Except for custodial arrests, vehicle tows extend traffic stops well beyond the “typical stop.” White drivers experienced a vehicle tow during 0.77 percent of their traffic stops (N = 90). Black driver vehicle tows occurred during 2.24 percent of stops (N = 35), while Hispanic drivers had the highest rate of vehicle tows with 4.87 percent of Hispanic stops involving a vehicle being towed (N = 228).

This research found no statistically significant difference in stops involving training between Black and White drivers. In contrast, we found statistically significant differences in delays caused by training between White and Hispanic and White and Minority drivers, White drivers experienced delays associated with training during 5.06 percent of traffic stops. Training stops were identified during 6.94 percent of Hispanic stops and 6.70% of stops of all Minority drivers.

Finally, other delays documented during traffic stops indicated statistically significant differences between all racial/ethnic groups when compared to White drivers. Deputies documented that White drivers were delayed for other issues during 5.47 percent of stops. In contrast, Black drivers were delayed during stops for other issues during 10.45 percent of stops. Hispanic drivers were delayed for other issues during 8.82 percent of traffic stops while Minority drivers, as a group, were delayed during 8.95% of stops. Discussion of the other issues ETSI is provided in greater depth in the “Other Delays ETSI Comments” section below.

**Table 3a:** Frequency and percent use of ETSIs (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)

ETSI Type	Race/Ethnicity	Number of Stops	N ETSI	Percent ETSI By Race	Fisher’s Exact p-value
All ETSIs	Black	1,560	813	52.12%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	2,456	52.46%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	3,583	51.16%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	3,750	32.25%	–

**Table 3b:** Frequency and percent use of ETSIs (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)

ETSI Type	Race/Ethnicity	Number of Stops	N ETSI Within Type	Percent ETSI By Race	Fisher's Exact p-value
Arrest	Black	1,560	120	7.69%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	345	7.37%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	512	7.31%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	507	4.36%	–
Driving Documentation	Black	1,560	590	37.82%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	1,656	35.37%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	2,424	34.61%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	2,176	18.71%	–
DUI	Black	1,560	37	2.37%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	136	2.90%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	191	2.73%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	169	1.45%	–
Language	Black	1,560	12	0.77%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	379	8.09%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	426	6.08%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	16	0.14%	–
Search	Black	1,560	49	3.14%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	266	5.68%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	341	4.87%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	160	1.38%	–
Technical	Black	1,560	137	8.78%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	420	8.97%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	615	8.78%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	775	6.66%	–
Tow	Black	1,560	35	2.22%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	228	4.93%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	281	4.06%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	90	0.80%	–
Training	Black	1,560	95	6.09%	0.09
	Hispanic	4,682	325	6.94%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	469	6.70%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	589	5.06%	–
Other	Black	1,560	162	10.38%	<0.01*
	Hispanic	4,682	418	8.93%	<0.01*
	Minority	7,004	630	8.99%	<0.01*
	White	11,629	644	5.54%	–

\* $p < 0.05$



## ETSI Descriptive Statistics

In the section below, we identify ETSI use by type of ETSI and report summary statistics for stop length that include the minimum and maximum length of stop observed for stops with each ETSI type, median stop length, the mean and standard deviations for each ETSI and, as a measure of skewness, we provide the percent of cases whose stop lengths are above the mean.

Because multiple ETSIs may be selected during any given stop, we provide analyses of stop length when the ETSI is selected but other ETSIs may also be selected (e.g., ETSIs are not mutually exclusive) in Table 4 below. In contrast, we provide summary statistics for stop length when only one ETSI was selected on the VSCF form (e.g., ETSIs are mutually exclusive) in Table 5.

Following our analyses of individual ETSIs we include seven tables that provide summary statistics for stops with multiple ETSIs selected. Table 6 identifies all combinations in the data where only two ETSIs were selected by a deputy and Table 7 identifies stops with three ETSIs selected (and so forth). The most ETSIs selected for all MCSO traffic stops in 2023 were seven, whose combinations and summary statistics are available at the bottom of Table 7.

In Table 4 below we provide descriptive statistics for stop length of stops with all ETSIs, whether or not another ETSIs was indicated during a stop. Summary statistics for stop length for stops without any ETSI are provided for comparison. The average stop length for non-ETSI stops was 11.31 minutes. In comparison, the average stop length when any ETSI was selected (N = 7,332) was 25.17 minutes. Delays associated with driving documentation issues had an average length of stop over twice that of non-ETSI stops, with an average of 25.49 minutes. Stops with DUI investigations, Searches and Vehicle tow had the longest average stop lengths with each exceeding, on average, one and a half hours.

**Table 4:** Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length (in minutes; ETSI use not mutually exclusive)

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,301	2	154	11.00	11.31	3.99	38.72%
Any ETSI Used	7,332	1	458	17.00	25.17	33.35	84.17%
Arrest	1,019	6	458	21.00	56.30	72.71	27.09%
Driving Documentation	4,600	1	439	17.00	25.49	31.24	23.54%
DUI	360	5	458	43.50	90.99	89.07	40.56%
Language Barrier	442	7	442	22.00	38.63	48.84	24.66%
Search	501	6	458	80.00	109.18	79.83	39.12%
Technical Issue	1,390	5	298	17.00	21.61	20.29	28.78%
Tow	371	6	458	78.00	109.93	79.37	34.77%
Training	1,058	6	371	17.00	22.72	27.32	24.67%
Other Delay	1,273	1	458	20.00	33.06	42.82	25.61%

In Table 5 below we provide descriptive statistics for stop length of stops with only one ETSI selected. Summary statistics for stop length for stops without any ETSI are provided for comparison. There were a total of 4,947 traffic stops when only one ETSI was used. The average stop length for non-ETSI stops was 11.32 minutes. Delays associated with driving documentation issues alone had an average length of stop about four minutes longer than stops without any ETSIs (16.60 minutes). Stops with a vehicle tow alone had the longest average stop length of 51.57 minutes while stops with searches averaged nearly 40 minutes.

**Table 5:** Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length (ETSIs use is mutually exclusive)

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,301	2	154	11.00	11.31	3.99	38.72%
All Stops with One ETSI	4,947	2	234	15.00	16.53	8.95	37.74%
Arrest	353	7	180	13.00	14.37	11.12	30.59%
Driving Documentation	2,675	5	81	15.00	16.60	6.63	39.55%
DUI	92	5	58	19.00	19.39	8.39	46.74%
Language Barrier	119	8	44	15.00	16.56	5.82	44.54%
Search	6	11	104	24.50	39.83	37.04	33.33%
Technical Issue	670	5	80	15.00	15.96	6.83	44.03%
Tow	7	35	67	52.00	51.57	10.58	57.14%
Training	565	6	45	15.00	15.53	5.00	42.83%
Other Delay	460	2	234	14.00	18.43	18.40	28.34%

In Table 6 below, we provide summary statistics for stop length for stops which include only two ETSIs. All combinations of two ETSIs that occurred in the data are provided in Table 6. Three combinations (DUI-Tow, Technical-Tow, and Tow-Training) did not occur in the data and were thus excluded from this table. Summary statistics for stops without any ETSI selected are provided for comparison. There were 1,571 stops where two ETSIs were selected (8.43% of all 2023 traffic stops) and these stops averaged 24.15 minutes.

The most common combination of two ETSIs selected was for Driving Documentation and Technical Other issues. This combination occurred during 356 stops (4.98% of stops with ETSIs, and 1.94% of all stops). On average, stops with delays associated with driving documentation and other delays lasted about 24.10 minutes. Other common combinations of two ETSIs that were common in the data included driving documentation and training, arrests with driving documentation issues, driving documentation issues and language barriers, and technical issues with training. Traffic stops with the longest average stop lengths that included only two ETSIs were stops with DUI investigations and searches. There were 7 stops with this combination of ETSIs with an average stop length of 89.14 minutes.

**Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Two ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Two ETSIs	1,571	1	226	20.00	24.15	18.24	31.19%
Arrest, Driving Docs	174	11	182	19.00	22.10	16.40	35.63%
Arrest: DUI	18	15	203	29.50	63.28	64.04	22.22%
Arrest; Language	8	13	27	22.50	21.63	5.58	50.00%
Arrest; Search	16	10	176	29.50	57.44	59.13	25.00%
Arrest; Technical	14	11	32	18.50	18.64	6.15	50.00%
Arrest; Tow	1	55	55	-	55.00	-	-
Arrest; Training	10	13	32	19.50	19.70	6.13	50.00%
Arrest; Other	24	11	160	20.50	28.54	31.02	20.83%
Driving Docs; DUI	37	12	64	23.00	25.65	11.05	40.54%
Driving Docs; Language	124	9	66	22.50	25.28	10.27	50.00%
Driving Docs; Search	8	24	64	31.50	37.88	14.59	37.50%
Driving Docs; Technical	331	8	68	18.00	20.25	8.22	37.16%
Driving Docs; Tow	16	36	108	56.00	58.13	18.30	37.50%
Driving Docs; Training	219	8	47	18.00	19.47	7.13	41.55%
Driving Docs; Other	356	1	134	20.50	24.10	14.17	35.11%
DUI; Language	3	16	24	20.00	20.00	4.00	33.33%
DUI; Search	7	33	226	40.00	89.14	74.39	42.86%
DUI; Technical	6	15	29	20.00	20.50	4.85	33.33%
DUI; Training	3	12	44	41.00	32.33	17.67	66.66%
DUI; Other	6	19	55	26.00	29.00	13.05	16.67%
Language; Search	1	29	29	-	29.00	-	-
Language; Technical	9	11	42	15.00	19.89	9.70	44.44%
Language; Tow	1	60	60	-	60.00	-	-
Language; Training	11	12	31	20.00	21.82	7.40	45.45%
Language; Other	9	7	58	20.00	21.56	14.55	33.33%
Search; Technical	1	19	19	-	19.00	-	-
Search; Tow	9	29	166	56.00	70.11	41.97	44.44%
Search; Training	1	18	18	-	18.00	-	-
Search; Other	8	12	39	28.50	39.50	28.77	37.50%
Technical; Training	74	8	61	19.00	20.59	7.69	37.84%
Technical; Other	52	9	78	17.00	20.44	11.38	53.85%
Tow; Other	1	43	43	-	43.00	-	-
Training; Other	13	6	35	16.00	17.85	8.05	30.77%

In Tables 7a-7b below, we present descriptive statistics for stops that included three ETSIs. There were a total of 476 traffic stops when deputies selected three indicators (2.55% of 2023 traffic stops). All combinations of three ETSIs selected in VSCFs are provided in the table. We include descriptive statistics for stops with no ETSIs selected for comparison. The most common stop with three types of delays were stops with driving documentation issues, technical issues, and other delays (N = 67). The average stop length for these stops was 25.81 minutes. Traffic stops with three ETSIs which had the longest average stop length were stops with Arrest, DUI, and Search selected. Twenty-five stops met this criterion and averaged 158.33 minutes. Other notable combinations of ETSIs included stops with an arrest, driving documentation issues, and other delays (N = 45; average stop length of 43.62 minutes), stops with driving documentation issues, language barriers, and other delays (N = 25; average stop length of 32.16 minutes), and stops with driving documentation issues, technical issues, and training (N = 42; average stop length of 26.55 minutes).

**Table 7a:** Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Three ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Three ETSIs	476	9	340	20.00	51.94	49.94	32.56
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI	6	18	101	65.50	62.00	30.32	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language	2	12	14	13.00	13.00	1.41	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search	13	23	205	68.00	85.92	62.91	46.15%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Technical	19	12	56	30.00	30.84	14.53	47.37%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Tow	4	43	245	64.00	104.00	94.87	25.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Training	12	18	68	29.50	32.75	14.35	33.33%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Other	45	11	248	29.00	43.62	47.08	22.22%
Arrest; DUI; Search	27	19	340	170.00	158.33	73.55	59.26%
Arrest; DUI; Technical	1	100	100	-	100.00	-	-
Arrest; Search; Tow	13	38	267	88.00	116.92	81.44	30.77%
Arrest; Search; Training	2	69	120	94.50	94.50	30.06	50.00%
Arrest; Search; Other	18	21	298	45.50	82.17	71.84	33.33%
Arrest; Technical; Training	2	19	24	21.50	21.50	3.54	50.00%
Arrest; Technical; Other	1	18	18	-	18.00	-	-
Arrest; Tow; Training	1	55	55	-	55.00	-	-
Arrest; Tow; Other	1	70	70	-	70.00	-	-
Arrest; Training; Other	1	14	14	-	14.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Language	2	21	57	39.00	39.00	25.46	50.00%
Driving Docs; DUI; Search	2	58	83	70.50	70.50	17.68	50.00%
Driving Docs; DUI; Technical	7	18	31	26.00	24.43	5.91	57.14%

**Table 7b: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Three ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Three ETSIs	476	9	340	20.00	51.94	49.94	32.56
Driving Docs; DUI; Tow	1	47	47	-	47.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Other	3	23	57	29.00	36.33	18.15	33.33%
Driving Docs; Language; Search	2	84	100	92.00	92.00	11.31	50.00%
Driving Docs; Language; Technical	23	12	43	23.00	23.83	7.44	47.83%
Driving Docs; Language; Tow	5	49	78	59.00	59.40	11.46	40.00%
Driving Docs; Language; Training	13	13	41	27.00	27.31	8.43	46.15%
Driving Docs; Language; Other	25	12	76	24.00	32.16	19.56	28.00%
Driving Docs; Search; Tow	64	24	239	56.50	63.42	29.63	40.63%
Driving Docs; Search; Other	9	24	138	55.00	56.89	33.68	33.33%
Driving Docs; Technical; Tow	1	62	62	-	62.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Technical; Training	42	12	61	23.50	26.55	11.05	38.10%
Driving Docs; Technical; Other	67	9	85	23.00	25.81	13.39	40.30%
Driving Docs; Tow; Training	1	34	34	-	23.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Tow; Other	8	28	146	76.00	84.63	35.62	37.50%
Driving Docs; Training; Other	22	15	73	29.00	34.55	16.26	31.82%
DUI; Language; Other	1	19	19	-	19.00	-	-
DUI; Search; Technical	1	34	34	-	34.00	-	-
Language; Search; Tow	2	39	59	49.00	49.00	14.14	50.00%
Language; Technical; Other	1	13	13	-	13.00	-	-
Technical; Training; Other	4	11	57	30.50	32.25	21.47	50.00%
Search; Tow; Other	2	42	69	55.50	55.50	19.09	50.00%

In Tables 8a and 8b below, we present descriptive statistics for stops that included four ETSIs. There were a total of 226 traffic stops when deputies selected four indicators (1.21% of 2023 traffic stops). All combinations of four ETSIs selected in VSCFs are provided in the table. The average stop length for stops where four ETSI indicators were selected in the VSCF was 102.90 minutes, with the longest stop lasting 397 minutes. The most common stop when four indicators were employed involved delays from an arrest, a DUI investigation, a search, and a tow. These four indicators are common when a DUI arrest is processed. Other common combinations of four indicators included stops with delays for arrests, driving documentation, searches and vehicle tows (N = 27; average stop length of 103.37 minutes), stops with arrests, driving documentation, searches, and other delays (N = 24; average stop length of 96.04 minutes), and stops with delays associated with driving documentation, language barriers, searches, and vehicle tows (N = 29; average stop length of 81.10 minutes). There was a total of eighteen stops where deputies indicated four different ETSI and for which no other stops occurred with these combinations of circumstances indicated on the VSCF.

**Table 8a: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Four ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Four ETSIs	226	9	397	80.50	102.90	69.19	40.27
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search	15	73	302	141.00	154.40	59.44	26.67%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Training	1	54	54	-	54.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Other	1	80	80	-	80.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Technical	2	18	83	50.5	50.5	45.96	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Training	1	52	52	52.00	52.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Other	1	32	32	-	32.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Technical	2	47	244	145.50	145.50	139.30	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Training	1	35	35	-	35.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Tow	27	38	341	86.00	103.37	65.55	37.04%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Other	24	9	387	63.00	96.04	84.19	37.50%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Technical; Training	4	16	66	40.50	40.75	20.42	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Technical; Other	7	16	68	39.00	42.43	17.92	28.57%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Training; Other	4	36	49	42.00	42.25	5.38	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Tow; Other	2	47	81	64.00	64.00	24.04	50.00%
Arrest; DUI; Search; Technical	1	98	98	-	98.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Search; Training	2	147	166	156.50	156.50	13.44	50.00%
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tow	46	66	318	163.50	159.98	53.83	52.17%
Arrest; DUI; Search; Other	3	119	136	121.00	125.33	9.29	33.33%
Arrest; Search; Technical; Tow	2	55	123	89.00	89.00	48.08	50.00%
Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Technical	2	25	53	39.00	39.00	19.80	50.00%



**Table 8b: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Four ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Four ETSIs	226	9	397	80.50	102.90	69.19	40.27%
Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Other	3	20	64	56.00	46.67	23.44	33.33%
Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Tow	1	305	305	-	305.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Other	1	65	65	-	65.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Technical; Other	1	53	53	-	53.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Train; Other	1	20	20	-	20.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Tow; Other	1	68	68	-	68.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Tow	29	37	184	74.00	81.10	34.38	31.03%
Driving Docs; Language; Technical; Tow	1	81	81	-	81.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Language; Technical; Other	2	22	28	25.00	25.00	4.24	50.00%
Driving Docs; Language; Tow; Other	1	108	108	-	108.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Language; Train; Other	2	29	51	40.00	40.00	15.56	50.00%
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow	2	30	51	40.50	40.50	14.85	50.00%
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Training	1	47	47	-	47.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Other	1	63	63	-	63.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Training; Tow	7	47	87	73.00	70.29	13.57	57.14%
Driving Docs; Search; Training; Other	1	53	53	-	53.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Tow; Other	14	38	397	83.50	113.07	92.88	35.71%
Driving Docs; Technical; Training; Other	7	18	67	32.00	36.29	15.96	42.85%
Language; Search; Train; Tow	1	44	44	-	44.00	-	-
Search; Technical; Tow; Other	1	100	100	-	100.00	-	-

In Table 9 below, we present descriptive statistics for stop length for traffic stops that included five ETSIs. The number of stops when deputies select five indicators is small relative to other ETSI stops. There were only 83 stops with five ETSIs selected in the VSCF. This accounted for 0.45 percent of all traffic stops made by MCSO deputies in 2023. The average length of stop when five indicators were selected was 144.49 minutes with the longest stop lasting 458 minutes. The most common stop when five indicators were selected included stops with an arrest, driving documentation issues, DUI investigations, searches, and vehicle tows. These nineteen stops lasted an average of 189.84 minutes. Another common stop with five indicators included stops with arrests, driving documentation issues, searches, vehicle tows, and other delays. There were fifteen stops with this criterion and lasted, on average 126.07 minutes.

**Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Five ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Five ETSIs	83	6	458	118.00	144.49	99.31	37.35%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Tow	19	59	411	182.00	189.84	89.98	42.11%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Other	1	141	141	-	141.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Technical; Other	1	94	94	-	94.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Search; Tow	3	93	247	239.00	193.00	86.69	66.66%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Search; Other	1	93	93	-	93.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Technical; Other	1	42	42	-	42.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow	1	274	274	-	274.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Train	1	66	66	-	66.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Tow; Train	2	72	87	79.50	79.50	10.61	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Tow; Other	15	39	439	89.00	126.07	101.16	33.33%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Train; Other	1	62	62	-	62.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Technical; Training; Other	1	30	30	-	30.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Language; Search; Tow	5	137	374	190.00	222.40	93.00	40.00%
Arrest; DUI; Language; Search; Other	1	140	140	-	140.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tech; Tow	3	109	298	133.00	180.00	102.89	33.33%
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tech; Other	1	169	169	-	169.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tow; Train	3	135	294	233.00	220.67	80.21	66.66%
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tow; Other	3	178	458	247.00	294.33	145.88	33.33%
Arrest; Language; Search; Tow; Other	1	267	267	-	267.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Search; Tow	1	60	60	-	60.00	-	-
Driving Docs; DUI; Technical; Training; Other	1	28	28	-	28.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Technical; Tow	2	65	80	72.50	72.50	10.61	50.00%
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Tow; Training	2	66	93	79.50	79.50	19.09	50.00%
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Tow; Other	6	42	182	74.00	89.00	48.63	33.33%
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow; Training	1	83	83	-	83.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow; Other	2	54	118	86.00	86.00	45.25	50.00
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Training; Other	1	65	65	-	65.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Tow; Training; Other	3	29	64	52.00	48.33	17.79	66.66%

In Table 10 below, we present descriptive statistics for stop length for traffic stops that included six ETSIs. There were 20 traffic stops in 2023 when deputies indicated five different ETSIs in the VSCF. The average length of stop for these stops was 174.75 minutes. Unlike other combinations of ETSIs discussed above, most combinations of six ETSIs are unique. There were four combinations of six ETSIs which occurred multiple times in the data. These included stops with arrests, driving documentation issues, DUI investigations, language barriers, searches, and vehicle tows (N = 3; with an average length of stop of 252 minutes), stops with arrests, driving

documentation issues, DUI investigations, searches, vehicle tows, and training (N = 3; with an average length of stop of 231.33 minutes), stops with arrests, driving documentation issues, DUI investigations, and other delays (N = 3; with an average length of stop of 167 minutes), and stops with driving documentation issues, language barriers, searches, technical issues, vehicle tows and other delays (N = 3; with an average length of stop of 65 minutes). The remaining eight stops had unique combinations of ETSIs and did not otherwise occur during traffic stops made in 2023.

**Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Six ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF**

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Six ETSIs	20	47	417	169.50	174.75	108.37	40.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Search; Tow	3	166	417	173.00	252.00	142.94	33.33%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Search; Other	1	260	260	-	260.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Tow; Train	3	173	263	258.00	231.33	50.58	66.66%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Tow; Other	3	84	293	124.00	167.00	110.94	33.33%
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow; Other	1	101	101	-	101.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Training; Other	1	49	49	-	49.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Search; Tow; Training; Other	1	371	371	-	371.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Language; Search; Tow; Other	1	183	183	-	183.00	-	-
Arrest; DUI; Search; Tow; Train; Other	1	220	220	-	220.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Technical; Tow; Other	3	62	70	63.00	65.00	4.36	33.33%
Driving Docs; Language; Search; Tow; Training; Other	1	118	118	-	118.00	-	-
Driving Docs; Search; Technical; Tow; Training	1	47	47	-	47.00	-	-

Finally, in Tables 11a and 11b we present descriptive statistics for stop length for traffic stops that included seven ETSIs. There were only six stops in 2023 when deputies indicated seven different ETSIs. The average length of stop for these stops was 156.67 minutes. There were two stops where a deputy selected eight ETSIs. Information on this stop is available at the bottom of Table 11.

**Table 11a:** Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Seven ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF

Type of Stop	N	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percent Above Mean
No ETSI	11,180	2	154	11.00	11.32	4.00	38.78%
All Stops with Seven ETSIs	6	51	351	129.50	156.67	108.22	33.33%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Search; Tow; Train	1	351	351	-	351.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Language; Search; Tow; Other	1	114	114	-	114.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Technical; Tow; Train	2	145	199	172.00	172.00	38.18	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Docs; DUI; Search; Tow; Train; Other	1	51	51	-	51.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Docs; Language; Search; Technical; Tow; Other	1	275	275	-	275.00	-	-

**Table 11b:** Descriptive Statistics for Stop Length when Eight ETSIs were Indicated in the VSCF

All Stops with Eight ETSIs	2	125	275	200.00	200.00	106.07	50.00%
Arrest; Driving Documentation; DUI; Language; Search; Technical; Train; Tow;	1	125	125	-	125.00	-	-
Arrest; Driving Documentation; DUI; Language; Search; Technical; Tow; Other	1	275	275	-	275	-	-

## Modeling Stop Length from ETSIs

After tabulating the ETSIs and providing stop lengths for each combination of ETSIs observed in the data, MCSO researchers wished to identify the overall impact on stop length for each type of delay indicated by the ETSI used, independent of other ETSIs. In Table 12 below we provide two regression equations identifying the impact of delays indicated by ETSIs, searches, and arrests. In the first model, we use the ETSIs described and used throughout this report (Arrest, Driving Documentation Issues, DUI Investigations, Language, Search, Technical Issues, Vehicle Tows, Training, and Other Delay). In this model, the Constant can be interpreted as the stop length, in minutes, for traffic stops where no ETSI, search, or arrest, was indicated in the VSCF. In this case stops without documented delays lasted about 11 minutes. All variables in this model were statistically significant. The coefficients for each ETSI can be interpreted as the average number of minutes added to the Constant, when these delays occurred. Some notable patterns in Model 1 are that all arrests combined contribute almost 15 minutes to traffic stops, on average, when holding other ETSI indicators constant. Vehicle Tows have the largest impact, according to this model, adding nearly 51 minutes to a traffic stop, absent other delays. The variables used in Model 1 explained about 60 percent ( $R^2 = 0.599$ ) of the variation in stop length for MCSO traffic stops in 2023.

