IRis

Northeastern University

Institute on Race and Justice Publications

Institute on Race and Justice

May 04, 2004

Massachusetts racial and gender profiling study: final report

Amy Farrell
Northeastern University

Jack McDevitt
Northeastern University

Lisa Bailey
Northeastern University

Carsten Andresen
Northeastern University

Erica Pierce
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Farrell, Amy; McDevitt, Jack; Bailey, Lisa; Andresen, Carsten; and Pierce, Erica, "Massachusetts racial and gender profiling study: final report" (2004). *Institute on Race and Justice Publications.* Paper 13. http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20004315

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Study

Final Report
May 4, 2004

Prepared by:

Dr. Amy Farrell
Associate Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Dean Jack McDevitt
Director, Institute on Race and Justice

Lisa Bailey
Assistant Director of Community Outreach, Institute on Race and Justice

Carsten Andresen
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

Erica Pierce
Research Associate, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of the dedication of a large number of individuals who have worked hard to help produce one of the most comprehensive statewide studies of racial disparities in traffic enforcement to date. We would like to begin by thanking the Secretary of Public Safety, Edward Flynn, whose leadership and dedication to the issue has been instrumental in producing as fair and comprehensive of a study possible. We are particularly grateful to the work of Susan Prosnitz and Jane Wiseman for their representation of the Executive Office during our Working Group meetings and their efforts to support and provide guidance to this project.

The Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Working Group has worked with us tirelessly to discuss difficult statistical questions, express their concerns and the concerns of the community, and where necessary to raise issues so that this report could be as fair and useful to both community members and police as possible. Jose Barros, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative; Christina Beaumud, Cambridge Police Department; Pastor Jeffrey Brown, Union Baptist Church; Albert Cardarelli, University of Massachusetts-Boston; Richard Cole, Office of the Attorney General; Jack Collins, Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association; Kenneth Daddabbo, Massachusetts Minority State Police Officers Association; Chief Edward Davis, Lowell Police Department; Peter Didomenica, Massachusetts State Police; Barbara Dougan, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights; King Downing, National Coordinator, ACLU; Jill Soffiyah Elijah, Harvard Law School; Denise Gonsalves, Cape Verdean Community Task Force; Ann Marie Harris, Salem State College; Jim Machado, Massachusetts Patrolmen's Association; Jorge Martinez, Project R.I.G.H.T.; Chief Kevin Mearn, Milton Police Department; Don Muhammead, Nation of Islam; Stacey Fortes-White, Suffolk County District Attorney's Office; Noel Richardson, La Alianza Hispana; John Roberts, ACLU; Carol Rose, ACLU; Renee Scott Grey; Debra Shopteese, Roxbury Defenders Service; Rev. Filipe Teixeira, Dioceses of St. Francis of Assisi, Michael Van, Lowell Juvenile Court; Samuel Williams, Youth Opportunity Boston; Carl Walters, Boston Police Department; Linda Wick, Office of Senator Rosenberg; Onyen Yong, Suffolk Country District Attorney's Office. In addition to the working group, Northeastern University was assisted by a statewide task force who provided leadership and feedback on the issue. A full list of the statewide task force is appended to this report.

The Legislators who sponsored this study have been full participants in this process and have assisted the working group and Northeastern University in many areas including answering the working group's questions about legislative intent. Particular thanks goes to the work of Senator Stanley Rosenberg, Senator Diane Wilkerson and Representative Byron Rushing.

Also we would like to acknowledge the support of many police and governmental officials who have worked with us over this period. During the course of the study, a number of law enforcement executives reached out to provide feedback on the data collection process and answer questions from the research team.

The report would not have been possible without the support of staff at the Institute of Race and Justice and the College of Criminal Justice at Northeastern University. The authors would especially like to thank the Dean of the College of Criminal Justice Jack Greene and those individuals who spent endless hours assisting with data entry, retrieving information,

participating in road surveys and conducting various analyses. We are particularly grateful to the work of Shea Cronin who oversaw much of the original project and devoted countless hours to data cleaning and analysis. In addition we would like to thank particular members of the Northeastern University staff Wendy Alexander, Danielle Dignan, Chris Eggiman, Jared Garland, Nghi Nguyen, Sasha O'Connell, Glenn Pierce, Jennifer Paniello, Tane Peterson, Jana Rumminger, Alan Saiz, Marion Sullivan, Matt White, and Mary Yee for all their hard work on the project.

Table of Contents

Introduction……. ……... 1

National Debate About Racial and Gender Profiling …….. 3

Data Collection as a Management Tool…… 5

Limitations of the Massachusetts Study…… 7

Summary Measures Design…… 9

Release of Preliminary Report……... 20

Summary of Findings…… 23

Issues to Consider…….. 30

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary Measures…… 10

Table 2: Distribution of Searches with Racial Disparity Across City Types……. 28

Appended Materials and Data Tables

Instructions on Reading Tables……. 35

Summary Table……. 36

Residents Cited Compared to Resident Population Data…….……... 50

Citations Compared to Driving Population Estimate Data……. 63

Search Data……. 76

Warnings vs. Citation Data…….. 89

Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Task Force Members……. 102

INTRODUCTION

Questions about whether law enforcement officers stop, cite, and search motorists differently based on race or gender is one of the most troublesome issues facing contemporary law enforcement today. Truly effective policing can only be achieved when police both protect the members of their communities from crime and simultaneously respect civil liberties. Confronting the controversial issue of racial profiling is a necessary step toward building and enhancing effective police-community partnerships.

In response to national and local concerns about issues of racial and gender profiling the Massachusetts legislature passed Chapter 228 of the Acts of 2000 providing for data collection on traffic citations issued in the Commonwealth. The Act was intended to provide data necessary for a statewide assessment of racial and gender profiling with the overall aim of identifying and eventually eliminating any instances of profiling. One component of this Act required the Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV) to record data on the race, gender, and search status of individuals receiving a written warning or citation.[1] The data collected by RMV between April 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003 provides the basis for the statewide analysis presented in this report.

Using data on traffic citations and written warnings collected by the RMV, this study examines the existence of racial and gender disparities in approximately 1.6 million traffic citations issued between April 1, 2001 and June 30, 2003.[2] It is important to note at the outset that research on racial profiling in traffic stops is a relatively new area of inquiry. Although numerous studies have begun to address questions of differential treatment in traffic stops, no absolute consensus exists about the best way to determine disparities.[3] Racial disparities in citations can result from

---

[1] Due to resource limitations the RMV computerized data on written warnings only between April 1, 2001 and May 31, 2001.

[2] The original intent of the legislation was to conduct an analysis for one year. Northeastern University received data from the Registry of Motor Vehicles which covered a much larger time period. In consultation with the Executive Office of Public Safety and the Racial and Gender Profiling Working Group, Northeastern University conducted an analysis on all citations for the full time period that data was available in order to provide communities with the most information that was possible to assess any potential disparities in traffic citations. A breakdown of the racial demographic of citations by year is included in the technical report.

[3] For an overview of the most common racial profiling analysis methods and benchmarks see: Lorie Fridell (2003) *By the Numbers: A Guide for Analyzing Race Data From Vehicle Stops*, Police Executive Research Forum.

a number of factors that social scientists are just beginning to understand. Bias on the part of an individual officer is one of several possible explanations for disparities in citations. Racial disparities can also be caused by departmental deployment decisions, targeted enforcement actions or by differential rates of traffic violations. Although there are limits to the types of questions that traffic citation data can answer, this study addresses four important questions that commonly arise in public concern over racial profiling:

1. Are non-white drivers who are residents in a community cited more often than their representation in the residential population would predict?
2. Are non-white drivers overall cited more often their representation in the population of people driving on the roadways would predict?
3. Once stopped are non-white drivers more likely to receive a citation than white drivers?
4. Once stopped are non-white drivers more likely to be subject to a search than white drivers?

While these questions do not represent the full set of inquiries that community members or law enforcement officials may have about the existence of racial profiling, they address the issues that we are most confident can be answered with the data that is available in this study. No statistical analysis can adequately address all the concerns about racial profiling that may exist in a local community. However, the analysis conducted in this report can serve as a very useful starting point for addressing concerns about racial profiling that may exist in communities throughout the state.

From the outset it is important to note that aggregate data, such as the data presented in this report, can indicate patterns of disparate traffic citation activity in a department but cannot identify the motives involved in individual traffic stops, citations or other enforcement decisions. Racial profiling involves an individual decision by a particular police officer – something that this report cannot measure. Social science cannot provide reliable explanations for what individual officers are thinking when they decide to stop or cite a particular motorist. Bias on the part of individual officers may be just one of many reasons that racial or gender disparities exist in traffic stops, citations or searches. For example, certain department enforcement strategies or

allocation of patrol resources – while perhaps race neutral on their face – may result in the disparate treatment of particular racial groups. In some communities, police commanders may assign a larger number of officers to a particular neighborhood because that neighborhood has more crime and thus an increased need for police services. It may then be the case that police assigned to this high crime area engage in traffic enforcement as part of their normal patrol activities and since there are more police working in this neighborhood, individuals who live, work or drive through this neighborhood are more likely to be stopped and cited than individuals who live in other neighborhoods. If the neighborhoods where police assign additional patrols are neighborhoods where people of color are more likely to live, then the deployment decision may result in racial disparities in traffic citations. While this report cannot determine whether disparities are caused by institutional practices or individual bias by officers, the report does identify whether certain groups are treated differently in traffic stop encounters based on a number of different measures.

Regardless of why they occur, racial disparities in traffic stops, citations and searches can impose serious costs on minority citizens as well as create societal costs on race relations which may influence how community members perceive the police in their community. As indicated in a previous news story and analysis by *The Boston Globe*, disproportionate traffic citations may result in increased insurance premiums for those targeted by the police.[4] In addition to the individual financial costs, these kinds of disparities may erode the trust between the police and members of their local community. If members of certain communities perceive that they are targeted by the police, they may be reluctant to report crimes, and equally important, to work with police to solve the crimes that have been reported. This situation can have serious implications for the overall public safety of a community.

NATIONAL DEBATE ABOUT RACIAL AND GENDER PROFILING

Recently, there has been an increased public debate about the discretionary decisions officers make during traffic enforcement, including the decisions to stop, search and cite motorists. While a number of factors may influence an officer's decision to stop and search an individual, it has

[4] Bill Dedman and Francie Latour (2003) "Speed Trap: Who Gets A Ticket, Who Gets A Break" *Boston Globe*, July 20, A1.

been suggested that some police officers inappropriately use race when making decisions about whom to stop, search or cite.[5] Allegations of racial bias in traffic stops have become so common that the practice has been popularly labeled "driving while black" or "driving while brown." Racial profiling is generally understood as the practice of targeting or stopping a pedestrian or motor vehicle based primarily on the person's race, rather than any individualized suspicion.[6] The popular understanding of the term racial profiling is derived from the "profile" of drug couriers developed by the Drug Enforcement Agency during the mid-1980s to interdict interstate drug trafficking. Although originally targeting particular types of stops, the term racial profiling has come to represent the full range of potential disparate treatment that can occur during a traffic stop.

In the context of vehicle stops, racially biased police actions often involve the use of a legitimate traffic violation in combination with race as the justification for a traffic stop. Although employing a traffic violation as a justification for pre-textual traffic stops is supportable under the Fourth Amendment doctrine of reasonable suspicion or probable cause,[7] such action if practiced in a racially biased manner would constitute a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection under the law.

National surveys have confirmed that a majority of Americans, regardless of race, believe that racial bias in police stops is a significant social problem. In a widely cited poll taken by the Gallop Organization in 1999, 59% of all Americans reported that they believed the practice known as racial profiling was widespread. The poll reported differences by race in this perception, with 56% of the white respondents believing that racial profiling was widespread and 77% of the African-American respondents responding that the practice was widespread. Although some suggested that the public's acceptance of racial profiling would increase after the

---

[5] Although there are numerous public claims of racial profiling for a general review of the issues see: Gary Webb (1999). "DWB." *Esquire*, April, pp. 118-127; David Harris (2000). "Driving While Black" American Civil Liberties Union, and Ronald Weitzer (1999). "Citizens' Perceptions of Police Misconduct: Race and Neighborhood Contexts" *Justice Quarterly*, 16: 819-846.

[6] The statute in Massachusetts defines racial profiling as "the practice of detaining a suspect based on a broad set of criteria which casts suspicion on an entire class of people without any individualized suspicion of the particular person being stopped." An Act Providing for the Collection of Data Relative to Traffic Stops (Section 1, Chapter 228 of the Acts of 2000).

[7] *US v. Whren*, 517 U.S. 806 (1996)

attacks of September 11, 2001, recent polling data indicates that public concern about racial profiling remains strong overall and for some groups concern has actually increased. In a Gallup Poll taken in February 2003 responses were identical to the 1999 data with 59% of Americans believing the practice was widespread. For African-American respondents, however, the perception that racial profiling is widespread actually increased from 77% in 1999 to 85% in 2003.[8]

Similar questions about gender disparities in traffic stops have recently been given new attention. Following a number of highly publicized incidents of officers sexually abusing women following routine traffic stops, some have begun to question whether certain officers use their traffic enforcement powers disproportionately against female drivers.[9] In fact, preliminary analysis from other jurisdictions indicates that young males may be disproportionately likely to be stopped, cited, and searched. At the present time there is little empirical evidence about how gender influences the discretionary decisions of police. Moreover, scholarship on profiling is only beginning to address the interactive effects of gender and race in an officer's decision to stop, cite, or search motorists.

DATA COLLECTION AS A MANAGEMENT TOOL

The controversy around racial and gender profiling in traffic stops has prompted local and state officials across the country to request information about the characteristics and demographics of those who are stopped and cited. Although traffic stops are the most frequent form of contact that law enforcement has with the citizenry, they are one area of policing where we have kept very little systematic information. A recent study by the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicates that traffic stops are the most common cause of police citizen interaction, reported three times more often than any other type of contact.[10] Because they are such a common source of interaction, traffic stops have the potential to dramatically shape how individuals perceive the

[8] Jack Ludwig (2003) "Americans See Racial Profiling As Widespread" Gallup Poll Tuesday Briefing, May 13, www.gallup.com.
[9] Michael Luo (2001) "Officers May Face Federal Charges," *Newsday,* March 9.
[10] Patrick Langan, Lawrence Greenfeld, Steven Smith, Matthew Dunrose and David Levin (2001). Contacts Between Police and the Public: Findings from the 1999 National Survey. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

police and thus have been the national focus of much of the debate around racial profiling. Massachusetts is one of nine states who have collected or who are in the process of collecting state-wide data on racial disparities in traffic stop practices.[11]

Today the collection and analysis of data on traffic enforcement is seen by many law enforcement agencies as simply a good management practice. Historically, most law enforcement agencies have not systematically collected or analyzed information about their traffic enforcement practices. Despite the limited information on traffic stops, police agencies have taken a leadership role among many public sector organizations when it comes to using data to organize and manage day-to-day operations of their organizations in many other areas. For example, police routinely analyze information on calls for service, incidents reported to the police and on arrests to determine where problems exist. In recent years police managers have used this information to identify the characteristics of problems as a tool for developing unique and focused strategies to address the problems. While this has been the practice in many police agencies when dealing with crime, few have conducted similar analyses of traffic enforcement information.

Most police agencies cannot identify where traffic stops are occurring, for what violations their officers are making traffic stops and most importantly who is being stopped in their jurisdiction. In light of the Justice Department finding cited above that traffic stops are the most common interaction between police and their community members many local police agencies have identified data on traffic stops as essential information which can allow them to manage their practices more efficiently. In fact the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement (CALEA) has mandated collecting and analyzing information on traffic enforcement as a standard for all its member agencies. CALEA believes that analyzing information on all traffic stops is critical to professionalizing of law enforcement operations nationally.

[11] Other states requiring all jurisdiction to collect data include Connecticut, Missouri, Texas, Nebraska, Rhode Island, Utah, Illinois and Maryland.

LIMITATIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STUDY

There are a number of limitations concerning the data collected in Massachusetts that affect the types of questions that this study can address and depth of the potential analysis. One of the most serious limitations in Massachusetts is that as prescribed in the enabling legislation information on the race and gender of drivers was only collected for traffic stops that resulted in a citation being issued. In all other statewide studies data is being collected on every traffic stop regardless of the outcome. Having only citation data limits our analysis in a number of ways. We do not have information across the whole study period on those individuals stopped who received a verbal warning and were told to go on their way. In other statewide studies of traffic stops, approximately one-half of the drivers stopped received a citation.[12] While there is much local variation in the likelihood of receiving a citation once stopped, it remains true that many drivers are stopped and do not receive any formal citation.

The absence of data on all traffic stops also limits our ability to fully identify racial disparities in searches. Some drivers are subject to searches as part of the traffic stop but it is possible that no traffic citation is issued. As a result we do not have any information on some number of traffic stops where searches occurred but no citation was written. If these kinds of traffic stops were more likely to happen to one racial or gender group more than another we would have no information on that disparity.

An additional limitation of the Massachusetts study is that due to an expressed prohibition in the legislation, no information was collected on the identity of the officers who issued the citations. It should be noted that the term profiling refers to the individual motivation of an officer to make a stop, issue a citation or search a vehicle. In Massachusetts our analysis cannot determine officer motives, and can only note aggregate trends in citations by jurisdictions. It may be the case that aggregate patterns of disparities for any given law enforcement agency are the

[12] For example in Rhode Island only 54% of all stops resulted in the issuance of a citation, for more information see: Amy Farrell, Jack McDevitt, Shea Cronin, Erica Pierce (2003) *Rhode Island Traffic Stop Statistics Final Report*. Submitted to Rhode Island Attorney General. In Connecticut 46% of all stops resulted in a formal citation, for more information see: Stephen Cox, Susan Pease, Daniel Miller and C. Benjamin Tyson (2001) *Report on Traffic Stop Statistics For the State of Connecticut, July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001*. Submitted to the Office of the Chief State's Attorney.

cumulative result of the underlying motives of individual officers. It also may be the case that aggregate patterns of disparity are the result of institutional decisions about deployment or enforcement prerogatives of the department. Therefore, this study cannot determine if an individual officer is engaged in racial profiling, but rather determines whether there are patterns in the traffic citation and search activities in a department that result in racially disparate treatment and suggests areas where it would be necessary to gather more information to understand the underlying motivation of officers. This analysis also cannot identify those jurisdictions where a single officer is engaged in racial profiling but his or her behavior is not individually identified and may be masked by the enforcement activity of the majority of other officers in the department. Rooting out such individual level disparities is best addressed at the local agency level where the actions of an individual officer can be identified and addressed.

Although this study cannot evaluate the existence of bias on the part of any individual officers, it is important to note that the study relied on law enforcement officers to self-report the race and gender of drivers on the Massachusetts Uniform Citation.[13] While we believe that the majority of officers completely and accurately recorded information about traffic citation activity to the best of their ability, it is important to note that the level of inaccurate information reported on citations is unknown. Following the release of the preliminary report some police agencies contacted Northeastern University and suggested that officers in their departments incorrectly specified whether or not a non-inventory search was conducted. It is impossible for us to determine the accuracy of the non-inventory search measure considering that some officers may have over-reported searches while others may have under-reported such activity.