**Table 12:** Regression Equations Predicting Stop Length from ETSI Indicators

ETSI Predictors	Model 1	Model 2
	B (SE)	B (SE)
All Arrests	14.71* (0.50)	-
Cite & Release/No Custodial Arrest	-	4.18* (0.51)
Custodial Arrest	-	70.62* (1.29)
Driving Documentation	4.64* (0.25)	4.88* (0.24)
DUI	37.69* (0.81)	40.18* (0.76)
Language	6.41* (0.69)	6.75* (0.65)
Search	50.91* (1.01)	33.87* (1.03)
Technical Issue	3.86* (0.39)	3.85* (0.37)
Tow	31.44* (1.09)	39.20* (1.05)
Training	4.43* (0.45)	4.50* (0.42)
Other Delay	7.85* (0.42)	6.93* (0.40)
Constant (No ETSI)	10.86* (0.13)	11.18* (0.12)
N	18,632	18,632
F	3091.63*	3302.03*
R <sup>2</sup>	0.599	0.639

\* $p < 0.05$

Because the coefficient for arrests was low in Model 1, we also modeled stop length as a function of ETSIs and arrests disaggregated as custodial arrests and cite and release/non-custodial arrests.<sup>16</sup> Like Model 1, all predictors used in Model 2 were statistically significant. Based on Model 2, we found that cite and release/non-custodial arrests add about four minutes to a traffic stop, when holding other predictors constant and that custodial arrests add an average of almost 71 minutes to a traffic stop. The variables used in Model 2 explain nearly 64 percent of variation in stop length.

As discussed above, we recognize that the traffic stop delays documented in the VSCF are often related to one another and likely interact in different ways.<sup>17</sup> For example, in comparing these two models the reader can observe the impact of disaggregating the arrest type has on effect of vehicle tows on stop length. As the goal of the analysis presented in Table 12 was to model the impact of the ETSI-documented delays on stop length, independent of one another, we did not explore how different delays interact with each other and acknowledge that interactions among certain events during traffic stops play an important role in predicting how long a traffic stop might last.

---

<sup>16</sup>Custodial arrests comprised 16.80% (N = 149) of arrests during traffic stops in 2023 while cite and release/non-custodial arrests accounted for 83.20% (N = 738) of arrests during traffic stops in 2023.

<sup>17</sup>Post-hoc examination of variance inflation factors found no predictors with VIF scores above 3.0 in either Model 1 or Model 2.

## Contact Conclusion and Extended Stop Indicator Use

In this section we identify the contact conclusion of citations and warnings for the stops with ETSIs documented in the VSCF. For comparison, we include contact conclusion information for stops where no ETSI was indicated. Table 13 provides stop outcome (citation, warning, incidental contact) rates for stops with ETSIs (multiple ETSI may be selected for these stops). Several patterns in the relationships between stop outcomes and ETSIs are notable. First, the difference in citation rates between stops without any ETSI and stops with any ETSI was 11.82 percent. Using an independent samples t-test for the difference in proportions, we determined the difference to be statistically significant ( $t = 15.64, p < 0.05$ ).<sup>18</sup>

**Table 13:** Percent Distribution of Contact Conclusion for ETSI stops (ETSI use not mutually exclusive)<sup>19</sup>

Contact Conclusion	N Stops	N Citation	Percent Citation	N Warning	Percent Warning	N Incidental Contact	Percent Incidental Contact
No ETSI	11,301	5,395	47.74%	5,850	51.77%	52	0.46%
Any ETSI	7,332	4,344	59.25%	2,929	39.95%	58	0.79%
Arrest	1,019	989	97.06%	30	2.94%	0	0.00%
Driving Docs	4,600	2,863	62.24%	1,1,707	37.11%	29	0.63%
DUI	360	238	66.11%	122	33.89%	9	2.61%
Language	442	243	54.98%	197	44.57%	2	0.45%
Search	501	449	89.62%	50	9.98%	2	0.40%
Technical	1,390	660	47.48%	725	52.16%	5	0.37%
Tow	371	357	96.23%	12	3.23%	2	0.54%
Training	1,058	521	49.24%	532	50.28%	5	0.47%
Other Issue	1,274	807	63.34%	433	33.99%	33	2.59%

The relationship between stop outcomes and ETSIs largely reflect the circumstances of the stop and MCSO would expect that certain ETSIs be unrelated to citation/warning outcomes while other ETSIs are directly related to citations/warnings. For example, when an arrest was made, 97.06 percent of drivers were issued citations and citations for criminal driving offenses and arrests are concurrent. For custodial arrests, MCSO policy dictates that drivers are searched prior to being

<sup>18</sup>Because this difference was so large, MCSO conducted t-tests for stops with each ETSI compared to stops without that ETSI selected. Note that these estimates do not account for stops with multiple ETSIs and are therefore suggestive of relationships between ETSIs and citations, absent additional controls. Results of t-tests for differences in proportions were as follows (positive t-values indicate that stops with that ETSI had a higher citation rates than stops without that ETSI): Arrests ( $t = 30.03, p < 0.05$ ); Driving Documentation Issues ( $t = 16.74, p < 0.05$ ); DUI investigations ( $t = 6.78, p < 0.05$ ), Language Barrier ( $t = 2.99, p < 0.05$ ), Search ( $t = 18.36, p < 0.05$ ); Technical Issues ( $t = -0.23, p = 0.820$ ), Vehicle Tow ( $t = 18.44, p < 0.05$ ); Training ( $t = -0.93, p < 0.05$ ); Other Delay ( $t = 11.43, p < 0.05$ ).

<sup>19</sup>Field Interviews and Long Form contact conclusions are excluded from calculations made for this table.



placed in a patrol vehicle. For drivers who were arrested and issued warnings, 23 were arrested on warrants while the remaining ten drivers were arrested for DUIs (N = 5), aggravated assault (N = 1), and possession of dangerous drug (N = 1). In these cases, warnings for the initial traffic violations were issued.

Similarly, the high citation rate of 89.62 percent when a search occurred and the high citation rate of 96.23 percent when a tow occurred are, in part, a result of ARS 28-3511A.1.a-c which dictates a deputy shall tow the vehicle when a person’s driving privilege is revoked for any reason, the person has not ever been issued a driver’s license or permit issued by this state or any other jurisdiction, or the person is subject to ignition interlock device and is operating the vehicle without one. These violations are almost universally cited, and searches of vehicles are required when a tow occurs.

To illustrate how the ETSIs are related to one another we have produced a correlation matrix for the ETSIs used during traffic stops (Table 14) and included citations in this matrix. The strongest relationships among ETSIs, citations, and warnings were between DUI investigations and arrests ( $r = 0.270$ ); between searches and arrests ( $r = 0.392$ ); between vehicle tow and arrests ( $r = 0.258$ ); between citations and arrests ( $r = 0.215$ ), and conversely, between warnings and arrests ( $r = -0.215$ ); between DUI investigations and searches ( $r = 0.367$ ); between DUI investigations and vehicle tows ( $r = 0.262$ ); and between vehicle tows and searches ( $r = 0.732$ ).

**Table 14:** Correlations Among ETSIs and Citations<sup>20</sup>

	Arrest	Driving Docs	DUI	Language	Search	Technical	Tow	Training	Other Issue
Driving Docs	0.101	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
DUI	<b>0.270</b>	0.033	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Language	0.017	0.130	0.047	–	–	–	–	–	–
Search	<b>0.392</b>	0.145	<b>0.367</b>	0.127	–	–	–	–	–
Technical	-0.004	0.096	-0.003	0.022	-0.002	–	–	–	–
Tow	<b>0.258</b>	0.155	<b>0.262</b>	0.160	<b>0.732</b>	-0.001	–	–	–
Training	0.002	0.055	-0.001	0.012	0.021	0.057	0.020	–	–
Other Issue	0.096	0.170	0.021	0.047	0.134	0.053	0.079	-0.004	–
Citation	<b>0.215</b>	0.115	0.038	0.008	0.125	-0.028	0.126	-0.015	0.067

In Table 15 below we provide contact conclusion rates for stops with ETSIs when only one ETSI was selected. Unlike stops with multiple ETSI’s selected, citation rates for stops with only one ETSI selected are much lower than stops with No ETSI with two exceptions. For stops with only an arrest, the citation rate was 100 percent. Of these stops, 319 citations were for criminal speed. For Citations issued during these stops, other violations included criminal traffic violations such

<sup>20</sup>Excluded from analyses are stops with outcomes other than a citation or warning. Thus, correlations among ETSIs and warnings are the inverse of the correlation of the ETSI and a citation (e.g., the correlation between Arrest and Warning is -0.215).

as driving on a suspended license or reckless driving. Of these arrests, 350 were “cite and release/no custodial arrest” type arrests (99.15%). The citation rate when only the Vehicle Tow ETSI was selected (85.71%) was comparable to the citation rate for when the Vehicle Tow ETSI was selected on any stop, although there were only seven stops when Vehicle Tow was the only ETSI selected.

**Table 15:** Percent Distribution of Contact Conclusion for ETSI stops (ETSI use mutually exclusive)<sup>21</sup>

Contact Conclusion	N Stops	N Citation	Percent Citation	N Warning	Percent Warning	N Incidental Contact	Percent Incidental Contact
No ETSI	11,180	5,312	47.51%	5,814	45.29%	50	0.45%
Any One ETSI	4,948	2,701	54.59%	2,206	44.58%	41	0.83%
Arrest	353	353	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Driving Docs	2,675	1,534	57.35%	1,127	42.13%	14	0.52%
DUI	92	29	31.52%	63	70.59%	0	0.00%
Language	119	35	29.41%	84	70.59%	0	0.00%
Search	6	1	16.67%	5	83.33%	0	0.00%
Technical	670	263	39.25%	404	60.30%	3	0.45%
Tow	7	7	85.71%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%
Training	565	239	42.30%	324	57.34%	2	0.35%
Other Issue	461	241	52.28%	198	42.95%	22	4.77%

In the next section we address the question of how the Other Delay ETSI has been used by deputies followed by an analysis of agreement between deputy ETSI and traffic stop reviewers to determine if deputies have been using ETSI indicators appropriately.

<sup>21</sup>Field Interviews and Long Form contact conclusions are excluded from calculations made for this table.

## Other Issue ETSI Comments

In 2022 an ETSI was added to the VSCF form to capture delays in traffic stops that were not available with the existing ETSIs. When deputies select “Other Delay” in the VSCF form, they are prompted to document the circumstances of the delay. In 2023 there were 1,274 stops where deputies selected the Other Delay ETSI (6.84% of MCSO traffic stops). In most of these stops (N = 813, 63.81%) deputies also selected additional ETSI indicators. There were 461 stops where the only ETSI that was selected was Other Delay.

MCSO identified all stops for which the Other Delay ETSI was used and qualitatively coded the comments associated with these stops to determine the circumstance for which deputies considered the Other Delay as appropriate. As with the other ETSIs, traffic stops included circumstances where multiple delays occurred. This was a common theme in most of the stops where a deputy used the Other Delay ETSI. Comments indicated that delays associated with technology, arrests, searches, driving documentation, etc. would necessitate the use of existing ETSIs. Additionally, after coding the comments associated with the Other Delay ETSIs, identified multiple delays, not available in existing ETSIs, were common.

In Table 16 below, we have provided a tabulation of emergent categories that were apparent in the VSCF comments documenting the use of the Other Delay ETSI. Note that in addition to existing ETSI indicators, these multiple other delays associated within these different categories were documented in the VSCF comments. We discuss these categories and their contents below.

**Table 16:** Emergent Categories of Delays from Qualitative Reviews of Stops with Other Issue ETSIs, Categories not mutually exclusive

	N	Percent Other Delay Stops	Percent all ETSI Stops	Percent All Stops
Assisting Driver	37	2.83%	0.50%	0.20%
Communication/Education	183	13.98%	2.50%	0.98%
Complex Stop	57	4.35%	0.78%	0.31%
Commercial Vehicles	15	1.15%	0.20%	0.08%
Driver Pick-Up	17	1.30%	0.23%	0.09%
Dispatch Issue	38	2.90%	0.52%	0.20%
Firearm	31	2.37%	0.42%	0.17%
Investigation	22	1.68%	0.30%	0.12%
Manual Entry	134	10.24%	1.83%	0.72%
Multiple Vehicles	9	0.69%	0.12%	0.05%
Passenger Contact	29	2.22%	0.40%	0.16%
Physical/Mental Health	36	2.75%	0.49%	0.19%
Seized Plates	59	4.51%	0.80%	0.32%
Stop Process Issues	52	3.97%	0.71%	0.28%
Warrant	87	6.65%	1.19%	0.47%
No Issue Indicated	85	6.49%	1.16%	0.46%
Other Issue	100	7.64%	1.36%	0.54%

**Assisting Driver** delays occurred when deputies assisted drivers in a variety of circumstances. Common delays identified in this category included deputies providing directions for drivers and deputies assisting drivers with issues with their vehicles. For example, drivers who had been stopped for failing to display license plates often had temporary license plates in their vehicles. In these situations, deputies would assist drivers attaching license plates. Other examples included drivers who were stopped with no headlights. Deputies determined the drivers did not know how to turn the headlights on (because they were rental vehicles) and would help drivers with their equipment so they could drive away safely. There were several stops in this category where drivers' vehicles had stalled or would not restart after the stop. Deputies would remain with drivers for tow trucks or assist in jump starting vehicles. In some cases, drivers were disoriented because they were not from the Phoenix area and deputies would follow or lead them to their destinations.

**Communication/Education** delays occurred when drivers were especially talkative during the stop, asked multiple questions, or wished to discuss topics with the deputies unrelated to the traffic stop. In several cases, drivers were argumentative with deputies about citations or details about the traffic stop. For example, several drivers requested to see the radar/laser gun reading related to the speeding violation as evidence they were speeding, and in some cases, drivers requested to speak

to supervisors. Additional delays for communication occurred when drivers evidenced distress and deputies worked to de-escalate situations. Other delays for communication included difficulty communicating with high volume traffic nearby or when drivers had difficulty hearing for medical reasons. Finally, during several stops, vehicles were stopped because of an ATL and deputies took time speaking with the driver to confirm if the driver was associated with the ATL.

Educational conversations were also common when deputies used the Other Delay ETSI. During these circumstances, deputies often explained different laws and consequences related to specific violations such as driving after using marijuana, helmet requirements for minors on OHVs, the difference between civil and criminal speeding violations or drivers would have multiple questions about the citation or processes to address the citation (this was common with out-of-state drivers). In many cases, drivers asked for directions and deputies spent extra time explaining where to go. This was common for drivers of commercial delivery trucks and deputies would explain designated truck routes (these stops occurred in Guadalupe and Fountain Hills which have commercial truck routes and commercial truck restrictions in their respective cities).

**Complex Stops** occurred when comments indicated multiple delays that were often related to one another or occurred in fluid situations that clearly departed from what might be considered a “normal” traffic stop. Many of these delays could have been documented by existing ETSIs, however, this research identified the circumstances for complex stops documented in the VSCF comments as exceptional. An example below from the VSCF comments field illustrates how delays during a traffic stop are complex and how it can be difficult to identify exact extended stop indicators to document the delays:

On 11/2023 at about 1844 hours, I conducted a traffic stop on 2018 red Audi, Arizona plate# due to no lights to the rear of the vehicle on Litchfield Rd and SR 85 in Litchfield Park. I made contact with driver, as I spoke and observed her she seemed disoriented and confused. She was unable to provide her driver's license, vehicle insurance or vehicle registration when requested. Upon verification of information it was found, 's driver license status was cancelled due to a vision report requirement. told me she was emotionally distraught due to returning from a funeral in Yuma. She was on her way home when she made a wrong turn and became lost. I called Fire to conduct a medical evaluation on due to her confusion and disorientation. Once fire was on scene, could only answer one of five questions asked by fire responders. Fire stated seemed alert and she adamantly refused to be transported. I contacted and spoke with 's daughter who sent her daughter, to assist her grandmother. Once arrived on scene she did not have her driver's license on her. Upon verifying her information, it was found had a valid driver's license and an active warrant for her arrest. I did not act on the warrant after consulting with Sergeant as it was determined the main concern was to transport home safely.

Of the 57 stops identified as Complex Stops, many involved situations similar to the one above,

where existing ETSI options could not adequately capture the complexity of the situation. These stops often included medical issues, driving documentation issues, delays associated with warrants, children in vehicles, drug investigations, multiple persons in the vehicle, and/or contacting parents when the driver was a juvenile.

**Commercial Vehicle** stops occurred at a relatively low rate compared to the other categories that emerged from reviews of the VSCF comments. These stops occurred mainly in the Towns of Guadalupe and Fountain Hills. Both municipalities have local commercial transport laws which restrict or direct commercial traffic. When commercial vehicles were stopped, deputies often spent additional time identifying whether the vehicles were delivering to local businesses or to inform drivers of local ordinances governing commercial transport in the cities. In several cases, deputies assisted drivers with equipment issues with their vehicles.

**Driver Pick-Up** delays occurred when deputies would remain with drivers who would be arriving to take the driver or vehicle from the traffic stop. Circumstances common in this category of delay were minor drivers waiting for parents, or drivers who could not legally drive the vehicle away because of a suspended/revoked/cancelled license, no license, or suspended license plates. In several cases, drivers were not safe to drive vehicles away due to mental or physical health reasons.

**Dispatch Issues** were identified in the comments of 38 stops. Common delays associated with dispatch included miscommunications between the deputy and the dispatcher and when a deputy would require the dispatcher to identify information about the vehicle or driver. Additional dispatch delays occurred when radio traffic was restricted for priority events or when radio traffic was especially high. In both cases, deputies identified the need to wait for the radio to clear or the need to contact dispatch via other means. Finally, when reviewing VSCF comments, we noted that when deputies ended the traffic stop for priority calls, they would note that stop times on the traffic stop were not accurate because the traffic stop had not officially ended with dispatch.

**Firearm** delays occurred when deputies or drivers identified that a firearm was present in the vehicle or was on the driver's person. In these situations, deputies would take possession of the firearm, process the traffic stop, and return the firearm to the driver (and in one case 3 firearms to three passengers). One stop was coded into this category because knives were secured during the stop instead of a firearm.

**Investigation** delays occurred when deputies identified that the traffic stop involved investigation into other crimes unrelated to the traffic stop itself. These stops occurred during ATL traffic stops, or during stops that evolved into drug investigations, missing persons investigations, identification of minors in vehicles with open containers of alcohol, investigations of stolen vehicles and vehicles with fictitious plates, and when drivers were identified as suspects in open criminal cases.

**Manual Entry** delays were the second most common delay identified in VSCF comments when the Other Delay ETSI was selected. Manual entry delays occurred when deputies were required to enter driver and/or vehicle information into TraCS to process the traffic stop. Circumstances leading to manual entry included drivers not providing appropriate driving documentation (license,

registration, and/or proof of insurance) or when the driving documentation would not scan information into a deputy's computer, which was common with out-of-state licenses and registration.

**Multiple Vehicle** stops were not common in the VSCF comments. However, these stops included 2-4 vehicles stopped at the same time. In half of these cases the vehicles were OHV vehicles with drivers riding in groups with violations associated with each of the drivers. In these situations, deputies were required to create contact receipts (citations/warnings/incidental contact) for each driver.

**Passenger Contact** delays were delays caused by deputies interacting with passengers. In some cases, passengers would initiate conversations with deputies, asking questions about the stop or engage in conversation with the deputy as he processed the traffic stop. In other situations, passengers would be contacted by the deputy because contact was relevant to the traffic stop. This occurred most often when the driver of the vehicle could not drive because their license was suspended/revoked/canceled or when the driver did not have a license. In these situations, deputies would identify whether the passenger was licensed to drive and released the vehicle to the passenger. During one stop, the passengers each had firearms and the deputy contacted the passengers to secure the firearms while he processed the traffic stop.

**Physical/Mental Health** delays occurred during a number of stops when the Other ETSI was selected, and drivers evidenced mental or physical health limitations. During many of these stops, deputies initially suspected drivers under the influence because of the driving behavior they observed. After speaking with drivers, they determined that other medical or mental health issues were influencing their interactions with drivers. In these situations, deputies indicated the need to de-escalate situations, contact emergency medical personnel, or contact family members to ensure the safety of the drivers. In several situations, drivers were on their way to hospital emergency rooms and refused transportation and deputies followed the drivers to their destinations.

**Seized Plates** delay traffic stops for several reasons. Based on the comments reviewed when Other Delay was selected, deputies seized fictitious license plates and license plates that had been suspended by the Arizona MVD for lack of mandatory insurance. In both situations, deputies identified the need to confirm that the plate was fictitious or suspended prior to seizing the license plate. Deputies would use a screwdriver or other tool to remove the plate from the vehicle. Drivers whose license plates were seized were cited for criminal violations and in some cases, vehicles were towed from the scene.

**Stop Process Issues** included delays associated with steps of the stop that are typically routine during the stop. Examples included correcting paperwork during the stop (most common), taking time to research correct ARS codes for the violations, identifying proper court for juveniles, stopping of the wrong driver (drivers issued incidental contact forms), reading the wrong plate number to dispatch, and in one case, the deputy needed to relocate the driver because he did not give the driver a copy of the citation.



**Warrants:** When drivers were stopped and possessed warrants for their arrest, deputies spent time to determine whether warrants are extraditable and spend time confirming that the warrant is valid. Drivers were not always arrested when possessing a warrant either because of the nature of the circumstances (e.g., children were in the vehicle, municipal police could not receive the driver for processing, warrants were non-extraditable, etc.). When drivers were not arrested, deputies indicated discussing warrants with drivers and advising them on how to address the warrants.

**No Issue Indicated:** When reviewing VSCF comments, reviewers identified stops where deputies did not explain the circumstances justifying the use of the “Other Issue” ETSI. There were several notable patterns in the VSCF comments when this occurred. First, deputies would identify delays that were relevant to other available ETSIs. This occurred during eighteen stops coded as No Issue Indicated. There were a number of stops identified in this category for which deputies ended the stop to attend to priority calls or the stop conclusion was incidental contact. Other comments in the VSCF identified situations that could have been expanded on by the deputy to clarify how the stop was delayed. For example, several stops’ comments identified suspended license plates, but did not indicate if the plate was seized or how suspended plates were related to delays during the stop. As another example of the need to clarify the delay in comments, one stop in this category was a traffic stop of OHV vehicles in a restricted area where the deputy indicated “made this stop by horseback” but did not identify this as the reason for the delay.

**Other Issues** included traffic stop delays that could not be categorized as one of the previously discussed reasons for delays. Comments for these stops often indicated that other ETSIs were relevant in delaying the stop. These comments were observed in 96 stops for which an “Other Delay” was categorized. The reasons documented for these delays were often unique. Several stops in this category included law enforcement from other agencies arriving at the stop. One deputy indicated that the citation was hand-written. During one stop a deputy stopped processing the traffic stop to assist a person being attacked by a dog. Another driver wanted to say a prayer with the deputy prior to ending the stop. In another stop, the vehicle’s make, and model was not available in TraCS. Several stops included deputies identifying the need to contact their supervisors during the stop. A number of other stops included delays for courtesy rides. In all, these stops identified circumstances that delayed stops that were unique among stops with the Other ETSI selected.

In TSQR 3, published in March of 2021, MCSO identified that deputies often used the Technical Issues ETSI in unique ways when drivers did not possess required driving documents. In that research, deputies identified the Technical Issues ETSI to include the inability to scan drivers’ licenses and registration and the necessity to enter drivers’ information into TraCS by hand, thus delaying the processing of the traffic stop. A similar pattern was observed in the analysis presented above. This confusion underscores the distinction (or lack thereof) between Driving Documentation Issues, Technical Issues, and Other Delays. Deputies identified “manual entry” of drivers’ information in 134 stops when the Other Delay ETSI was selected. Furthermore, during 719 stops deputies selected the other Delay ETSI in conjunction with either technical issues or

driving documentation issues.

An additional insight gained from evaluating the comments from stops with the Other ETSI selected was that it was typical that deputies documented their stops thoroughly, allowing reviewers to identify reasons stops were delayed and importantly allowed supervisory review of stops that exceeded typical stop times (stops with the Other Delay ETSI selected averaged over 32 minutes in length, nearly three times longer than stops with no ETSI selected, see Table 4). Stops with the Other Delay ETSI selected but which no clear rationale was provided for the delay comprised 6.49 percent of stops with the Other Delay ETSI selected, 1.16 percent of all stops with an ETSI selected and 0.46 percent of all MCSO stops.

## Body Worn Camera and Comment Analysis

Body Worn Camera footage was reviewed to determine the appropriateness of deputy selected ETSI indicators. Social interactions and the circumstances of the stop were observed to determine whether stop activities were consistent with the use of any of the ETSIs. Reviewers also made note of additional activity during the stops that could have potentially delayed the stop. Additionally, MCSO reviewed VSCF comments from each stop to determine if an explanation for the ETSI was available to verify its use. Videos were randomly assigned to reviewers and reviewers had no knowledge of the delays. The sample size for the reviews was N = 72. In Table 17 we report the results of the analysis of the agreement between a) reviewers' observations of delays and deputy-selected ETSIs in the VSCF, b) VSCF comments documenting the delay and deputy-selected ETSIs in the VSCF, and c) reviewers' observations of delays and VSCF comments documenting the delay combined and deputy-selected ETSIs in the VSCF.

We found high and statistically significant agreement for all ETSIs and comparisons except for the agreement between reviewers' determination of Other Delays and the deputy-selected ETSI of Other Delay. For all possible selections from the 72 stops (with 9 possible selections each) there were a total of 648 possible ETSI selections in the sample. The agreement between reviewers and deputy-selected ETSIs was 88.27 percent, and this level of agreement was statistically significant.

**Table 17:** Agreement Analysis Results for BWC Reviews and VSCF Data

VSCF Items	Reviewer Agreement	VSCF Comments Agreement	Reviewer/VSCF Combined
Arrest	88.89% (K = 0.706*)	91.67% (K = 0.786*)	94.44% (K = 0.862*)
Driving Documentation	70.83% (K = 0.351*)	79.17% (K = 0.541*)	75.00% (K = 0.386*)
DUI	98.61% (K = 0.916*)	98.61% (K = 0.916*)	98.61% (K = 0.916*)
Language	97.22% (K = 0.884*)	97.22% (K = 0.860*)	97.22% (K = 0.884*)
Search	98.61% (K = 0.948*)	84.72% (K = 0.132*)	84.72% (K = 0.132*)
Technical	80.56% (K = 0.344*)	91.67% (K = 0.625*)	84.72% (K = 0.529*)
Tow	97.22% (K = 0.893*)	88.89% (K = 0.455*)	97.22% (K = 0.893*)
Training	97.22% (K = 0.900*)	86.11% (K = 0.145*)	97.22% (K = 0.900*)
Other Delay	65.28% (K = 0.068)	87.50% (K = 0.566*)	69.44% (K = 0.293*)
All ETSIs	88.27% (K = 0.666*)	89.51% (K = 0.663*)	90.12% (K = 0.734*)

\* $p < 0.05$

Following the initial review of Body Worn Camera footage to identify the delays during stops that used ETSIs, MCSO researchers identified several limitations which threatened the validity of findings of the agreement analysis. For example, driver arrests are based on an objective standard, (e.g., was the driver cited for a criminal offense? Or was the driver taken into custody?). Both phenomena should have been identifiable in BWC footage, yet agreement between reviewers and deputy-identified arrests was only 88.89 percent.

Because the purpose of this analysis was to determine whether deputy selections of ETSIs were appropriate, MCSO identified any stop where the reviewer and the deputy's ETSI selection did not agree and reviewed BWC footage a second time to determine whether disagreement could be attributed to reviewer coding or deputy data entry. The purpose of the second review was to confirm appropriate or inappropriate ETSI selection and to reduce errors in the subjective determinations of reviewers as the cause of disagreement. For example, during the second review, MCSO identified that in some cases, reviewers did not indicate that an arrest was made when drivers were issued criminal citations. In these circumstances, drivers remained in their vehicles and were never taken into custody. These cite and release arrests were miscategorized as no arrest, even though deputies explained to drivers that these offenses were criminal.

MCSO has supplied MC numbers and narratives detailing the delays observed in the BWC footage for all stops that were reviewed a second time. For each review, we identified the initial reviewer's determination of the delay (or lack thereof) and supply rationale for why the reviewers' determination of the delay/no delay should be changed. This information is supplied in Appendix C. Following the second review, the determinations of ETSI/No ETSI were revised when evidence from the BWC contradicted the reviewers' initial determinations. For some stops, reviewers identified a delay associated with an ETSI when the second review could not confirm that delay. For other stops, evidence showed that certain ETSIs were appropriate, and reviewers failed to identify those delays. MCSO conducted a second agreement analysis using the same comparisons as those presented in Table 17 but with revised determinations of delay/no delay to determine if (dis)agreement was a function of reviewer error, or if deputies themselves were responsible for the disagreement. In total, reviewer determinations of delays were revised for 41 indicators (out of 648) for 30 stops.

In Table 18 below, we report the results of the analysis with revised determinations for delays observed during all stops. In comparing the results from Table 17 to the results presented below (Table 18), there were no changes in statistical significance for agreement between reviewers and deputy determinations about delays with the exception of agreement between reviewers' determinations of Other Delays and deputy-selected use of the Other Delay ETSI. The magnitude of agreement between reviewers and deputies increased following the second review of BWC footage for Arrests, Driving Documentation, DUIs, Language, Technical Issues, and Vehicle Tows. The magnitude of agreement between reviewers and deputies remained unchanged for Searches and Training. The overall agreement for all stops, across all ETSIs increased from 88.27 percent (initial review) to 94.29 percent (initial and secondary review). While MCSO identified errors in the review coding of stops, both analyses identify high, statistically significant levels of agreement between identified delays in BWC footage and the ETSI indicators used during stops.

**Table 18:** Agreement Analysis Results for BWC Reviews and VSCF Data Following Second Review

VSCF	Reviewer Agreement	VSCF Comments Agreement	Reviewer/VSCF Combined
Arrest	98.61% (K = 0.967*)	91.67% (K = 0.786*)	98.61% (K = 0.967*)
Driving Documentation	86.81% (K = 0.674*)	79.17% (K = 0.541*)	84.72% (K = 0.624*)
DUI	100.00% (K = 1.000*)	98.61% (K = 0.916*)	98.61% (K = 0.916*)
Language	98.61% (K = 0.939*)	97.22% (K = 0.860*)	98.61% (K = 0.948*)
Search	98.61% (K = 0.948*)	84.72% (K = 0.132*)	98.61% (K = 0.948*)
Technical	90.28% (K = 0.716*)	91.67% (K = 0.625*)	90.28% (K = 0.716*)
Tow	98.61% (K = 0.948*)	88.89% (K = 0.455*)	98.61% (K = 0.118*)
Training	97.22% (K = 0.900*)	86.11% (K = 0.145*)	100.00% (K = 1.000*)
Other Delay	77.78% (K = 0.465*)	87.50% (K = 0.566*)	77.78% (K = 0.505*)
All ETSIs	94.29% (K = 0.844*)	89.51% (K = 0.663*)	93.98% (K = 0.840*)

\* $p < 0.05$

In the next section we discuss limitations related to reviews of BWC footage as well as limitations to other analyses presented in this report.

## Limitations

Limitations to this research must be acknowledged. Deputies select extended stop indicators based on their perception of the circumstances that delay the stop. These perceptions can often be subjective and influenced by many factors that may be routine to one deputy, yet out of the ordinary for another. The language barrier ETSI provides a good example for this point. If a deputy stops a driver who speaks only Spanish and the deputy is Spanish-English bilingual, there would be no language barrier. If a deputy speaks only English and the driver speaks only Spanish, it is clear there is a language barrier that would delay the stop and that use of the Vioance translation service or receiving assistance from a bilingual deputy would be appropriate. However, many residents of Maricopa County have both “working” English and/or Spanish language skills which would allow communication between a deputy and a driver. In these circumstances a deputy may facilitate the stop in a normal fashion but must determine whether the language differences impacted the stop length.

A similar limitation exists for the use of the driving documentation ETSI and the Technical Issues ETSI. When drivers present deputies with driving documentation with bar codes that will not scan, deputies are required to enter driver information into TraCS by hand. The deputy is delayed during the stop because of this but must make a subjective decision about whether this is a Technical Issue, Driving Documentation issue, or Other Delay ETSI. As we found in TSQR3, deputies often selected the Technical Issue ETSI in this circumstance and during the course of BWC reviews and review of the Other Issue ETSI comments, we identified deputies using different ETSIs in these situations. What is encouraging however, is that deputies are documenting these delays when they occur with at least one ETSI, allowing MCSO to identify circumstances outside of the deputy’s control that impact stop length.

Another limitation regarding the selection of ETSIs on the VSCF includes whether deputies

indicate delays when they occur. For example, there were 194 stops (1.04% of MCSO traffic stops) in the 2023 data that exceeded 20 minutes in length, but for which no ETSI was selected in the VSCF. Four of these stops exceeded one hour in length. Without further investigation into these stops, we cannot determine whether ETSIs were appropriate for documenting delays that may or may not have occurred.

Additional limitations in reviews of BWC footage must be acknowledged. Reviewers observed several situations that could not be easily coded in the BWC reviews. When deputies experienced technical issues with computer equipment, or some issues with driving documentation delays, these issues may not have been visible in the BWC footage. Thus, while reviewers could not directly confirm these delays, their existence could not be ruled out. Finally, one limitation of the reviews with the “Other Issue” ETSIs selected included reviewers’ ability to identify whether circumstances that were not clearly defined like other extended stop indicators actually delayed the stop. This was apparent in the low level of agreement between reviewers and the deputy’s use of the Other ETSI. Furthermore, reviewers identified other ETSIs (e.g., Technical Issues or Documentation Issues) as appropriate for a stop when the deputies themselves selected the Other ETSI.

Finally, the analysis of racial/ethnic differences in ETSI use as presented in this report identified differences in ETSI use, searches, and arrests by race. This analysis only identified that a difference existed but did not investigate other correlates of delays during traffic stops that may have impacted these stops. Most relevant to this comparison are the racial/ethnic differences in arrests and searches. This research did not distinguish between custodial and non-custodial arrests when analyzing racial/ethnic differences, nor did it identify types of arrests that may impact stop length such as warrant or DUI arrests or arrests that resulted from other investigations that occurred during the traffic stop. Regarding searches, MCSO distinguishes types of searches in the VSCF and identify searches of drivers and vehicles. Furthermore, MCSO identifies searches as discretionary and non-discretionary in their analyses of searches in the TSAR and TSMR. These distinctions were not investigated in this quarterly.<sup>22</sup>

## Summary of Findings

In this section, we provide a summary of the major findings identified by analyses of this report and draw attention to patterns of ETSI use which MCSO considers important. Delays during traffic stops are common and MCSO uses the ETSI options in the VSCF to document these delays as stop length is one of the major benchmarks used in the TSAR, TSMR, and TSQR reports as indicia of

---

<sup>22</sup>Research on MCSO arrests and searches has been conducted using previous years’ data in TSQR 7 and TSQR 10, respectively. Furthermore, monthly investigation of racial/ethnic disparity in arrests and searches is conducted with the TSMR and annual analyses of disparity in searches and arrests are conducted each year in the TSAR. Finally, analyses of searches and arrest activity at the district level has been conducted in two quarterly reports, TSQR 5 and TSQR 12. Future analyses of arrests and searches at the office and district-level will be conducted for TSAR 9 and TSQR 14, respectively. All published annual and quarterly reports are available at <https://www.mcsobio.org/traffic-stop-data>.



potential bias, which MCSO is required to investigate based on the dictates of the Second Order.

## **Office and District-Level differences in ETSI Use**

MCSO deputies documented delays during nearly 40 percent of traffic stops made in 2023. The most common delay during traffic stops was a delay associated with driving documentation (see Table 1). This delay was the most common delay across all districts (Tables 2a-2c). However, this delay impacted stop length differentially by district with some districts experiencing delays associated with driving documentation during nearly 40 percent of their stops (District 1) while stops made by deputies from other districts were delayed for driving documentation issues at less than half that rate (26.17% of traffic stops; District 7).

At the district-level, arrest rates were highest in Districts 1 (6.79%), 3 (7.80%), and 5 (7.38%). Stops with DUI investigations were most common in District 5 (4.01% of traffic stops). Delays associated with language barriers were most common in District 2 (4.22%) and District 5 (3.01%). Delays associated with searches of vehicles or drivers were most common in District 1 (6.47%) and District 2 (3.78%). Deputies indicated delays associated with technical issues most commonly in Districts 1 (11.01%), District 2 (10.18%), and District 5 (8.52%). Delays associated with vehicle tows were most common in District 1 (4.54%) and District 2 (3.58%). Training stops were most common in District 2 with nearly 12 percent of stops involving training. District 1 and District 4 also had a relatively high proportion of stops with delays associated with training at 9.14 percent and 9.16 percent of stops, respectively. Finally, the Other Issue ETSI was most commonly used in District 1 with 11.65 percent of stops delayed due to circumstances identified by deputies as some other delay.

## **Racial/Ethnic Differences in ETSI Use**

MCSO compared rates across all ETSIs, searches, and arrests and found that these documented delays were more common for Black, Hispanic, and Minority drivers than they were for White drivers with the exception of delays for delays for training with Black drivers (Table 3). In most cases the magnitude of the racial/ethnic differences in documented delays were high, as was the case with Arrests, Driving Documentation issues, Language Barriers, Searches, Vehicle Tows, and Other Issues. For example, over one-third of stops involving minority drivers involved documented delays with driving documentation issues while 18.71 percent of stops of White drivers involved delays of this type. The racial/ethnic difference in delays associated with language barriers were expected based on previous research and the cultural/demographic composition of Maricopa County. Differences in vehicle tows and searches have been documented in previous MCSO research and are, in part, a product of ARS 28-3151 (driver's license requirement) and ARS 28-3511 (requirement to tow vehicles driven by a driver who has never been issued a driver's license). Additional investigation is necessary for MCSO to better understand the racial/ethnic differences identified in this report for delays for DUI, Technical Issues, Training, and Other Issues. In regard to training issues, MCSO has previously documented that training stops are most common in District 2 which is the district with the highest proportion of stops of Hispanic drivers



and the MCSO's largest district (See TSQR 12).

## **Descriptive Statistics on ETSI Use**

MCSO provided summary statistics for stop length for all ETSIs, arrests, and searches identified by deputies in 2023 (Tables 4-11). One challenge to this analysis was identifying the impact on stop length not only when a single ETSI was used, but also when ETSIs were used in combinations. To address this MCSO provided a regression analysis predicting stop length as a function of ETSI indicators searches and arrests. Additionally, certain types of delays may interact with one another impacting stop length in different ways (See Table 14 for correlations among ETSIs). Of all ETSIs indicated by deputies, vehicle tows had the largest impact on the length of a stop. This was true when only one ETSI was selected or when the vehicle tow ETSI was selected in combination with other documented delays. There were a number of notable combinations of ETSIs in the data. Several combinations worth noting when two ETSIs were indicated on the VSCF included: Arrest/Driving Documentation (average stop length of 22.99 minutes), Driving Documentation/Language (average stop length of 23.35 minutes), Driving Documentation/Technical Issues (average stop length of 20.26 minutes), Driving Documentation/Training (average stop length of 19.93 minutes) and Driving Documentation/Other Issue (average stop length of 24.11 minutes). When three ETSIs were indicated in the VSCF, combinations with the highest frequencies included Arrest/Driving Documentation/Other Issue (average stop length of 43.62 minutes), Driving Documentation/Search/Vehicle Tow (average stop length of 63.42 minutes) and Driving Documentation/Technical/Other (average stop length of 25.81 minutes). The most notable combination of four ETSIs included stops with Arrests/DUI Investigations/Search/Vehicle Tow (average stop length of 159.89 minutes). Stops with five or more ETSIs selected were relatively rare with only 110 traffic stops occurring where deputies indicated five or more different types of delays on the VSCF. The most common combinations in this group were stops with Arrests/Driving Documentation/DUI/Search/Tow (N = 19; average length of stop of 189.84 minutes) and Arrest/Driving Documentation/Search/Tow/Other (N = 15; average length of stop of 180.00 minutes).

## **Contact Conclusion and ETSI Use**

MCSO identified citation and warning rates for stops identified as extended (Table 13). Without accounting for whether multiple delays were experienced during the stop (e.g., multiple ETSIs used), we found that citation rates were higher for all stops with ETSIs with the exception of stops with technical issues and training stops. When evaluating the relationship between ETSI use and citation activity, we identified that certain ETSIs are commonly used together (See Table 14). Correlated ETSI use was identified for the following ETSI combinations: Arrests/Searches, DUI/Searches, and DUI/Vehicle Tow. The strongest correlation between citations/warnings and ETSI involved arrests. While findings from the analysis of ETSI use and citation activity cannot be conclusive, the relationships identified with this analysis identifies that stop length (and delays

during the stop) and arrests are indeed related. Several examples underscore this point. When the only delay indicated in the VSCF was that an arrest was made (N = 353), every driver was cited for a criminal traffic offense. Furthermore, stops with DUI arrests are often delayed for DUI investigations, searches, and vehicle tows. Similarly, because MCSO policy requires inventory searches of vehicles prior to a tow, which often coincide with custodial arrests, these delays often occur during the same stop.

## **The Other Issue ETSI**

MCSO reviewed VSCF comments from stops where deputies utilized the “Other Issue” delay in the VSCF. There were a total of 1,274 stops where deputies indicated that some other delay was present during the stop. All comments from these stops were reviewed and coded based on themes that emerged in the comments. A total of 17 categories for Other Delay ETSI were identified from this process. Note that deputies often identified multiple delays during these stops that included existing ETSIs as well as different delays identified by the 17 categories. Based VSCF comments, the most common Other Delay that was indicated in VSCF comments included stops where drivers and deputies had extended conversations (13.98% of other ETSI, VSCF comments). While many of these conversations included information relevant to the stop, many also included information unrelated to the stop such as drivers asking for directions. The second most common other delay was deputies indicating that they were required to manually enter driver or vehicle information into TraCS. Nearly 10 percent of VSCF comments from “Other Issue” stops included some discussion of this type of delay. One overarching theme in the review of comments from the “Other Issues” stops was that deputies would identify multiple delays during the stops. This was most apparent in stops that were coded as “Complex Stop,” where circumstances during the stop could not be captured using existing ETSIs or simple narratives. There were 79 stops identified in the reviews of the VSCF comments where the reason the Other ETSI was not clear. While some of these stops identified existing ETSIs in the comments, others identified circumstances during the stop that could potentially extend the stop, but which were not clear to reviewers. In some of these comments no reason was provided for the use of the Other Issue ETSI.

## **Appropriate Use of ETSI indicators**

In the final analysis presented in this report, MCSO utilized a random sample of traffic stops that employed ETSI indicators and reviewed BWC footage and VSCF comments to determine whether deputies were appropriately using extended stop indicators. Analysis of agreement from the initial reviews showed high, statistically significant, agreement between reviewers and deputy documentation with agreement between deputies and reviewers exceeding 88 percent. Because one goal of this research was to identify if deputies were selecting ETSIs with fidelity, MCSO chose to re-examine stops for which reviewers and deputy indicators did not agree. Following a second review of BWC footage, MCSO identified that the initial reviewers’ determinations of appropriate ETSI use should have been revised for 41 stops. While the statistical significance of the overall agreement between reviewers and deputies did not change after this second review, the

magnitude of agreement, with 94.29 percent agreement between reviewers and deputies and overall 93.98 percent agreement between reviewer/VSCF comments and deputy use of the ETSI indicators. Based on both the initial agreement analysis and the agreement analysis following the second review of BWC footage, we conclude that deputies correctly use ETSI indicators.

---

## Conclusion and MCSO Response

This research sought to document and describe the use of extended stop indicators used by deputies to identify circumstances during traffic stops that lead to delays during the stop and validate that MCSO deputies are using ETSI's appropriately when delays occur. MCSO found in both an initial review and a confirmatory second review high levels of agreement that ETSI's are being used appropriately by deputies in the field. The use of extended stop indicators are not a legal outcome but a documentation measure used by a deputy when he/she encounters circumstances that delay their "normal" traffic stop. These stops are then excluded from the analysis of stop length in the TSAR as agreed upon by the Monitoring Team and Parties. Another purpose of the research was to examine the use of the "Other Delay" ETSI and determine if there was an emerging theme that warranted the creation of an additional ETSI. The review indicated no need to update Other Delay ETSI. They capture delays from complex stops that include current ETSIs and situations that are relatively rare but taken together capture dynamic and fluid situations which deviate from a "typical" traffic stop.

This research has led to additional recommendations to further improve our data collection and understanding of traffic stop delays at MCSO. In addition to addressing the findings of this report with our internal review group, a multidisciplinary group including policy, patrol, and compliance staff to determine recommendations for additional actions in the next quarter, we currently suggest the following for follow-up to this report.

- Review all stops for which the Other Issues ETSI was selected but for which there was no clear description of the delay in the VSCF and send out data validations.
- Review stops and stop data for stops which have unusual stop lengths associated with ETSI use (e.g., stops with very short stop lengths and any ETSI is selected)
- Continue new process implemented in January 2024 whereby reviews of stops where no ETSI was selected, but which exceeded 20 minutes in length occur and data validations sent out if determined to be appropriate.
- Disseminate published guidelines, or "cheat sheet", for the use of ETSIs to reinforce the proper use of ETSIs.
- Conduct internal town halls with each district explaining the results of this research and work with District commanders to better understand each district's unique circumstances that delay traffic stops.
- Communicate with fleet management to inspect vehicles and equipment associated with a high proportion of stops experiencing technical issues.
- Discuss findings with the MCSO Internal Review Group to determine any additional actions MCSO Patrol may take.



---

## Appendices:

In these appendices, we present information referenced throughout the main body of the report. In Appendix A we provide definitions supplied to deputies in the Vehicle Stop Contact form for Extended Traffic Stop Indicators. In Appendix B we supply tabulations of ETSI use by beat and deputy and supply a tabulation of the use of Technical Issue ETSIs by patrol vehicles to identify if any vehicles may need additional service to prevent traffic stop delays for technical issues. In addition to the descriptive statistics on ETSI use by beat, deputy, and vehicles, in Appendix C we include narratives derived from reviews of BWC footage identifying delays during stops (with BWC time stamps) and the rationale for correcting initial coding errors from by initial BWC reviewers.

## Appendix A: Vehicle Stop Contact Form Definitions/Instructions for Extended Stop Indicators

Included below are the descriptions of the extended stop indicators provided in TraCS to assist deputies while filling out the VSCF.

**Driving Documentation:** Were driver's license/registration/insurance verification issues experienced during the stop? Select "Yes" if the stop was delayed due to license/registration/insurance issues. (Example: driver required additional time to produce documents or documents required additional time for verification)

**DUI:** Did the stop involve a DUI investigation? Select "Yes" if stop involved a DUI Investigation. (Note any specifics in the "Comments" box.)

**Language:** Was there a language issue experienced on the stop? Select "Yes" if stop involved a DUI investigation. (Note any specifics in the "Comments" box.)

**Technical Issues:** Were there any technological issues during the stop? Select "Yes" if there were technological issues during the stop. (Technological issues would include, but not be limited to MDC, TraCS, Scanner, Printer failures/resets, etc.)

**Vehicle Tow:** Was the Vehicle Towed from the scene? Select "Yes" if a vehicle was towed from the scene. (Note any specifics in the "Comments" box.)

**Training:** Did the traffic stop involve training? Select "Yes" if stop duration was impacted due to MCSO personnel training/learning. (Note any specifics in the "Comments" box.)

**Other Delays:** Select "Yes" if the stop was delayed due to other issues (Examples may include deputy error, education conversation, license plate seizure, traffic issues, or unspecified investigation. Note: Issue must be specified in the comments)

**Search:** Not technically an ETSI, this is indicated whenever a deputy indicates a search was conducted either on a person or vehicle.

**Arrest:** Not technically an ETSI, an arrest is marked anytime a custodial restraint or temporary custody of a person occurs. Various types of arrest are counted in this category, they are as follows:

*Booked* - Custodial arrest and transported/in jail

*Cite and Release/Custodial Arrest* - Physical custody, later released with criminal citation.

*Cite and Release/No Custodial Arrest* - No physical custody, released with criminal citation

*Custodial Arrest/Pending Follow-Up and/or Long Form* - Physical custody, released pending follow-up/(i.e. evidence examination/testing/collection, witness statements, etc.)



*Custodial Arrest/Released Other Agency* - Physical arrest, turned over to another agency (i.e. city warrant)

*Custodial Arrest/Released No Further Action* - Physical arrest, released with no further action (i.e. Probable cause dispelled after further investigation, decision made not to charge due to MCAO charging standards not met).

## **Appendix B: ETSI use by Beat, Deputy, and Vehicle**

### **ETSI Use by Beat**

In this appendix, each table provides values for the 7 ETSI (Driving Documentation Issues, DUI Investigations, Language Barriers, Technical Issues, Vehicle Tows, Training Stops, and Other Delays), searches, and arrests as presented in this report for MCSO beats, deputies, and vehicles. Note that the beat “LAK” is a beat on water. As reservoir levels in Maricopa rise and fall seasonally, land may become exposed and OHV vehicles are able to traverse areas that are inundated during other times of the year. Thus, traffic stops may occur in the geographic boundary of a body of water. The beat “PNL” are traffic stops which occur in Pinal County. These are most common in the southeast portion of Maricopa County as deputies must enter Pinal County to access San Tan Regional Park which is a Maricopa County Regional Park. It should be noted that MCSO deputies are authorized to make traffic stops anywhere in the state of Arizona.