Another significant limitation of the study stems from the lack of specific neighborhood or street-level information about the location of citations and written warnings. Citation and warning data received from the RMV only indicates the city or jurisdiction in which the citation or written warning was issued, with the exception of Boston where district level information is specified in the RMV data. The lack of specific neighborhood information limits our ability to determine if certain neighborhoods in a city have greater levels of disparity than others.

[13] Through the Executive Office of Public Safety, a protocol was developed advising police departments and officers how to complete the revised Uniform Citation. The protocol instructs that the race of the driver is to be recorded based on upon the officer's perception at the time he or she decides to engage in a motor vehicle stop.

Additionally, we are unable to assess whether city-wide disparities may be explained by targeted traffic enforcement activities in particular neighborhoods or sections of a community.

One of the most unique aspects of the Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling legislation is that the mandate for data collection is broken down into two phases. In an attempt to minimize the burden to law enforcement agencies the Massachusetts Legislature decided to conduct an initial study of racial and gender disparities in traffic citations and then in a second phase, communities that had the appearance of engaging in a pattern of racial or gender profiling would be required to collect data on all traffic stops. This two-phase process has had a number of important implications. First the burden on all police departments in Massachusetts has indeed been minimal when compared to most other states collecting data on traffic enforcement. The uniform citation was modified to include a box to indicate whether or not a non-inventory search was conducted and a box to indicate the driver's gender. In addition, officers were advised as to the six race codes to be used in completing a box to indicate the driver's race.[14] This information in addition to the information routinely collected on the uniform citation constitutes the data used for the analysis in the present study. In phase-two, departments, either voluntarily or as required by the statute, will collect significantly more information from which researchers, policymakers, department leaders and community members will be able to understand, monitor and reduce any disparities that cannot be explained by legitimate law enforcement factors.

SUMMARY MEASURES DESIGN

This study reviews data from over 366 law enforcement agencies in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Any study that attempts to review such a large number of jurisdictions and draw fair conclusions about the existence of a disparity must by definition treat each jurisdiction similarly. In this study we have analyzed the data for each jurisdiction using the same set of procedures and analytic rules. Unfortunately, the process of drawing conclusions about disparities across an entire state does not allow for the in-depth analysis that can and should occur in a particular community. This report is intended to highlight the main areas of concern, offer interpretations of different types of disparities and hopefully serve as a springboard for

[14] Officers were instructed to identify drivers as White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American or Middle Eastern.

more detailed analysis that can best be done at the community level between local police and members of their community.

Through the process of conducting preliminary analysis, receiving extensive comment from the working group and task force members, and reviewing comments received from community members and law enforcement across the state we identified four main areas of concern which could be measured by the data available in the Massachusetts study: 1) disparities in traffic citations given to residents, 2) disparities in traffic citations given to all drivers including those who drive through but do not reside in a particular community, 3) disparities in receiving a citation versus a written warning, and 4) disparities in the likelihood of being searched once cited. For each of these measures we established a comparative population (where necessary) and a threshold above which policymakers could conclude that racial disparities were most problematic. Each of the four summary measures will be described in more detail and we have provided a table that briefly outlines each summary measure (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary Measures

Measure	Data Source	Comparative Population	Threshold for Substantial Disparity
1. Citations of Residents	Only citations of residents	2000 Residential Census	Above Positive Statewide Median
2. Citations of All Drivers	All citations	Driving Population Estimate	Above Positive Statewide Median
3. Searches	All citations	None	Test of Statistical Significance
4. Warnings vs. Citations	Matched sample of written warnings and citations	None	Test of Statistical Significance

Measure One: Citations of Residents to Residential Population

To determine if racial disparities exist in traffic stops or citations it is critical to first develop an estimate of the demographics of populations who are driving on roads that are patrolled by the law enforcement agency in question. By themselves, the demographics of traffic stops or citations are difficult to interpret. For example, if after collecting data, a particular city discovers that 45% of its traffic citations are of Black drivers, that number by itself does not reveal very much. Instead, we would want to know the proportion of traffic stops compared to an

appropriate benchmark or base rate of those driving in that community. In Massachusetts the present study utilized two measures to determine the degree of disparity that exists in traffic citations across the state. First we compare the racial demographics of town residents who are cited against the residential population of that community. Second we compare the racial demographics of all traffic citations made by an agency (both citations of residents and citations of non-residents) to an estimate of the demographics of the driving population. This second measure is described in more detail in the section below.

The first measure, a comparison of citations of residents to the residential population assumes that the demographic of residential traffic citations should be similar to the demographics of the people who live in that community. We used the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau statistics of 18 individuals who are 18 years old and older to determine the racial and gender demographics of individuals who live in each community in Massachusetts. Some agencies such as colleges, universities and transportation police have no census population against which to compare the demographics of their citations. The comparative population numbers for these agencies are designated as not available (NA).

Measure Two: All Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate (DPE)

The second measure of disparity compares the race of all citations against an estimate of the racial breakdown of the driving population for each community in Massachusetts.[15] The driving population is calculated using a sophisticated model to predict how strongly the residential population and the population of surrounding communities influence the driving population for each community.

Research in the field of transportation planning provides rich information about the influence of city characteristics on driving behavior. Transportation planners have created models to better estimate traffic flow in and out of communities in order to forecast the effect of traffic on road construction, maintenance and safety. Although transportation studies have not traditionally focused on the racial demographics of traffic patterns, we have used this literature as a starting

[15] No driving population estimate calculations were conducted for the sex of the driving population demographics because the distribution of male and female residents is nearly identical in most Massachusetts communities.

point for understanding how populations of surrounding communities may influence the driving population in Massachusetts cities and towns.

The driving population estimate (DPE) begins with the assumption that cities and towns close to a particular city contribute more people to the driving population of the target city.[16] Other factors besides distance, however, influence travel. Research on transportation has long shown that people will drive further if attractive features such as shopping, employment or entertainment exist in the target city.[17] For example, the DPE model assumes that if distances were equal a driver is more likely to go to a city with some economic draw (e.g.: shopping, employment, entertainment) than a city without such draws. Fundamentally, the DPE seeks to measure the factors that both *push* drivers out of surrounding communities and *draw* drivers into target cities from surrounding communities.

The first step in creating the DPE is estimating the degree to which surrounding cities contribute to the driving population of the target city. To create the pool of contributing cities for each target city in Massachusetts we began with the assumption that the driving population of a jurisdiction is primarily influenced by communities that fall within a 30 minute drive time perimeter.[18] Once we calculated the total population and demographic breakdown of each potential contributing city we determined how many people were eligible to be "*pushed*" from the cities. The factors that we used to measure "*push*" were 1) the percentage of people within the community who own cars, making them eligible to drive out of the city; 2) the percentage of people who drive more than 10 miles to commute to work based on the 2000 Journey To Work data provided by the 2000 United States Census Data; and 3) the travel time (in minutes) between the contributing city and the target city. These three factors were used in the following

[16] J.D. Carroll (1955). "Spatial Interactions and the Urban-Metropolitan Description" *Traffic Quarterly*, April, 149-161; Lothlorien Redmond and Patricia Mokhtarian (2001). "The Positive Utility of the Commute: Modeling Ideal Commute Time and Relative Desired Commute Amounts" *Transportation*, 28: 179-205.
[17] Raith, Michael (1996). "Spatial Retail Markets with Commuting Consumers" *International Journal of Industrial Organizations*, 14: 447-463.
[18] James Anderson (1979). "A Theoretical Foundation for the Gravity Equation," American Economic Review, 69:106-116; K. Mikkonen-and M. Luoma (1999). The Parameters of the Gravity Model are Changing - How and Why*?" Journal-of-Transport-Geography*, 7(4): 277-283; Tim Schwanen and Martin Dijst (2002). "Travel-Time Ratios for Visits to the Workplace: The Relationship Between Commuting and Work Duration" *Transportation Research* 36: 573-592.

formula to determine how many people were *"pushed*" out of each contributing community toward our target city.

The second step in calculating the DPE was determining the level at which each city in Massachusetts draws in drivers from surrounding communities. People travel to or pass through cities to shop, to go out to dinner or see entertainment, to go to work, or to take care of other business. While there are certainly reasons to travel to or through every city in Massachusetts, certain cities exhibit relatively high degrees of draw compared to others. There can be innumerable factors that influence travel, but there are certain major economic and social indicators that can be measured using the same standard for every city. To determine the degree to which each city in Massachusetts "*draws*" in drivers from surrounding communities we created a measure of the relative economic and social attraction of each city. Five indicators were used to construct measures of "*draw"* in each target city: 1) percent of State employment, 2) percent of State retail trade, 3) percent of State food and accommodation sales, 4) percent of State recreation and amusement sales, and 5) percent of State average daily road volume. The average of these five measures was taken for each city to create a final ranking of the relative "*draw"* power for each city. A more in-depth explanation of the draw ranking for individual cities is found in the technical report.

The driving population estimate is meant to provide the best possible estimation of the racial demographics of drivers in Massachusetts communities. It was designed using principles from transportation planning and economic literature. This model was previously used in a statewide study of racial disparities in traffic stops in Rhode Island and has recently been used by the Prairie Village Kansas Police Department as a benchmark against which traffic stop data was compared.[19] During the Rhode Island study, the model was field tested on different communities to determine how closely the racial demographics of the DPE matched the racial demographics of the roadways made through physical observation protocols. In two separate tests of the DPE

[19] In the *2003 Bias-Based Policing Report* the Prairie Village Police Department compared the demographics of traffic from both the Driving Population Estimate model designed by Northeastern University and an observational traffic survey previous conducted for the city by the firm Bucher, Willis and Ratliff in 2000. The non-white driving population from the observational traffic survey was 15.8% non-white and the non-white population from the Driving Population Estimate model was 14.1% non-white. The department concluded that the Driving Population Estimate was a useful and reliable model for predicting the demographics of drivers in their community.

in different Rhode Island communities the model successfully predicted the racial breakdown of drivers for all racial groups within less than one percent when compared to physical observations of the roadways.[20] Although the DPE is still a relatively new form of benchmarking traffic stop data, the Police Executive Research Forum recently argued that the DPE is one of the most promising models for constructing estimates of traffic demographics for statewide studies of racial profiling.[21] It is important to note that one of the limitations of the driving population estimate is that it may be less accurate at measuring driving populations for jurisdictions where a larger proportion of drivers travel over 30 minutes to work, shop or recreate in that community. This limitation would be particularly important when examining the data for jurisdictions that experience heavy driving volume of tourists for example that is demographically different from their resident drivers.

Traffic citations for the Massachusetts State Police are compared to the demographics of drivers observed on the roadways of each State Police Troop through a rolling observation survey protocol. The rolling road survey methodology used in Massachusetts was adapted from other methods used by researchers in Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland and North Carolina.[22] The goal of the Massachusetts rolling road survey was to observe representative traffic demographics in each State Police Troop area (excluding Troop F, Logan Airport, since traffic was deemed too difficult to observe at that location). To determine such demographics we placed observers out on the roadways in cars to visually assess the racial make-up of drivers on particular roadways. A summary of the demographics of drivers for each State Police Troop Area was constructed as the benchmark against which to compare traffic citations from those Troops. Additional information about the roadway observation survey for the State Police can be found in the technical report.

---

[20] Farrell, et al., supra note 12.
[21] Fridell, supra note 3, pg. 109.
[22] For information on other uses of road survey methodology see: Matthew Zingraff, William Smith, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey (2001). "North Carolina Highway Traffic and Patrol Study: "Driving While Black." *The Criminologist*, 25: 1-3; John Lamberth (2003). *Racial Profiling Study and Services: A Multijurisdictional Assessment of Traffic Enforcement and Data Collection in Kansas*. Washington D.C.: Police Foundation.

Creating a Threshold for Comparative Population Disparities

For the comparison of traffic citations of residents to census population and the comparison of traffic citations to the driving population estimate it is difficult to determine the appropriate threshold at which disparities become meaningful. Various standards have been used in other studies to draw conclusions about racial profiling based on comparisons between the demographics of those stopped and the demographics of those in the comparative population, but as a recent report by the Office of Community Oriented Policing (COPS) states "current research has failed to establish a consistent set of criteria to determine the nature and extent of racial profiling."[23] As with other studies, we faced a problem of establishing a "bright line" above which the conclusion is that all departments are engaged in disparate citation practices that constitute racial profiling and below which all departments are not engaged in disparate citation practices.

In studies of disparity, regardless of topic area, it is generally inappropriate to conclude that any difference between the studied population and the comparative population automatically constitutes a meaningful disparity or racial bias. Such differences may be the result of real differences or may be a product of sampling or measurement error. Different studies rely on various thresholds above which they determine that observed differences are not solely attributable to error or chance. These thresholds differ dramatically depending on the type of sample used and the analytic methodology employed.

Studies of racial profiling nationwide have not been able to establish a uniform threshold for differences between the demographics of drivers stopped and the demographics of the comparison population. Although some studies have used differences in percent of 3% or 5%[24] and others have relied on ratios of varying amounts[25] to determine disparity, these levels were often arrived at haphazardly and as a result the conclusions have largely been overlooked.[26] Understanding the limitations of establishing definitive measure of racial profiling, we instead seek to simply identify disparities between the racial demographics of citations and racial

[23] Joyce McMahon, Joel Garner, Ron Davis and Amanda Kraus. *How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data: Your Reputation Depends on It!* Office of Community Oriented Policing, 2003. pg. 39
[24] Howard Greenwald, 2003. Sacramento Vehicle Stop Data Collection Report: 2001-2002.
[25] 2000 Annual Report on Missouri Traffic Stops, Office of the Attorney General.
[26] McMahon et al., supra note 17.

demographics of the census and/or driving population estimates for each jurisdiction and identify those agencies that have the greatest levels of disparity when compared to other Massachusetts law enforcement agencies. As a result, the statewide positive median (mid-point) for each measure of disparity was chosen as a threshold for comparisons of citations to residents or to the driving population estimate.[27]

As with most studies of racial profiling, it is not possible to explain fully whether or not such disparities are justified or legitimate with the information that was made available through the Massachusetts citation data. It is important to remember that the existence of disparities may be attributable to officer bias, institutional bias, or differential law enforcement action in particular neighborhoods in response to crime control problems. *How much disparity is acceptable to a community is fundamentally a question that should be addressed by stakeholders and policy makers in each jurisdiction.* Our goal in this report is to identify jurisdictions with disparities above the statewide median and where we are most confident observed differences between groups are not due to error or chance.

Measure Three: Searches

The third summary measure examines the differences in the likelihood of being searched by race and gender. Nationwide, racial disparities in the likelihood of being searched once a vehicle is stopped have become one of the most persistent concerns in assessments of racial profiling. Racially disparate search rates have raised a great deal of concern both locally and nationally. In the mind of many motorists, searches transform a traffic stop from a potentially benign civil enforcement action to a more serious suspicion of criminal activity. Motorists of color report that once a search is instigated the traffic stop itself is viewed as only a pre-text to justify searching and harassing motorists.[28] Searches heighten the perception that law enforcement perceives particular motorists as potential criminals.

---

[27] The statewide median for disparity of non-white residents cited to non-white residents in the population was a difference in percent of 2.1 and the statewide median for disparities of non-white citations to the driving population was a difference in percent of 3.2.

[28] For numerous examples of such perceptions see David Harris, (2002). *Profiles in Injustice: Why Racial Profiling Can't Work*, New York: New Press.

An officer's decision to conduct a search during a traffic stop is limited by a number of legal protections. Most importantly, police searches of vehicles are protected by the Fourth Amendment doctrine that we are secure in our "persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."[29] Throughout the years the courts have clarified exactly how this phrase applies to the searches of motor vehicles. In a landmark decision in 1925, the Supreme Court reasoned that drivers of vehicles have a lower expectation of privacy than residents in a home and therefore police are not required to obtain a warrant prior to searching a vehicle.[30] While the court has clearly specified that in most instances the police are required to obtain a warrant prior to the search of a home, motor vehicle searches are subject to the "automobile exception" to the warrant requirement. Because automobiles are mobile, allowing for easier escape of valuable evidence or suspects, and because drivers expect regulations to govern their driving privileges, such as a driver's license, speed limits, and equipment regulations, vehicle searches are subject to a lower threshold of protection.[31]

In Massachusetts officers are required to identify on the uniform citation whether or not a non-inventory search of the motorists or motor vehicle occurred. Analysis was conducted on all citations to determine what proportion of white citations and what proportion of non-white citations resulted in a non-inventory search. Racial differences that are considered statistically significant are marked with asterisks (*). Statistical significance measures the probability that the observed differences are solely due to chance. Unlike the threshold problem we identified for measures one and two (described above as residents cited compared to resident population and all citations compared to the driving population estimate) a test of statistical significance is an appropriate and commonly accepted threshold for identifying substantial disparity in search analysis. For some jurisdictions the total number of citations or searches of particular groups is too small to conduct meaningful analysis. In these cases we report the proportion of drivers who are searched but do not conduct an analysis of disparity. Instead, the term IC is placed in the disparity column to indicate an insufficient number of cases for analysis. In this analysis any

[29] Fourth Amendment, United States Constitution
[30] *Carroll v. U.S.*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925).
[31] Five basic legal thresholds govern the search of automobiles or persons following a lawful traffic stop. Searches may be conducted on the basis of individual consent, probable cause, reasonable suspicion, as an inventory for impounded vehicles, or incident to arrest. Only inventory searches which followed the impounding of a vehicle were excluded from the search category on the uniform citation.

agency that conducted less than 50 total searches over the 27 month period of the study or less than 50 citation of non-white motorists overall was identified as having an insufficient number of cases for analysis.

Measure Four: Warnings vs. Citations

Our final summary measure identified racial differences in those drivers who received written warnings versus those drivers who received citations. There are a number of reasons why the disposition of a traffic stop has received attention in the racial profiling context. The decision to write a citation or issue a written warning is an area in which officers possess a great deal of discretion. In deciding to make a stop, the officer confronts one decision with only two possible outcomes: pull the vehicle over or allow the driver to continue. In deciding on a disposition, the officer must choose from several outcomes. Therefore, it is possible that the same offense committed by five different people might result in five different dispositions. Such discretionary power may become a cause for concern when racial differences in stop dispositions are identified.

The officer's decision to write a written warning as opposed to a ticket has serious financial implications for the driver. The driver faces the immediate effects of the fine attached to the offense, which can be quite large in some cases. The driver may also have to deal for at least a couple of years with an increased insurance premium. Further, the penalties for a moving violation offense often follow a driver over state lines to affect his/her insurance premiums. The financial impact of citation and warning decisions in Massachusetts was highlighted in a *Boston Globe* series which examined racial disparities in traffic citations.[32]

Another troublesome aspect of racial disparities in traffic stop dispositions involves the concern that official records of police action might be interpreted as a reflection of trends in driving behavior. If non-white drivers receive more traffic citations because of their race or ethnicity rather than differences in driving behavior, these practices may create a record that could be used in subsequent decisions by other governmental units. Social scientists and policy makers are just

[32] Dedman and Latour, supra note 4.

now beginning to examine how differential driving records may have a race effect on other decisions made in the criminal justice system such as criminal sentencing.[33]

The Massachusetts study was originally limited by a lack of information on written warnings. While the RMV initially computerized two months of data for April and May of 2001, due to funding limitations, they concluded shortly into the study that it was not financially possible to continue to computerize data on written warnings. Two months of data on written warnings would have been insufficient to serve as a basis for any reliable statistical analysis of racial or gender disparities disposition outcomes. With an additional $150,000 that was appropriated by the legislature, the Registry of Motor Vehicles computerized a sample of 200,000 additional written warnings issued throughout the full study period. These warnings were then matched with citations from the original database we received from the RMV by date giving us a complete sample of all warnings and citations issued by a jurisdiction on sampled days. Due to the limitations of the sampling design we were only able to conduct reliable estimates of racial disparities in citations versus warnings for 142 of the 366 agencies in Massachusetts.[34] Although this limited sample design means that no analysis of disparities in dispositions could be conducted for some communities in Massachusetts, we are quite confident that the sample of 142 jurisdictions provides a reliable measure of the racial disparities that may exist between citations and warnings across the whole study period for these sampled jurisdictions. More detailed information about the matched sample design for written warnings is included in the technical report.

As with searches, the analysis of racial disparities in warnings versus citations does not have to rely on a comparative population. We can simply compare the proportion of drivers receiving a warning or citation by race. Therefore, a measure of statistical significance is used as the threshold to determine when observed racial differences in dispositions are not due to chance or error alone.

---

[33] Kevin Blackwell (2001). "Traffic Stops and Race: Its Effects on Criminal History" Paper Presented at the American Society of Criminology.

[34] In order to be included in the disposition outcomes measure a sufficient numbers of warnings had to be sampled from a jurisdiction to ensure a margin of error less than 5 at a 95% confidence level.

Reporting Disparities in All Four Summary Measures

In all four summary measures of disparity we utilize a comparison between white and non-white populations. While the non-white population group is comprised of multiple racial and ethnic groups (Black, Hispanic, Asian and Native American) we chose this more simplistic measure to help clarify instances of disparity. In response to specific concerns about disparate treatment of Black and Hispanic drivers and non-white male drivers raised by members of our working group and community meetings which following the release of the preliminary report we also conducted a separate analysis on Black citations compared to white citations, Hispanic citations compared to white citations and non-white male citations compared to white male citations. Although concern about disparate traffic citations of Asian drivers has been raised in many communities, statewide there were too few citations of Asian drivers to conduct a reliable analysis of disparities for citations, searches and warnings. If communities have a particular concern about Asian disparities they should refer to the technical report where statistics and disparities for all racial groups are individually reported.

For all four measures of disparity we present differences between groups using a measure of the difference in percent. For example, if 7.4% of the traffic citations in a particular jurisdiction were given to non-white drivers and that same jurisdiction had a 3.1% non-white driving population estimate, the difference in percent would be 4.3% (7.4% minus 3.1%). For purposes of further illustrating these differences we also calculated the disparities based on a ratio measure. Using the above example, a 7.4% non-white citation population is 2.39 times the jurisdiction's 3.1% non-white driving population estimate. Although both differences in percent and ratios are calculated in the report, we use the measures of difference in percent to determine whether or not disparities rise above our determined threshold.[35]

RELEASE OF PRELIMINARY REPORT

In keeping with our goal of creating an open analytic process that included feedback from community members, law enforcement leaders and other stakeholders the Northeastern

[35] The Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling working group spent some time discussing the possibility of using both the median of ratios and the median of the differences in percent measures to draw thresholds. Although there are strengths and weaknesses of each measurement technique we determined that a measure of differences in percent was the most stable method for assessing disparity for a statewide study where the base rates of non-white residents and drivers vary vastly between communities.

University research team worked with the Executive Office of Public Safety and the Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Working Group to release a preliminary report and begin a statewide dialogue about the issue of racial profiling. This represents the most extensive public discussion and comment process that has been attempted in any racial profiling study to date. In January 2004, Northeastern University released the preliminary report which identified levels of disparity in traffic citations and searches for all communities in Massachusetts. The goal of the preliminary report was to provide official statistics about the demographics of traffic citation data so that police departments and community members could review the information, offer comment about the analytic approach and on any potentially unaddressed sources of racial or gender disparity.

To solicit feedback from community members and law enforcement the preliminary report was posted on the Institute on Race and Justice website along with a comment box that allowed general readers to provide feedback on the findings or any concerns relevant to particular communities. Community members and law enforcement officials were invited to send us written comments about the report's methodology, analysis, findings and any specific concerns that the preliminary report raised in their particular community (Copies of these letters and a list of changes can be found in the technical report).

In addition to the public release of the report we conducted six regional community meetings aimed at bringing police and community members together to discuss the findings and offer comment (see the technical report for a more in-depth discussion of the community meeting organizational process and feedback). We also presented the report to members of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, regularly scheduled community meetings and special forums designed to address the issues of racial profiling in specific communities. The information and suggestions that we received from this comment period have been important for designing the final analysis presented in this report. For example, in some cases departments disagreed with the driving population estimates that were created for their community. Some agencies sent in updated information on road density, economic data for their community and information on the city employment which was integrated into our driving population estimate. In other cases departments conducted their own independent road survey observations. Although

the observational data submitted from departments was not used as the basis of our driving population estimate, this data was nonetheless useful in reviewing the reliability of the Driving Population Estimate and a notation has been placed next to these communities indicating that they have provided comment on our estimates. In other cases community members indicated that certain groups of drivers (young non-white males, Hispanic drivers, etc.) were targeted by the police in their communities. Such comments prompted us to utilize disparity measures that looked at individual racial group differences and the interactive effects of race and gender in our final analysis. Additionally, many community members spoke of being stopped in communities where they drive (but do not live). They discussed particular communities or roadways where they hesitate to drive for fear of being stopped. In response to this feedback we suggest that the driving population estimate is important method of measuring disparities that have been identified by non-resident drivers.

From the comments received as part of this process a number of themes emerged that can provide a context for the issues addressed in this report. Many community members expressed the opinion that regardless of the data collection outcomes, they perceive that the practice of stopping drivers based on their race or ethnicity is real, damaging, and something people from communities of color regularly experience. In addition, a number of those who spoke at community forums told of having to deal with this issue for generations and expressed a hope that this report will serve as a starting point for developing strategies aimed at reducing the practices in the locations where they have been identified.

Many of the law enforcement representatives who spoke expressed the firm belief that if the practice of stopping drivers based on their race or ethnicity was happening anywhere it was wrong and should be dealt with and eliminated. Law enforcement members suggested that they had not encountered such practices very often in their years serving as police officers and at times expressed frustration with allegations of bias because they felt it was not something they had observed or engaged in during their career. In addition, many law enforcement officials expressed a strong willingness to address such issues if they were brought to their attention and they had the appropriate tools to identify the sources of the problem.

These comments help illuminate the need for concrete information around which departments can begin to identify problems and respond to the concerns of the community. Without such tools the disconnect between community and law enforcement perceptions about this issue could unfortunately remain firmly entrenched.

While the process of receiving public comment about traffic citation disparities identified in the preliminary report was at times challenging we firmly believe that this feedback makes the Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Report one of the strongest statewide reports on racial profiling to date. It was our goal from the outset to produce a fair, accurate and understandable report about the existence of racial and gender disparities in traffic citations. We believe that these elements are necessary for such a report if it is ever expected to help identify areas of concern and bring about real change.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The goal of the Massachusetts Racial and Gender Profiling Study is unique. Unlike most studies which seek to provide descriptive information about the characteristics of traffic stops in a particular community or statewide, the Legislature specified that the Massachusetts study would identify communities that appear to have engaged in racial and gender profiling so that these communities can be required to collect additional information (such as information on all stops) in an effort to determine if the documented disparities are based on race or ethnicity. In most studies there is no legislatively or administratively mandated sanction that results from the findings in the study. This places an additional burden on policy makers such as the Secretary of Public Safety and the Attorney General as they attempt to make informed decisions about the degree of disparity necessary to prompt such additional action. This is fairly new territory for any state and thus Massachusetts policy makers are working in somewhat uncharted territory.

To provide the most accurate, fair and easily interpretable conclusions on the existence of disparities we have utilized multiple measures of disparity in an attempt to best identify those jurisdictions with patterns of racial disparity. The Massachusetts legislation called for a study

which would identify jurisdictions where the data suggests the appearance of racial profiling.[36] Although as we have indicated earlier in this report the Massachusetts data does not allow for definitive findings of racial profiling on the part of individual officers or within a department, we believe that the use of multiple measures of disparity allows conclusions to be drawn about the existence of patterns of racial disparity in traffic enforcement which may best help policymakers identify those jurisdictions that are in need of additional monitoring. In the following section we provide a brief overview of the results of each measure and then present final conclusions about the existence of disparity for all communities.

Gender Disparities

Overall we found that males were more likely to be cited than their representation in either the residential or the driving population estimate. Males were uniformly more likely to be subject to a search and to be cited than women. These findings were consistent across virtually all communities in Massachusetts. This report finds no indication that female drivers, in the aggregate, are more likely to be stopped, cited or subject to a search than their male counterparts. In fact, quite the opposite appears to be the case. Part of the legislative intent of including gender disparities in the analysis was to identify cases where female drivers were stopped and searched or harassed because they were a woman. Some high profile reports of sexual assault or harassment of women during traffic stops raise concern about this important issue. Unfortunately, since these egregious events are presumed to be fairly rare and they most likely would not be documented by official citation records, this type of data may be inappropriate for measuring the actual frequency of such incidents. This issue could be much more accurately addressed by having traffic citation data that included officer identification. With this data departments or outside analysts could identify if certain groups of officers made disproportionately more stops of women than their similarly situated peers.

Measure One: Residents Cited Compared to Residential Population

The resident cited measure presents information about the degree to which residents of a jurisdiction are disproportionately stopped and cited by their local police agency. Statewide the

[36] An Act Providing for the Collection of Data Relative to Traffic Stops, Massachusetts Chapter 228 of the Acts of 2000.

average disparity between non-white residents cited and non-white residents in the census population was .06% with non-white residents being cited slightly more frequently than their representation in the residential population. Statewide the largest racial difference between citations to residents and residential population was for Black drivers (average disparity of 1.3%) and non-white male drivers (average disparity 2.2%). Although the statewide disparity is relatively low 18 communities in the state had extreme levels of disparity above 10% (See Resident Citation Tables in Appendix for detailed information).

Across the 366 agencies we found racial disparities of residents that rose above the statewide positive median in 141 communities or approximately 38% of Massachusetts jurisdictions.[37] This measure is useful because it only includes citations given to residents and is unaffected by people who drive through a community for work or other reasons. In these cases disparities are likely caused by disproportionate enforcement action against a group, potentially because of where they normally live or drive. Such disparities may be the result of deployment of officers to particular parts of towns which results in differential enforcement against one group of residents. Additional information, such as the location of the stop, would be useful for helping departments understand why non-white residents are disproportionately cited.

Measure Two: Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate

The comparison of all citations to the racial demographics of the driving population estimate is an important feature of this report. While comparing citations of residents to residential populations may be useful for evaluating the existence of certain types of bias, only the driving population estimate comparisons can measure the effect of bias against individuals traveling through communities in the Commonwealth. The concern that some law enforcement officers stop non-white drivers when they are perceived to be "out of place" is one of the most visible areas of concern in both the local and national dialogue about racial profiling.

[37] It is important to note that although statewide averages are given as a reference for all measures, the thresholds for resident citations and citations compared to the driving population estimate were based on the positive statewide median (mid-point) which is different than the overall statewide average. The positive statewide median is a more conservative estimate of the degree of disparities among those communities who had positive racial disparities.

Across the 366 agencies in the study, we found racial disparities in citations compared to the driving population estimate that rose above the statewide positive median in 56% or 201 communities. This measure suggests that racial disparities in traffic enforcement in Massachusetts affect out-of-town drivers more than residents, and that the perception of many in the community that they are more likely to be stopped when they drive through certain communities may in fact be true.

Statewide the average disparity between non-white drivers cited and non-whites in the driving population estimate was 2.6%. Very consistent disparities were found when Black citations (average disparity of 2.3%) and Hispanic citations (average disparity 2.2%) were compared to the driving population estimate.

Measure Three: Searches

Searches following a traffic citation are a relatively rare event in Massachusetts. Only 1.3% of all traffic citations resulted in a non-inventory search of the motorists or their vehicle statewide. Even though searches were a relatively rare event there are important racial differences in the likelihood of being searched that emerge from this analysis. Across the state, non-white drivers were more likely to be searched following a citation than white drivers (1.3% of white drivers searched compared to 1.8% of non-white drivers). Some level of racial disparity in searches was observed in 208 jurisdictions throughout the state. Although some agencies will be more likely to conduct searches due to organizational mandates and community needs, Table 3 illustrates that racial disparities in searches are found across all types of communities. While searches are clearly an issue that should be addressed by communities with large populations, as 100% of these communities have racial disparities in searches, however, 45% of the jurisdictions with the smallest populations (less than 10,000) have racial disparities in searches. As a result of these findings, racially disparate search practices should be taken seriously by all communities throughout the Commonwealth.

The finding that searches are conducted in only 1.3% of the stops resulting in a citation raises a number of important questions. This rate of searches is much lower than in most other research on racial disparities in traffic stops. For example, in Rhode Island searches were conducted in

7.9 % of the stops,[38] in Missouri searches were conducted in 7.9% of stops[39] and in Connecticut searches were conducted in 7% of the stops.[40] These statewide study estimates also include a large number of stops that did not receive a citation. The low number of searches in Massachusetts may be an indication of some data quality issues that should be addressed before additional data collection is implemented. Since in many studies racial disparities, searches are a significant area of concern, some discussion should take place among law enforcement leaders and community representatives about the optimal criteria for conducting searches as we move forward. This discussion should include the goals of searches, the productivity of searches and the impact of differential search rates on members of the community of color.

Since searching as part of a traffic stop is a relatively rare event, some communities with observed disparities actually conducted very few searches. Consequently, some communities with disparities had to be removed from the overall disparity analysis.[41] Table 3 illustrates that smaller communities who had racial disparities in searches were less likely to be included in the final search analysis due to insufficient cases. In fact, for the smallest population type (under 10,000) only 12% of the jurisdictions with racial disparities in searches could be analyzed. Even after removing these cases, however, we found that non-white drivers were significantly more likely to be searched than white drivers in 40 of 87 jurisdictions.

---

[38] Farrell, et al., supra note 12.
[39] *2002 Annual Report of Missouri Traffic Stops*, Office of the Missouri Attorney General.
[40] Cox, supra note 11.
[41] Jurisdictions with less than 50 searches or less than 10 citations of non-white drivers were removed from the analysis to address the problem of small numbers. The search tables in the appendix identify these jurisdictions with the designation IC for insufficient cases.

Table 2: Distribution of Searches with Racial Disparity Across City Types

Population Size	Number of Cities with Racial Disparity	% of Cities in Group with Disparity	Range of Disparity (Diff in %)	% with Sufficient Cases
100,000+	5	100%	0.43-1.17	100%
50,000-99,999	14	78%	0.14-6.72	100%
25,000-49,999	35	72%	0.08-6.72	37%
10,000-24,999	67	65%	0.05-10.02	25%
Under 10,000	87	45%	0.03-19.44	12%

From the data collected in Massachusetts it is impossible to determine whether or not a search occurred and a motorist was subsequently arrested, or whether a lawful arrest resulted in the search of a motorist or vehicle. In these later cases officers may have little discretion in the decision to search a motorist. To provide the most conservative estimate of any potential racial disparity in searches that arise from officer's discretionary decisions an analysis was also conducted on racial disparities in searches after all citations that had a corresponding arrest were removed from the database. After removing all citations with a corresponding arrest we found that non-white drivers were still significantly more likely to be searched than white drivers in 26 communities.

Measure Four: Warnings vs. Citations

Statewide, in our sample of warnings and citations 32.9% of all the stops resulted in a written warning and 67.1% of the stops resulted in a citation. When citations and warnings are analyzed by race we find that statewide non-white drivers were significantly more likely to receive a citation than white drivers (72% of non-white drivers receive citations compared to 65.9% of white drivers). This suggests that in some communities in Massachusetts officers may be more likely to use their discretion to give written warnings to white drivers rather than to non-white drivers. In fact out of the 142 communities that could be included in our sample of citations and warnings non-white drivers were significantly more likely to receive a citation in 58% or 83 of the communities.

While all drivers may be more likely to be cited for egregious violations of the law, differential behavior patterns do not appear to explain away racial differences in citation and warning rates. When examining only drivers who were cited for speeding violations 15 mph or less over the

posted speed limit, 73.6% of white drivers received a citation compared to 82.6% of non-white drivers - a statistically significant difference of 9%. Race differences still exist even when the most serious speeding offenses are isolated. For drivers cited for speeding over 15 miles per hour or more above the speed limit 81.6% of whites are cited compared to 86.8% of non-whites – a statistically significant difference of 5.2%). More sophisticated analysis could be done for each jurisdiction to determine whether or not the type of offense mediated the effect of race, however there is no indication from the statewide data that differential violation rates explain away racial differences in dispositions.

Summary Findings

As a final step to the analysis we identified whether disparities that fell above the specified threshold existed in any categories for the above four summary measures. If communities were found to have disparities in any single category that fell above the specified threshold of disparity for that category, then they were identified as having a disparity in that particular summary area. For example, if a jurisdiction had a statistically significant disparity in searches of Hispanics they would be identified as having a disparity on the summary measure of searches.

Once disparities were tabulated across all summary measures we identified the total number of summary areas in which communities had disparities. The summary table appended to this report, identifies disparities in a single category (non-white, Black, Hispanic, or non-white male) within each summary measure with an "*". If any of the individual categories within a summary measure had disparities that fell above the specified threshold, an "X" was placed next to that summary measure. Communities in Massachusetts were then classified into two groups. First, communities with substantial disparity are defined as communities with disparities that fall above the defined threshold for at least one of the summary measures (marked with an X). Second, communities with minimal or no disparity are defined as those jurisdictions having either racial disparities on one or more measures that did not rise to the specified threshold or having no disparities across any of the summary measures.

In summary, **249** agencies were identified as having substantial racial disparity in one or more measures that fell above our specified threshold, **92** agencies were identified as having minimal or no disparities, and no measure of disparity could be calculated in **25** of the agencies.

This report provides much more information than simply the number of measures of disparity for each jurisdiction. The report provides information on the level of disparity for each of 16 individual race, ethnic and gender measures. This information can be very useful as departments begin to focus their efforts to understand and reduce areas of greatest disparity. Each department should review their individual information on disparity to determine the greatest areas of need and to help identify strategies that might be implemented to reduce disparities. For example, the report identifies if a particular jurisdiction has a disparity with citations to specific groups, such as Hispanic drivers or non-white males. In additional, a community may find that racial disparities do not appear in citations but do appear to be a problem with respect to searches.

The detailed level of information provided in this report will be extremely important as departments develop strategies to reduce the disparities that have been identified. If for example, citations to Black drivers are a problem area, a police agency might look to where and when these stops are occurring. Officers could then discuss the goals they are attempting to meet with stops in certain neighborhoods and supervisors can evaluate whether or not such stops are effectively meeting the goals of the department. In some cases the department may determine that they could better meet their goals using stop and search methods that do not produce racial disparities. By using the full analysis that is presented in the tables for this report and the larger technical report, local community members and police officials have a starting point to begin discussions about the most effective ways to address and reduce disparities in their community.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER

Based the findings of the Massachusetts study, national research on the issue and recommendations from the Working Group and other stakeholders we offer the following set of issues to consider which provide guidance to those who must begin to formulate policies based on the findings in this report.