## Appendix B1: ETSI Use by Beat

**Table 1A:** Number/Percentage of Traffic Stops with Arrests, by Beat

Beat	N Stops	N Arrests	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N Arrests	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	7	2.62%	432	631	38	6.02%
122	392	33	8.42%	433	384	17	4.43%
123	141	15	10.64%	434	991	19	1.92%
124	203	18	8.87%	435	659	63	9.56%
125	430	29	6.74%	436	639	13	2.03%
126	285	18	6.32%	521	254	17	6.69%
127	858	54	6.29%	522	476	28	5.88%
128	58	1	1.72%	523	261	19	9.00%
221	229	19	8.30%	524	45	3	6.67%
222	652	47	7.21%	525	14	2	14.29%
223	385	21	5.45%	529	53	4	7.55%
224	33	0	0.00%	531	47	5	10.64%
225	992	84	8.47%	532	16	0	0.00%
229	12	0	0.00%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	11	4.47%	536	5	1	20.00%
232	279	10	3.58%	541	22	4	18.18%
233	80	3	3.75%	543	454	24	5.29%
234	88	2	2.27%	544	48	4	8.33%
235	648	2	0.31%	545	2	0	0.00%
236	28	1	3.57%	547	28	2	7.14%
341	402	26	6.47%	551	34	2	5.88%
342	450	28	6.22%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	29	10.18%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	39	5.57%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	64	11.27%	741	1748	46	2.63%
346	360	20	5.56%	742	817	8	0.98%
347	157	27	17.20%	743	429	10	2.33%
348	2	1	50.00%	744	326	13	3.99%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	4	4.82%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	4	20.00%
371	218	17	7.80%	PNL	49	2	4.08%
431	33	3	9.09%				

**Table 1B: Number/Percentage of Traffic Stops with the Driving Documentation ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	68	25.47%	432	631	140	22.19%
122	392	98	25.00%	433	384	89	23.18%
123	141	43	30.50%	434	991	160	16.15%
124	203	80	39.41%	435	659	74	11.23%
125	430	122	28.37%	436	639	120	18.78%
126	285	132	46.32%	521	254	38	14.96%
127	858	340	39.63%	522	476	57	11.97%
128	58	17	29.31%	523	261	6	2.30%
221	229	95	41.48%	524	45	2	4.44%
222	652	289	44.33%	525	14	8	57.14%
223	385	141	36.62%	529	53	5	9.43%
224	33	17	51.52%	531	47	19	40.43%
225	992	428	43.15%	532	16	5	31.25%
229	12	3	25.00%	533	2	1	50.00%
231	246	94	38.21%	536	5	2	40.00%
232	279	88	31.54%	541	22	6	27.27%
233	80	30	37.50%	543	454	144	31.72%
234	88	21	23.86%	544	48	25	52.08%
235	648	157	24.23%	545	2	1	50.00%
236	28	3	10.71%	547	28	3	10.71%
341	402	100	24.88%	551	34	2	5.88%
342	450	105	23.33%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	81	28.42%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	106	15.14%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	131	23.06%	741	1748	286	16.36%
346	360	64	17.78%	742	817	94	11.51%
347	157	50	31.85%	743	429	80	18.65%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	56	17.18%
351	8	2	25.00%	745	83	18	21.69%
352	11	1	9.09%	LAK	20	2	10.00%
371	218	43	19.72%	PNL	49	12	24.49%
431	33	8	24.24%				

**Table 1C: Number/Percentage Use of the DUI Investigation ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	68	25.47%	432	631	140	22.19%
122	392	98	25.00%	433	384	89	23.18%
121	267	6	2.25%	432	631	12	1.90%
122	392	5	1.28%	433	384	10	2.60%
123	141	1	0.71%	434	991	13	1.31%
124	203	3	1.48%	435	659	12	1.82%
125	430	19	4.42%	436	639	2	0.31%
126	285	9	3.16%	521	254	9	3.54%
127	858	47	5.48%	522	476	12	2.52%
128	58	2	3.45%	523	261	1	0.38%
221	229	2	0.87%	524	45	1	2.22%
222	652	8	1.23%	525	14	1	7.14%
223	385	5	1.30%	529	53	0	0.00%
224	33	0	0.00%	531	47	1	2.13%
225	992	31	3.13%	532	16	0	0.00%
229	12	1	8.33%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	7	2.85%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	4	1.43%	541	22	0	0.00%
233	80	3	3.75%	543	454	30	6.61%
234	88	0	0.00%	544	48	3	6.25%
235	648	2	0.31%	545	2	1	50.00%
236	28	0	0.00%	547	28	3	10.71%
341	402	3	0.75%	551	34	2	5.88%
342	450	12	2.67%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	9	3.16%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	9	1.29%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	26	4.58%	741	1,748	7	0.40%
346	360	1	0.28%	742	817	1	0.12%
347	157	3	1.91%	743	429	6	1.40%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	1	0.31%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	1	1.20%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	0	0.00%

**Table 1D: Number/Percentage Use of the Language Barrier ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	6	2.25%	432	631	8	1.27%
122	392	6	1.53%	433	384	7	1.82%
123	141	2	1.42%	434	991	11	1.11%
124	203	5	2.46%	435	659	8	1.21%
125	430	10	2.33%	436	639	5	0.78%
126	285	8	2.81%	521	254	8	3.15%
127	858	25	2.91%	522	476	3	0.63%
128	58	2	3.45%	523	261	1	0.38%
221	229	7	3.06%	524	45	1	2.22%
222	652	29	4.45%	525	14	1	7.14%
223	385	9	2.34%	529	53	0	0.00%
224	33	1	3.03%	531	47	2	4.26%
225	992	36	3.63%	532	16	1	6.25%
229	12	1	8.33%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	2	0.81%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	15	5.38%	541	22	2	9.09%
233	80	5	6.25%	543	454	37	8.15%
234	88	5	5.68%	544	48	11	22.92%
235	648	44	6.79%	545	2	1	50.00%
236	28	2	7.14%	547	28	0	0.00%
341	402	8	1.99%	551	34	1	2.94%
342	450	4	0.89%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	16	5.61%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	7	1.00%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	9	1.58%	741	1748	20	1.14%
346	360	8	2.22%	742	817	3	0.37%
347	157	2	1.27%	743	429	3	0.70%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	7	2.15%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	0	0.00%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	1	5.00%
371	218	8	3.67%	PNL	49	0	0.00%
431	33	2	6.06%				

**Table 1E: Number/Percentage of Traffic Stops with Searches, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N Search	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N Search	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	3	1.12%	432	631	13	2.06%
122	392	15	3.83%	433	384	7	1.82%
123	141	9	6.38%	434	991	12	1.21%
124	203	13	6.40%	435	659	9	1.37%
125	430	18	4.19%	436	639	2	0.31%
126	285	29	10.18%	521	254	8	3.15%
127	858	50	5.83%	522	476	6	1.26%
128	58	2	3.45%	523	261	1	0.38%
221	229	11	4.80%	524	45	1	2.22%
222	652	39	5.98%	525	14	1	7.14%
223	385	10	2.60%	529	53	0	0.00%
224	33	1	3.03%	531	47	0	0.00%
225	992	45	4.54%	532	16	0	0.00%
229	12	0	0.00%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	10	4.07%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	5	1.79%	541	22	0	0.00%
233	80	8	10.00%	543	454	16	3.52%
234	88	2	2.27%	544	48	4	8.33%
235	648	9	1.39%	545	2	0	0.00%
236	28	1	3.57%	547	28	0	0.00%
341	402	5	1.24%	551	34	2	5.88%
342	450	17	3.78%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	14	4.91%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	7	1.00%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	22	3.87%	741	1,748	26	1.49%
346	360	7	1.94%	742	817	3	0.37%
347	157	3	1.91%	743	429	3	0.70%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	9	2.76%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	4	4.82%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	0	0.00%
371	218	5	2.29%	PNL	49	1	2.04%
431	33	3	9.09%				

**Table 1F: Number/Percentage Use of the Technical Issues ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	16	5.99%	432	631	37	5.86%
122	392	28	7.14%	433	384	25	6.51%
123	141	11	7.80%	434	991	32	3.23%
124	203	19	9.36%	435	659	21	3.19%
125	430	40	9.30%	436	639	40	6.26%
126	285	26	9.12%	521	254	21	8.27%
127	858	101	11.77%	522	476	26	5.46%
128	58	10	17.24%	523	261	7	2.68%
221	229	17	7.42%	524	45	2	4.44%
222	652	68	10.43%	525	14	1	7.14%
223	385	44	11.43%	529	53	2	3.77%
224	33	5	15.15%	531	47	17	36.17%
225	992	93	9.38%	532	16	4	25.00%
229	12	1	8.33%	533	2	2	100.00%
231	246	31	12.60%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	28	10.04%	541	22	2	9.09%
233	80	7	8.75%	543	454	45	9.91%
234	88	14	15.91%	544	48	10	20.83%
235	648	66	10.19%	545	2	1	50.00%
236	28	1	3.57%	547	28	1	3.57%
341	402	35	8.71%	551	34	5	14.71%
342	450	32	7.11%	552	5	3	60.00%
343	285	25	8.77%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	27	3.86%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	38	6.69%	741	1748	90	5.15%
346	360	22	6.11%	742	817	44	5.39%
347	157	17	10.83%	743	429	20	4.66%
348	2	2	100.00%	744	326	14	4.29%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	5	6.02%
352	11	1	9.09%	LAK	20	0	0.00%
371	218	16	7.34%	PNL	49	4	8.16%
431	33	3	9.09%				



**Table 1G: Number/Percentage Use of the Vehicle Tow ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	3	1.12%	432	631	7	1.11%
122	392	9	2.30%	433	384	3	0.78%
123	141	3	2.13%	434	991	10	1.01%
124	203	9	4.43%	435	659	7	1.06%
125	430	14	3.26%	436	639	0	0.00%
126	285	25	8.77%	521	254	3	1.18%
127	858	33	3.85%	522	476	3	0.63%
128	58	1	1.72%	523	261	1	0.38%
221	229	9	3.93%	524	45	1	2.22%
222	652	34	5.21%	525	14	0	0.00%
223	385	7	1.82%	529	53	0	0.00%
224	33	1	3.03%	531	47	0	0.00%
225	992	46	4.64%	532	16	0	0.00%
229	12	0	0.00%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	8	3.25%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	2	0.72%	541	22	0	0.00%
233	80	8	10.00%	543	454	6	1.32%
234	88	1	1.14%	544	48	5	10.42%
235	648	11	1.70%	545	2	0	0.00%
236	28	0	0.00%	547	28	0	0.00%
341	402	5	1.24%	551	34	1	2.94%
342	450	10	2.22%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	9	3.16%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	4	0.57%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	14	2.46%	741	1,748	18	1.03%
346	360	8	2.22%	742	817	2	0.24%
347	157	2	1.27%	743	429	3	0.70%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	8	2.45%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	3	3.61%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	0	0.00%
371	218	1	0.46%	PNL	49	1	2.04%
431	33	2	6.06%				

**Table 1H: Number/Percentage Use of the Training ETSI, by Beat**

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	17	6.37%	432	631	35	5.55%
122	392	14	3.57%	433	384	14	3.65%
123	141	9	6.38%	434	991	78	7.87%
124	203	19	9.36%	435	659	3	0.46%
125	430	28	6.51%	436	639	53	8.29%
126	285	15	5.26%	521	254	9	3.54%
127	858	113	13.17%	522	476	18	3.78%
128	58	24	41.38%	523	261	3	1.15%
221	229	49	21.40%	524	45	1	2.22%
222	652	94	14.42%	525	14	0	0.00%
223	385	42	10.91%	529	53	0	0.00%
224	33	1	3.03%	531	47	0	0.00%
225	992	133	13.41%	532	16	1	6.25%
229	12	2	16.67%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	14	5.69%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	29	10.39%	541	22	0	0.00%
233	80	14	17.50%	543	454	10	2.20%
234	88	18	20.45%	544	48	3	6.25%
235	648	15	2.31%	545	2	0	0.00%
236	28	5	17.86%	547	28	1	3.57%
341	402	8	1.99%	551	34	0	0.00%
342	450	20	4.44%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	10	3.51%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	38	5.43%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	19	3.35%	741	1,748	4	0.23%
346	360	17	4.72%	742	817	3	0.37%
347	157	4	2.55%	743	429	4	0.93%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	0	0.00%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	0	0.00%
352	11	1	9.09%	LAK	20	0	0.00%
371	218	7	3.21%	PNL	49	0	0.00%
431	33	2	6.06%				

**Table 11:** Number/Percentage Use of the Other Delay ETSI, by Beat

Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops	Beat	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent of Beat Stops
121	267	15	5.62%	432	631	41	6.50%
122	392	36	9.18%	433	384	16	4.17%
123	141	9	6.38%	434	991	36	3.63%
124	203	22	10.84%	435	659	16	2.43%
125	430	26	6.05%	436	639	21	3.29%
126	285	24	8.42%	521	254	8	3.15%
127	858	101	11.77%	522	476	14	2.94%
128	58	4	6.90%	523	261	3	1.15%
221	229	9	3.93%	524	45	3	6.67%
222	652	63	9.66%	525	14	1	7.14%
223	385	32	8.31%	529	53	2	3.77%
224	33	2	6.06%	531	47	9	19.15%
225	992	70	7.06%	532	16	2	12.50%
229	12	1	8.33%	533	2	0	0.00%
231	246	25	10.16%	536	5	0	0.00%
232	279	20	7.17%	541	22	3	13.64%
233	80	6	7.50%	543	454	75	16.52%
234	88	4	4.55%	544	48	5	10.42%
235	648	31	4.78%	545	2	0	0.00%
236	28	1	3.57%	547	28	6	21.43%
341	402	44	10.95%	551	34	0	0.00%
342	450	20	4.44%	552	5	0	0.00%
343	285	26	9.12%	556	1	0	0.00%
344	700	23	3.29%	558	1	0	0.00%
345	568	42	7.39%	741	1,748	125	7.15%
346	360	26	7.22%	742	817	42	5.14%
347	157	18	11.46%	743	429	26	6.06%
348	2	0	0.00%	744	326	18	5.52%
351	8	0	0.00%	745	83	14	16.87%
352	11	0	0.00%	LAK	20	3	15.00%
371	218	12	5.50%	PNL	49	5	10.20%
431	33	4	12.12%				

## Appendix B2: Arrests by Deputy

**Table 2A: Number/Percent Arrests, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	4	12.50%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	38	8.86%	39	665	25	3.76%
5	113	13	11.50%	40	6	0	0.00%
6	43	1	2.33%	41	18	0	0.00%
7	4	0	0.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	4	26.67%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	15	21.43%
10	5	2	40.00%	45	194	12	6.19%
11	85	0	0.00%	46	35	2	5.71%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	0	0.00%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	5	6.33%	50	11	0	0.00%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	3	7.69%
17	53	1	1.89%	52	29	2	6.90%
18	10	0	0.00%	53	4	2	50.00%
19	385	46	11.95%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	114	11.95%	55	21	1	4.76%
21	65	6	9.23%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	0	0.00%	57	12	0	0.00%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	1	2.63%
24	80	2	2.50%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	1	6.25%
27	29	0	0.00%	62	32	0	0.00%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	1	1.20%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	1	50.00%	66	195	1	0.51%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	2	2.94%	68	8	0	0.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	0	0.00%
35	96	35	36.46%	70	2	1	50.00%

**Table 2B: Number/Percent Arrests, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent
71	118	13	11.02%	106	28	0	0.00%
72	24	1	4.17%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	0	0.00%	108	134	1	0.75%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	4	1.77%	110	34	3	8.82%
76	40	1	2.50%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	16	18.39%	112	239	18	7.53%
78	35	0	0.00%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	1	3.13%	114	15	1	6.67%
80	15	1	6.67%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	1	2.44%
83	39	6	15.38%	118	81	0	0.00%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	25	8.71%
85	57	0	0.00%	120	16	0	0.00%
86	39	1	2.56%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	18	2.89%
88	70	20	28.57%	123	528	6	1.14%
89	170	5	2.94%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	0	0.00%	125	111	2	1.80%
91	16	1	6.25%	126	139	5	3.60%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	40	6.34%	128	3	0	0.00%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	0	0.00%	130	3	2	66.67%
96	7	1	14.29%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	0	0.00%	133	2	1	50.00%
99	13	1	7.69%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	1	25.00%	135	217	13	5.99%
101	21	4	19.05%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	11	9.57%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	10	4.50%	138	78	2	2.56%
104	107	7	6.54%	139	118	6	5.08%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	0	0.00%

**Table 2C: Number/Percent Arrests, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent
141	113	8	7.08%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	9	9.00%	177	47	1	2.13%
143	158	5	3.16%	178	61	0	0.00%
144	36	1	2.78%	179	31	0	0.00%
145	106	7	6.60%	180	26	3	11.54%
146	91	4	4.40%	181	32	3	9.38%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	1	1.56%
148	499	21	4.21%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	4	14.29%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	11	4.44%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	0	0.00%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	5	20.00%	190	88	5	5.68%
156	97	0	0.00%	191	38	2	5.26%
157	75	3	4.00%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	7	20.00%	193	161	26	16.15%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	2	0.65%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	1	5.00%	196	28	0	0.00%
162	104	2	1.92%	197	51	0	0.00%
163	67	2	2.99%	198	152	1	0.66%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	4	12.50%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	1	2.38%
167	46	2	4.35%	202	54	5	9.26%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	9	22.50%
169	1	1	100.00%	204	16	0	0.00%
170	115	2	1.74%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	7	8.05%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	2	1.60%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	1	1.89%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	10	12.99%	210	200	16	8.00%

**Table 2D: Number/Percent Arrests, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Arrests	Percent
211	61	8	13.11%	246	30	0	0.00%
212	4	1	25.00%	247	81	3	3.70%
213	93	2	2.15%	248	193	13	6.74%
214	32	0	0.00%	249	179	1	0.56%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	0	0.00%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	0	0.00%
217	30	1	3.33%	252	98	8	8.16%
218	112	14	12.50%	253	133	3	2.26%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	1	4.76%
221	152	6	3.95%	256	15	0	0.00%
222	18	0	0.00%	257	34	3	8.82%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	0	0.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	8	5.23%	260	42	5	11.90%
226	63	1	1.59%	261	48	0	0.00%
227	52	0	0.00%	262	26	0	0.00%
228	24	2	8.33%	263	44	4	9.09%
229	282	15	5.32%	264	8	0	0.00%
230	324	6	1.85%	265	153	0	0.00%
231	550	30	5.45%	266	88	8	9.09%
232	70	0	0.00%	267	24	1	4.17%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	0	0.00%
234	83	2	2.41%	269	32	1	3.13%
235	100	1	1.00%	270	26	4	15.38%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	8	9.64%
237	45	6	13.33%	272	11	0	0.00%
238	124	3	2.42%	273	33	3	9.09%
239	40	0	0.00%	274	23	0	0.00%
240	87	3	3.45%	275	32	2	6.25%
241	74	2	2.70%	276	5	1	20.00%
242	53	0	0.00%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	1	6.25%	278	3	1	33.33%
244	163	12	7.36%	279	2	1	50.00%
245	13	0	0.00%	280	2	0	0.00%



## Appendix B3: Driving Documentation ETSI Use by Deputy

**Table 2A: Number/Percent Use of Driving Documentation ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	1	100.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	11	34.38%
3	1	1	100.00%	38	1	1	100.00%
4	429	3	0.70%	39	665	50	7.52%
5	113	32	28.32%	40	6	4	66.67%
6	43	13	30.23%	41	18	7	38.89%
7	4	3	75.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	1	6.67%
9	22	4	18.18%	44	70	9	12.86%
10	5	2	40.00%	45	194	38	19.59%
11	85	10	11.76%	46	35	6	17.14%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	1	4.00%
13	27	11	40.74%	48	4	4	100.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	2	7.69%
15	79	16	20.25%	50	11	3	27.27%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	26	66.67%
17	53	10	18.87%	52	29	2	6.90%
18	10	7	70.00%	53	4	1	25.00%
19	385	123	31.95%	54	75	18	24.00%
20	954	133	13.94%	55	21	7	33.33%
21	65	29	44.62%	56	12	8	66.67%
22	20	6	30.00%	57	12	7	58.33%
23	2	2	100.00%	58	38	19	50.00%
24	80	49	61.25%	59	9	2	22.22%
25	23	3	13.04%	60	1	1	100.00%
26	9	4	44.44%	61	16	2	12.50%
27	29	19	65.52%	62	32	13	40.63%
28	4	2	50.00%	63	16	8	50.00%
29	83	22	26.51%	64	1	1	100.00%
30	2	1	50.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	21	10.77%
32	34	10	29.41%	67	4	1	25.00%
33	68	20	29.41%	68	8	5	62.50%
34	2	1	50.00%	69	15	9	60.00%
35	96	55	57.29%	70	2	2	100.00%

**Table 2B: Number/Percent Use of Driving Documentation ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	81	68.64%	106	28	4	14.29%
72	24	4	16.67%	107	3	2	66.67%
73	27	3	11.11%	108	134	59	44.03%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	44	19.47%	110	34	13	38.24%
76	40	9	22.50%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	52	59.77%	112	239	87	36.40%
78	35	18	51.43%	113	2	2	100.00%
79	32	7	21.88%	114	15	3	20.00%
80	15	4	26.67%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	1	25.00%	117	41	11	26.83%
83	39	36	92.31%	118	81	22	27.16%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	103	35.89%
85	57	11	19.30%	120	16	2	12.50%
86	39	16	41.03%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	6	66.67%	122	623	93	14.93%
88	70	4	5.71%	123	528	25	4.73%
89	170	8	4.71%	124	51	5	9.80%
90	15	4	26.67%	125	111	18	16.22%
91	16	3	18.75%	126	139	15	10.79%
92	6	3	50.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	41	6.50%	128	3	0	0.00%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	5	62.50%
95	5	2	40.00%	130	3	1	33.33%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	1	3.70%
97	1	1	100.00%	132	1	1	100.00%
98	39	10	25.64%	133	2	0	0.00%
99	13	0	0.00%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	2	50.00%	135	217	101	46.54%
101	21	0	0.00%	136	10	1	10.00%
102	115	19	16.52%	137	25	2	8.00%
103	222	9	4.05%	138	78	28	35.90%
104	107	23	21.50%	139	118	24	20.34%
105	10	7	70.00%	140	4	0	0.00%

**Table 2C: Number/Percent Use of Driving Documentation ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	9	7.96%	176	57	4	7.02%
142	100	5	5.00%	177	47	4	8.51%
143	158	5	3.16%	178	61	7	11.48%
144	36	11	30.56%	179	31	15	48.39%
145	106	33	31.13%	180	26	7	26.92%
146	91	42	46.15%	181	32	18	56.25%
147	10	4	40.00%	182	64	17	26.56%
148	499	135	27.05%	183	18	9	50.00%
149	28	4	14.29%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	1	5.88%	185	248	168	67.74%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	8	9.41%
152	11	1	9.09%	187	12	1	8.33%
153	30	2	6.67%	188	21	2	9.52%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	2	18.18%
155	25	20	80.00%	190	88	45	51.14%
156	97	12	12.37%	191	38	11	28.95%
157	75	17	22.67%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	23	65.71%	193	161	25	15.53%
159	15	1	6.67%	194	307	34	11.07%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	2	22.22%
161	20	11	55.00%	196	28	12	42.86%
162	104	30	28.85%	197	51	23	45.10%
163	67	2	2.99%	198	152	31	20.39%
164	6	1	16.67%	199	43	11	25.58%
165	32	20	62.50%	200	27	4	14.81%
166	5	1	20.00%	201	42	5	11.90%
167	46	8	17.39%	202	54	12	22.22%
168	12	3	25.00%	203	40	30	75.00%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	2	12.50%
170	115	12	10.43%	205	34	14	41.18%
171	87	30	34.48%	206	32	5	15.63%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	29	23.20%
173	41	16	39.02%	208	53	18	33.96%
174	55	1	1.82%	209	48	15	31.25%
175	77	31	40.26%	210	200	87	43.50%