1. All law enforcement agencies, as a part of good professional police practices, should establish a system to collect and monitor data on all traffic stop activity.

Data on all traffic stops provides the only reliable way to determine if disparities exist in traffic enforcement and to determine if those communities with disparities are effectively reducing the disparities that have been identified. Consequently we believe that all communities in Massachusetts should join the thousands of other law enforcement agencies across the nation currently collecting information on all traffic stops.

By collecting and analyzing information on all traffic stops departments can apply the same analytic approach currently being utilized to understand and reduce crime to their efforts to make the roadways safer. Nationally over 6,000 law enforcement agencies have begun collecting data on all traffic stops. In addition, the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement (CALEA) has mandated collecting and analyzing information on traffic enforcement for all its member agencies. CALEA believes that analyzing information on all traffic stops is critical to professionalizing of law enforcement operations nationally.

Understanding this need to collect detailed information on traffic stops, a number of Massachusetts law enforcement agencies including Boston Police Department, Cambridge Police Department, Lowell Police Department, Brookline Police Department, Provincetown Police Department and the MBTA Police have already either begun to collect information on all stops or have committed to begin such data collection regardless of the decision of the Secretary of Public Safety.

2. Following national models for traffic stop data collection, a uniform set of data elements to be collected on all stops should be identified. It is important that any new data collection system include information on officer identification and the location of the stop in the required data collection elements. Additionally a specific timetable for data collection, auditing and reporting should be established.

Creating a uniform process for data collection will guarantee that sufficient information is collected from all agencies to conduct a full analysis of disparities in traffic stop activity. Uniformity in the type of data collected is important because it allows departments to make

comparisons with the present study so that agencies can document progress in reducing any disparities that have been identified. Additionally, a uniform data collection system allows comparisons to be made across various agencies.

The collection of officer identification and location of the stop are two important elements of any new data collection process. In order to deal with disparities at the departmental level, command staff members and supervisors must be able to identify individual officers who may be causing disparities in parts of their community. This information could then become part of the ongoing monitoring process that would be implemented within each agency. Information on the traffic stop behavior of individual officers would also allow the department to begin to address questions of gender disparities in stop practices to determine if some officers are stopping larger number of female drivers compared to their similarly situated peers. Additionally, in response to the present study many law enforcement agencies have suggested that deployment decisions based on traffic safety may contribute to their overall community disparity. Without street, neighborhood or district information this question cannot be answered.

3. All local police agencies should begin or continue a conversation with members of their community about the existence of disparities in traffic stops, the goals of traffic enforcement and strategies to monitor and reduce such disparities.

This process has begun in some jurisdictions and was already ongoing in others. One challenge that has been identified by some communities is that many local police agencies, particularly those with very small non-white populations, have expressed frustration identifying members of their community who are concerned about this issue. We suggest that police departments utilize a broader definition of community than is typically used. This data supports the conclusion that in some communities non-resident drivers are more likely to stopped and cited than resident drivers. Therefore, the effected population of drivers is much broader than only the residents of a particular community. As a result, police may need to expand their notion of community to include those who drive through the city or town for many purposes. In this definition of community, police officials may want to reach out to stores, churches, business, entertainment and other locations that may attract non-resident drivers. In addition police officials may have to develop partnerships with police departments from neighboring communities with a larger non-

white population to hold regional community meetings about the racial disparities identified in the report. It is interesting to note that most police departments who submitted feedback in the comment period could identify sources of non-white drivers driving to and through their jurisdiction. These sources might be the very groups that could be contacted to begin a conversation about traffic stop disparities.

4. Local community groups and representatives can assist departments that express a sincere willingness to work on the issue by gathering participants who could provide meaningful feedback to police agencies about the goals of traffic enforcement and the levels of disparity identified in the report.

While we recognize that certain members of the community may not feel comfortable coming forward to discuss the issue of racial profiling and others may not have faith in a dialogue process due to negative experiences with the police, it is important that community-police dialogues about this issue include as many voices as possible. In most cases this means ensuring that the voices of youth, non-English speaking populations, and other disenfranchised groups be represented and encouraged to participate in ongoing police-community discussions about the existence of racial disparities in traffic enforcement.

Appended Materials and Data Tables

Instructions on Reading Summary Tables

Overall Summary Table
The overall summary table summarizes the disparities found across multiple categories for each summary measure. For each agency an "*" is placed in each categories if the level of disparity falls above the specified threshold for that category. If no analysis could be conducted for that agency due to missing or insufficient data the category is marked with a "–." If disparities fall above the specified threshold for any category within a summary measure an "X" is placed at the end of that summary measure. The jurisdictions listed in this table are grouped alphabetically by the total number of summary measures in which that jurisdiction was found to have a disparity.

Summary Measure 1: Residents Cited Compraed to the Residential Population
Threshold for disparities marked with * = above the statewide median.

- Disparities in Non-White vs. White Resident Citations Compared to the Residential Population.
- Disparities in Black vs. White Resident Citations Compared to the Residential Population.
- Disparities in Hispanic vs. White Resident Citations Compared to the Residential Population.
- Disparities in Non-White Male vs. White Male Resident Citations Compared to the Residential Population.

Summary Measure 2: All Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate
Threshold for disparities marked with * = above the statewide median**.**

- Disparities in Non-White vs. White Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate.
- Disparities in Black vs. White Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate.
- Disparities in Hispanic vs. White Citations Compared to the Driving Population Estimate.

Summary Measure 3: Searches
Threshold for disparities marked by * = statistically significant disparities.
IC indicates that departments had an insufficient number of searched upon which reliable analysis of disparities could be conducted.

- Disparities in Non-White Search Rates vs. White Search Rates
- Disparities in Black Search Rates vs. White Search Rates
- Disparities in Hispanic Search Rates vs. White Search Rates
- Disparities in Non-White Male Search Rates vs. White Male Search Rates

Summary Measure 4: Citations vs. Warnings
Threshold for disparities marked by * = statistically significant disparities.

- Disparities in Non-White Citation Rates vs. White Citation Rates
- Disparities in Black Citation Rates vs. White Citation Rates
- Disparities in Hispanic Citation Rates vs. White Citation Rates
- Disparities in Non-White Male Citation Rates vs. White Male Citation Rates

Summary Table of Disparities

	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Barnstable	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*		*		**X**	*				**X**	**4**
Boston (All)	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*			*	**X**	*	*		*	**X**	**4**
Brookline				*	**X**		*		**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*		**X**	**4**
Cambridge		*		*	**X**		*		**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	**X**	**4**
Framingham	*	*	*	*	**X**			*	**X**	*	*		*		**X**	*		*	*	**X**	**4**
Leicester	*	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**					*	**X**	*	*	*		**X**	**4**
Lynn	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*		*	*	*	**X**	*		*	*	**X**	**4**
New Bedford	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*		**X**	**4**
Peabody	*		*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**				*		**X**	*		*	*	**X**	**4**
Quincy	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*		**X**		*				**X**	*		*	*	**X**	**4**
Springfield	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	**X**	**4**
Stoughton	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*		**X**	*	*				**X**			*		**X**	**4**
W. Bridgewater	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*			*	**X**	*		*		**X**	**4**
Waltham	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**		*		*		**X**	*		*	*	**X**	**4**
Worcester	*	*	*	*	**X**		*		**X**	*	*		*		**X**	*	*	*	*	**X**	**4**
Abington		*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*				**X**	**3**
Andover+				*	**X**	*		*	**X**							*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Arlington		*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Auburn						*	*	*	**X**	*		*	*	*	**X**	*				**X**	**3**
Berlin			*		**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**3**
Braintree		*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**							*		*		**X**	**3**
Bridgewater							*		**X**	*		*	*		**X**	*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Brockton	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**3**
Canton	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**3**
Chicopee			*		**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Dedham+		*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**3**
Everett	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*		*		**X**	**3**
Falmouth	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*			**X**	**3**

+ Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report.

Summary Table	**1. Resident Citations**					**2. Driving Population**				**3. Search Disparities**						**4. Citations vs. Warnings**					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Fitchburg	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Haverhill	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-		**3**
Hudson	*		*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Lawrence	*		*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**							*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Leominster	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Longmeadow		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**3**
Lowell	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*				*	**X**						**3**
Malden		*		*	**X**		*		**X**		*				**X**	-	-	-	-		**3**
Marlborough	*		*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**							*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Mattapoisett		*			**X**	*	*	*	**X**									*		**X**	**3**
Medway	*	*		*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Methuen	*		*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**							*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Milford	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**3**
N. Adams		*		*	**X**		*		**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-		**3**
Needham				*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**3**
Northampton			*	*	**X**					*					**X**	*				**X**	**3**
Pittsfield	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**3**
Randolph+	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Revere	*		*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Shrewsbury+		*	*		**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*		*		**X**	**3**
Somerville	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**							*				**X**	**3**
Southborough						*		*	**X**	*		*	*		**X**			*		**X**	**3**
State Police (All)	*	*	*	-	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**3**
Taunton	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	*	*		*		**X**						**3**
Townsend		*			**X**			*	**X**	*	*		*		**X**						**3**
Wareham	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	*			*		**X**						**3**
Watertown+		*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Westborough			*		**X**		*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**3**
Yarmouth	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*			**X**	**3**
Adams		*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Amesbury										*		*	*	*	**X**	*				**X**	**2**
Amherst	*	*	*	*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**
Ashland	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Athol		*		*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Avon		*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Belchertown		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Bellingham						*	*	*	**X**							*	*	*	*	**X**	**2**
Belmont							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**2**
Billerica								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Bourne		*			**X**		*		**X**												**2**
Boxborough	*		*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Chatham	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Chelsea				*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Cheshire		*			**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Chilmark	*	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Clinton			*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Dennis	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**
Dracut						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Dudley			*		**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Dunstable						*	*	*	**X**		*				**X**	-	-	-	-		**2**
E. Bridgewater							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*				**X**	**2**
E. Brookfield		*			**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Easton		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Edgartown	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**2**
Fairhaven							*		**X**	*	*		*		**X**	-	-	-	-		**2**
Fall River		*		*	**X**					*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**2**
Foxborough		*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Georgetown		*			**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Hanson		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Harwich	*	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Hatfield	*	*	*		**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Holbrook				*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Holyoke	*		*	*	**X**			*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**2**
Kingston	*	*	*	*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Lancaster	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Lexington	*			*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		*			*	**X**	**2**
Littleton	*		*		**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Marion[+]	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Mashpee	*	*		*	**X**	*	*		**X**							-	-	-	-		**2**
Maynard	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Medford		*	*	*	**X**		*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**2**
Mendon		*	*		**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Millbury		*			**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**
Milton[+]	*	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Montague	*		*	*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
N. Andover						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Nantucket	*	*	*	*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Natick						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Newton										*	*	*	*		**X**			*		**X**	**2**
Northbridge		*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**
Northborough	*		*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Norton		*			**X**		*		**X**												**2**
Norwood		*	*		**X**					-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Oak Bluffs		*	*	*	**X**		*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Oakham	*			*	**X**			*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Orange		*	*	*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Orleans	*		*	*	**X**			*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**2**
Paxton	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Raynham		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Rochester		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**

Summary Table	**1. Resident Citations**					**2. Driving Population**				**3. Search Disparities**						**4. Citations vs. Warnings**					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Rockland			*		**X**					-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Salem	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Salisbury						*	*	*	**X**			*			**X**	-	-	-	-		**2**
Sharon		*			**X**		*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Shirley							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-			*	*	*	**X**	**2**
Shutesbury		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Southbridge	*	*	*	*	**X**		*		**X**												**2**
Sturbridge								*	**X**							*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Sudbury						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Sutton		*			**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Tewksbury								*	**X**	*			*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-		**2**
Tisbury	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Truro						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*		*	**X**	**2**
Upton						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
W. Springfield				*	**X**		*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
W. Tisbury						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*	*	**X**	**2**
Walpole								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Ware		*			**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**2**
Warwick	*	*		*	**X**		*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Wayland		*		*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Webster	*	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**
Wellesley						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**2**
Weston						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Weymouth	*	*	*	*	**X**											*			*	**X**	**2**
Wilmington								*	**X**	*	*		*		**X**						**2**
Winthrop			*	*	**X**	*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**2**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Acushnet						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Aquinnah	-	-	-	-			*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Ashburnham						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Ashby						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Attleboro										*	*		*		**X**						**1**
Ayer								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Bedford												*			**X**						**1**
Berkley		*			**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Bernardston						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Beverly		*			**X**					-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Blackstone										-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**1**
Bolton						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Boylston						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Buckland	*			*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Carver							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Charlton						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Chelmsford						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Chester						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Clarksburg	*	*	-	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Cohasset		*			**X**		*			-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Dartmouth							*		**X**												**1**
Douglas						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Dover						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
E. Longmeadow						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Erving			*		**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Franklin										-	-	-	-	-				*		**X**	**1**
Freetown							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Gill							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Gloucester			*	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Goshen						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Granby						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Granville							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Greenfield		*		*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Groveland						*		*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Hadley						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Hampden							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Heath	-	-	-	-		*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Hingham								*	**X**												**1**
Holden							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Holland										-	-	-	-	-					*	**X**	**1**
Holliston						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Hopedale						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Hopkinton						*		*	**X**												**1**
Hull							*		**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Huntington							*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Ipswich		*			**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Lakeville							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Lanesborough						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Lee			*		**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Lenox						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Lincoln										-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**1**
Lunenburg						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Lynnfield								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Mansfield										*			*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-		**1**
Marblehead								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Melrose							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Merrimac						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Middleborough		*			**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Millis		*		*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Millville								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
N. Attleboro																		*		**X**	**1**
Nahant						*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
New Marlborough						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
New Salem						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Newburyport										-	-	-	-	-		*				**X**	**1**
Northfield		*		*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Palmer										-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**1**
Pelham	*	*	-	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Pepperell								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Plymouth																*		*	*	**X**	**1**
Rehoboth						*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Rockport								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Rowley						*		*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Royalston	*		*	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
S. Hadley								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Sandwich							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Saugus							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Scituate		*		*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Seekonk							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Sherborn						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Somerset										-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**1**
Southwick										-	-	-	-	-		*				**X**	**1**
Spencer										*		*			**X**	-	-	-	-		**1**
Sterling						*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Stockbridge	*		*	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Stoneham			*	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Stow								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Sunderland	*	*	*	*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Swampscott[+]						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Topsfield								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**

Summary Table	**1. Resident Citations**					**2. Driving Population**				**3. Search Disparities**						**4. Citations vs. Warnings**					
Agencies with Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Tyngsborough						*	*	*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
W. Brookfield						*	*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
W. Newbury						*		*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Wakefield										-	-	-	-	-		*		*	*	**X**	**1**
Wellfleet		*		*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Wendell				*	**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Wenham								*	**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Westfield										-	-	-	-	-		*				**X**	**1**
Westwood							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Whitman						*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**
Wilbraham							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-							**1**
Winchendon		*			**X**					-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Windsor							*		**X**	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**1**
Woburn		*	*		**X**																**1**
Wrentham						*	*	*	**X**							-	-	-	-		**1**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Minimal or No Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Acton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Agawam										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
AMTRAK	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Ashfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
B&M Railroad	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Barre										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Becket										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Blandford										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Boxford										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Brewster										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Bridgewater SC	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Brimfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Brookfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Bunker Hill CC	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Burlington										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Carlisle										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Charlemont										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Chesterfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Colrain										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Concord										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Conway										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
CSX	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Cummington										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Dalton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Danvers										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Deerfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Dighton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Duxbury										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Eastham										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Easthampton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Minimal or No Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Egremont	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Environmental PD	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Essex										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Fernald State School	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Gardner										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Grafton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Groton										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Gt. Barrington										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Halifax										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Hamilton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Hanover																					**0**
Hardwick										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Harvard										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Hinsdale										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Hubbardston	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Leverett										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Leyden	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Ludlow										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
MA Maritime Police	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Manchester										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Marshfield																-	-	-	-		**0**
Massasoit CC	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
MBTA	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Medfield										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Metro Police Lwr. Basin	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Metro Police Marine	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Middleton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Monroe	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Monson										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Monterey										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Minimal or No Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Mt Wachusett CC	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
N. Brookfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
N. Reading										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
New Braintree										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Newbury										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Norwell										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Norfolk										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Otis										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Oxford										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Pembroke										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Peru										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Petersham										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Phillipston	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Plainfield										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Plainville										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Plympton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Princeton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Provincetown										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Reading										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Registry of MV	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Rowe	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Rutland										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Sandisfield	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Savoy	-	-	-	-						-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Sheffield										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Shelburne										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Somerville Housing Auth.	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Southampton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
State Fire Marshal	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Swansea										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**

Summary Table	1. Resident Citations					2. Driving Population				3. Search Disparities						4. Citations vs. Warnings					
Agencies with Minimal or No Disparity	Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		Non-White	Black	Hispanic		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male	NW no arrest		Non-White	Black	Hispanic	NW Male		**Overall**
Templeton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Templeton Dev. Cent.	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Tolland										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Tufts University	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Tyringham										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Univ Of Mass Amherst	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Univ Of Mass Boston	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Univ Of Mass Dartmouth	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Univ Of Mass Lowell	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Univ Of Mass Worcester	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Uxbridge										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
W. Boylston										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
W. Stockbridge										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Wales										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Warren										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Washington										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Westfield SC	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Westford										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Westhampton										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Westminister										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Westport																-	-	-	-		**0**
Whately										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Williamsburg										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Williamstown										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Winchester										-	-	-	-	-							**0**
Worcester Co. Sheriff	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**
Worthington										-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-		**0**

Boston Police Department Districts																					
Summary Table	**1. Resident Citations**					**2. Driving Population**				**3. Search Disparities**						**4. Citations vs. Warnings**					
	Non-White	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**NW Male**		**Non-White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**		**Non-White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**NW Male**	**NW no arrest**		**Non-White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**NW Male**		**Overall**
Boston (All)	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		*	*			*	**X**	*	*	*	*	**X**	**3**
Boston Area A	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*	*			**X**	**2**
Boston Area B	*	*		-	**X**	-	-	-		*			*		**X**	*		*		**X**	**3**
Boston Area C		*		-	**X**	-	-	-		*		*	*	-	**X**						**2**
Boston Area D	*	*		-	**X**	-	-	-		*		*	*	-	**X**	*	*	*		**X**	**3**
Boston Area E	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*		**X**	**2**
Boston Area F	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*		**X**	**2**
Boston Area G				-		-	-	-		*		*	*	*	**X**						**1**
Boston Area H	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		*			*		**X**	*	*	*		**X**	**3**
Boston Area J	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*	*	*		**X**	**2**
Boston Area K	*	*		-	**X**	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Boston Area L	*	*	*	-	**X**	-	-	-								*	*	*		**X**	**2**
Boston Special OPS	-	-	-	-			-	-		-	-	-	-	-		*		*		**X**	**2**
Massachusetts State Police Units																					
State Police (All)	*	*	*	-	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**3**
SP Other (All)	-	-	-	-		NA	NA	NA		*	*	*	*		**X**			*		**X**	**2**
SP Troop A (All)	*	-	-	-	**X**	*	*	*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**	*		*		**X**	**4**
SP Troop B (All)	*	-	-	-	**X**	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**3**
SP Troop C (All)	*	-	-	-	**X**	*		*	**X**	*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**3**
SP Troop D (All)	*	-	-	-	**X**					*	*	*	*	*	**X**						**2**
SP Troop E (All)	-	-	-	-		*	*		**X**	*	*		*	*	**X**						**1**
SP Troop F (All)	-	-	-	-		NA	NA	NA								*	*			**X**	**1**
SP Troop H (All)	*					*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	**X**						
SP Troop I (All)						NA	NA	NA								-	-	-	-		

1. Traffic Citations to Residents

Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Abington	1.6		1.6	*	1.5	*	2.2	*
Acton	-1.2		0.1		1.1		0.4	
Acushnet	-2		0.2		-0.6		-0.7	
Adams	2		2.2	*	0.1		2.1	*
Agawam	-1.1		0.4		-0.2		0.6	
Amesbury	0.2		1.0		1.1		1.1	
Amherst	3.3	*	6.1	*	2.3	*	10.7	*
AMTRAK	-		-		-		-	
Andover	0.3		0.2		1.1		2.1	*
Aquinnah	-		-		-		-	
Arlington	1.8		2.9	*	-0.5		3.4	*
Ashburnham	-1.6		0.4		-0.8		-0.4	
Ashby	-2.2		-0.2		-0.8		-1.1	
Ashfield	-2.7		-0.8		-0.4		-1.6	
Ashland	2.9	*	1.3	*	5.7	*	5.2	*
Athol	2.1		2.0	*	1.2		2.7	*
Attleboro	-1.1		0.8		-0.2		0.7	
Auburn	0.5		0.2		-0.2		0.6	
Avon	1.3		3.1	*	0.1		3.3	*
Ayer	-3		-0.6		0.7		1.6	
B&M Railroad	-		-		-		-	
Barnstable	4.3	*	5.4	*	2.6	*	5.3	*
Barre	-2		-0.5		-0.5		-1.0	
Becket	-2.6		-0.7		-0.8		-1.1	
Bedford	-0.3		0.1		-0.6		0.6	
Belchertown	-0.5		1.6	*	-0.7		0.7	
Bellingham	-0.5		-0.3		0.4		0.6	
Belmont	1.5		-0.1		-0.5		1.5	
Berkley	-0.3		1.9	*	0.4		1.0	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Berlin	-0.4		-0.2		1.7	*	0.8	
Bernardston	-1		-0.1		-0.4		-0.5	
Beverly	0.4		1.3	*	0.5		1.2	
Billerica	-1.2		-0.4		0.6		-0.1	
Blackstone	-1.4		0.0		-0.2		-0.3	
Blandford	-1.6		-0.5		-0.3		-0.9	
Bolton	-0.6		-0.1		-0.6		0.9	
Boston (All)	23.2	*	25.7	*	4.6	*	26.7	*
Bourne	0.7		3.7	*	-0.6		0.9	
Boxborough	4.2	*	0.3		4.7	*	6.6	*
Boxford	-1.9		-0.3		-0.7		0.5	
Boylston	-1.3		1.0		-0.5		0.3	
Braintree	0.7		2.6	*	0.3		2.4	*
Brewster	-0.2		0.1		0.3		0.8	
Bridgewater	-11.3		-1.4		-2.7		-6.6	
Bridgewater SC	-		-		-		-	
Brimfield	-2.8		-0.5		-1.1		-1.6	
Brockton	18.2	*	25.4	*	6.3	*	23.9	*
Brookfield	-0.3		0.3		0.7		0.8	
Brookline	-1.7		0.4		-1.3		2.6	*
Buckland	9.2	*	-0.3		-0.7		11.1	*
Bunker Hill CC	-		-		-		-	
Burlington	-5.3		1.1		0.2		-1.4	
Cambridge	2.1		11.3	*	-1.1		8.1	*
Canton	4.2	*	4.6	*	0.6		3.0	*
Carlisle	1.3		-0.2		-1.2		0.0	
Carver	-2.2		0.2		-0.7		-0.6	
Charlemont	-1.7		-0.3		-1.2		0.6	
Charlton	-1.2		0.3		-0.5		-0.1	
Chatham	2	*	2.0	*	1.0		2.6	*
Chelmsford	-0.1		-0.1		-0.6		1.2	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Chelsea	-8.7		-0.5		-3.5		8.3	*
Cheshire	0.3		1.5	*	-0.3		1.1	
Chester	-1.9		-0.1		-0.8		-1.2	
Chesterfield	-1.3		0.0		-0.1		-0.4	
Chicopee	0.8		0.6		1.6	*	1.8	
Chilmark	22.5	*	9.7	*	-0.7		3.8	*
Clarksburg	2.2	*	1.7	*	0.7		2.2	*
Clinton	1.1		0.4		3.4	*	3.3	*
Cohasset	0.2		1.2	*	-0.5		0.8	
Colrain	-1.8		-0.1		-0.8		-0.6	
Concord	-4.9		-2.4		-2.5		-5.2	
Conway	-1.9		-0.1		-1.0		-1.0	
CSX	-		-		-		-	
Cummington	-4.8		-0.7		-1.8		-2.3	
Dalton	-0.9		-0.1		-0.7		-0.1	
Danvers	-1.8		0.2		-0.5		-0.6	
Dartmouth	-7.8		0.9		-1.2		-4.0	
Dedham	2		3.2	*	0.2		3.6	*
Deerfield	-0.9		0.5		-0.2		0.8	
Dennis	2.4	*	4.0	*	0.4		3.5	*
Dighton	-1.3		0.8		-0.9		0.0	
Douglas	-0.8		0.3		0.2		-0.1	
Dover	0.9		-0.3		-1.1		0.7	
Dracut	-1.9		0.2		0.4		-0.3	
Dudley	0.3		0.2		1.5	*	1.2	
Dunstable	-1.3		-0.2		-0.6		-1.1	
Duxbury	-1.2		0.6		-0.6		0.1	
E. Bridgewater	-1.1		0.7		-0.4		0.4	
E. Brookfield	1.9		3.3	*	-0.8		-0.6	
E. Longmeadow	-1.3		-0.3		0.2		-1.1	
Eastham	-0.7		-1.2		0.7		-0.2	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Easthampton	0.4		1.1		-0.1		1.3	
Easton	-4.5		1.8	*	-1.3		-2.0	
Edgartown	6.3	*	3.0	*	7.9	*	6.0	*
Egremont	-		-		-		-	
Environmental PD	-		-		-		-	
Erving	-0.3		-0.2		2.2	*	1.2	
Essex	-1.1		-0.1		-0.8		0.1	
Everett	4.9	*	4.5	*	6.6	*	8.6	*
Fairhaven	-1.9		0.9		-0.4		-0.3	
Fall River	0.4		1.9	*	0.7		2.6	*
Falmouth	4.8	*	6.9	*	1.1		2.9	*
Ferneld State School	-		-		-		-	
Fitchburg	20.9	*	4.3	*	17.2	*	23.9	*
Fitchburg SC	-		-		-		-	
Foxborough	2		1.8	*	0.8		31.6	*
Framingham	7.8	*	1.6	*	13.6	*	11.3	*
Franklin	-1.8		0.1		-0.7		-0.4	
Freetown	-2.4		0.5		-0.5		-0.6	
Gardner	1.3		0.8		1.2		0.8	
Georgetown	1.1		2.1	*	0.0		1.4	
Gill	0.0		-0.2		0.7		0.2	
Gloucester	1.4		1.0		1.9	*	2.1	*
Goshen	-1.1		0.0		-0.6		-0.7	
Grafton	-3.7		-0.8		-1.2		-1.6	
Granby	-2.6		-0.4		-1.1		-1.2	
Granville	1.3		-0.1		-0.7		-0.5	
Greenfield	0		1.6	*	0.9		2.0	*
Groton	-0.9		-0.4		0.3		0.6	
Groveland	0.5		0.5		0.8		1.0	
Gt. Barrington	-2.9		-1.1		-0.3		-0.4	
Hadley	1.8		0.9		0.4		1.8	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Halifax	0		0.4		0.8		0.9	
Hamilton	-5.3		-0.4		-0.3		-2.4	
Hampden	-1.3		-0.2		-0.6		-0.5	
Hanover	-1.5		-0.3		-0.2		-0.2	
Hanson	1.3		3.3	*	-0.3		1.7	
Hardwick	-0.9		0.9		-0.8		0.1	
Harvard	-11.2		-5.0		-5.7		-9.2	
Harwich	3	*	5.1	*	1.0		4.6	*
Hatfield	2.4	*	1.7	*	1.9	*	1.8	
Haverhill	7.3	*	1.8	*	7.3	*	8.3	*
Heath	-		-		-		-	
Hingham	-1.3		0.1		-0.4		-0.2	
Hinsdale	-1		0.5		-0.3		-1.0	
Holbrook	-0.1		0.3		1.3		3.3	*
Holden	0.2		0.6		0.3		0.7	
Holland	-3.1		0.0		-1.0		-1.6	
Holliston	0.4		0.7		1.1		1.8	
Holyoke	9.5	*	1.1		10.0	*	18.2	*
Hopedale	-1.1		-0.5		0.6		-0.6	
Hopkinton	-2.6		-0.1		-1.0		-0.8	
Hubbardston	-		-		-		-	
Hudson	2.7	*	0.0		5.4	*	5.2	*
Hull	-0.4		0.8		0.2		0.5	
Huntington	-2.8		-0.4		-1.2		-1.5	
Ipswich	0.3		1.2	*	-0.3		0.9	
Kingston	3.2	*	2.0	*	2.2	*	3.0	*
Lakeville	-1.6		0.9		-0.7		-0.1	
Lancaster	9.2	*	11.8	*	-1.3		8.7	*
Lanesborough	-2.3		-0.7		-0.4		-1.0	
Lawrence	24.2	*	0.3		26.0	*	37.8	*
Lee	2		0.7		2.2	*	1.6	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Leicester	2.9	*	3.6	*	0.4		2.3	*
Lenox	1.1		1.0		0.1		1.4	
Leominster	13.7	*	2.9	*	12.6	*	16.1	*
Leverett	-3.6		-0.3		-0.9		-1.0	
Lexington	4.5	*	0.3		-0.7		3.1	*
Leyden	-		-		-		-	
Lincoln	-3.3		-0.7		-1.9		-0.3	
Littleton	2.4	*	0.1		1.7	*	1.4	
Longmeadow	-0.9		1.2	*	-0.6		0.8	
Lowell	17.6	*	4.6	*	10.2	*	21.3	*
Ludlow	-9.5		-2.1		-5.8		-7.7	
Lunenburg	-1.5		0.5		-0.4		0.2	
Lynn	19.6	*	5.7	*	15.8	*	22.1	*
Lynnfield	-0.5		1.1		-0.6		1.4	
MA Maritime Police	-		-		-		-	
Malden	1.5		5.4	*	1.1		7.4	*
Manchester	-0.5		-0.1		-0.2		-0.1	
Mansfield	-1.6		0.7		-0.6		-0.1	
Marblehead	0		0.7		0.1		0.2	
Marion	3.9	*	10.2	*	-0.4		7.1	*
Marlborough	20.5	*	0.8		25.0	*	19.8	*
Marshfield	0.1		0.2		1.2		1.3	
Mashpee	13.4	*	16.5	*	-0.9		10.9	*
Massasoit CC	-		-		-		-	
Mattapoisett	-0.2		1.7	*	0.6		1.6	
Maynard	11.7	*	2.7	*	9.9	*	9.1	*
MBTA	-		-		-		-	
Medfield	-3.6		-0.6		-0.7		-1.7	
Medford	1		1.6	*	2.4	*	4.8	*

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Medway	2.8	*	2.4	*	1.3		3.1	*
Melrose	-1.9		1.1		-0.1		-1.1	
Mendon	1.9		1.7	*	1.6	*	1.1	
Merrimac	-1		-0.2		-0.6		0.0	
Methuen	13.5	*	0.5		14.6	*	13.3	*
Metro Police Lwr. Basin	-		-		-		-	
Metro Police Marine	-		-		-		-	
Middleborough	-0.9		1.6	*	-0.5		0.6	
Middleton	-7.5		0.2		-7.3		-8.2	
Milford	7.4	*	1.3	*	9.2	*	7.5	*
Millbury	-0.5		1.2	*	-0.4		0.6	
Millis	1.7		1.5	*	0.3		2.4	*
Millville	-0.8		-0.7		0.7		0.5	
Milton	12.1	*	14.7	*	0.3		13.8	*
Monroe	-		-		-		-	
Monson	-0.5		0.4		-0.5		0.6	
Montague	2.9	*	-0.3		3.9	*	4.0	*
Monterey	-3.2		-0.5		-1.4		-1.9	
Mt Wachusett CC	-		-		-		-	
N. Adams	2.1		4.1	*	-0.1		3.3	*
N. Andover	-1.9		-0.3		0.4		0.2	
N. Attleboro	-1.2		0.9		0.6		0.0	
N. Brookfield	-0.8		-0.7		-0.8		-0.4	
N. Reading	-1.8		0.1		-0.7		-0.3	
Nahant	-2.4		-0.3		-0.1		-0.7	
Nantucket	3.8	*	2.0	*	3.5	*	7.8	*
Natick	-2.5		-0.1		0.5		-0.4	
Needham	0.4		1.1		0.6		2.1	*
New Bedford	7	*	9.7	*	6.6	*	12.2	*
New Braintree	-1.2		0.0		-0.5		-0.8	
New Marlborough	-2.2		-1.0		-0.9		-1.2	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
New Salem	-4.0		-0.9		-0.6		-2.3	
Newbury	-1		-0.2		-0.5		-0.2	
Newburyport	-0.5		0.5		-0.4		0.2	
Newton	-4		-0.1		-1.4		-0.8	
Norfolk	-14		-5.3		-6.3		-13.0	
Northampton	-0.7		0.6		2.0	*	3.5	*
Northborough	2.5	*	-0.2		2.5	*	2.8	*
Northbridge	-2.3		2.0	*	-0.2		2.1	*
Northfield	1.4		1.2	*	1.3		2.2	*
Norton	-5		2.4	*	-0.3		0.0	
Norwell	-1.4		-0.1		-0.5		-0.7	
Norwood	1.5		2.9	*	2.6	*	1.9	
Oak Bluffs	2.1		6.2	*	2.4	*	5.9	*
Oakham	2.3	*	-0.4		-0.6		3.3	*
Orange	1.8		1.6	*	1.8	*	2.5	*
Orleans	2.2	*	0.0		3.2	*	3.1	*
Otis	-3.1		-0.6		-0.4		-1.3	
Oxford	0.6		0.2		0.9		1.6	
Palmer	-1		0.4		-0.2		-0.6	
Paxton	3.7	*	4.4	*	1.2		3.3	*
Peabody	5	*	0.9		6.6	*	5.9	*
Pelham	4.0	*	3.5	*	-1.0		4.4	*
Pembroke	-1.1		-0.5		-0.1		-0.6	
Pepperell	-2		-0.3		-0.2		-0.8	
Peru	-1.9		-0.2		-0.2		-1.0	
Petersham	-3.3		-0.4		-1.0		-1.5	
Phillipston	-		-		-		-	
Pittsfield	4.8	*	5.0	*	1.6	*	5.9	*
Plainfield	-2.3		0.0		-0.9		-1.6	
Plainville	-3		-0.7		-0.9		-1.3	
Plymouth	0.1		0.7		1.2		1.1	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Plympton	-3		-0.9		-0.4		-1.4	
Princeton	-2.6		-0.2		-0.9		-1.2	
Provincetown	-6.9		-1.8		-1.1		-2.5	
Quincy	7.1	*	2.7	*	2.4	*	10.5	*
Randolph	13.2	*	17.7	*	1.0		17.9	*
Raynham	0.6		2.3	*	-0.2		0.9	
Reading	0.1		0.8		0.7		0.5	
Registry of MV	-		-		-		-	
Rehoboth	-0.6		0.6		-0.4		-0.2	
Revere	2.4	*	1.0		2.5	*	5.4	*
Rochester	-0.6		1.5	*	0.5		1.3	
Rockland	0.7		1.0		1.6	*	1.9	
Rockport	-0.7		-0.2		0.9		0.0	
Rowe	-		-		-		-	
Rowley	0.1		0.7		-0.2		0.1	
Royalston	3.6	*	0.0		4.2	*	4.2	*
Rutland	-1.6		0.9		-1.0		0.1	
S. Hadley	-3.5		0.4		-0.7		1.2	
Salem	13.1	*	2.2	*	13.2	*	12.8	*
Salisbury	0		0.7		0.0		0.8	
Sandisfield	-		-		-		-	
Sandwich	-1.3		0.8		-0.7		-0.6	
Saugus	-0.7		0.0		-0.2		0.2	
Savoy	-		-		-		-	
Scituate	1.5		3.4	*	-0.2		2.2	*
Seekonk	-0.8		0.6		0.1		0.0	
Sharon	-1.6		1.9	*	-0.9		0.6	
Sheffield	-0.1		0.7		-0.2		1.9	
Shelburne	-0.8		-0.2		1.3		0.4	
Sherborn	-2.9		-0.4		0.3		-0.8	
Shirley	-10		-0.5		-5.6		-9.0	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Shrewsbury	-0.4		1.5	*	2.3	*	1.6	
Shutesbury	-0.6		4.7	*	-1.5		-0.4	
Somerset	-1		0.5		-0.2		-0.2	
Somerville	5.7	*	5.1	*	10.1	*	11.9	*
Somerville Housing Auth.	-		-		-		-	
Southampton	-1.2		-0.2		-0.1		-0.1	
Southborough	-0.8		0.0		0.6		1.1	
Southbridge	4.6	*	1.8	*	5.2	*	9.9	*
Southwick	-2.1		0.3		-1.2		-0.9	
Spencer	-1.1		-0.1		-0.2		-0.1	
Springfield	22.3	*	12.5	*	12.2	*	27.9	*
State Fire Marshal	-		-		-		-	
State Police (All)	4.4	*	4.3	*	2.7	*	-	
Sterling	1		0.4		1.3		0.5	
Stockbridge	2.7	*	-0.9		4.4	*	4.8	*
Stoneham	1.4		-0.7		5.1	*	3.4	*
Stoughton	3.7	*	4.4	*	2.9	*	5.8	*
Stow	-3.3		-0.4		-0.2		-0.9	
Sturbridge	-2.2		0.0		-0.6		-0.7	
Sudbury	0.1		1.0		0.1		1.3	
Sunderland	5.8	*	3.2	*	1.4	*	8.8	*
Sutton	0.7		1.8	*	-0.2		1.9	
Swampscott	0		0.3		0.5		0.7	
Swansea	-1.3		0.4		-0.5		-0.4	
Taunton	2.4	*	4.1	*	1.3		4.7	*
Templeton	-0.4		0.7		-0.7		0.0	
Templeton Dev. Cent.	-		-		-		-	
Tewksbury	-2.3		-0.2		-0.6		-1.2	
Tisbury	8.5	*	3.1	*	9.9	*	10.7	*
Tolland	-3.1		-0.6		-1.2		-1.9	
Topsfield	0.3		0.2		0.2		1.7	