**Table 2D: Number/Percent Use of Driving Documentation ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	45	73.77%	246	30	12	40.00%
212	4	2	50.00%	247	81	21	25.93%
213	93	64	68.82%	248	193	39	20.21%
214	32	20	62.50%	249	179	89	49.72%
215	22	14	63.64%	250	130	38	29.23%
216	20	9	45.00%	251	57	26	45.61%
217	30	9	30.00%	252	98	10	10.20%
218	112	30	26.79%	253	133	42	31.58%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	2	5.41%	255	21	10	47.62%
221	152	94	61.84%	256	15	8	53.33%
222	18	6	33.33%	257	34	12	35.29%
223	58	21	36.21%	258	30	5	16.67%
224	7	4	57.14%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	17	11.11%	260	42	25	59.52%
226	63	38	60.32%	261	48	16	33.33%
227	52	29	55.77%	262	26	6	23.08%
228	24	18	75.00%	263	44	13	29.55%
229	282	50	17.73%	264	8	7	87.50%
230	324	31	9.57%	265	153	20	13.07%
231	550	103	18.73%	266	88	56	63.64%
232	70	23	32.86%	267	24	15	62.50%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	13	36.11%
234	83	6	7.23%	269	32	8	25.00%
235	100	12	12.00%	270	26	17	65.38%
236	28	3	10.71%	271	83	41	49.40%
237	45	32	71.11%	272	11	6	54.55%
238	124	26	20.97%	273	33	6	18.18%
239	40	11	27.50%	274	23	4	17.39%
240	87	31	35.63%	275	32	17	53.13%
241	74	53	71.62%	276	5	4	80.00%
242	53	11	20.75%	277	5	4	80.00%
243	16	4	25.00%	278	3	2	66.67%
244	163	79	48.47%	279	2	2	100.00%
245	13	1	7.69%	280	2	2	100.00%

## Appendix B4: DUI ETSI Use by Deputy

**Table 3A: Number/Percent Use of DUI ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	3	9.38%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	3	0.70%	39	665	0	0.00%
5	113	2	1.77%	40	6	0	0.00%
6	43	1	2.33%	41	18	0	0.00%
7	4	0	0.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	1	6.67%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	0	0.00%
10	5	1	20.00%	45	194	1	0.52%
11	85	0	0.00%	46	35	2	5.71%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	0	0.00%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	2	2.53%	50	11	0	0.00%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	1	2.56%
17	53	0	0.00%	52	29	0	0.00%
18	10	2	20.00%	53	4	1	25.00%
19	385	15	3.90%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	21	2.20%	55	21	1	4.76%
21	65	17	26.15%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	0	0.00%	57	12	0	0.00%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	1	2.63%
24	80	0	0.00%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	1	6.25%
27	29	0	0.00%	62	32	0	0.00%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	1	1.20%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	1	0.51%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	2	2.94%	68	8	0	0.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	1	6.67%
35	96	2	2.08%	70	2	0	0.00%

**Table 3B: Number/Percent Use of DUI ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	6	5.08%	106	28	0	0.00%
72	24	0	0.00%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	0	0.00%	108	134	0	0.00%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	1	0.44%	110	34	7	20.59%
76	40	0	0.00%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	3	3.45%	112	239	5	2.09%
78	35	0	0.00%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	0	0.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	1	6.67%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	1	2.44%
83	39	1	2.56%	118	81	0	0.00%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	24	8.36%
85	57	0	0.00%	120	16	0	0.00%
86	39	2	5.13%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	2	0.32%
88	70	16	22.86%	123	528	2	0.38%
89	170	17	10.00%	124	51	1	1.96%
90	15	0	0.00%	125	111	1	0.90%
91	16	1	6.25%	126	139	3	2.16%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	2	0.32%	128	3	0	0.00%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	1	20.00%	130	3	1	33.33%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	0	0.00%	133	2	1	50.00%
99	13	0	0.00%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	1	25.00%	135	217	11	5.07%
101	21	6	28.57%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	14	12.17%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	4	1.80%	138	78	2	2.56%
104	107	3	2.80%	139	118	6	5.08%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	0	0.00%

**Table 3C: Number/Percent Use of DUI ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	12	10.62%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	10	10.00%	177	47	1	2.13%
143	158	1	0.63%	178	61	0	0.00%
144	36	0	0.00%	179	31	0	0.00%
145	106	0	0.00%	180	26	2	7.69%
146	91	1	1.10%	181	32	3	9.38%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	2	3.13%
148	499	4	0.80%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	1	3.57%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	4	1.61%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	0	0.00%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	1	4.00%	190	88	3	3.41%
156	97	0	0.00%	191	38	2	5.26%
157	75	0	0.00%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	0	0.00%	193	161	12	7.45%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	0	0.00%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	0	0.00%	196	28	0	0.00%
162	104	0	0.00%	197	51	0	0.00%
163	67	2	2.99%	198	152	0	0.00%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	2	6.25%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	1	2.38%
167	46	0	0.00%	202	54	2	3.70%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	0	0.00%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	0	0.00%
170	115	0	0.00%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	0	0.00%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	0	0.00%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	0	0.00%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	2	2.60%	210	200	2	1.00%



**Table 3D: Number/Percent Use of DUI ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	2	3.28%	246	30	0	0.00%
212	4	0	0.00%	247	81	2	2.47%
213	93	1	1.08%	248	193	1	0.52%
214	32	0	0.00%	249	179	0	0.00%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	0	0.00%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	0	0.00%
217	30	1	3.33%	252	98	0	0.00%
218	112	1	0.89%	253	133	0	0.00%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	0	0.00%
221	152	9	5.92%	256	15	0	0.00%
222	18	0	0.00%	257	34	1	2.94%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	1	3.33%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	4	2.61%	260	42	1	2.38%
226	63	0	0.00%	261	48	0	0.00%
227	52	0	0.00%	262	26	0	0.00%
228	24	0	0.00%	263	44	0	0.00%
229	282	4	1.42%	264	8	0	0.00%
230	324	2	0.62%	265	153	0	0.00%
231	550	2	0.36%	266	88	3	3.41%
232	70	0	0.00%	267	24	0	0.00%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	0	0.00%
234	83	3	3.61%	269	32	1	3.13%
235	100	1	1.00%	270	26	0	0.00%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	3	3.61%
237	45	4	8.89%	272	11	0	0.00%
238	124	0	0.00%	273	33	2	6.06%
239	40	0	0.00%	274	23	0	0.00%
240	87	4	4.60%	275	32	1	3.13%
241	74	0	0.00%	276	5	1	20.00%
242	53	0	0.00%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	0	0.00%	278	3	0	0.00%
244	163	4	2.45%	279	2	0	0.00%
245	13	0	0.00%	280	2	0	0.00%

## Appendix B5: Language Barrier ETSI Use by Deputy

**Table 4A:** Number/Percent Use of the Language Barrier ETSI, by Deputy

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	2	6.25%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	4	0.93%	39	665	2	0.30%
5	113	6	5.31%	40	6	1	16.67%
6	43	1	2.33%	41	18	0	0.00%
7	4	0	0.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	0	0.00%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	0	0.00%
10	5	0	0.00%	45	194	2	1.03%
11	85	3	3.53%	46	35	1	2.86%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	1	3.70%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	1	3.85%
15	79	3	3.80%	50	11	0	0.00%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	0	0.00%
17	53	2	3.77%	52	29	0	0.00%
18	10	2	20.00%	53	4	0	0.00%
19	385	16	4.16%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	0	0.00%	55	21	1	4.76%
21	65	1	1.54%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	3	15.00%	57	12	1	8.33%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	1	2.63%
24	80	2	2.50%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	0	0.00%
27	29	0	0.00%	62	32	1	3.13%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	0	0.00%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	2	1.03%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	2	2.94%	68	8	2	25.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	1	6.67%
35	96	7	7.29%	70	2	0	0.00%

**Table 4B: Number/Percent Use of the Language Barrier ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	9	8.20%	106	28	0	6.67%
72	24	0	25.00%	107	3	0	2.47%
73	27	0	5.38%	108	134	1	4.15%
74	1	0	18.75%	109	7	0	1.68%
75	226	4	9.09%	110	34	2	16.92%
76	40	0	7.63%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	6	0.00%	112	239	3	0.00%
78	35	4	0.00%	113	2	0	0.75%
79	32	2	0.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	0	1.77%	115	1	0	5.88%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	1	6.90%	117	41	3	1.26%
83	39	2	11.43%	118	81	1	0.00%
84	1	0	6.25%	119	287	2	0.00%
85	57	0	0.00%	120	16	1	0.00%
86	39	1	0.00%	121	4	2	0.00%
87	9	0	25.00%	122	623	12	7.32%
88	70	9	5.13%	123	528	7	1.23%
89	170	2	0.00%	124	51	2	0.70%
90	15	2	0.00%	125	111	4	6.25%
91	16	0	2.56%	126	139	1	50.00%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	1.93%
93	631	11	12.86%	128	3	0	1.33%
94	3	0	1.18%	129	8	1	3.92%
95	5	0	13.33%	130	3	0	3.60%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.72%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	2	1.74%	133	2	0	0.00%
99	13	0	0.00%	134	7	1	12.50%
100	4	0	0.00%	135	217	11	0.00%
101	21	2	0.00%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	10	0.00%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	3	5.13%	138	78	2	0.00%
104	107	2	0.00%	139	118	2	14.29%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	0	5.07%

**Table 4C: Number/Percent Use of the Language Barrier ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	12	10.62%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	10	10.00%	177	47	1	2.13%
143	158	1	0.63%	178	61	0	0.00%
144	36	0	0.00%	179	31	0	0.00%
145	106	0	0.00%	180	26	2	7.69%
146	91	1	1.10%	181	32	3	9.38%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	2	3.13%
148	499	4	0.80%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	1	3.57%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	4	1.61%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	0	0.00%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	1	4.00%	190	88	3	3.41%
156	97	0	0.00%	191	38	2	5.26%
157	75	0	0.00%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	0	0.00%	193	161	12	7.45%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	0	0.00%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	0	0.00%	196	28	0	0.00%
162	104	0	0.00%	197	51	0	0.00%
163	67	2	2.99%	198	152	0	0.00%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	2	6.25%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	1	2.38%
167	46	0	0.00%	202	54	2	3.70%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	0	0.00%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	0	0.00%
170	115	3	2.61%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	0	0.00%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	0	0.00%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	0	0.00%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	2	2.60%	210	200	2	1.00%

**Table 4D: Number/Percent Use of the Language Barrier ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N ETSIs	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	0	0.00%	246	30	2	6.67%
212	4	1	25.00%	247	81	4	4.94%
213	93	4	4.30%	248	193	6	3.11%
214	32	0	0.00%	249	179	4	2.23%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	1	0.77%
216	20	1	5.00%	251	57	1	1.75%
217	30	0	0.00%	252	98	1	1.02%
218	112	2	1.79%	253	133	2	1.50%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	7	18.92%	255	21	2	9.52%
221	152	5	3.29%	256	15	0	0.00%
222	18	1	5.56%	257	34	0	0.00%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	0	0.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	0	0.00%	260	42	4	9.52%
226	63	9	14.29%	261	48	1	2.08%
227	52	1	1.92%	262	26	1	3.85%
228	24	0	0.00%	263	44	0	0.00%
229	282	4	1.42%	264	8	0	0.00%
230	324	4	1.23%	265	153	4	2.61%
231	550	8	1.45%	266	88	4	4.55%
232	70	2	2.86%	267	24	2	8.33%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	0	0.00%
234	83	1	1.20%	269	32	3	9.38%
235	100	2	2.00%	270	26	1	3.85%
236	28	1	3.57%	271	83	4	4.82%
237	45	3	6.67%	272	11	1	9.09%
238	124	9	7.26%	273	33	0	0.00%
239	40	0	0.00%	274	23	0	0.00%
240	87	9	10.34%	275	32	4	12.50%
241	74	10	13.51%	276	5	0	0.00%
242	53	1	1.89%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	1	6.25%	278	3	0	0.00%
244	163	2	1.23%	279	2	0	0.00%
245	13	1	7.69%	280	2	0	0.00%

## Appendix B6: Searches by Deputies

**Table 5A: Number/Percent Searches, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	3	9.38%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	3	0.70%	39	665	3	0.45%
5	113	3	2.65%	40	6	0	0.00%
6	43	1	2.33%	41	18	0	0.00%
7	4	0	0.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	1	6.67%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	0	0.00%
10	5	2	40.00%	45	194	3	1.55%
11	85	1	1.18%	46	35	3	8.57%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	3	11.11%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	1	1.27%	50	11	0	0.00%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	2	5.13%
17	53	0	0.00%	52	29	1	3.45%
18	10	3	30.00%	53	4	1	25.00%
19	385	7	1.82%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	25	2.62%	55	21	0	0.00%
21	65	3	4.62%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	0	0.00%	57	12	1	8.33%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	0	0.00%
24	80	2	2.50%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	1	6.25%
27	29	0	0.00%	62	32	1	3.13%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	1	1.20%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	1	0.51%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	0	0.00%	68	8	3	37.50%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	0	0.00%
35	96	2	2.08%	70	2	1	50.00%

**Table 5B: Number/Percent Searches, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent
71	118	15	12.71%	106	28	1	3.57%
72	24	1	4.17%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	0	0.00%	108	134	1	0.75%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	2	0.88%	110	34	2	5.88%
76	40	1	2.50%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	4	4.60%	112	239	4	1.67%
78	35	0	0.00%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	0	0.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	1	6.67%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	1	2.44%
83	39	6	15.38%	118	81	0	0.00%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	19	6.62%
85	57	1	1.75%	120	16	0	0.00%
86	39	1	2.56%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	13	2.09%
88	70	7	10.00%	123	528	5	0.95%
89	170	2	1.18%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	0	0.00%	125	111	2	1.80%
91	16	0	0.00%	126	139	2	1.44%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	4	0.63%	128	3	0	0.00%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	0	0.00%	130	3	2	66.67%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	1	2.56%	133	2	1	50.00%
99	13	2	15.38%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	1	25.00%	135	217	6	2.76%
101	21	4	19.05%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	6	5.22%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	3	1.35%	138	78	3	3.85%
104	107	2	1.87%	139	118	8	6.78%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	0	0.00%



**Table 5C: Number/Percent Searches, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent
141	113	6	5.31%	176	57	1	1.75%
142	100	8	8.00%	177	47	1	2.13%
143	158	6	3.80%	178	61	0	0.00%
144	36	2	5.56%	179	31	1	3.23%
145	106	1	0.94%	180	26	3	11.54%
146	91	7	7.69%	181	32	5	15.63%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	0	0.00%
148	499	3	0.60%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	2	7.14%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	0	0.00%
151	4	1	25.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	1	4.76%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	7	28.00%	190	88	5	5.68%
156	97	2	2.06%	191	38	2	5.26%
157	75	1	1.33%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	8	22.86%	193	161	6	3.73%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	1	0.33%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	0	0.00%	196	28	2	7.14%
162	104	1	0.96%	197	51	4	7.84%
163	67	2	2.99%	198	152	0	0.00%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	8	25.00%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	2	4.76%
167	46	0	0.00%	202	54	1	1.85%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	10	25.00%
169	1	1	100.00%	204	16	0	0.00%
170	115	0	0.00%	205	34	1	2.94%
171	87	4	4.60%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	2	1.60%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	1	1.89%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	7	9.09%	210	200	10	5.00%

**Table 5D: Number/Percent Searches, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N Searches	Percent
211	61	4	6.56%	246	30	0	0.00%
212	4	2	50.00%	247	81	4	4.94%
213	93	6	6.45%	248	193	5	2.59%
214	32	1	3.13%	249	179	2	1.12%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	0	0.00%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	0	0.00%
217	30	1	3.33%	252	98	2	2.04%
218	112	1	0.89%	253	133	0	0.00%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	3	14.29%
221	152	8	5.26%	256	15	3	20.00%
222	18	0	0.00%	257	34	1	2.94%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	0	0.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	2	1.31%	260	42	2	4.76%
226	63	3	4.76%	261	48	0	0.00%
227	52	2	3.85%	262	26	0	0.00%
228	24	2	8.33%	263	44	0	0.00%
229	282	9	3.19%	264	8	1	12.50%
230	324	2	0.62%	265	153	2	1.31%
231	550	4	0.73%	266	88	11	12.50%
232	70	0	0.00%	267	24	2	8.33%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	0	0.00%
234	83	2	2.41%	269	32	0	0.00%
235	100	0	0.00%	270	26	3	11.54%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	3	3.61%
237	45	8	17.78%	272	11	0	0.00%
238	124	5	4.03%	273	33	4	12.12%
239	40	0	0.00%	274	23	0	0.00%
240	87	4	4.60%	275	32	2	6.25%
241	74	5	6.76%	276	5	1	20.00%
242	53	0	0.00%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	0	0.00%	278	3	0	0.00%
244	163	17	10.43%	279	2	0	0.00%
245	13	0	0.00%	280	2	0	0.00%

## Appendix B7: Use of Technical ETSIs by Deputy

**Table 6A: Number/Percent Use of the Technical Issue ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N ETSIs	N Arrests	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	1	100.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	4	12.50%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	1	100.00%
4	429	12	2.80%	39	665	26	3.91%
5	113	6	5.31%	40	6	4	66.67%
6	43	6	13.95%	41	18	2	11.11%
7	4	2	50.00%	42	13	4	30.77%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	3	20.00%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	9	12.86%
10	5	0	0.00%	45	194	6	3.09%
11	85	8	9.41%	46	35	9	25.71%
12	6	2	33.33%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	5	18.52%	48	4	2	50.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	1	3.85%
15	79	5	6.33%	50	11	3	27.27%
16	1	1	100.00%	51	39	2	5.13%
17	53	2	3.77%	52	29	2	6.90%
18	10	1	10.00%	53	4	0	0.00%
19	385	18	4.68%	54	75	8	10.67%
20	954	6	0.63%	55	21	8	38.10%
21	65	4	6.15%	56	12	1	8.33%
22	20	2	10.00%	57	12	1	8.33%
23	2	1	50.00%	58	38	7	18.42%
24	80	17	21.25%	59	9	2	22.22%
25	23	5	21.74%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	3	33.33%	61	16	0	0.00%
27	29	9	31.03%	62	32	6	18.75%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	8	50.00%
29	83	8	9.64%	64	1	1	100.00%
30	2	1	50.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	1	50.00%	66	195	6	3.08%
32	34	5	14.71%	67	4	1	25.00%
33	68	10	14.71%	68	8	4	50.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	5	33.33%
35	96	9	9.38%	70	2	1	50.00%

**Table 6B: Number/Percent Use of the Technical Issue ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	5	4.24%	106	28	0	0.00%
72	24	4	16.67%	107	3	2	66.67%
73	27	1	3.70%	108	134	8	5.97%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	12	5.31%	110	34	8	23.53%
76	40	1	2.50%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	11	12.64%	112	239	35	14.64%
78	35	5	14.29%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	8	25.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	7	46.67%	115	1	1	100.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	3	10.71%
82	4	1	25.00%	117	41	9	21.95%
83	39	20	51.28%	118	81	10	12.35%
84	1	1	100.00%	119	287	23	8.01%
85	57	4	7.02%	120	16	2	12.50%
86	39	6	15.38%	121	4	2	50.00%
87	9	3	33.33%	122	623	25	4.01%
88	70	4	5.71%	123	528	7	1.33%
89	170	4	2.35%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	4	26.67%	125	111	9	8.11%
91	16	0	0.00%	126	139	2	1.44%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	1	100.00%
93	631	6	0.95%	128	3	2	66.67%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	4	50.00%
95	5	2	40.00%	130	3	1	33.33%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	1	3.70%
97	1	1	100.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	2	5.13%	133	2	0	0.00%
99	13	1	7.69%	134	7	4	57.14%
100	4	0	0.00%	135	217	31	14.29%
101	21	14	66.67%	136	10	2	20.00%
102	115	5	4.35%	137	25	3	12.00%
103	222	9	4.05%	138	78	10	12.82%
104	107	5	4.67%	139	118	14	11.86%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	1	25.00%

**Table 6C: Number/Percent Use of the Technical Issue ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	11	9.73%	176	57	2	3.51%
142	100	4	4.00%	177	47	0	0.00%
143	158	5	3.16%	178	61	3	4.92%
144	36	13	36.11%	179	31	1	3.23%
145	106	11	10.38%	180	26	2	7.69%
146	91	7	7.69%	181	32	4	12.50%
147	10	2	20.00%	182	64	10	15.63%
148	499	2	0.40%	183	18	2	11.11%
149	28	7	25.00%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	1	5.88%	185	248	24	9.68%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	3	3.53%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	2	16.67%
153	30	4	13.33%	188	21	7	33.33%
154	16	1	6.25%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	13	52.00%	190	88	4	4.55%
156	97	38	39.18%	191	38	6	15.79%
157	75	1	1.33%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	0	0.00%	193	161	15	9.32%
159	15	3	20.00%	194	307	19	6.19%
160	7	1	14.29%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	5	25.00%	196	28	0	0.00%
162	104	18	17.31%	197	51	1	1.96%
163	67	0	0.00%	198	152	8	5.26%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	11	34.38%	200	27	7	25.93%
166	5	1	20.00%	201	42	3	7.14%
167	46	2	4.35%	202	54	2	3.70%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	2	5.00%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	1	6.25%
170	115	1	0.87%	205	34	2	5.88%
171	87	15	17.24%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	9	7.20%
173	41	4	9.76%	208	53	1	1.89%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	5	10.42%
175	77	6	7.79%	210	200	20	10.00%

**Table 6D: Number/Percent Use of the Technical Issue ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	4	6.56%	246	30	5	16.67%
212	4	0	0.00%	247	81	16	19.75%
213	93	12	12.90%	248	193	18	9.33%
214	32	8	25.00%	249	179	12	6.70%
215	22	4	18.18%	250	130	12	9.23%
216	20	6	30.00%	251	57	7	12.28%
217	30	1	3.33%	252	98	11	11.22%
218	112	1	0.89%	253	133	17	12.78%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	1	2.70%	255	21	3	14.29%
221	152	9	5.92%	256	15	6	40.00%
222	18	4	22.22%	257	34	2	5.88%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	6	20.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	1	20.00%
225	153	0	0.00%	260	42	7	16.67%
226	63	5	7.94%	261	48	10	20.83%
227	52	13	25.00%	262	26	2	7.69%
228	24	4	16.67%	263	44	2	4.55%
229	282	9	3.19%	264	8	4	50.00%
230	324	13	4.01%	265	153	15	9.80%
231	550	18	3.27%	266	88	5	5.68%
232	70	8	11.43%	267	24	0	0.00%
233	1	1	100.00%	268	36	9	25.00%
234	83	1	1.20%	269	32	3	9.38%
235	100	0	0.00%	270	26	7	26.92%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	8	9.64%
237	45	5	11.11%	272	11	3	27.27%
238	124	7	5.65%	273	33	2	6.06%
239	40	5	12.50%	274	23	4	17.39%
240	87	3	3.45%	275	32	0	0.00%
241	74	8	10.81%	276	5	4	80.00%
242	53	2	3.77%	277	5	1	20.00%
243	16	1	6.25%	278	3	1	33.33%
244	163	26	15.95%	279	2	1	50.00%
245	13	4	30.77%	280	2	0	0.00%

## Appendix B8: Use of Vehicle Tow ETSIs by Deputy

**Table 7A: Number/Percent Use of the Vehicle Tow ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSI	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	0	0.00%	37	32	3	9.38%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	3	0.70%	39	665	2	0.30%
5	113	3	2.65%	40	6	0	0.00%
6	43	1	2.33%	41	18	0	0.00%
7	4	0	0.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	2	13.33%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	0	0.00%
10	5	1	20.00%	45	194	1	0.52%
11	85	1	1.18%	46	35	2	5.71%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	1	3.70%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	1	1.27%	50	11	0	0.00%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	1	2.56%
17	53	0	0.00%	52	29	0	0.00%
18	10	0	0.00%	53	4	1	25.00%
19	385	1	0.26%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	24	2.52%	55	21	0	0.00%
21	65	0	0.00%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	0	0.00%	57	12	1	8.33%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	0	0.00%
24	80	0	0.00%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	1	6.25%
27	29	1	3.45%	62	32	1	3.13%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	1	1.20%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	1	0.51%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	0	0.00%	68	8	2	25.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	0	0.00%
35	96	2	2.08%	70	2	0	0.00%

**Table 7B: Number/Percent Use of the Vehicle Tow ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	14	11.86%	106	28	1	3.57%
72	24	1	4.17%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	0	0.00%	108	134	0	0.00%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	1	0.44%	110	34	0	0.00%
76	40	0	0.00%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	3	3.45%	112	239	3	1.26%
78	35	0	0.00%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	0	0.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	1	6.67%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	1	2.44%
83	39	4	10.26%	118	81	0	0.00%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	17	5.92%
85	57	0	0.00%	120	16	0	0.00%
86	39	0	0.00%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	11	1.77%
88	70	4	5.71%	123	528	4	0.76%
89	170	1	0.59%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	0	0.00%	125	111	1	0.90%
91	16	0	0.00%	126	139	2	1.44%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	1	0.16%	128	3	0	0.00%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	0	0.00%	130	3	2	66.67%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	1	2.56%	133	2	1	50.00%
99	13	0	0.00%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	0	0.00%	135	217	0	0.00%
101	21	3	14.29%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	3	2.61%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	3	1.35%	138	78	1	1.28%
104	107	0	0.00%	139	118	0	0.00%
105	10	0	0.00%	140	4	0	0.00%