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Townsend	0.4		1.7	*	-0.3		1.0	
Truro	-2.5		0.5		-0.9		0.7	
Tufts University	-		-		-		-	
Tyngsborough	-1.8		-0.1		-1.0		0.3	
Tyringham	-3.9		-0.4		-0.4		-1.8	
Univ Of Mass Amherst	-		-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Boston	-		-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Dartmouth	-		-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Lowell	-		-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Worcester	-		-		-		-	
Upton	-0.3		0.6		-0.6		0.0	
Uxbridge	-1		0.4		0.2		-0.2	
W. Boylston	-11.7		-5.7		-5.5		-11.2	
W. Bridgewater	4.1	*	2.3	*	2.4	*	2.7	*
W. Brookfield	-2		-0.2		-0.7		-1.1	
W. Newbury	-0.4		0.3		0.1		-0.7	
W. Springfield	-0.5		0.8		0.8		2.1	*
W. Stockbridge	-2.1		-0.2		-0.7		-0.7	
W. Tisbury	-1.6		1.0		-0.5		0.4	
Wakefield	-2		0.5		-0.5		-0.5	
Wales	-1.8		-0.4		-0.4		-0.6	
Walpole	-2.1		-0.8		-0.5		-1.5	
Waltham	9.8	*	5.1	*	8.7	*	13.3	*
Ware	0.2		1.5	*	0.3		0.4	
Wareham	2.9	*	11.5	*	-0.5		6.6	*
Warren	-2.4		-0.4		-0.5		-1.0	
Warwick	11.8	*	14.3	*	-0.5		13.4	*
Washington	-0.7		0.0		-0.5		-0.8	
Watertown	0.8		1.4	*	0.4		2.1	*
Wayland	1.9		2.3	*	1.1		2.8	*
Webster	2.8	*	1.9	*	2.4	*	3.9	*

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Wellesley	-3.5		-0.5		-1.1		0.9	
Wellfleet	2		4.1	*	0.1		2.9	*
Wendell	0.3		0.9		-1.4		2.5	*
Wenham	-2.7		-0.5		-0.5		-1.2	
Westborough	-1.1		0.2		4.1	*	1.7	
Westfield	-1.7		0.5		-0.6		0.3	
Westfield SC	-		-		-		-	
Westford	-0.5		0.7		0.1		1.1	
Westhampton	-1.3		0.0		-0.5		-0.7	
Westminister	0.3		0.2		-0.1		-0.5	
Weston	-4.1		0.4		0.2		-1.4	
Westport	-1.2		0.7		-0.6		-0.3	
Westwood	-3.8		-0.4		-0.8		-1.8	
Weymouth	3.1	*	1.3	*	3.6	*	3.7	*
Whately	-2.5		-0.7		-1.1		-1.8	
Whitman	-0.1		0.5		0.5		0.6	
Wilbraham	-1.6		0.1		-0.6		-0.5	
Williamsburg	-0.4		0.7		-0.1		0.4	
Williamstown	-6.5		-0.4		-1.9		-1.1	
Wilmington	-1		0.4		0.4		0.1	
Winchendon	-0.5		1.6	*	-0.1		0.8	
Winchester	-1.4		0.0		-0.8		0.9	
Windsor	-0.9		0.0		0.0		-0.3	
Winthrop	1.9		1.0		2.1	*	2.3	*
Woburn	-0.5		2.1	*	1.6	*	1.6	
Worcester	13	*	8.7	*	7.0	*	15.7	*
Worcester Co. Sheriff	-		-		-		-	
Worthington	-2.3		-0.1		-0.9		-1.3	
Wrentham	0.4		0.6		1.1		1.8	
Yarmouth	2.6	*	3.3	*	1.5	*	3.3	*

1. Traffic Citations to Residents (continued) Agency	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (2.1)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.1)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.3)	Non-White Male Disparity	Above Median (1.9)
Boston Police Department Districts								
Boston (All)	23.2	*	25.2	*	4.5	*	NA	
Boston Area A	1.2	*	4.2	*	2.9	*	NA	
Boston Area B	15.4	*	21.5	*	6.0	*	NA	
Boston Area C	-1.3		7.0	*	-2.5		NA	
Boston Area D	18.9	*	26.4	*	0.7		NA	
Boston Area E	20.0	*	13.1	*	10.3	*	NA	
Boston Area F	20.6	*	16.9	*	4.4	*	NA	
Boston Area G	-4.1		0.9		0.8		NA	
Boston Area H	22.2	*	29.0	*	2.0	*	NA	
Boston Area J	25.6	*	13.2	*	16.7	*	NA	
Boston Area K	0.3	*	1.9	*	1.1		NA	
Boston Area L	22.8	*	18.0	*	39.9	*	NA	
Boston Special OPS	NA		NA		NA		NA	
State Police								
State Police (All)	4.4	*						
SP Other (All)	NA							
SP Troop A (All)	5.1	*						
SP Troop B (All)	5.8	*						
SP Troop C (All)	5.9	*						
SP Troop D (All)	3.9	*						
SP Troop E (All)	NA							
SP Troop F (All)	NA							
SP Troop H (All)	3.6	*						
SP Troop I (All)	NA							
Average Overall	0.60		1.3		0.9		2.2	
Average Positive	4.39		2.4		3.0		4.4	
Median Overall	-0.50		0.5		-0.1		0.7	
Positive Median	**2.1**		**1.1**		**1.3**		**1.9**	

2. Driving Population Estimate

Agency	Number	Non-White Disparity	Above Median (3.2)	Black Disparity	Above Median (1.8)	Hispanic Disparity	Above Median (1.7)
Abington	1,941	5.0	*	5.2	*	2.8	*
Acton	3,547	-1.5		1.5		1.1	
Acushnet	996	3.4	*	4.9	*	0.9	
Adams	949	3.2		3.4	*	0.3	
Agawam	2,003	-1.4		-0.2		0.4	
Amesbury	3,963	1.8		1.4		1.6	
Amherst	2,323	-2.2		4.0	*	-1.4	
AMTRAK	4	-		-		-	
Andover[+]	7,283	10.6	*	0.6		13.1	*
Aquinnah	93	-28.8		7.5	*	3.8	*
Arlington	2,901	6.5	*	5.2	*	3.0	*
Ashburnham	1,056	3.9	*	1.8		3.0	*
Ashby	723	7.1	*	3.4	*	3.2	*
Ashfield	380	-0.9		-0.3		0.1	
Ashland	1,145	5.4	*	2.1	*	7.7	*
Athol	929	2.7		1.6		1.9	*
Attleboro	12,249	-1.1		1.4		0.2	
Auburn	4,948	6.7	*	2.9	*	3.7	*
Avon	1,754	29.9	*	25.2	*	7.9	*
Ayer	2,704	-1.7		-0.6		1.8	*
B&M Railroad	68	-		-		-	
Barnstable	8,342	4.1	*	5.4	*	1.9	*
Barre	462	-0.1		-0.1		1.0	
Becket	301	2.7		1.6		1.5	
Bedford	3,298	0.4		0.4		0.3	
Belchertown	2,114	2.1		2.3	*	-1.0	
Bellingham	3,377	4.9	*	2.5	*	3.0	*
Belmont	4,767	2.4		3.1	*	1.1	

[+] Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report.

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Berkley	980	-3.6		0.4		-0.9	
Berlin	1,182	14.0	*	2.6	*	11.6	*
Bernardston	317	3.4	*	2.4	*	0.9	
Beverly	4,022	-1.4		0.5		0.4	
Billerica	5,418	2.2		-0.1		2.7	*
Blackstone	2,174	1.4		1.0		0.9	
Blandford	61	-1.6		-0.5		-0.3	
Bolton	653	11.0	*	3.0	*	7.5	*
Boston (All)	136,608	16.8	*	18.3	*	2.6	*
Bourne	1,327	0.3		3.7	*	-0.5	
Boxborough	1,301	4.9	*	2.2	*	6.5	*
Boxford	582	-0.7		-0.1		1.1	
Boylston	1,079	22.3	*	5.8	*	16.6	*
Braintree	2,840	3.4	*	4.8	*	1.2	
Brewster	763	0.6		0.9		0.9	
Bridgewater	3,745	-5.6		2.5	*	-1.2	
Bridgewater SC	351	-		-		-	
Brimfield	730	1.2		0.7		1.5	
Brockton	16,098	11.6	*	18.4	*	3.7	*
Brookfield	1,955	1.3		1.4		1.0	
Brookline	18,552	1.2		4.7	*	0.0	
Buckland	345	-0.4		0.6		1.0	
Bunker Hill CC	146	NA		NA		NA	
Burlington	5,445	-6.0		-0.1		-0.6	
Cambridge	11,505	1.7		6.8	*	0.4	
Canton	3,551	3.6	*	5.1	*	1.1	
Carlisle	903	0.9		1.5		0.1	
Carver	539	-0.2		2.0	*	-0.1	
Charlemont	547	-1.8		1.0		-1.0	
Charlton	2,481	7.6	*	2.0	*	6.3	*
Chatham	1,424	2.1		1.9	*	1.4	
Chelmsford	3,268	9.5	*	2.7	*	3.4	*

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Chelsea	9,957	-10.5		1.1		-6.8	
Cheshire	486	3.6	*	3.5	*	0.3	
Chester	460	4.0	*	1.2		3.8	*
Chesterfield	442	-0.2		0.5		-0.1	
Chicopee	6,513	6.4	*	2.5	*	5.2	*
Chilmark	129	12.2	*	5.1	*	5.5	*
Clarksburg	219	1.9		0.8		0.7	
Clinton	893	3.9	*	2.4	*	3.9	*
Cohasset	1,308	2.4		2.1	*	0.4	
Colrain	178	-0.7		-0.1		-0.8	
Concord	5,889	-0.1		0.1		0.6	
Conway	184	-0.8		0.4		-1.0	
CSX	1	-		-		-	
Cummington	232	-1.4		0.6		-0.5	
Dalton	1,053	-0.2		0.8		-0.2	
Danvers	4,972	-1.8		0.5		0.2	
Dartmouth	2,897	-4.3		3.8	*	-1.0	
Dedham[+]	5,224	8.4	*	8.8	*	2.6	*
Deerfield	902	0.3		1.0		0.2	
Dennis	3,160	4.0	*	4.9	*	1.1	
Dighton	381	0.4		1.2		0.4	
Douglas	1,795	3.7	*	1.1		2.6	*
Dover	527	4.4	*	1.6		4.4	*
Dracut	1,597	3.6	*	2.0	*	4.2	*
Dudley	1,524	5.3	*	1.6		4.3	*
Dunstable	1,094	3.3	*	1.9	*	2.1	*
Duxbury	876	-1.2		0.4		0.3	
E. Bridgewater	2,881	0.7		2.7	*	0.4	
E. Brookfield	681	5.3	*	3.2	*	0.8	
E. Longmeadow	1,095	5.0	*	4.3	*	1.5	

[+] Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report.

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Eastham	3,316	2.0		0.8		1.0	
Easthampton	1,922	-1.7		0.6		-0.9	
Easton	1,747	0.1		6.1	*	0.0	
Edgartown	511	8.5	*	4.3	*	8.5	*
Egremont	1,338	0.7		0.9		0.4	
Environmental PD	2,050	NA		NA		NA	
Erving	1,076	1.2		0.9		0.8	
Essex	1,194	-1.4		0.2		-0.1	
Everett	8,007	6.1	*	5.8	*	5.6	*
Fairhaven	1,862	-0.1		2.6	*	0.4	
Fall River	22,681	-3.2		1.6		-1.5	
Falmouth	3,715	4.5	*	6.5	*	1.1	
Ferneld State School	4	NA		NA		NA	
Fitchburg	3,515	14.2	*	3.3	*	12.3	*
Fitchburg SC	1	NA		NA		NA	
Foxborough	1,114	1.4		2.9	*	0.3	
Framingham	9,883	3.1		0.8		8.7	*
Franklin	2,725	-2.2		-0.3		0.1	
Freetown	2,791	0.4		3.5	*	-0.3	
Gardner	2,815	-2.1		0.3		-0.8	
Georgetown	863	6.1	*	2.7	*	4.4	*
Gill	1,320	3.2		1.9	*	1.4	
Gloucester	2,088	1.2		1.1		1.7	
Goshen	424	3.4	*	2.4	*	0.8	
Grafton	1,029	-2.7		0.3		-0.9	
Granby	1,271	5.1	*	2.9	*	2.5	*
Granville	161	2.7		3.6	*	-0.7	
Greenfield	2,672	-1.3		1.2		-0.2	
Groton	1,087	-0.1		0.4		0.7	
Groveland	2,563	5.4	*	1.1		4.2	*
Gt. Barrington	1,076	-2.8		-0.9		-0.5	

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Hadley	1,494	8.6	*	3.2	*	2.8	*
Halifax	874	1.4		1.2		0.9	
Hamilton	1,095	-4.9		-0.4		0.1	
Hampden	1,291	2.9		2.1	*	0.9	
Hanover	3,558	-2.7		-0.2		0.3	
Hanson	2,521	2.6		2.7	*	1.3	
Hardwick	394	0.0		1.1		-0.3	
Harvard	557	-4.3		-1.4		-1.8	
Harwich	1,828	3.9	*	4.8	*	1.9	*
Hatfield	596	9.6	*	3.2	*	6.8	*
Haverhill	6,688	4.2	*	1.4		5.1	*
Heath	5	17.4	*	0.0		19.3	*
Hingham	2,907	0.7		0.0		3.0	*
Hinsdale	795	-0.5		0.2		0.2	
Holbrook	655	1.7		3.9	*	0.9	
Holden	2,222	1.9		2.1	*	1.2	
Holland	446	-1.1		0.9		-0.1	
Holliston	1,699	10.6	*	0.5		12.0	*
Holyoke	6,710	1.4		1.1		2.2	*
Hopedale	975	6.3	*	1.4		5.6	*
Hopkinton	2,871	3.5	*	1.5		3.3	*
Hubbardston	1,102	2.2		0.9		1.7	
Hudson	2,118	5.4	*	0.3		8.4	*
Hull	2,365	2.7		2.4	*	1.3	
Huntington	215	3.2		1.9	*	2.5	*
Ipswich	1,081	-2.1		0.2		-0.8	
Kingston	1,186	2.2		1.5		3.1	*
Lakeville	1,535	2.5		3.1	*	0.9	
Lancaster	1,460	-1.2		2.3	*	-1.1	
Lanesborough	547	4.6	*	3.7	*	1.1	
Lawrence	15,024	23.1	*	0.3		25.1	*

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Lee	2,035	0.4		1.8		-0.7	
Leicester	2,153	10.5	*	4.8	*	6.7	*
Lenox	2,012	3.5	*	3.3	*	1.1	
Leominster	3,891	14.5	*	3.3	*	13.5	*
Leverett	1,010	-2.8		0.6		-1.1	
Lexington	4,716	1.7		1.6		0.7	
Leyden	196	-1.1		-0.4		0.1	
Lincoln	2,625	-1.1		-0.5		1.3	
Littleton	3,687	5.5	*	2.0	*	3.2	*
Longmeadow	1,194	1.9		2.0	*	1.7	
Lowell	12,884	12.2	*	3.6	*	7.6	*
Ludlow	1,397	-7.6		-1.2		-5.0	
Lunenburg	1,106	9.4	*	2.8	*	7.9	*
Lynn	21,641	12.7	*	4.1	*	11.8	*
Lynnfield	751	2.3		1.8		3.9	*
MA Maritime Police	5	NA		NA		NA	
Malden	4,999	-3.2		3.0	*	1.3	
Manchester	1,398	1.8		0.5		0.9	
Mansfield	3,027	-2.2		0.7		-0.3	
Marblehead	1,311	1.6		0.7		3.0	*
Marion[+]	528	7.3	*	12.2	*	0.6	
Marlborough	9,531	15.9	*	1.4		19.3	*
Marshfield	2,974	-2.5		-0.8		0.7	
Mashpee	1,571	9.6	*	11.7	*	0.6	
Massasoit CC	460	NA		NA		NA	
Mattapoisett	952	6.5	*	5.2	*	2.9	*
Maynard	3,336	8.2	*	1.2		7.4	*
MBTA	1,477	NA		NA		NA	
Medfield	424	0.0		1.5		1.3	
Medford	6,515	2.4		2.4	*	2.6	*

[+] Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Medway	1,226	6.2	*	1.8		5.6	*
Melrose	1,524	0.1		1.9	*	0.6	
Mendon	3,717	2.0		1.2		2.3	*
Merrimac	641	5.5	*	0.9		3.9	*
Methuen	4,552	29.1	*	1.5		29.7	*
Metro Police Lwr. Basin	38	NA		NA		NA	
Metro Police Marine	4	NA		NA		NA	
Middleborough	4,789	-1.2		1.5		-0.2	
Middleton	1,939	-1.1		0.8		0.5	
Milford	2,041	3.8	*	1.7		5.4	*
Millbury	1,511	5.9	*	4.1	*	3.1	*
Millis	1,153	2.9		1.3		1.7	
Millville	491	2.0		-0.1		2.0	*
Milton[+]	2,160	40.3	*	37.9	*	5.5	*
Monroe	2	0.0		0.0		0.0	
Monson	1,111	1.4		1.0		0.8	
Montague	651	2.6		1.6		2.6	*
Monterey	633	-1.1		0.8		-0.8	
Mt Wachusett CC	2	NA		NA		NA	
N. Adams	1,735	1.8		3.1	*	0.0	
N. Andover	5,031	8.8	*	1.4		9.6	*
N. Attleborough	6,457	-0.3		0.4		1.4	
N. Brookfield	397	-0.3		1.0		-0.2	
N. Reading	767	0.0		0.9		0.7	
Nahant	1,016	6.3	*	5.1	*	3.4	*
Nantucket	1,263	1.5		0.2		3.0	*
Natick	10,734	5.6	*	2.2	*	6.1	*
Needham	1,695	2.4		1.7		3.2	*
New Bedford	7,731	5.1	*	7.7	*	5.2	*
New Braintree	150	0.8		1.3		0.2	

[+] Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
New Marlborough	12	6.1	*	7.3	*	-0.9	
New Salem	771	7.3	*	2.6	*	2.3	*
Newbury	1,088	2.7		1.4		1.2	
Newburyport	3,197	-0.9		0.6		-0.6	
Newton	9,789	-3.8		0.1		-0.8	
Norfolk	733	-10.1		-4.2		-4.1	
Northampton	4,159	-2.5		0.5		-0.2	
Northborough	2,411	8.4	*	3.4	*	6.4	*
Northbridge	1,222	0.1		2.0	*	-0.1	
Northfield	1,799	2.9		1.6		0.9	
Norton	1,296	-4.2		2.2	*	0.2	
Norwell	1,413	-0.8		1.0		1.2	
Norwood	3,986	-2.9		1.4		0.2	
Oak Bluffs	1,969	-1.2		2.1	*	3.9	*
Oakham	332	3.2		1.4		1.8	*
Orange	538	2.9		2.1	*	1.7	
Orleans	1,240	2.4		1.5		1.9	*
Otis	282	0.8		1.2		1.0	
Oxford	1,186	1.7		1.6		1.3	
Palmer	2,564	-1.6		0.5		-1.1	
Paxton	973	1.4		2.1	*	0.6	
Peabody	7,591	8.4	*	1.8		9.5	*
Pelham	1,365	2.5		1.8		-0.6	
Pembroke	897	1.0		0.4		0.9	
Pepperell	1,147	1.3		0.6		1.9	*
Peru	95	-0.8		0.9		-0.2	
Petersham	709	0.2		1.3		0.1	
Phillipston	476	0.5		0.3		1.3	
Pittsfield	3,853	4.2	*	4.3	*	1.1	
Plainfield	12	-2.3		0.0		-0.9	
Plainville	1,381	-1.9		0.3		0.1	