**Table 7C: Number/Percent Use of the Vehicle Tow ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	4	3.54%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	3	3.00%	177	47	0	0.00%
143	158	2	1.27%	178	61	0	0.00%
144	36	2	5.56%	179	31	1	3.23%
145	106	1	0.94%	180	26	2	7.69%
146	91	5	5.49%	181	32	5	15.63%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	2	3.13%
148	499	1	0.20%	183	18	4	22.22%
149	28	2	7.14%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	1	5.88%	185	248	4	1.61%
151	4	1	25.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	2	9.52%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	6	24.00%	190	88	3	3.41%
156	97	1	1.03%	191	38	1	2.63%
157	75	1	1.33%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	2	5.71%	193	161	3	1.86%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	0	0.00%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	0	0.00%	196	28	2	7.14%
162	104	1	0.96%	197	51	3	5.88%
163	67	0	0.00%	198	152	1	0.66%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	5	15.63%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	2	4.76%
167	46	1	2.17%	202	54	1	1.85%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	7	17.50%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	0	0.00%
170	115	2	1.74%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	2	2.30%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	1	0.80%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	2	3.77%
174	55	1	1.82%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	5	6.49%	210	200	13	6.50%

**Table 7D: Number/Percent Use of the Vehicle Tow ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	1	1.64%	246	30	0	0.00%
212	4	1	25.00%	247	81	3	3.70%
213	93	7	7.53%	248	193	7	3.63%
214	32	1	3.13%	249	179	3	1.68%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	0	0.00%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	0	0.00%
217	30	1	3.33%	252	98	2	2.04%
218	112	1	0.89%	253	133	1	0.75%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	0	0.00%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	2	9.52%
221	152	5	3.29%	256	15	2	13.33%
222	18	0	0.00%	257	34	0	0.00%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	0	0.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	0	0.00%	260	42	1	2.38%
226	63	3	4.76%	261	48	0	0.00%
227	52	2	3.85%	262	26	0	0.00%
228	24	2	8.33%	263	44	0	0.00%
229	282	8	2.84%	264	8	1	12.50%
230	324	3	0.93%	265	153	1	0.65%
231	550	7	1.27%	266	88	9	10.23%
232	70	1	1.43%	267	24	2	8.33%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	0	0.00%
234	83	1	1.20%	269	32	2	6.25%
235	100	0	0.00%	270	26	1	3.85%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	2	2.41%
237	45	5	11.11%	272	11	0	0.00%
238	124	5	4.03%	273	33	2	6.06%
239	40	1	2.50%	274	23	1	4.35%
240	87	3	3.45%	275	32	2	6.25%
241	74	4	5.41%	276	5	0	0.00%
242	53	0	0.00%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	0	0.00%	278	3	0	0.00%
244	163	11	6.75%	279	2	0	0.00%
245	13	0	0.00%	280	2	0	0.00%

## Appendix B9: Use of Training ETSIs by Deputy

**Table 8A: Number/Percent Use of the Training ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	1	50.00%	37	32	0	0.00%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	2	0.47%	39	665	0	0.00%
5	113	0	0.00%	40	6	0	0.00%
6	43	0	0.00%	41	18	7	38.89%
7	4	4	100.00%	42	13	0	0.00%
8	2	1	50.00%	43	15	0	0.00%
9	22	0	0.00%	44	70	0	0.00%
10	5	0	0.00%	45	194	0	0.00%
11	85	3	3.53%	46	35	0	0.00%
12	6	0	0.00%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	1	3.70%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	0	0.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	0	0.00%	50	11	2	18.18%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	2	5.13%
17	53	0	0.00%	52	29	0	0.00%
18	10	0	0.00%	53	4	0	0.00%
19	385	2	0.52%	54	75	0	0.00%
20	954	0	0.00%	55	21	0	0.00%
21	65	0	0.00%	56	12	0	0.00%
22	20	0	0.00%	57	12	0	0.00%
23	2	1	50.00%	58	38	0	0.00%
24	80	0	0.00%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	0	0.00%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	0	0.00%	61	16	0	0.00%
27	29	0	0.00%	62	32	4	12.50%
28	4	0	0.00%	63	16	1	6.25%
29	83	0	0.00%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	0	0.00%
32	34	0	0.00%	67	4	0	0.00%
33	68	2	2.94%	68	8	0	0.00%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	0	0.00%
35	96	0	0.00%	70	2	0	0.00%

**Table 8B: Number/Percent Use of the Training ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	1	0.85%	106	28	0	0.00%
72	24	0	0.00%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	0	0.00%	108	134	0	0.00%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	1	0.44%	110	34	0	0.00%
76	40	1	2.50%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	1	1.15%	112	239	0	0.00%
78	35	0	0.00%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	0	0.00%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	0	0.00%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	0	0.00%
83	39	6	15.38%	118	81	0	0.00%
84	1	0	0.00%	119	287	7	2.44%
85	57	0	0.00%	120	16	0	0.00%
86	39	4	10.26%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	4	0.64%
88	70	0	0.00%	123	528	16	3.03%
89	170	0	0.00%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	0	0.00%	125	111	0	0.00%
91	16	0	0.00%	126	139	0	0.00%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	0	0.00%	128	3	1	33.33%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	0	0.00%	130	3	1	33.33%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	1	100.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	0	0.00%	133	2	0	0.00%
99	13	0	0.00%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	0	0.00%	135	217	0	0.00%
101	21	0	0.00%	136	10	0	0.00%
102	115	0	0.00%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	0	0.00%	138	78	0	0.00%
104	107	1	0.93%	139	118	0	0.00%
105	10	1	10.00%	140	4	0	0.00%

**Table 8C: Number/Percent Use of the Training ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	0	0.00%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	1	1.00%	177	47	0	0.00%
143	158	0	0.00%	178	61	1	1.64%
144	36	0	0.00%	179	31	0	0.00%
145	106	39	36.79%	180	26	0	0.00%
146	91	0	0.00%	181	32	0	0.00%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	0	0.00%
148	499	0	0.00%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	0	0.00%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	1	0.40%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	0	0.00%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	5	16.67%	188	21	0	0.00%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	0	0.00%
155	25	2	8.00%	190	88	0	0.00%
156	97	0	0.00%	191	38	1	2.63%
157	75	4	5.33%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	2	5.71%	193	161	33	20.50%
159	15	1	6.67%	194	307	0	0.00%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	0	0.00%
161	20	0	0.00%	196	28	0	0.00%
162	104	0	0.00%	197	51	0	0.00%
163	67	0	0.00%	198	152	1	0.66%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	0	0.00%
165	32	0	0.00%	200	27	0	0.00%
166	5	0	0.00%	201	42	0	0.00%
167	46	0	0.00%	202	54	0	0.00%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	0	0.00%
169	1	0	0.00%	204	16	1	6.25%
170	115	0	0.00%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	0	0.00%	206	32	0	0.00%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	0	0.00%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	0	0.00%
174	55	0	0.00%	209	48	0	0.00%
175	77	0	0.00%	210	200	0	0.00%

**Table 8D: Number/Percent Use of the Training ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	1	1.64%	246	30	2	6.67%
212	4	0	0.00%	247	81	43	53.09%
213	93	0	0.00%	248	193	62	32.12%
214	32	0	0.00%	249	179	71	39.66%
215	22	0	0.00%	250	130	25	19.23%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	19	33.33%
217	30	0	0.00%	252	98	55	56.12%
218	112	0	0.00%	253	133	49	36.84%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	11	100.00%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	17	80.95%
221	152	0	0.00%	256	15	5	33.33%
222	18	0	0.00%	257	34	19	55.88%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	24	80.00%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	4	80.00%
225	153	1	0.65%	260	42	27	64.29%
226	63	0	0.00%	261	48	19	39.58%
227	52	1	1.92%	262	26	25	96.15%
228	24	3	12.50%	263	44	14	31.82%
229	282	0	0.00%	264	8	7	87.50%
230	324	0	0.00%	265	153	78	50.98%
231	550	1	0.18%	266	88	30	34.09%
232	70	1	1.43%	267	24	24	100.00%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	26	72.22%
234	83	0	0.00%	269	32	29	90.63%
235	100	0	0.00%	270	26	25	96.15%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	34	40.96%
237	45	0	0.00%	272	11	11	100.00%
238	124	2	1.61%	273	33	26	78.79%
239	40	0	0.00%	274	23	23	100.00%
240	87	0	0.00%	275	32	31	96.88%
241	74	3	4.05%	276	5	5	100.00%
242	53	1	1.89%	277	5	5	100.00%
243	16	6	37.50%	278	3	3	100.00%
244	163	7	4.29%	279	2	2	100.00%
245	13	2	15.38%	280	2	2	100.00%

## Appendix B10: Other Delay ETSI Use by Deputy

**Table 9A: Number/Percent Use of the Other Delay ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
1	1	0	0.00%	36	1	0	0.00%
2	2	1	50.00%	37	32	3	9.38%
3	1	0	0.00%	38	1	0	0.00%
4	429	5	1.17%	39	665	18	2.71%
5	113	2	1.77%	40	6	1	16.67%
6	43	9	20.93%	41	18	1	5.56%
7	4	1	25.00%	42	13	2	15.38%
8	2	0	0.00%	43	15	2	13.33%
9	22	3	13.64%	44	70	3	4.29%
10	5	2	40.00%	45	194	5	2.58%
11	85	8	9.41%	46	35	0	0.00%
12	6	2	33.33%	47	25	0	0.00%
13	27	7	25.93%	48	4	0	0.00%
14	1	1	100.00%	49	26	0	0.00%
15	79	7	8.86%	50	11	1	9.09%
16	1	0	0.00%	51	39	1	2.56%
17	53	6	11.32%	52	29	2	6.90%
18	10	6	60.00%	53	4	0	0.00%
19	385	83	21.56%	54	75	5	6.67%
20	954	44	4.61%	55	21	0	0.00%
21	65	8	12.31%	56	12	2	16.67%
22	20	1	5.00%	57	12	0	0.00%
23	2	0	0.00%	58	38	1	2.63%
24	80	2	2.50%	59	9	0	0.00%
25	23	1	4.35%	60	1	0	0.00%
26	9	1	11.11%	61	16	2	12.50%
27	29	5	17.24%	62	32	0	0.00%
28	4	1	25.00%	63	16	2	12.50%
29	83	18	21.69%	64	1	0	0.00%
30	2	0	0.00%	65	5	0	0.00%
31	2	0	0.00%	66	195	18	9.23%
32	34	2	5.88%	67	4	1	25.00%
33	68	23	33.82%	68	8	3	37.50%
34	2	0	0.00%	69	15	6	40.00%
35	96	11	11.46%	70	2	0	0.00%

**Table 9B: Number/Percent Use of the Other Delay ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
71	118	8	6.78%	106	28	0	0.00%
72	24	0	0.00%	107	3	0	0.00%
73	27	2	7.41%	108	134	8	5.97%
74	1	0	0.00%	109	7	0	0.00%
75	226	7	3.10%	110	34	4	11.76%
76	40	4	10.00%	111	1	0	0.00%
77	87	28	32.18%	112	239	16	6.69%
78	35	2	5.71%	113	2	0	0.00%
79	32	6	18.75%	114	15	0	0.00%
80	15	2	13.33%	115	1	0	0.00%
81	2	0	0.00%	116	28	0	0.00%
82	4	0	0.00%	117	41	2	4.88%
83	39	30	76.92%	118	81	1	1.23%
84	1	1	100.00%	119	287	6	2.09%
85	57	2	3.51%	120	16	2	12.50%
86	39	3	7.69%	121	4	0	0.00%
87	9	0	0.00%	122	623	40	6.42%
88	70	3	4.29%	123	528	3	0.57%
89	170	0	0.00%	124	51	0	0.00%
90	15	1	6.67%	125	111	23	20.72%
91	16	0	0.00%	126	139	3	2.16%
92	6	0	0.00%	127	1	0	0.00%
93	631	19	3.01%	128	3	1	33.33%
94	3	0	0.00%	129	8	0	0.00%
95	5	4	80.00%	130	3	2	66.67%
96	7	0	0.00%	131	27	0	0.00%
97	1	0	0.00%	132	1	0	0.00%
98	39	2	5.13%	133	2	0	0.00%
99	13	1	7.69%	134	7	0	0.00%
100	4	1	25.00%	135	217	46	21.20%
101	21	2	9.52%	136	10	1	10.00%
102	115	5	4.35%	137	25	0	0.00%
103	222	0	0.00%	138	78	0	0.00%
104	107	7	6.54%	139	118	13	11.02%
105	10	4	40.00%	140	4	0	0.00%



**Table 9C: Number/Percent Use of the Other Delay ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
141	113	29	25.66%	176	57	0	0.00%
142	100	1	1.00%	177	47	2	4.26%
143	158	7	4.43%	178	61	1	1.64%
144	36	4	11.11%	179	31	3	9.68%
145	106	2	1.89%	180	26	3	11.54%
146	91	0	0.00%	181	32	0	0.00%
147	10	0	0.00%	182	64	1	1.56%
148	499	11	2.20%	183	18	0	0.00%
149	28	0	0.00%	184	1	0	0.00%
150	17	0	0.00%	185	248	9	3.63%
151	4	0	0.00%	186	85	1	1.18%
152	11	0	0.00%	187	12	0	0.00%
153	30	0	0.00%	188	21	0	0.00%
154	16	0	0.00%	189	11	1	9.09%
155	25	9	36.00%	190	88	6	6.82%
156	97	5	5.15%	191	38	1	2.63%
157	75	1	1.33%	192	7	0	0.00%
158	35	6	17.14%	193	161	11	6.83%
159	15	0	0.00%	194	307	8	2.61%
160	7	0	0.00%	195	9	1	11.11%
161	20	2	10.00%	196	28	1	3.57%
162	104	3	2.88%	197	51	0	0.00%
163	67	0	0.00%	198	152	6	3.95%
164	6	0	0.00%	199	43	1	2.33%
165	32	6	18.75%	200	27	4	14.81%
166	5	1	20.00%	201	42	1	2.38%
167	46	4	8.70%	202	54	2	3.70%
168	12	0	0.00%	203	40	19	47.50%
169	1	1	100.00%	204	16	2	12.50%
170	115	2	1.74%	205	34	0	0.00%
171	87	1	1.15%	206	32	1	3.13%
172	8	0	0.00%	207	125	31	24.80%
173	41	0	0.00%	208	53	2	3.77%
174	55	3	5.45%	209	48	1	2.08%
175	77	2	2.60%	210	200	34	17.00%

**Table 9D: Number/Percent Use of the Other Delay ETSI, by Deputy**

Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent	Deputy	N stops	N ETSIs	Percent
211	61	5	8.20%	246	30	2	6.67%
212	4	1	25.00%	247	81	2	2.47%
213	93	5	5.38%	248	193	8	4.15%
214	32	6	18.75%	249	179	3	1.68%
215	22	2	9.09%	250	130	22	16.92%
216	20	0	0.00%	251	57	10	17.54%
217	30	0	0.00%	252	98	6	6.12%
218	112	9	8.04%	253	133	25	18.80%
219	1	0	0.00%	254	11	1	9.09%
220	37	0	0.00%	255	21	3	14.29%
221	152	49	32.24%	256	15	0	0.00%
222	18	3	16.67%	257	34	3	8.82%
223	58	0	0.00%	258	30	2	6.67%
224	7	0	0.00%	259	5	0	0.00%
225	153	9	5.88%	260	42	4	9.52%
226	63	1	1.59%	261	48	18	37.50%
227	52	7	13.46%	262	26	1	3.85%
228	24	5	20.83%	263	44	0	0.00%
229	282	13	4.61%	264	8	1	12.50%
230	324	2	0.62%	265	153	2	1.31%
231	550	12	2.18%	266	88	4	4.55%
232	70	8	11.43%	267	24	4	16.67%
233	1	0	0.00%	268	36	7	19.44%
234	83	1	1.20%	269	32	0	0.00%
235	100	3	3.00%	270	26	2	7.69%
236	28	0	0.00%	271	83	24	28.92%
237	45	9	20.00%	272	11	0	0.00%
238	124	2	1.61%	273	33	2	6.06%
239	40	3	7.50%	274	23	0	0.00%
240	87	9	10.34%	275	32	1	3.13%
241	74	15	20.27%	276	5	1	20.00%
242	53	0	0.00%	277	5	0	0.00%
243	16	1	6.25%	278	3	0	0.00%
244	163	29	17.79%	279	2	1	50.00%
245	13	0	0.00%	280	2	1	50.00%

## Appendix B11: Use of Technical Issue ETSIs by Vehicle

**Table 10A:** Number and Percentage Use of ETSI Technical by Vehicle

Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent	Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent	Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent
311354	6	0	0.00%	312037	75	12	16.00%	321444	49	6	12.24%
311419	4	0	0.00%	312038	65	6	9.23%	321477	2	0	0.00%
311458	125	14	11.20%	312039	21	4	19.05%	321511	28	14	50.00%
311528	88	11	12.50%	312040	38	8	21.05%	321516	14	2	14.29%
311626	50	0	0.00%	312041	69	12	17.39%	321518	29	4	13.79%
311639	10	1	10.00%	312042	76	4	5.26%	321519	11	5	45.45%
311642	146	11	7.53%	312043	65	4	6.15%	321534	40	3	7.50%
311644	28	2	7.14%	312049	1	0	0.00%	321717	5	7	140.00%
311645	59	3	5.08%	312053	3	0	0.00%	321725	76	6	7.89%
311648	31	1	3.23%	312055	69	5	7.25%	321812	9	1	11.11%
311649	3	2	66.67%	312060	172	3	1.74%	321817	60	7	11.67%
311651	87	6	6.90%	312071	662	25	3.78%	321818	11	2	18.18%
311653	37	3	8.11%	312072	75	8	10.67%	321819	69	8	11.59%
311655	41	9	21.95%	312136	56	8	14.29%	321820	35	0	0.00%
311656	112	9	8.04%	312138	54	4	7.41%	321822	6	1	16.67%
311661	2	0	0.00%	312143	155	13	8.39%	321824	36	2	5.56%
311701	49	11	22.45%	312144	87	5	5.75%	321825	367	9	2.45%
311704	20	1	5.00%	312145	109	14	12.84%	321826	40	3	7.50%
311705	79	2	2.53%	312146	215	19	8.84%	321836	72	6	8.33%
311706	14	1	7.14%	312151	12	5	41.67%	321837	57	11	19.30%
311717	45	11	24.44%	312152	79	3	3.80%	321838	448	24	5.36%
311722	31	8	25.81%	3122157	5	0	0.00%	321839	177	13	7.34%
311723	147	4	2.72%	312228	6	2	33.33%	321840	95	6	6.32%
311725	1	0	0.00%	312262	2	0	0.00%	321841	123	5	4.07%
311743	81	10	12.35%	312271	18	1	5.56%	321843	61	4	6.56%
311789	172	20	11.63%	312272	17	8	47.06%	321845	56	10	17.86%
311790	42	5	11.90%	312273	26	3	11.54%	321847	27	15	55.56%
311791	18	1	5.56%	312274	2	1	50.00%	321055	11	5	45.45%
311792	50	5	10.00%	312278	109	3	2.75%	321214	28	0	0.00%
311915	8	2	25.00%	312279	15	0	0.00%	321430	1	0	0.00%
311960	40	11	27.50%	312280	22	6	27.27%	321848	154	8	5.19%
312013	60	7	11.67%	312281	13	4	30.77%	321849	27	3	11.11%
312014	24	4	16.67%	312282	101	10	9.90%	321852	70	4	5.71%
312019	115	5	4.35%	312283	36	9	25.00%	321853	36	5	13.89%
312021	30	2	6.67%	312285	276	10	3.62%	321854	22	4	18.18%
312025	38	5	13.16%	312286	37	7	18.92%	321860	9	0	0.00%
312026	77	5	6.49%	312287	38	2	5.26%	321861	55	3	5.45%
312027	100	8	8.00%	312288	36	2	5.56%	321862	10	0	0.00%
312029	38	8	21.05%	312290	48	6	12.50%	321863	28	5	17.86%

Table 10B: Number and Percentage Use of ETSI Technical by Vehicle

Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent	Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent	Vehicle	N Stops	N ETSI	Percent
321864	27	4	14.81%	321947	140	12	8.57%	322154	32	4	12.50%
321866	47	3	6.38%	321948	41	0	0.00%	322156	38	2	5.26%
321867	74	2	2.70%	322007	196	18	9.18%	322158	15	5	33.33%
321868	114	9	7.89%	322009	76	2	2.63%	322305	2	0	0.00%
321872	26	4	15.38%	322010	174	8	4.60%	322306	17	3	17.65%
321873	27	0	0.00%	322106	33	4	12.12%	322307	12	3	25.00%
321905	22	2	9.09%	322108	68	8	11.76%	322308	137	25	18.25%
321906	227	16	7.05%	322109	72	4	5.56%	322309	40	5	12.50%
321907	98	7	7.14%	322110	76	8	10.53%	322310	84	6	7.14%
321908	69	16	23.19%	322111	750	8	1.07%	322311	62	6	9.68%
321909	53	10	18.87%	322112	51	6	11.76%	322312	21	3	14.29%
321910	21	2	9.52%	322113	8	0	0.00%	322313	36	5	13.89%
321912	31	2	6.45%	322114	369	16	4.34%	322315	88	20	22.73%
321913	62	3	4.84%	322115	40	4	10.00%	322316	145	40	27.59%
321914	123	12	9.76%	322116	30	3	10.00%	322320	399	22	5.51%
321920	30	4	13.33%	322117	79	5	6.33%	322321	51	7	13.73%
321921	119	16	13.45%	322118	256	19	7.42%	322325	62	8	12.90%
321922	19	0	0.00%	322119	56	15	26.79%	322326	34	2	5.88%
321928	18	3	16.67%	322120	13	1	7.69%	322327	26	1	3.85%
321929	33	3	9.09%	322133	7	1	14.29%	322328	61	4	6.56%
321930	661	5	0.76%	322134	85	6	7.06%	322329	119	17	14.29%
321933	86	9	10.47%	322135	73	6	8.22%	322330	134	9	6.72%
321934	15	2	13.33%	322136	61	6	9.84%	322331	107	7	6.54%
321935	394	29	7.36%	322137	64	1	1.56%	322332	141	7	4.96%
321937	152	3	1.97%	322139	129	8	6.20%	322333	6	1	16.67%
321938	32	8	25.00%	322140	168	8	4.76%	322342	299	2	0.67%
321940	304	25	8.22%	322141	19	6	31.58%	322343	1	1	100.00%
321941	617	24	3.89%	322142	77	9	11.69%	331401	3	0	0.00%
321942	58	1	1.72%	322143	59	5	8.47%	331502	2	0	0.00%
321943	319	8	2.51%	322144	141	11	7.80%	512101	118	2	1.69%
321944	1	1	100.00%	322145	54	2	3.70%	512102	378	0	0.00%
321946	516	7	1.36%	322153	80	17	21.25%	711503	16	0	0.00%

## Appendix C: Initial BWC Review Results and Second Reviews

Following the initial review of Body Worn Camera footage, MCSO researchers identified reviewer errors which threatened the validity of findings of the agreement analysis. MCSO spent additional time reviewing stops where deputies and reviewers were not in agreement. For transparency, MCSO has identified which changes were made to reviewers' determinations and why. MC-numbers and rationale for the changes are provided should members of the Monitor's team and Parties wish to review any stops for which any data correction was made. Below is the initial agreement analysis prior to any changes in the reviewers' determinations of the delays in the stops.

### Second Reviewer Coding, BWC Evidence, and Rationale for Changes:

**MC23001961:** The reviewer indicated that there was no arrest during this stop while the VSCF data indicated that an arrest was made. A second review of the BWC video identified the deputy stating that the driver was exceeding 100 MPH in a 50 MPH zone. While explaining the citation to the driver, the deputy stated that the citation was "criminal" (at the 9:00 mark in the video). The deputy explained additional details about receiving a criminal citation between the 9:00 mark and 9:32 mark in the BWC video. The driver was not placed in custody but remained in his vehicle throughout the traffic stop. Criminal citations are considered arrests. The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-701.02A2 for driving 100 mph in a 50-mph zone as captured by radar. This is considered criminal speed.

**MC23009258:** The reviewer indicated that there was no arrest during this stop while the VSCF data indicated that an arrest was made. A second review of the BWC video identified the deputy stating to the driver that he was traveling 77 mph in a 45-mph zone (at the 2:48 mark in the video). At the 6:40 mark in the video, a voice from a second deputy was heard. The primary deputy stated to the second deputy that the driver was traveling at 77 mph. At the 7:26 mark in the video, the primary deputy stated to the second deputy, "I'm doing a criminal cite." The deputy stated to the driver that he was issuing a citation "for driving over 20 over the speed limit" (16:00 minute mark in the video). The deputy explained to the driver that he must appear in court for this citation. The driver did not exit the vehicle during the traffic stop. The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-701.02A3 for traveling 77 mph in a 45-mph zone as captured by radar. This is considered criminal speed.

**MC23012339:** The reviewer identified that no arrest was made during this stop while the VSCF data indicated that an arrest was made. A second review of the BWC video identified the deputy stating to the driver that he was traveling at 74 mph in a 50-mph zone. The driver did not have a driver's license with him and provided the deputy with an identification card. The driver stated that he had lost his license, but that it was valid. The driver also stated that he was on parole. When returning to the vehicle the deputy explained to the driver that his license was suspended in 2018 (12:55-minute mark in the video). The deputy explained why the driver's license was suspended. At the 13:50 mark in the video, the deputy explained that the driver was being cited for driving on a suspended license and stated "that's a criminal violation." The deputy explained that the driver must attend court to address the citation. The driver did not exit the vehicle during the stop. The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-3473A (Driving with a license suspended/revoked/cancelled). This is a criminal offense. The driver was also cited for speeding (ARS 28-701A) for traveling at 74 mph in a 50-mph zone as captured by radar.

**MC23016973:** The initial reviewer indicated there were driving documentation issues that delayed the stop while the deputy did not indicate that driving documentation issues were present during the stop. The driver took approximately one minute to supply the license and registration but provided a temporary insurance card to deputy. The driver eventually tried pulling up insurance information on his phone but did not supply it. At the 3:30 mark the driver stated "I don't speak English." When the deputy returned to the vehicle he verbalized that there was a language barrier. He also stated that the driver did not have his insurance and that it was in the driver's other vehicle. The driver used google translate to communicate with the deputy. There was a second person (deputy) who seemed to be directing the deputy during the stop but had questions for the primary deputy that seemed like he did not understand the traffic stop process. It was unclear if the other person in the vehicle was training or if it was a ride-along, although the second person appeared to be reviewing the paperwork as the primary deputy completed it but was otherwise not visible in the video. There was no additional BWC footage and the second deputy seemed to stay in the vehicle during the stop. The deputy was able to scan the registration without issue. The deputy can be seen re-opening TraCS at the 10:45-minute mark in the video and stated "It's going to take a minute or two to sign back into this." The deputy processed the citation for running a red light. The primary deputy called a second deputy to translate when issuing the citation. Based on the delay caused by the driver not being able to provide proof of insurance in a timely manner, as evidenced in the BWC footage, the reviewer's determination of driving documentation issue was not changed for the analysis presented in the main body of the report.

**MC23017051:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were delays related to driving documentation issues that delayed the stop while the deputy did not indicate driving documentation issues in the VSCF form. Additional review of the BWC footage revealed that the driver had

expired registration for the vehicle and the driver took a few minutes to find his insurance. The driver's registration had been expired for over four years. The old registration would not scan into the system. The deputy stated audibly at the 6:10-minute mark "It's not scanning." The deputy could be seen entering vehicle information into TraCS by hand at 7:00-minute mark. Based on the second review of the BWC that there were driving documentation issues that delayed the stop, the reviewer's initial determination was not changed for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23018498:** The initial reviewer indicated that there was no Other Delay involved in this video. In review of the BWC footage, a second deputy's BWC footage is relatively stationary while the primary deputy completes the paperwork to process the stop. At the 4:40 mark in the video, the second deputy can be heard giving instructions to the primary deputy. The secondary deputy indicated that dispatch had run the driver's information incorrectly (6:00-minute mark in the video). The primary deputy asked dispatch to run an updated "28" (License plate) at the 7:00-minute mark in the video. Dispatch returned information on the vehicle at the 8:00-minute mark. Further, this stop appeared to be a training stop, with deputies reviewing the vehicle information together while processing the stop. Based on the delays observed with dispatch needing to run the license plate a second time and the deputy needing to review this information for accuracy, the reviewer's determination of no "Other Delay" was changed to Other Delay present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. Further, this stop appeared to be a training stop, with deputies reviewing the vehicle information together while processing the stop.

**MC23019039:** The initial reviewer did not identify any delays associated with this stop while the deputy identified other delays in the VSCF. When initially contacting the driver, the driver indicated that she did not have current insurance with her in the vehicle and that she would look it up on her phone. (at 3:30 in the BWC video). The driver supplied the deputy with a paper temporary drivers license issued by the MVD. The deputy can be seen entering information from this document into the computer at 4:30 in the BWC footage. The deputy verbalizes frustration with the form she is working on at the 7-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy then verbalizes at the 7:45-minute mark that she would need to enter the driver's information into TraCS manually. The deputy verbalizes that she was having difficulty finding the vehicle's model in the computer (9:30). When the deputy returned to the vehicle, the driver had accessed her proof of insurance on her computer and showed it to the deputy. At the end of the stop (12:15 in the BWC footage), the driver needed directions and the deputy took time to help the driver with her navigation. Based on observing the deputy assisting the driver with her navigation the initial reviewer's determination of no other delay, was changed to other delay for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23021422:** The initial reviewer identified Driving Documentation Issues for this stop while the deputy indicated on the VSCF the Driving Documentation Issues were not present as a delay. BWC footage indicated the driver took about one minute to collect her license, insurance and registration. There did not appear to be any delays on the BWC footage and the stop only lasted



11 minutes. The deputy did indicate in the VSCF that he scanned an older registration for the vehicle and needed to rescan the document. Absent convincing evidence, the reviewer's determination that the stop was not delayed for driving documentation issues stayed the same for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23027146:** The initial reviewer for this stop indicated that there were no driving documentation issues for the stop while the deputy did indicate driving documentation issues. The stop was of a commercial vehicle (semi) for aggressive driving/reckless driving. The deputy asked for the driver's license, registration, and proof of insurance. The deputy was also provided with the driver's logbook. The driver wished to show the deputy his dash camera video to show that the other driver was being aggressive. The video was visible in the BWC footage and eventually showed the truck driver driving aggressively in relation to the other vehicle on the road. The deputy noted to dispatch that the stop was going to be delayed because he was reviewing the driver's dash camera video (at 18:00-minutes into the BWC footage. The deputy can be seen rebooting TraCS at the 27:15-minute mark. At the 30:30 mark in the video, the deputy asked dispatch if there was a DPS CDL inspector available to assist with the stop. The deputy was reviewing the driver's log/folder with information about the truck and transport. The deputy was reviewing the contents of the folder to identify insurance and registration. Dispatch asked what level of service the deputy needed from DPS for the commercial vehicle stop. The deputy indicated that he was unsure what he was looking at in regard to the documentation the driver provided for the commercial vehicle (about the 34:30-minute mark in the BWC video). Dispatch notified the deputy to standby. At the 37:40-mark in the video dispatch indicated that the deputy would need to call the DPS. The deputy called the trooper at the 39:00-minute mark in the BWC footage and explained that he did "not do CDL stuff" and that he did "not know what he was looking at." The trooper indicated that there was no one in the area and gave advice on how to handle the stop and the CDL situation. Based on the evidence observed in the BWC footage and the conversation the deputy had with the DPS trooper about the driver's logbook, the reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issue was changed to driving documentation issue present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23035400:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were no Technical Issues experienced during the stop. The initial reviewer also indicated that there were no driving documentation issues present during the stop while the deputy selected the Driving Documentation ETSI in the VSCF. After a second review of the video, The driver was notified at the beginning of the stop that his license plate was suspended by the MVD for no mandatory insurance (1:00-minute mark in the BWC video). Later, the primary deputy is speaking with a second deputy during the stop and states that he is having issues with the form he is filling out (9:15-mark in the video). The two deputies spend a bit of time discussing the issue with the form and what should be entered into a particular field to properly document a plate seizure. At the 12:00-minute mark the deputy states "it won't let me..." followed by something inaudible. At the 12:40-mark the deputy indicates that the seizure form "freezes all the time." Based on the audio communication evident in the BWC footage, the



reviewer's initial determination of no Technical Issue present was changed to Technical Issue present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

The reviewer for this stop indicated no Other Delay and the deputy indicated Other Delay for the stop. During the stop a license plate was seized from the vehicle because it had been suspended by the MVD for mandatory insurance. The seizure is visible in the second deputy's BWC at the 1:03-minute mark. Based on the evidence in the BWC footage, the reviewer's initial determination of no Other Delay present was changed to Other Delay present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. Based on the explanation to the driver about a suspended license plate, the reviewer determination of no Driving Documentation issues was changed to driving documentation issues present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23037473:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were no "Other Delays" during this stop while the deputy indicated Other Delays in the VSCF data. This initial reviewer also indicated driving documentation issues during the stop while the deputy did not select driving documentation issues in the VSCF. Review of the body worn camera footage indicated early in the stop that the driver did not have a license and had never been issued a license. The driver could also not provide proof of insurance or registration. The driver delayed the stop by speaking on the telephone while the deputy began to explain the stop. The deputy explained that the vehicle was going to be towed per ARS 28-3511 and that the driver should call someone to come and pick her up. At the 8:00-mark in the BWC footage, the deputy informs dispatch that he needs a tow for a 28-3511. The driver called the deputy back to the vehicle at the 10:00-minute mark in the BWC footage to ask why her vehicle was being impounded. The deputy explained, for the second time, that the vehicle was being impounded per ARS 28-3511, driving without a driver's license and never having been issued one. The driver wanted to argue with the deputy about the vehicle tow. The driver was on the phone with the owner of the vehicle and requested to speak with a supervisor (at the 11:00 mark in the BWC footage). The deputy informed dispatch of the request to speak to a supervisor at the 11:30 mark in the BWC footage. The supervisor called the primary deputy at 16:40-minute mark in the video. The primary deputy noted to the supervisor that the driver was being belligerent and that the driver wanted to argue about the tow. The supervisor arrived at the stop at the 25:50-minute mark in the video. The deputy exits his vehicle and explains the paperwork to the driver beginning at the 34:00-minute mark. The driver continued to argue with the deputy and kept interrupting as the deputy explained the paperwork on the stop. The driver was issued a citation for 28-3151 and also received a warning for the initial violation (traveling 81 mph in a 65-mph zone). While the deputy was reviewing the stop with the driver, the registered owner arrived at the stop. The supervisor assisted the owner of the vehicle with removing valuables from the vehicle. The deputy offered to give the driver and the owner of the vehicle rides. The driver wanted to continue arguing with the deputy and called him an "ass-hole." The deputy responded and noted that he "cut you a break on three things." The tow truck arrived at the 41:00-minute mark in the BWC footage. At the 45:00-minute mark in video, the owner of the vehicle told the primary deputy that they had a ride coming. The deputies discussed with his supervisor that he needed to stay at the stop until the driver and the vehicle's owner had been picked up. The deputy then informed the

driver that she was free to leave, but that he would be staying on scene until they were picked up. The deputy contacted dispatch at the 48:10-minute mark in the BWC video to note that the stop would be extended while the driver waits for a ride. The deputy drove away from the scene at the 57:30-minute mark in the BWC video. Based on the evidence in the BWC footage, the stop was delayed for multiple reasons as documented above. The reviewer's determination of no Other Delay was changed to Other Delay and the reviewer's determination of the presence of a driving documentation issue delay was confirmed for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23043412:** The reviewer identified that no arrest was made during this stop while the VSCF data indicated that an arrest was made. There were two videos available for review during this stop. A second review of the BWC videos identified several delays analyzed in this report. At the 0:45 mark in the video the deputy can be heard explaining to another deputy in the vehicle the "placement" of the vehicle during the stop. Upon exiting the vehicle, it appeared that an FTO was riding as a passenger in the patrol vehicle. The primary deputy explained to the driver that he was doing "66 on Broadway" (at the 0:00 mark in the video). At the 5:00-minute mark in the video, the FTO explained to the primary deputy that he should have explained to the driver "you were doing 66 in a posted 40, you said '66 on Broadway'" At the 12:00-minute mark, the FTO confirmed that the citation was for criminal speed and stated "yeah it's 26 over" and advised the trainee to "stay consistent." At the 15:00-minute mark in the video, the FTO advised the trainee to explain the "actual infraction, completely." The primary deputy returned to the vehicle (15:50-mark in the video) and explained to the driver that they were traveling at 66 mph where the speed limit was posted as 40 mph. The primary deputy explained that the driver must appear in court for this citation. The driver asked if the deputy was training and the deputy answered in the affirmative.

Review of the primary deputy's video confirmed the details of stop in the narrative above. At the 12:00-minute mark the primary deputy asks the FTO if the citation is for criminal speed because the driver was traveling at 26-mph over and the FTO confirms that this is the correct citation.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-701.02A3 for traveling 77 mph in a 45-mph zone as captured by radar. This is considered criminal speed.

The initial reviewer correctly determined that this stop involved training.

**MC23034427:** The initial reviewer did not identify delays associated driving documentation issues while the deputy indicated that there were delays caused by driving documentation issues. At the 2:00-minute mark the driver indicated that she did not have insurance and that she could access that information on her phone. The deputy noted that there was "bad service here" in regard to cell service. The driver was able to provide proof of insurance at the 3:00-minute mark on her phone. The deputy noted that he "hates this area" in mild frustration and voiced driver information to dispatch at the 4:00-minute mark. Dispatch returned with information about the driver which the deputy entered into TraCS. The deputy stated again (at the 6:00-minute mark in the BWC footage) that he "hates this area" and picked up his phone to identify the driver's address or the stop location

(verbalizing the address while he typed it in his phone and again while typing the driver/vehicle information into the computer. Based on the deputy's verbalization about problems with the computer not connecting and the need to enter the driver's information into the computer by hand, it appeared that the deputy experienced delays from both technology and driving documentation issues. Because of this, the reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issues was changed to driving documentation issues present in for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23049577:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that the vehicle was not towed while the deputy indicated that the vehicle was towed from the scene. The driver was on a motorcycle. And approached the deputy as the deputy exited the vehicle. The deputy immediately asked the rider "How much have you had to drink?" The rider stated "I don't know, not much." The deputy replied "What's not much?" The deputy then explained why the rider was stopped and stated that they would need to do some tests to make sure he was okay to ride. Initially the rider declined SFTs. The rider stated he was ex-police (Phoenix PD and Pinal County Sheriff's office) and asked "can we just make this a 701A?" The deputy denied this request. The deputy continued to ask if he could conduct additional tests with the rider and explained that he could not "give him a break." The driver eventually agreed to roadside sobriety tests. The deputy proceeded to conduct an HGN test with the rider. The deputy then conducted the walk and turn test. Following the walk and turn test the rider and the deputy had a conversation about what would happen. The deputy requested a breath sample and the driver declined. The driver was then arrested for suspected DUI and subsequently searched before being placed in the vehicle. At 18:17 in the video, the primary deputy asked a secondary deputy "Want to do the tow?" The second deputy answered "sure." The driver asked where they would be towing his motorcycle to and the deputy stated that he did not know. The second deputy stated that he would do a tow sheet and would bring it to the station at the 19:45-minute mark in the video. The primary deputy stayed at the scene and waited for the tow. He had a couple of conversations with his supervisor on the phone during this time. A third deputy arrived at the scene to process the tow. IN the BWC footage from the third deputy, the tow truck is visible at the 13:42-minute mark. The motorcycle is loaded onto the flatbed tow truck and removed from the scene. Based on the BWC footage the initial reviewer's determination of no Vehicle Tow was changed to Vehicle Tow present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23051215:** The initial reviewer identified that there was no Other Delay during this stop while the deputy indicated on the VSCF that an Other delay was present. The driver took extra time to find her insurance and registration stating "This is my aunt's car." At the 4:40 mark in the BWC video, the driver had still not supplied proof of insurance or registration. The deputy returned to his vehicle to try to identify registration (as stated in the BWC footage). The deputy returned to the vehicle at the 7:00-minute mark in the BWC video and informed the driver that the registration on the vehicle was suspended for financial responsibility. The deputy offered to call the MVD if the driver's aunt could provide proof of insurance. The driver was given the opportunity to call her aunt and spent several minutes on the phone with her aunt explaining the situation. At the 10:30-

minute mark in the video, the deputy verbalized that since she didn't have paperwork that he was going to return to his vehicle to start the paperwork. At the 27:50-minute mark in the video, the deputy returns to the vehicle and provides the driver with her license. The deputy gave the driver a warning for the original violation but cited the driver for failure to provide proof of insurance and driving with suspended plates. After the deputy explained the citation, the driver had other questions about insurance and suspended plates. The deputy took time to explain how to address the lack of insurance with the MVD. The driver and the deputy had a short conversation unrelated to the traffic stop. The deputy noted audibly in the BWC footage at 33:00-minute mark that the form did not have the information for the license plate on it and had to write it down on the property receipt. The deputy is seen removing the license plate at the 34:00-minute mark in the BWC video. Based on the evidence available in the BWC video as detailed above, there were a number of circumstances during this stop that prolonged the stop, including the seizure of the plate. The reviewer's determination of no Other Delay was changed to Other Delay for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23055232:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were other delays apparent in the review of the BWC footage while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. The driver was going 76 mph in a 45-mph zone. The deputy asked for the driver's license, insurance, and registration. The driver supplied the deputy with the finance paperwork instead of the registration. The driver did not have proof of insurance or registration. The driver wanted to argue with the deputy about how fast he was going and whether he was going to be issued a citation (beginning at the 3:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The deputy returned to the driver at the 6:20-minute mark to confirm the driver's address. The driver stated, "I'm at two different places right now," but supplied an address different than what was displayed on his driver's license and registration. The deputy stated that he was able to find the vehicle registration with the DMV. Following review of this stop, BWC footage indicated a number of different things that led to delays during the stop and which cumulatively increased the length of the stop. The initial reviewer's determination of "Other Delay" was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23057848:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that no technical issue was visible in the video while the deputy indicated that technical issues were present. At the 5:35-minute mark in the BWC video, the deputy is seen entering the driver's information into TraCS and exclaims "I have to do all four of these names? I guess so." The deputy discusses with a second deputy hyphenated names and how it might be entered into the computer system. The deputy is seen making several attempts to pull the driver information in his system without success. At the 7:15-mark in the video, the deputy contacts dispatch to identify the driver with information from the driver's license. While this occurs the second deputy can be seen operating the computer attempting to access the driver's information. At the 9:30-mark in the video dispatch confirms the driver's identity with the driver's license number. It is unclear why the license was not scanned to access this information (the license is eventually scanned at the 11:45 mark in the video). At the 10:30-mark in the video, the deputy can be seen signing back into TraCS. Based on the above

evidence presented in the video, the reviewer's determination of no Technical Issues was changed to Technical Issue present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23071670:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that there were no Technical Issues apparent in the BWC footage while the deputy indicated in the VSCF that there were Technical Issues. The initial reviewer also indicated there were no driving documentation issues during the stop while the deputy selected the driving documentation issues ETSI in the VSCF. At the 2:45-mark in the video, the deputy verbalizes that the stop would be extended for waiting to get to a safe place to stop. The deputy did not contact the driver until the 4:00-minute mark in the video. The driver immediately explained that he was having issues with his license plate because someone tried to "rip it off." When the deputy asked for license, registration and proof of insurance, the driver stated that his proof of insurance had been seized by Maricopa (city) PD and that he would need to pull his insurance on his phone. The deputy explained at the 5:15 mark in the video that he could not see the license plate because it was situated behind the bike rack. The driver also noted that he did not have an address because he was living in a motorhome but that he could receive mail at his mother's address. At the 7:40 mark in the video, the deputy verbalizes "Why is it not coming up?" regarding the information he is entering into the computer. The deputy can be seen re-entering information into the computer and eventually identifying the driver (at the 8:45-mark in the video). The deputy verbalizes to dispatch at the 9:00-minute mark that "I just had to find his MVD." At the 13:00 minute mark the deputy prints a citation and crumples it up. He returns to the computer and begins the process of filling out information for a second time at the 14-minute mark in the video. The second citation form begins at the 17:15-mark in the video. Based on evidence visible in the video, the initial reviewer's determination of no Technical Issue was changed to Technical Issue present and the reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issues was changed to driving documentation issues for the analysis presented in the main body of this report

**MC23073020:** The reviewer indicated that there was no language barrier during this stop while the deputy indicated there was a language barrier. This was a stop of a driver for speeding in a school zone. While the driver spoke English, it was clear that he did not understand many of the questions the deputy was asking him. For example, when the deputy asked him if driver knew how fast he was driving in the school zone, the driver asked, "at the scar?" When the deputy asked if the driver saw the speed limit sign, the driver indicated that he saw a sign to stop for children. When the deputy indicated that the registration was expired and asked for documentation of current registration the driver did not understand what he was being asked. The deputy also asked whether the driver's address on the registration was current, and the driver did not seem to understand the question. While the deputy asked about current insurance several times and it took extra time to determine whether the driver and/or passenger could access the insurance on the phone. When the deputy returned to the vehicle to explain the citation, he explained the options for addressing the citation, the driver asked questions about information that the deputy had just explained. The deputy took additional time to explain the citation and the driver's options. While the deputy did not need Voiance to facilitate the stop, the delays in comprehension by driver certainly delayed



the stop. The initial reviewer's determination of no language barrier was changed to language barrier because of the delayed communication between the deputy and the driver for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23076711:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that there was a Technical Delay apparent in the BWC footage while the deputy indicated that there were no technical issues. This stop appears to be a training stop. The stop was of a motorcycle rider for speed. As the primary deputy begins entering information into TraCS, the FTO informs her that she is in the wrong form (4:00-minute mark in the video). At 4:30, the FTO explains to the primary deputy that the GPS was not functioning, and she must update her actual location with dispatch. Throughout the processing of the stop, the FTO is explaining entering data and notes that the primary deputy is slowing down the computer because she is processing multiple things at once. At the 7:15-minute mark in the video, the FTO explains that "you just re-connected." Based on the conversations between the FTO and the primary deputy about the computer issues that are evidenced in the BWC footage, the initial reviewer's determination of a technical present was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23083294:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were other delays during traffic stop while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI on the VSCF. The deputy asked for the driver's license and the driver stated that he had never been issued a license. The deputy needed to write down the driver's information. Upon returning to the vehicle, the deputy entered the driver's information into JWI by hand because he had no license to scan. The deputy returned to the vehicle to inform the driver that the vehicle would be towed per 28-3511. The deputy allowed the driver to use his phone to call the vehicle's owner and let her know about the tow. An additional deputy arrived at the scene and began speaking with the primary deputy as he was completing paperwork for the stop. The driver was searched prior to being given a courtesy ride to his place of employment. There were no delays with this stop other than what would be common with a 28-3151/28-3511 vehicle tow. The initial reviewer's determination of "other delay" was changed to no other delay present for the analysis presented in the main body of the report.

**MC23088441:** The initial reviewer selected driving documentation issues as a delay observed in the BWC footage for this stop while the deputy did not select the driving documentation ETSI in the VSCF. Additionally, the initial reviewer selected a technical issue delay after reviewing the BWC footage while the deputy did not select the Technical Issue ETSI in the VSCF. This appeared to be a training stop with two deputies. The deputy in the passenger seat was giving instructions to the primary deputy. Contact was made with the driver at 2:30-minute mark in the BWC footage. After asking for the driver's license, registration, and proof of insurance the driver stated he didn't have his proof of insurance but handed the deputy his license. The deputy asked if he could get it on his phone. The time between the deputy asking for driving documentation and returning to his patrol vehicle was about 1.5 minutes. When the deputy was returning to his vehicle to process the stop he stated, "Just look for the insurance, if you can't find it, don't worry about it" (at 3:15 in the BWC). The deputy said to keep looking and returned to his patrol vehicle. When the deputy

returned to the patrol vehicle the FTO explained the process of running the license with dispatch. The deputy contacted dispatch with the driver's information at the 4:45-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy can be seen re-booting TraCS at the 8:00-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy returned to the vehicle and issued the driver a warning. At that time the driver started holding up his phone and the deputy stated, "don't worry about it." Based on the minimal delay for the driver looking for insurance and never being asked for it later the initial reviewer's determination of a driving documentation issue present was changed to no driving documentation issue. Based on the observation of TraCS rebooting in the BWC video, the initial deputy's initial determination of technical issue present was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of the report.