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Plymouth	3,668	1.0		1.4		1.5	
Plympton	956	-0.3		0.0		1.1	
Princeton	1,011	1.4		1.1		1.1	
Provincetown	707	-7.4		-3.2		-0.7	
Quincy	3,069	6.4	*	4.7	*	1.3	
Randolph[+]	4,433	11.9	*	17.0	*	1.5	
Raynham	1,889	1.5		3.2	*	0.7	
Reading	909	0.4		1.2		0.8	
Registry of MV	1	NA		NA		NA	
Rehoboth	1,950	7.9	*	4.0	*	4.2	*
Revere	5,621	10.4	*	5.2	*	7.5	*
Rochester	771	1.7		2.7	*	1.2	
Rockland	3,629	-2.0		0.5		1.1	
Rockport	413	1.1		0.3		2.0	*
Rowe	3	-1.4		0.0		-1.4	
Rowley	1,442	4.6	*	1.2		3.6	*
Royalston	180	0.5		0.0		0.5	
Rutland	603	0.9		0.8		0.8	
S. Hadley	1,578	2.4		1.6		3.4	*
Salem	8,987	7.2	*	2.0	*	8.2	*
Salisbury	2,394	5.7	*	2.8	*	3.9	*
Sandisfield	18	-2.9		-0.6		-0.8	
Sandwich	974	1.1		2.3	*	0.2	
Saugus	2,973	1.3		1.9	*	1.4	
Savoy	70	-2.8		-0.8		-0.6	
Scituate	638	-1.7		1.3		-0.7	
Seekonk	4,068	1.9		3.7	*	0.6	
Sharon	1,770	0.5		2.3	*	1.8	*
Sheffield	1,408	1.6		1.2		0.7	

[+] Department disagrees with NU driving population estimate based on independent road surveys of the driving population conducted by the department

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Shelburne	773	-0.3		0.4		0.5	
Sherborn	1,805	4.9	*	2.0	*	5.4	*
Shirley	610	-2.4		2.1	*	-0.6	
Shrewsbury+	6,528	9.9	*	5.5	*	8.2	*
Shutesbury	363	-1.4		2.6	*	-0.8	
Somerset	2,636	-0.4		1.6		-0.2	
Somerville	8,078	6.1	*	5.5	*	7.7	*
Somerville Housing Auth.	19	NA		NA		NA	
Southampton	679	-1.2		-0.5		0.2	
Southborough	2,007	12.0	*	1.8		12.2	*
Southbridge	2,627	-1.5		1.9	*	-0.7	
Southwick	877	0.8		1.0		0.7	
Spencer	2,522	-1.2		0.0		-0.3	
Springfield	19,523	18.1	*	9.6	*	10.7	*
State Fire Marshal	27	NA		NA		NA	
State Police (All)	358,777	7.0	*	3.0	*	3.8	*
Sterling	1,551	10.2	*	2.9	*	7.5	*
Stockbridge	119	0.2		-0.2		0.4	
Stoneham	863	-1.0		0.2		1.7	
Stoughton	4,129	4.1	*	7.0	*	1.5	
Stow	625	3.1		0.9		3.0	*
Sturbridge	4,415	2.9		1.7		2.3	*
Sudbury	2,756	5.7	*	0.6		7.1	*
Sunderland	1,070	-2.4		1.6		0.5	
Sutton	1,609	13.0	*	6.2	*	6.1	*
Swampscott+	1,648	11.0	*	4.0	*	9.1	*
Swansea	2,991	-3.1		0.3		-1.2	
Taunton	3,244	2.1		4.9	*	0.7	
Templeton	847	0.1		1.1		-0.3	
Templeton Dev. Cent.	3	NA		NA		NA	

+ Denotes that the agency presented Northeastern University with road survey data that differed from the Northeastern University driving population estimate used in this report

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Tewksbury	2,975	2.7		0.6		2.8	*
Tisbury	1,195	5.5	*	2.4	*	7.9	*
Tolland	50	0.9		1.4		0.8	
Topsfield	1,721	0.3		-0.1		1.9	*
Townsend	1,704	2.6		1.7		2.3	*
Truro	1,596	6.1	*	2.1	*	2.7	*
Tufts University	13	-		-		-	
Tyngsborough	1,741	6.9	*	2.2	*	2.4	*
Tyringham	88	-2.8		0.7		-0.4	
Univ Of Mass Amherst	2,287	-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Boston	263	-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Dartmouth	209	-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Lowell	177	-		-		-	
Univ Of Mass Worcester	148	-		-		-	
Upton	1,810	3.7	*	1.8		2.5	*
Uxbridge	726	0.1		1.0		0.8	
W. Boylston	1,856	-1.6		-1.3		0.8	
W. Bridgewater	3,253	11.9	*	8.3	*	5.8	*
W. Brookfield	1,115	5.2	*	2.5	*	1.2	
W. Newbury	1,343	3.9	*	0.5		3.7	*
W. Springfield	3,076	2.4		2.0	*	2.7	*
W. Stockbridge	956	1.2		1.5		0.1	
W. Tisbury	372	4.0	*	4.4	*	1.1	
Wakefield	1,442	-1.7		1.1		0.1	
Wales	78	-1.8		-0.4		-0.4	
Walpole	2,188	-0.1		-0.1		2.0	*
Waltham	6,246	4.2	*	3.3	*	3.9	*
Ware	2,363	3.1		2.9	*	0.8	
Wareham	3,289	1.3		9.0	*	-0.9	
Warren	278	0.1		1.0		0.2	
Warwick	108	1.2		1.9	*	-0.5	
Washington	90	-0.7		0.0		-0.5	

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Watertown[+]	17,972	6.1	*	3.9	*	2.4	*
Wayland	1,301	5.1	*	1.1		6.5	*
Webster	1,202	3.3	*	1.9	*	2.3	*
Wellesley	7,060	3.5	*	3.3	*	3.0	*
Wellfleet	1,848	2.1		1.8		1.5	
Wendell	135	-1.6		0.8		-1.4	
Wenham	917	2.5		0.9		2.3	*
Westborough	3,614	2.9		2.2	*	5.2	*
Westfield	6,112	-2.9		0.7		-1.8	
Westfield SC	159	-		-		-	
Westford	3,611	0.9		1.0		1.7	
Westhampton	573	0.3		0.3		0.4	
Westminister	2,008	2.5		1.5		1.4	
Weston	2,787	4.7	*	2.7	*	6.9	*
Westport	2,527	-1.2		0.9		-0.4	
Westwood	612	-1.3		1.9	*	-0.2	
Weymouth	8,175	-2.6		0.1		0.9	
Whately	1,290	1.3		0.5		0.8	
Whitman	5,502	3.7	*	3.0	*	3.0	*
Wilbraham	2,380	2.4		2.9	*	0.7	
Williamsburg	1,622	1.5		1.3		0.4	
Williamstown	1,234	-3.7		0.3		-1.1	
Wilmington	4,235	2.0		1.1		2.8	*
Winchendon	931	0.0		1.8		-0.1	
Winchester	1,113	-1.3		1.5		0.3	
Windsor	315	3.2		2.2	*	1.0	
Winthrop	1,488	4.7	*	1.8		5.0	*
Woburn	8,103	-2.6		0.9		0.4	
Worcester	24,195	1.9		4.4	*	0.9	

[+] Department disagrees with NU driving population estimate based on independent road surveys of the driving population conducted by the department

2. Driving Population Estimate							
Agency	**Number**	**Non-White Disparity**	**Above Median (3.2)**	**Black Disparity**	**Above Median (1.8)**	**Hispanic Disparity**	**Above Median (1.7)**
Worcester Co. Sheriff	341	-		-		-	
Worthington	169	0.1		1.1		0.3	
Wrentham	1,552	9.8	*	5.6	*	4.2	*
Yarmouth	3,169	4.1	*	5.0	*	1.7	
Average Overall		2.6		2.3		2.2	
Average Positive		4.8		2.6		3.1	
Median Overall		1.8		1.6		1.1	
Median Positive		**3.2**		**1.8**		**1.7**	
Massachusetts State Police Units Daytime Citations Only 6 A.M.-8:00 P.M							
State Police (All)	358,777	7.0	*	3.0	*	3.8	*
SP Troop A (All)	50,555	9.4	*	2.6	*	6.2	*
SP Troop B (All)	45,477	5.9	*	-0.3		6.1	*
SP Troop C (All)	61,304	7.3	*	1.4		5.4	*
SP Troop D (All)	45,683	-0.5		0.0		0.0	
SP Troop E (All)	89,204	4.0	*	3.5	*	1.3	
SP Troop F (All)	623	NA		NA		NA	
SP Troop H (All)	44,882	10.5		6.2	*	4.6	*
SP Troop I (All)	41	NA		NA		NA	
SP Other (All)	21,012	NA		NA		NA	

3. Search Disparities

Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Statewide	19,506	0.5	1.4	*	0.7	1.5	*	0.7	1.5	*	0.5	1.3	*			IC
Abington	71	1.01	1.26		-0.2	1.0		3.4	1.9		0.6	1.1		0.7	1.4	
Acton	45	0.67	1.53	IC	0.4	1.3	IC	2.4	2.8	IC	0.7	1.4	IC	0.6	2.2	IC
Acushnet	22	1.92	1.85	IC	3.6	2.6	IC	-2.2	0.0	IC	2.5	2.0	IC	2.1	2.6	IC
Adams	21	-0.39	0.84	IC	0.4	1.2	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.9	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC
Agawam	27	0.73	1.55	IC	2.6	3.0	IC	-0.4	0.7	IC	1.0	1.6	IC	0.2	1.2	IC
Amesbury	122	5.34	2.79	*	3.0	2.0		7.1	3.4	*	6.2	2.9	*	4.0	3.4	*
Amherst	12	0.38	1.79	IC	0.1	1.2	IC	0.6	2.3	IC	0.3	1.4	IC	0.3	1.6	IC
AMTRAK	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Andover	138	-1.29	0.45		-0.6	0.7		-1.3	0.4		-1.5	0.5		-0.4	0.6	
Aquinnah	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Arlington	24	0.09	1.11	IC	-0.4	0.5	IC	1.4	2.6	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-0.2	0.5	IC
Ashburnham	5	5.30	21.97	IC	10.3	41.6	IC	3.0	12.7	IC	6.5	19.6	IC	6.4	22.3	IC
Ashby	14	6.19	5.46	IC	10.6	8.6	IC	5.5	5.0	IC	6.6	6.0	IC	4.7	4.9	IC
Ashfield	5	-1.40	0.00	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC
Ashland	20	1.23	1.68	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	2.8	2.5	IC	1.3	1.6	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Athol	40	0.71	1.16	IC	0.8	1.2	IC	2.0	1.4	IC	0.9	1.2	IC	1.3	1.4	IC
Attleboro	78	0.63	2.06	*	1.1	2.8	*	0.6	2.0		0.7	1.8	*	0.1	1.5	IC
Auburn	56	1.60	2.37	*	2.4	3.0		1.9	2.6	*	1.6	2.1	*	1.1	2.4	*
Avon	14	-0.35	0.71	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	0.4	1.4	IC	-0.7	0.3	IC
Ayer	18	0.99	2.64	IC	1.2	3.0	IC	1.3	3.1	IC	1.0	2.7	IC	0.1	1.3	IC
B&M Railroad	1	-1.82	0.00	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-2.6	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Barnstable	136	2.31	2.53	*	4.1	3.7	*	-1.1	0.3		2.7	2.4	*	2.2	3.0	
Barre	4	-0.96	0.00	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC
Becket	2	6.77	19.21	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	13.9	37.9	IC	7.7	0.0	IC	7.3	19.3	IC
Bedford	66	0.28	1.14		1.4	1.7		3.9	3.0	*	-0.9	0.6		0.5	1.4	IC
Belchertown	13	1.29	2.37	IC	3.5	4.7	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	1.4	2.1	IC	1.3	2.4	IC
Bellingham	73	-1.32	0.62		-0.5	0.9		-1.1	0.7		-0.7	0.8		-1.2	0.6	
Belmont	28	0.36	1.58	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	1.1	2.8	IC	0.8	2.6	IC	-0.2	0.6	IC
Berkley	18	-1.93	0.00	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-2.6	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC
Berlin	10	0.03	1.04	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	0.4	1.5	IC	0.3	1.3	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC

3. Search																
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Bernardston	8	-2.72	0.00	IC	-2.7	0.0	IC	-2.7	0.0	IC	-4.3	0.0	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC
Beverly	31	-0.87	0.40	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.4	IC	0.1	1.2	IC
Billerica	40	-0.16	0.79	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	-0.2	0.8	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Blackstone	10	0.64	2.43	IC	3.1	8.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	0.8	2.5	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Blandford	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Bolton	8	-1.47	0.00	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC
Boston (All)	872	0.43	1.76	*	0.5	1.8	*	0.5	1.8		0.6	2.0		0.3	1.6	*
Bourne	51	-2.91	0.30		-2.6	0.4		-4.2	0.0		-3.0	0.4		-2.9	0.0	IC
Boxborough	24	-0.04	0.98	IC	2.9	2.5	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.7	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Boxford	4	4.81	7.41	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	6.4	9.4	IC	7.6	12.1	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC
Boylston	10	0.32	1.30	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	1.0	1.9	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.4	1.7	IC
Braintree	121	0.63	1.13		0.4	1.1		1.3	1.3		1.8	1.3		0.2	1.0	
Brewster	41	-2.43	0.60	IC	2.3	1.4	IC	-6.0	0.0	IC	-2.8	0.6	IC	-2.2	0.0	IC
Bridgewater	50	1.44	2.08	*	0.6	1.5		5.3	5.0	*	1.7	2.2	*	1.8	3.3	IC
Bridgewater SC	19	1.20	1.19	IC	-1.2	0.8	IC	-6.2	0.0	IC	1.6	1.2	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC
Brimfield	10	2.13	2.61	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	3.9	4.0	IC	2.6	2.6	IC	3.2	3.9	IC
Brockton	460	1.75	1.77	*	2.0	1.9	*	1.1	1.5	*	1.9	1.7	*	0.6	1.5	*
Brookfield	16	0.58	1.58	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	3.6	4.6	IC	1.5	2.4	IC	0.9	2.3	IC
Brookline	111	0.84	2.48	*	1.9	4.2	*	0.9	2.5	*	1.1	2.4	*	0.3	1.8	*
Buckland	4	-1.24	0.00	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC
Bunker Hill CC	2	2.20	0.00	IC	2.4	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	3.3	0.0	IC	2.3	0.0	IC
Burlington	21	0.29	1.66	IC	0.5	2.2	IC	1.4	4.2	IC	0.1	1.3	IC	0.2	1.7	IC
Cambridge	110	1.17	2.84	*	1.6	3.4	*	1.9	3.9	*	1.5	3.0	*	0.4	2.0	*
Canton	49	2.79	2.57	IC	4.1	3.3	IC	0.4	1.2	IC	3.8	2.7	IC	1.5	2.3	IC
Carlisle	14	2.18	2.14	IC	14.7	8.5	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	1.0	1.5	IC	1.2	2.2	IC
Carver	26	-0.38	0.93	IC	1.0	1.2	IC	-5.7	0.0	IC	0.2	1.0	IC	-3.3	0.0	IC
Charlemont	3	-0.60	0.00	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
Charlton	48	1.02	1.49	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC	1.5	1.7	IC	1.9	1.8	IC	0.6	1.4	IC
Chatham	11	-0.84	0.00	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
Chelmsford	37	0.75	1.69	IC	1.1	2.0	IC	1.0	1.9	IC	0.7	1.5	IC	0.7	1.7	IC
Chelsea	32	0.36	2.74	IC	0.6	3.6	IC	0.3	2.5	IC	0.4	3.0	IC	0.0	1.0	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Cheshire	2	4.32	19.77	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	24.8	108.3	IC	5.2	14.1	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Chester	30	5.38	1.81	IC	-6.6	0.0	IC	9.2	2.4	IC	0.1	1.0	IC	5.9	2.0	IC
Chesterfield	11	-2.61	0.00	IC	-2.6	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-3.0	0.0	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC
Chicopee	86	0.65	1.49		1.1	1.8		0.6	1.4		0.7	1.4		0.7	2.0	IC
Chilmark	13	9.13	1.95	IC	7.1	1.7	IC	4.7	1.5	IC	8.5	1.7	IC	8.7	7.7	IC
Clarksburg	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Clinton	27	-2.53	0.37	IC	-0.7	0.8	IC	-3.0	0.2	IC	-1.2	0.6	IC	-2.5	0.3	IC
Cohasset	13	1.25	1.77	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	9.5	6.9	IC	1.5	1.7	IC	2.1	3.1	IC
Colrain	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Concord	44	0.27	1.37	IC	0.7	2.0	IC	0.4	1.5	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Conway	5	-2.78	0.00	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-4.5	0.0	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC
CSX	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Cummington	4	-2.35	0.00	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC
Dalton	17	3.94	3.45	IC	6.1	4.8	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	4.4	3.5	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC
Danvers	33	0.95	2.43	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	2.0	4.0	IC	0.8	2.2	IC	0.3	1.8	IC
Dartmouth	68	0.91	1.38		0.2	1.1		3.8	2.6		1.5	1.5		0.4	1.2	IC
Dedham	43	0.21	1.20	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	0.4	1.4	IC	-0.3	0.8	IC	0.2	1.3	IC
Deerfield	7	-0.88	0.00	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Dennis	45	0.33	1.23	IC	1.0	1.7	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	0.5	1.3	IC	-0.3	0.6	IC
Dighton	17	-5.30	0.00	IC	-5.3	0.0	IC	-5.3	0.0	IC	-5.4	0.0	IC	-4.4	0.0	IC
Douglas	7	-0.83	0.00	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC
Dover	9	0.27	1.15	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	0.7	1.5	IC
Dracut	23	4.10	4.53	IC	1.1	1.9	IC	4.8	5.1	IC	3.2	3.7	IC	3.6	4.0	IC
Dudley	40	-0.22	0.94	IC	1.3	1.4	IC	-0.2	0.9	IC	-0.1	1.0	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Dunstable	72	3.43	1.48		15.6	3.2	*	-3.6	0.5		4.7	1.6		2.8	2.8	IC
Duxbury	6	2.49	3.59	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	6.7	7.9	IC	3.4	6.8	IC	3.6	10.0	IC
E. Bridgewater	14	2.27	7.43	IC	1.2	4.3	IC	5.6	17.0	IC	0.9	3.0	IC	2.3	24.0	IC
E. Brookfield	9	0.88	1.66	IC	3.0	3.2	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	1.3	1.9	IC	1.9	3.1	IC
E.Longmeadow	11	-0.35	0.70	IC	0.3	1.2	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.8	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
Eastham	12	-0.40	0.00	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Easthampton	12	0.95	2.63	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	2.5	5.3	IC	1.4	2.6	IC	1.2	4.0	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Easton	14	0.85	1.75	IC	0.8	1.7	IC	1.4	2.3	IC	1.1	1.8	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Edgartown*	68	2.21	1.14		5.9	1.4		-0.4	1.0		-0.3	1.0		5.2	1.7	IC
Egremont	1	-0.08	0.00	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Environmental PD	24	1.22	1.99	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	4.8	5.1	IC	0.7	1.6	IC	1.5	2.5	IC
Erving	4	-0.41	0.00	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Essex	31	3.22	1.93	IC	-3.4	0.0	IC	7.7	3.2	IC	3.0	1.8	IC	1.9	2.0	IC
Everett	78	0.14	1.14		-0.3	0.7		0.6	1.6		0.4	1.3		0.1	1.1	
Fairhaven*	58	5.81	2.77	*	6.9	3.1	*	5.0	2.5		5.7	2.4	*	3.2	2.4	IC
Fall River	138	1.28	3.09	*	1.1	2.8	*	1.9	4.1	*	1.5	2.7	*	0.9	4.0	*
Falmouth	42	0.66	1.60	IC	0.6	1.5	IC	1.5	2.4	IC	0.7	1.6	IC	-0.1	0.9	IC
Ferneld State School	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Fitchburg	37	1.55	3.20	IC	-0.2	0.8	IC	2.2	4.1	IC	1.8	3.5	IC	0.7	2.2	IC
Foxborough	26	-0.96	0.68	IC	-1.1	0.6	IC	0.1	1.0	IC	-0.6	0.8	IC	0.1	1.1	IC
Framingham	73	0.47	1.69	*	1.0	2.4	*	0.4	1.7		0.6	1.7	*	0.2	1.5	IC
Franklin	43	2.38	2.47	IC	6.4	4.9	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	2.0	2.0	IC	0.7	1.9	IC
Freetown	36	-0.70	0.62	IC	-1.1	0.4	IC	1.0	1.5	IC	-0.6	0.7	IC	-0.4	0.8	IC
Gardner	44	1.12	1.49	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	4.6	3.0	IC	2.2	1.9	IC	0.6	1.5	IC
Georgetown	34	0.93	1.21	IC	-4.4	0.0	IC	4.0	1.9	IC	2.4	1.6	IC	2.7	2.0	IC
Gill	1	-0.08	0.00	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC
Gloucester	44	0.72	1.30	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	3.0	2.2	IC	-0.9	0.7	IC	-0.2	0.8	IC
Goshen	7	-1.98	0.00	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC
Grafton	23	-2.48	0.00	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC	-3.1	0.0	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC
Granby	18	-1.04	0.49	IC	0.7	1.3	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.5	IC	-0.6	0.6	IC
Granville	4	-3.74	0.00	IC	-3.8	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-4.8	0.0	IC	-3.7	0.0	IC
Greenfield	38	0.38	1.25	IC	0.3	1.2	IC	0.8	1.5	IC	0.7	1.4	IC	0.1	1.1	IC
Groton	30	0.93	1.33	IC	5.5	3.0	IC	0.7	1.2	IC	1.1	1.4	IC	0.8	1.5	IC
Groveland	58	0.62	1.27		3.4	2.6		-0.4	0.8		0.6	1.2		1.6	2.1	IC
Gt. Barrington	7	3.30	5.70	IC	9.3	14.1	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	4.9	15.9	IC	3.5	8.0	IC
Hadley	11	1.40	2.80	IC	3.1	4.9	IC	2.2	3.8	IC	2.1	4.1	IC	1.6	3.3	IC