**MC23089488:** The initial reviewer identified that this stop was not delayed by driving documentation issues while the deputy selected driving documentation issues in the VSCF. The initial reviewer also selected Other Delay following the BWC review while the deputy did not select this ETSI in the VSCF. The deputy took a couple minutes to stop the driver after identifying the violation. Contact was made with the driver at the 2:30-mark in the BWC video. Upon contact the deputy asked for the driver's license, registration, and insurance. The driver handed the deputy her registration and the deputy stated, "looks like an old one," then realized it was registration for a temporary license plate (2:53-minute mark in the BWC video). The driver needed to access her insurance on her telephone while the deputy waited. She eventually identifies proof of insurance at the 4:40-minute mark in the video. The deputy vocalized "nice, no errors, that's a first" when completing the paperwork (at the 8:00-minute mark in the BWC video). The deputy spent a little extra time explaining traffic school to the driver versus simply paying for the citation. The driver had a couple of questions about the information provided in the envelope containing the citation and other information as well as the timeline for addressing the citation (at the 12:30-mark in the BWC footage). After the deputy issued the citation, he spoke briefly with the driver about maintaining her speed using cruise control and assisted her by explaining the functioning of the cruise control (13:00-minute mark in the BWC video). Because the driver required extra time to produce proof of insurance (per the VSCF instructions in TraCS) a driving documentation delay did occur during the stop. The additional conversation during the stop constituted an other delay. The initial reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issue was changed to driving documentation issue present and the initial reviewer's determination that the stop evidenced criteria for the Other Delay ETSI was not changed for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23090141:** The initial reviewer indicated that they observed other delays that impacted the stop length during this stop while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. Additionally, the initial reviewer did not indicate that there were technical issues during the stop while the deputy selected the Technical Issue ETSI in the VSCF. The vehicle was stopped for a MI suspended license plate. There were two deputies present during this stop and a third showed up during the stop. The stop appears to be a training stop as the second deputy was directing the primary deputy about communicating with dispatch. The deputy asked for the driver's license,

registration, and proof of insurance. The driver stated that he did not have a license (but stated that he had been issued one in Ohio) and that he did not have proof of insurance. He supplied his expired Ohio license and an Arizona identification card. The driver indicated that he did not have insurance. When the deputy returned to his vehicle, he determined that the driver had a warrant out of Ohio for driving on a suspended license. The deputy spent additional time identifying whether the driver had a warrant in Arizona. The FTO went to the vehicle to ask the driver if his address was current at the 8:30-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy contacted dispatch to assist with identification of the driver at the 10:00-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy then ran the Ohio license with dispatch at the 12:00-minute mark. At the 14:00-minute mark, the FTO explained that they would be seizing the license plate. The deputy could not locate the proper ARS code for the display of a suspended plate (at the 15:45-minute mark in the BWC footage). The primary deputy/trainee seemed to be having many issues when completing the citation and needed assistance from the FTO. The deputy needed to reconnect his computer while completing paperwork at the 22:45-minute mark and again at the 24:30-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy apologized to the driver for the delay because “we were having some printer issues (26:45-minute mark in the BWC footage). The FTO removed the license plate from the video at the 28:00-minute mark after issuing the driver a citation. There were multiple delays during the stop. While many of these delays were associated with training, collectively this was a complex stop with a plate seizure. The reviewer’s determination of Other Delay was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. Because the deputy needed to reconnect the computer twice to get the citation to print the reviewer’s determination of no technical delay during the stop was changed to Technical Issue present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23091410:** The reviewer identified that an arrest was made during this stop. The VSCF data did not indicate an arrest. The deputy verbally indicated that the driver “rolled a stop sign.” (0:32 minute mark in the video). As the deputy approached the vehicle the driver stated that he did not understand English. In Spanish, the deputy asked for the driver’s license and the driver indicated that he did not have a license. The driver supplied the deputy with paperwork for an “order of protection.” The paperwork was visible in the BWC footage. A second deputy arrived to serve as a translator. The second deputy asked (in Spanish) multiple questions regarding whether the driver had ever been issued a driver’s license anywhere. The driver stated no (2:00 mark of the second deputy video). The driver provided an identification card from Mexico. At the 5:00 minute mark in the video, the deputies discuss that the stop will be a “3511.” ARS 28-3511 is the statute requiring the tow of a vehicle when the driver does not have a license and has never been issued one in any jurisdiction. The deputy confirmed with dispatch that the driver did not have a license in Arizona or California (9:00-minute mark in the video). Deputies spent nearly 10 minutes trying to determine the correct statute for driving without a driver’s license. The deputies mistakenly stated that ARS 28-3151 was a criminal offense. The tow truck arrived to tow the vehicle at the 23:00-minute mark in the video. The driver asked the deputy to explain the order of protection. The deputy explained that the order of protection meant that the driver could not have contact with his spouse or two children and that he needed to go to court to address the order of protection.



There was no extensive search of the vehicle in the BWC footage. The deputy asked the driver if there was anything of value that the driver wished to retrieve from the vehicle. The vehicle was a mini-truck and BWC footage showed the deputy giving a cursory view of the interior of the vehicle and there was nothing visible in the vehicle.

The driver was arrested at the 36-minute mark in the video for charges related to the order of protection (violation of the order of protection). The driver was searched after the arrest was made.

The initial reviewer correctly identified delays caused by driving documentation issues, language barrier, vehicle search, and search of the driver. There were no changes made to the reviewer's coding of this stop.

**MC23142466:** The reviewer indicated that there was no arrest made during this stop while the VSCF indicated that an arrest was made. The initial reviewer did not select driving documentation issues after reviewing the BWC footage while the deputy did select driving documentation issues. The BWC footage indicated the driver was stopped for reckless driving. When approaching the deputy, the driver stated, "I'm off-duty" and provided the deputy with his driver's license and a police identification card. The vehicle was a rental car (indicates at 2:15 in the BWC video). The driver supplied the rental agreement for the vehicle which was visible in the BWC footage at the 3:00-minute mark. The driver needed to access his insurance on his phone and noted that "this is my persona insurance. The deputy contacted dispatch to identify the driver "out of Nevada and California, if you would?" (at the 4:00-minute mark in the video). The deputy waited one minute and 30 seconds for dispatch to return information on the driver's licenses (two minutes total to run the two licenses through dispatch. The deputy later asked if the driver lived in Nevada and worked in California at the 13:35-minute mark in the BWC video). As the deputy is in his patrol vehicle processing the violation, he speaks audibly (possibly on the telephone) and states. "I don't like this, but he's got three kids in the car. He was doing donuts at Jojoba. I was going between 60. I tried to keep it between 60 and 95 in order to catch up to him through sections that were either 50 miles an hour or 40 miles an hour. With his speed and his driving behavior, that would constitute reckless driving and in account of endangerment on each kid." (at 6:08-minute in the BWC footage). The deputy took extra time to explain the violation and the endangerment issue with the children in the vehicle. The deputy stated "we need to police ourselves before we police you." The deputy explained that the driver was being cited for reckless driving and explained that it was a criminal offense (at 13:35-minute mark in the video). The driver did not exit the vehicle during the traffic stop and there was no custodial arrest. The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. The initial reviewer's termination that no driving documentation issues were present was changed to driving documentation issues present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-693 (Reckless Driving). This is a criminal offense.

**MC23187634:** The reviewer indicated that there was a DUI investigation during the stop while data from the VSCF did not. The vehicle was stopped for expired registration. The driver did not have a driver's license and stated that he did not have identification either. The driver asked if he could step out of the vehicle and the deputy gave him a brief Terry frisk to check for weapons. The owner of the vehicle arrived at the scene to speak with the deputy. The driver was arrested on a warrant for probation violation out of Gilbert and a warrant out of Mesa PD for probation revocation (at the 9:00-minute mark during the stop). The deputy discussed marijuana usage with the driver. The deputy spoke to another deputy and stated that the driver would be cited for driving on a suspended license which is a criminal offense. The deputy asked the owners of the vehicle if the driver "smoked weed" and they answered yes. The deputy asked if the driver had "smoked today" and they stated "probably." (13:00-minute mark in the video). The deputy stated that he would not be "doing a DUI" with the driver at (13:30). The deputy had a conversation with the vehicle's owner about how marijuana can stay in someone's system for 24-hours. There was no "investigation" for DUI, but simply questions about marijuana use. At the 16:45 mark, the deputy asked the driver "what drugs have you done today?" The driver admitted to smoking weed. The deputy did not perform any field sobriety tests with the driver but discussed the issue of using marijuana and driving. The deputy stated to the driver "I'm not going to do a DUI on you today."

The reviewer correctly identified documentation issues for the lack of driver's license, a search, and other delay. Because no field sobriety tests were conducted (a DUI investigation) and the deputy indicated that he would not be processing a DUI, we opted to change the reviewer's designation of DUI ETSI to no DUI ETSI.

**MC23174543:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that there were Technical Issues apparent in the BWC footage while the deputy did not select the Technical Issues ETSI in the VSCF. The deputy asked the driver for license registration and insurance. The driver showed the deputy his insurance on his phone and provided an old copy of his registration. The driver stated that the insurance had just been renewed. The deputy exits his vehicle at the 7:43 mark in the BWC footage and grabs some papers from the other side of the car. The deputy is heard saying something about TraCS but it is not clear what he states. He then states "there we go, that's what I need" at the 8:84-minute mark in the video. The deputy is sighing audibly while working on his computer. When the deputy returns to the driver he states "Sorry about the wait. My computer's just not having it." (at 15:45-minute mark in the video). Based on the deputy's verbalizations and his apology to the driver for the wait because of his computer, the reviewer's determination that there was a technical delay during the stop was not changed for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23191240:** The initial reviewer of this stop indicated that there were no Technical Issues apparent in the BWC footage while the deputy indicated in the VSCF that there were technical issues. There were three BWC videos for this stop. At the beginning of one of the videos the primary deputy states to a secondary deputy "I'm just trying to print a cite and a property receipt for the license plate but my printer is just printing white paper." (at the 0:35 second mark in the video) The second deputy states (0:56), "yeah it might have to be rotated...like take it out and feed

it underneath” They then discuss loading the printer briefly before discussing other issues with the stop. The primary deputy can be seen working on the printer in the video. Based on this exchange in the BWC footage the initial reviewer’s determination of no Technical Issues was changed to Technical Issue present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23161015:** The initial reviewer indicated that there was no tow on this stop while the deputy indicated a tow on the VSCF. After reviewing the BWC footage, there was no evidence of a tow during the stop though the driver was issued a warning for no license plate. The deputy needed to run the VIN on the vehicle because the owner had just bought it at auction the day before and did not have paperwork with him. The reviewer’s determination of Vehicle Tow was changed to No Vehicle Tow for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23113781:** The initial reviewer indicated delays related to driving documentation issues while the deputy did not select the Driving Documentation ETSI in the VSCF. Review of the BWC footage indicated that this traffic stop involved a truck pulling a trailer (minute 1:00 in the BWC video). The deputy appeared to delay the stop of the vehicle, eventually contacting the driver at the (3:40-minute mark in the BWC footage). After asking the driver for his license, registration, and insurance, the driver stated that he did not have a driver’s license, but he had an ID (4:12-minute mark in the BWC footage). The deputy asked if the driver ever had a license and the driver stated he had a Mexican driver’s license. The deputy asked if anyone in the vehicle had a valid driver’s license (4:15-minute mark in the BWC footage) and the driver stated that the passenger did. The deputy stated that she would likely have to drive. When the deputy returned to the vehicle, he explained that the driver could not drive the vehicle. The driver was issued a citation for criminal speed and driving with no valid driver’s license. Based on the driver not having a driver’s license as evidenced in the BWC footage, the initial reviewer’s determination of driving documentation issues was confirmed and the data was not changed for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23103963:** The initial reviewer indicated that there was a delay for driving documentation during this stop while the deputy did not select the driving documentation ETSI in the VSCF. When the deputy approached the vehicle the driver indicated that she did not speak English and was a Spanish speaker. The deputy immediately contacted the Voiance translation service and proceeded with the stop. The deputy requested the driver’s license, registration, and proof of insurance (at the 4:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The driver provided her registration and indicated that she could access insurance on her phone. The deputy waited for the driver to provide proof of insurance which was available at the 6:15-minute mark in the BWC footage. The deputy processed a warning for the driver and returned to the vehicle to explain the warning to the driver. Based on the criteria in the VSCF and the evidence from the BWC footage, the reviewer’s determination of a delay for driving documentation issue delay was retained for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23126415:** The initial reviewer indicated that there was no delay for driving documentation during this stop while the deputy selected the driving documentation ETSI in the VSCF. When the

deputy is approaching the vehicle, the driver is on the phone asking someone to send her the insurance information. The deputy asked if the person on the phone was going to send the insurance information to the driver. The driver answered yes. The deputy asked about weapons in the vehicle and the driver stated that there was a gun in the glove box. The deputy asked that she not reach in that direction and told a secondary deputy about the firearm. The driver ended the phone call at the 3:00-minute mark in the BWC footage. At the same time, the second deputy is seen opening the glove box and securing the firearm. The passenger of the vehicle had a visible bulge in his shorts and the deputy stated, "you have a gun on you." The second deputy secured this firearm without issue (at 3:29-minute mark in the BWC video). When the deputy was processing the traffic stop, the driver's ID card (not a driver's license) was visible in the BWC footage (5:19-minute mark). The second deputy returns to the primary deputy's vehicle and both deputies discuss that the driver does not have proof of insurance (8:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The second deputy stated that she was not going to be able to get it. Following this they proceeded to check the firearms to determine if they were stolen. The driver was issued an incidental contact form as they had been pulled over for fictitious plates but the plates were not fictitious. The deputy could have also selected the "Other Delay" ETSI because they secured firearms during the stop. Because of the issue identified in the BWC video with the proof of insurance and the mix-up regarding the fictitious plates, the initial reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issues was changed to driving documentation issues present for the analysis in the main body of the report.

**MC23143584:** The initial reviewer for this stop identified delays associated with driving documentation while the deputy did not select the driving documentation ETSI on the VSCF. The initial reviewer also identified other delays present during the stop while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. There were no delays for driving documentation observed in the BWC footage and the stop lasted less than eight minutes. There were no other delays in the review of the BWC footage. Based on the second BWC review, the initial determination of driving documentation issue present was changed to no driving documentation issue present and the initial determination of other delay present was changed to no other delay present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23149308:** The initial reviewer indicated no driving documentation issues present while the deputy selected the driving documentation ETSI on the VSCF. At the 2:15-minute mark the deputy verbalizes that he is waiting for the light to turn green. The deputy finally contacted the driver at the 4:00-minute mark in the BWC footage. The driver was stopped for expired registration. The driver supplied the deputy with his license, proof of insurance and registration (expired in 2022). The driver was talkative upon contact and the deputy and the driver spoke for several minutes on topics unrelated to the stop. The deputy and the driver continued talking up until the 8:00-minute mark in the BWC video. The deputy appeared to be entering driver and/or vehicle information into his computer by hand. The deputy explained more information about the registration when he returned to the vehicle to issue the citation. While the stop was for expired registration, there were no delays in the BWC video related to the registration issue and the driver's other documents were

in order. The initial reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issues was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23153942:** The initial reviewer noted that there were no delays associated with driving documentation issues while the deputy selected the driving documentation delay. When the deputy approached the vehicle the driver supplied her driver's license but did not provide proof of insurance or registration. The driver was very uncooperative the deputy asked what she did for work and she stated, "I do what you do." The deputy returned to the vehicle to ask her for her credentials. The deputy processed stop with on only the driver's license. Because the driver did not supply her registration and proof of insurance, the deputy manually entered the vehicle information into the warning form. The lack of registration and proof of insurance did not appear to delay the stop in any way. The initial reviewer's determination of no driving documentation issues was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23147882:** The initial reviewer selected a driving delay for language barriers while the deputy did not select the Language Barrier ETSI in the VSCF. The driver had a thick accent, but this did not appear to delay the stop. The initial reviewer's determination that there was a language barrier was changed to no language barrier present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23171013:** The initial reviewer indicated that there was a delay associated with driving documentation while the deputy did not select a Driving Documentation ETSI in the VSCF. This stop appears to be a training stop there was a second deputy providing guidance during the stop. The driver was talkative at the beginning of the stop after he was asked for his license, insurance, and registration. The driver indicated that he needed to access his insurance on his phone and eventually supplied the registration to the deputy. The driver remained talkative until he finally provided the deputy with an old registration document. The deputy finally received driving documentation from the driver at the 7:20-minute mark in the BWC footage. Based on the footage indicating the driver took a very long time to supply the requested driving documentation the reviewer's determination of a driving documentation delay was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23144038:** The initial review of the BWC footage indicated that the stop was delayed for other issues while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. The driver indicated that he did not speak English well. The driver did not have proof of insurance. The deputy spent a long time examining the driver's identification. The identification did not appear to be a driver's license (maybe identification from work?). At the 20:30-minute mark in the BWC footage the deputy states to a second deputy "I'm going to take is plate...yeah it's suspended" The deputy noted that he was going to use Voiance to facilitate the stop. The primary deputy discussed with the second deputy how to best proceed with the stop given the information on the suspended plates available from the MVD. The license plate was seized from the vehicle at the 31:20-minute mark in the video. Due to the plate seizure, the initial reviewer's determination of other delay was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.



**MC23149571:** The initial reviewer indicated that the stop was delayed for other issues while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. At the 1:54-minute mark in the BWC footage, the dispatcher indicates that she is having CAD issues and that the deputy needed to repeat the information for the stop. Upon contacting the driver, the driver was talkative and speaking to the deputy about topics unrelated to the stop. Following this the driver asked the deputy if there was any way he could “make it a warning.” At the 6:39-minute mark in the BWC footage the deputy’s supervisor calls the deputy. The deputy asks the supervisor if he can call him back. When the deputy returned to the vehicle the deputy explained the difference between criminal and civil speed to the driver and explains to the driver that he is giving him a civil citation for speed in lieu of a criminal citation. The driver had several questions about addressing the citation and whether the deputy could change the speed listed on the citation. Based on the several delays associated with the talkative driver and the deputy needing to explain the civil/criminal distinction several times to the driver, the initial reviewer’s determination of Other Delay Present was preserved for the analysis in the main body of this report.

**MC23158125:** The initial reviewer identified other delays during their evaluation of the traffic stop while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. This stop took several minutes to start. The deputy needed to use his siren and finally made contact with the driver at the 3:16-minute mark in the BWC footage. Upon contact, the driver did not speak English. The deputy returned to his vehicle to grab his phone and call the Vioance translation service. The vehicle was stopped for MI Suspended plates. The deputy asked if the driver had insurance for his vehicle and the driver states that he did not. The driver’s license was also expired. The deputy returned to the vehicle at the 18:23-minute mark in the BWC footage and explained the citations to the driver. The deputy also explained that he was going to seize the license plates. The deputy stated that he would allow the driver to park the vehicle in the parking lot across the street after he seized the license plates. The license plate was taken off the vehicle at the 28:40-minute mark in the BWC footage. Because the license plate was seized from the vehicle, this created an additional delay during the stop. The initial reviewer’s determination of Other Delay present was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23159457:** The initial reviewer indicated that the stop was delayed for other issues while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. At the beginning of the stop, it took the driver a couple of minutes to catch up with the driver, who was speeding. Once stopped, the driver introduced himself and the reason for the stop. The deputy asked the driver to move her vehicle further off the road for safety reasons. The driver complied. When returning to the vehicle, the deputy asked for the driver’s registration and insurance. The driver could not locate her insurance. The deputy indicated that the driver was traveling around 100 mph. The deputy verbalized that it took a long time to catch up with the driver. The deputy finally returned to his vehicle to process the traffic stop at the 6:30-minute mark in the BWC footage. Upon returning to the vehicle the deputy spent some time educating the driver about her speed and how she was criminally speeding and what that means. The deputy explained the citation to the driver and the driver had several questions about the citation and the deputy took the time to answer them. Based on the delay

associated with the deputy trying to catch up with the driver's vehicle, the delay associated with moving the vehicle to a safe location off the road, the delay locating the insurance information and the extensive conversation about the speed the driver was traveling and the citation, the reviewer's determination of Other Delay present was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

**MC23203050:** The reviewer indicated that there was no arrest made during this stop while the VSCF indicated that an arrest was made. During the first audio of the BWC footage, the deputy stated "one-hundred and six." (0:30-minute mark). When approaching the vehicle, the deputy asked "Is there a reason you were driving 106 miles an hour today?" When asked for license, insurance, and registration, the driver stated that she did not have insurance and that her mother was "getting it today" (2:48). The deputy took several minutes to discuss the insurance situation with the driver. The deputy can be seen in the BWC footage reexamining the reading on his radar gun (at 10:45). The deputy returned to the vehicle and explained the citation to the driver. He explained that he was citing her for going 106 "on laser." The deputy explained that the citation for speeding was "criminal" and why it was considered a criminal offense. The deputy stated that the driver was also being cited for failing to provide proof of insurance. The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-701.02A3 for traveling 106 mph in a 65-mph zone as captured by laser. This is a criminal offense. The driver also received a citation for ARS 28-4135A (no mandatory insurance). This is a civil offense.

**MC23211430:** The reviewer indicated that there was no arrest made during this stop while the VSCF indicated that an arrest was made. A second review of the BWC video identified that the driver indicated that the vehicle was a rental and that she did not have the registration or insurance. The deputy is seen recording the VIN number from the vehicle. When returning to the vehicle after processing the citation, the deputy explained that the citation was "criminal," and that the driver would need to "see the judge." The driver asked why the citation was criminal and the deputy stated that "It's over 20 miles over the limit, ma'am. That's why." (16:00-minute mark in the video). After the deputy returned to his patrol vehicle, he spoke with a second deputy on the scene and stated that "she was doing 27 over." The initial reviewer's determination of "no arrest" was changed to an arrest for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.

Following the second BWC review, a review of the citation confirmed that the driver was cited for ARS 28-701.02A3 for traveling 67 mph in a 45-mph zone as captured by radar. Although this was not "27 over" as the deputy stated, it was 22 mph over the posted speed limit of 45. This is considered criminal speed.

**MC23202678:** The initial reviewer indicated that there were delays associated with driving documentation issues while the deputy did not select the driving documentation ETSI in the VSCF. The initial reviewer also indicated that there were other delays during the stop while the primary deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. When contacted by the deputy the driver immediately handed the deputy his driver's license. The deputy asked, "how much have you had to drink tonight?" the driver stated, "about five beers." The driver was immediately asked to step out of the vehicle "to do some tests." At 3:40 in the BWC footage, the driver stated that his license was suspended. The deputy conducted a series of sobriety tests with the driver. The driver was arrested for DUI at the 8:30-minute mark in the BWC video. The driver was searched after he was arrested and placed in the patrol vehicle. The driver's registration and insurance were retrieved from the vehicle at the 16:00-minute mark in the video (the documents were retrieved by the second deputy on the scene). The driver was talkative throughout the stop. He was friendly with the deputy. The two deputies discussed which substation to transport the driver to and discussed what to do with the registration for the vehicle (at the 19:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The deputy transported the driver to the substation and the drive took approximately 25 minutes. The deputy and the driver continued having a conversation while he was being processed for the DUI because the driver remained talkative. Processing for the DUI completed at about the 1:01:40-minute mark in the BWC video. The deputy gave the driver a courtesy ride home from 1:43-minute mark to the 1:58-minute mark. This was a DUI arrest stop of a driver with a suspended driver's license. The suspended driver's license did not seem to delay the stop nor did any insurance or registration issues. The most notable delays during the stop included the DUI investigation, arrest, transport to the substation, processing for the DUI, the driver's talkative nature, and the courtesy ride of the driver to his home. Based on the second review, the initial reviewer's determination of driving documentation issues present was changed to no driving documentation issues for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. The additional delays of transport to the substation and the courtesy ride home evidenced in the BWC footage suggest that the Other Delays ETSI was appropriate. The initial reviewer's determination of other delays present was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of the report.

**MC23203198** The initial reviewer did not indicate a delay associated with driving documentation while the deputy selected the driving documentation ETSi in the VSCF. In addition, the initial reviewer indicated a delay for other issues while the deputy did not select the Other Delay ETSI in the VSCF. The driver provided his license immediately upon contact and the deputy asked for the registration and insurance. The driver indicated that he had an old registration then stated that he did not have any insurance or registration. The driver supplied the deputy with an old registration. The driver spent several minutes looking for his insurance on his phone. The deputy asked when the driver last smoked marijuana and the driver stated that he had last smoked four hour earlier. The second deputy on the scene was discussing what to do about the marijuana situation. The deputy called his supervisor on the phone to receive consultation on what to do about a possible DUI for marijuana (at the 8:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The supervisor advised him to test the driver for impairment. When the deputy returned to the vehicle, he asked



---

the driver if he would submit to some tests to make sure he was safe to drive. After performing some FSTs the deputy placed the driver in custody and searched, the driver (at the 14:00-minute mark in the BWC footage). The deputy called his supervisor a second time at the 17:20-minute mark in the BWC footage. Prior to the arrest for DUI, there was evidence of driving documentation issues and other delays (the deputy contacting the supervisor) Because these were observed in the video, the initial reviewer's determination of no delay for driving documentation issues was changed to delay for driving documentation issues present for the analysis presented in the main body of this report. The initial reviewer's determination for other delays was preserved for the analysis presented in the main body of this report.