* Submitted information to Northeastern University about error in search designation

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Halifax	32	3.72	1.94	IC	-4.0	0.0	IC	5.1	2.3	IC	6.0	2.4	IC	2.7	2.7	IC
Hamilton	21	3.83	2.87	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC	2.9	2.4	IC	4.7	2.9	IC	4.7	4.4	IC
Hampden	23	1.66	1.96	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	8.3	5.8	IC	2.6	2.2	IC	2.8	5.0	IC
Hanover	85	-0.94	0.68		0.4	1.1		-1.6	0.5		-1.7	0.5		0.5	1.5	IC
Hanson	39	0.60	1.32	IC	2.2	2.2	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	1.3	1.6	IC	0.8	1.7	IC
Hardwick	3	-1.46	0.00	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC
Harvard	12	1.38	1.56	IC	4.7	2.9	IC	1.2	1.5	IC	2.4	1.9	IC	1.6	4.2	IC
Harwich	14	1.95	4.12	IC	3.5	6.5	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	2.3	3.9	IC	0.5	2.7	IC
Hatfield	9	-0.11	0.93	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	0.7	1.4	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
Haverhill	156	2.06	1.96	*	2.6	2.2	*	2.3	2.0	*	2.7	2.2	*	1.2	1.7	*
Heath	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Hingham	144	-0.33	0.94		7.7	2.5		-3.9	0.3		-0.6	0.9		-0.6	0.6	IC
Hinsdale	5	-0.72	0.00	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Holbrook	11	0.85	1.49	IC	2.2	2.3	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	1.6	2.2	IC	3.7	5.6	IC
Holden	36	6.50	1.77	IC	17.8	3.1	IC	-2.7	0.7	IC	6.1	1.6	IC	6.1	2.0	IC
Holland	11	8.74	4.68	IC	22.6	10.5	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	10.1	5.2	IC	10.1	11.1	IC
Holliston	9	0.23	1.39	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	0.4	1.7	IC	0.3	1.4	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Holyoke	144	0.55	1.21		-0.9	0.7		0.7	1.3		1.1	1.4		-0.3	0.8	
Hopedale	20	-1.12	0.51	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.7	IC	-0.7	0.7	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC
Hopkinton	69	-0.58	0.78		-1.1	0.6		-1.2	0.5		-0.9	0.7		-0.9	0.4	IC
Hubbardston	25	7.32	4.33	IC	7.8	4.5	IC	8.5	4.9	IC	5.4	2.9	IC	6.4	8.1	IC
Hudson	31	0.25	1.16	IC	4.9	4.1	IC	-0.2	0.9	IC	-1.5	0.2	IC	-0.2	0.7	IC
Hull	54	0.65	1.27		-0.7	0.7		2.0	1.8		1.0	1.3		0.9	2.0	IC
Huntington	4	-2.26	0.00	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC
Ipswich	24	3.62	2.60	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	9.5	5.2	IC	3.8	2.2	IC	5.3	4.8	IC
Kingston	31	2.07	1.73	IC	10.1	4.6	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC	2.8	1.8	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC
Lakeville	14	0.37	1.36	IC	1.2	2.2	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Lancaster	2	-0.26	0.00	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Lanesborough	5	-1.02	0.00	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
Lawrence	215	-0.39	0.79		-0.2	0.9		-0.4	0.8		-0.4	0.8		-0.1	0.9	
Lee	38	-0.93	0.53	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.8	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Leicester	121	0.97	1.17		2.7	1.5		0.6	1.1		1.6	1.3		2.0	1.7	*
Lenox	10	0.28	1.52	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	1.9	4.5	IC	0.3	1.4	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC
Leominster	35	0.37	1.44	IC	0.5	1.6	IC	0.4	1.5	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.2	1.5	IC
Leverett	1	-0.11	0.00	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Lexington	28	-0.09	0.85	IC	1.0	2.7	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Leyden	2	-16.67	0.00	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Lincoln	34	2.03	2.86	IC	2.9	3.6	IC	2.3	3.1	IC	2.1	2.6	IC	0.8	1.9	IC
Littleton	26	0.95	2.56	IC	0.3	1.5	IC	2.4	4.9	IC	0.7	1.8	IC	0.4	2.3	IC
Longmeadow	7	2.21	6.86	IC	1.5	5.0	IC	1.6	5.3	IC	3.2	13.6	IC	0.9	5.5	IC
Lowell	118	0.51	1.61	*	0.4	1.5		0.4	1.5		0.4	1.5		0.3	1.4	*
Ludlow	7	-0.66	0.00	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Lunenburg	18	1.02	1.62	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	2.3	2.4	IC	0.4	1.2	IC	0.5	1.5	IC
Lynn	154	0.39	1.65	*	0.3	1.5		0.5	1.9	*	0.4	1.6	*	0.3	1.8	*
Lynnfield	3	1.83	4.32	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	3.6	7.5	IC	2.4	7.7	IC	2.1	4.5	IC
MA Maritime Police	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Malden	99	0.73	1.36		1.4	1.7	*	0.5	1.2		1.2	1.5		0.5	1.4	
Manchester	12	1.31	2.51	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	4.0	6.0	IC	2.0	2.9	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Mansfield	104	2.87	1.83	*	2.7	1.8		7.2	3.1		3.5	1.8	*	3.2	2.0	*
Marblehead	14	1.08	1.92	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	0.5	1.5	IC	1.6	2.2	IC	1.1	3.8	IC
Marion	22	2.08	1.50	IC	2.9	1.7	IC	-4.2	0.0	IC	3.0	1.7	IC	1.1	1.3	IC
Marlborough	58	-0.27	0.62		-0.1	0.9		-0.3	0.6		-0.3	0.6		-0.2	0.5	IC
Marshfield	76	-2.81	0.00		-2.8	0.0		-2.8	0.0		-3.3	0.0		-2.0	0.0	
Mashpee	66	1.64	1.38		1.0	1.2		-4.3	0.0		1.6	1.3		3.2	1.9	IC
Massasoit CC	11	4.05	3.93	IC	4.4	4.1	IC	4.5	4.2	IC	1.7	2.3	IC	4.2	4.0	IC
Mattapoisett	55	-5.70	0.17		-5.0	0.3		-7.0	0.0		-8.1	0.0		-1.8	0.5	IC
Maynard	37	-0.10	0.92	IC	-0.1	0.9	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-0.6	0.5	IC
MBTA	25	2.00	2.57	IC	2.7	3.1	IC	2.1	2.6	IC	2.2	2.7	IC	0.8	2.0	IC
Medfield	2	-0.69	0.00	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
Medford	82	-0.23	0.87		0.1	1.0		-0.6	0.7		-0.5	0.8		-0.3	0.7	IC
Medway	13	-0.48	0.62	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.8	IC	-0.1	0.9	IC
Melrose	25	-2.01	0.00	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.6	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Mendon	25	0.84	2.22	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	1.8	3.7	IC	1.3	2.6	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Merrimac	13	2.53	2.25	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	5.1	3.5	IC	0.5	1.2	IC	1.9	3.4	IC
Methuen	177	-1.11	0.75		-1.1	0.8		-1.1	0.8		-1.2	0.8		-0.7	0.8	
Metro Police Lwr. Basin	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Metro Police Marine	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Middleborough	32	-0.30	0.59	IC	-0.1	0.9	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.7	IC	0.1	1.3	IC
Middleton	28	0.20	1.14	IC	1.8	2.2	IC	-0.8	0.4	IC	0.3	1.1	IC	0.1	1.1	IC
Milford	23	0.89	1.72	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	1.1	1.9	IC	1.1	1.7	IC	0.7	1.8	IC
Millbury	6	0.20	1.43	IC	0.9	3.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	0.1	1.2	IC	0.3	1.8	IC
Millis	2	-0.34	0.00	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Millville	9	10.16	7.34	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	16.6	11.3	IC	12.2	6.8	IC	13.7	23.8	IC
Milton	32	0.25	1.18	IC	0.3	1.2	IC	0.2	1.1	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	-0.2	0.9	IC
Monroe	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Monson	7	1.90	4.17	IC	5.3	9.8	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	2.2	3.7	IC	2.6	9.7	IC
Montague	25	2.82	1.65	IC	2.8	1.6	IC	3.7	1.8	IC	4.0	1.8	IC	0.6	1.2	IC
Monterey	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Mt Wachusett CC	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
N. Adams	149	10.02	2.11	*	10.8	2.2	*	12.8	2.4	*	8.8	1.8	*	5.1	2.2	*
N. Andover	49	0.41	1.41	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	1.0	2.0	IC	1.0	2.2	IC	0.1	1.1	IC
N.Attleborough	73	0.89	1.77		0.1	1.1		1.3	2.1		0.6	1.4		0.6	2.5	IC
N. Brookfield	4	-1.36	0.00	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC
N. Reading	44	7.23	2.31	IC	-0.3	1.0	IC	15.3	3.8	IC	8.3	2.4	IC	3.0	2.3	IC
Nahant	52	-3.36	0.49		-0.3	1.0		-6.5	0.0		-4.9	0.3		-1.4	0.6	IC
Nantucket	13	-0.67	0.44	IC	-0.4	0.7	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.5	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC
Natick	25	0.10	1.43	IC	0.5	3.2	IC	0.0	0.9	IC	0.0	0.9	IC	-0.1	0.5	IC
Needham	19	-0.16	0.87	IC	2.2	2.7	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.8	IC	-0.3	0.7	IC
New Bedford	407	3.54	1.68	*	4.7	1.9	*	2.5	1.5	*	4.2	1.7	*	1.7	1.5	*
New Braintree	1	-0.75	0.00	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
New Marlborough	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
New Salem	2	-0.30	0.00	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC

3. Search																
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Newbury	3	-0.37	0.00	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Newburyport	21	2.09	4.06	IC	2.2	4.2	IC	3.2	5.7	IC	2.5	4.2	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Newton	53	0.81	2.56	*	1.3	3.5	*	2.3	5.3	*	1.2	2.6	*	0.5	2.7	IC
Norfolk	6	2.23	3.76	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	5.9	8.2	IC	2.4	3.8	IC	3.3	9.3	IC
Northampton	96	1.71	1.78	*	-0.7	0.7		2.3	2.1		1.8	1.6		-0.5	0.4	IC
Northborough	17	0.05	1.07	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	0.3	1.4	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Northbridge	20	5.98	5.37	IC	4.5	4.3	IC	9.7	8.1	IC	7.0	5.6	IC	1.7	9.5	IC
Northfield	6	1.04	4.47	IC	3.7	13.4	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	1.7	10.8	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC
Norton	53	-0.96	0.78		-2.6	0.4		3.0	1.7		-1.2	0.8		-2.9	0.0	IC
Norwell	15	1.22	1.93	IC	3.9	4.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	1.2	1.6	IC	0.9	2.5	IC
Norwood	37	-0.28	0.72	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	-0.3	0.6	IC
Oak Bluffs	23	0.07	1.05	IC	1.2	2.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.7	IC	0.1	1.3	IC
Oakham	2	-0.68	0.00	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
Orange	18	-3.85	0.00	IC	-3.9	0.0	IC	-3.9	0.0	IC	-4.2	0.0	IC	-3.5	0.0	IC
Orleans	109	-0.94	0.91		-2.6	0.7		2.6	1.2		-1.4	0.9		2.2	1.6	IC
Otis	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Oxford	35	6.67	3.18	IC	7.3	3.4	IC	8.4	3.7	IC	4.6	2.4	IC	0.9	1.8	IC
Palmer	7	0.74	3.95	IC	1.8	8.3	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	1.0	3.8	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC
Paxton	15	-1.71	0.00	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC
Peabody	103	0.61	1.41		0.3	1.2		0.8	1.6		1.0	1.7	*	0.4	1.4	
Pelham	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Pembroke	31	-3.92	0.00	IC	-3.9	0.0	IC	-3.9	0.0	IC	-4.9	0.0	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC
Pepperell	33	-0.89	0.70	IC	5.3	2.7	IC	-3.0	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.8	IC	0.5	1.3	IC
Peru	2	-2.50	0.00	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC
Petersham	23	-5.16	0.00	IC	-5.2	0.0	IC	-5.2	0.0	IC	-5.8	0.0	IC	-3.5	0.0	IC
Phillipston	5	5.27	6.38	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	6.7	7.4	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC
Pittsfield	28	2.45	5.53	IC	2.2	5.0	IC	3.8	8.0	IC	2.6	4.4	IC	0.1	1.3	IC
Plainfield	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Plainville	15	4.02	5.10	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	10.6	11.7	IC	4.6	4.8	IC	1.2	3.0	IC
Plymouth	66	-0.60	0.70		0.9	1.5		-2.0	0.0		-0.4	0.8		-0.3	0.7	IC
Plympton	60	6.72	2.06	IC	4.8	1.8	IC	2.8	1.4	IC	7.3	2.6	IC	6.6	2.0	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Princeton	1	-0.10	0.00	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.0	IC
Provincetown	13	0.51	1.25	IC	1.6	1.8	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC	0.4	1.2	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC
Quincy	112	-0.30	0.93		5.4	2.2	*	-1.2	0.7		-0.2	1.0		0.0	1.0	
Randolph	48	0.08	1.07	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.3	1.2	IC	0.2	1.2	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Raynham	20	0.31	1.28	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	1.3	2.2	IC	0.5	1.4	IC	0.7	2.0	IC
Reading	33	-1.15	0.71	IC	-3.9	0.0	IC	3.5	1.9	IC	-0.9	0.8	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC
Registry of MV	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Rehoboth	59	0.55	1.18		1.9	1.6		0.3	1.1		1.5	1.5		0.8	1.3	IC
Revere	69	-0.17	0.88		-0.4	0.7		0.1	1.1		-0.2	0.9		0.0	1.0	IC
Rochester	29	7.40	3.00	IC	0.3	1.1	IC	18.5	6.0	IC	10.1	3.4	IC	4.1	2.6	IC
Rockland	23	0.56	1.90	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	1.3	3.3	IC	0.8	2.1	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC
Rockport	15	17.64	4.85	IC	-4.6	0.0	IC	20.4	5.4	IC	20.3	5.3	IC	20.1	5.1	IC
Rowe	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Rowley	70	-0.98	0.84		3.4	1.6		-2.3	0.6		-0.9	0.9		-0.6	0.9	
Royalston	9	-5.56	0.00	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-5.6	0.0	IC	-6.8	0.0	IC	-5.2	0.0	IC
Rutland	8	-1.46	0.00	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
S. Hadley	30	1.67	1.83	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	4.3	3.1	IC	1.5	1.6	IC	0.6	1.7	IC
Salem	47	0.70	2.39	IC	0.4	1.8	IC	0.9	2.9	IC	0.8	2.1	IC	0.5	2.7	IC
Salisbury	112	2.87	1.51		-1.0	0.8		5.3	1.9	*	3.1	1.6		3.8	2.0	
Sandisfield	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Sandwich	47	1.64	1.29	IC	-1.7	0.7	IC	4.3	1.8	IC	-2.2	0.6	IC	3.1	2.2	IC
Saugus	22	1.44	2.90	IC	1.3	2.7	IC	2.4	4.2	IC	1.3	2.2	IC	1.0	2.7	IC
Savoy	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Scituate	19	3.48	1.95	IC	1.6	1.4	IC	21.3	6.8	IC	5.3	2.4	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC
Seekonk	23	1.15	3.40	IC	1.0	3.1	IC	1.8	4.8	IC	1.5	3.6	IC	0.6	2.5	IC
Sharon	9	-0.07	0.89	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	1.2	2.7	IC	-0.2	0.8	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Sheffield	9	-0.82	0.00	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
Shelburne	2	-0.30	0.00	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC
Sherborn	27	0.64	1.41	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	2.1	2.3	IC	1.0	1.7	IC	0.7	1.6	IC
Shirley	10	-0.73	0.61	IC	0.4	1.2	IC	-1.9	0.0	IC	0.6	1.6	IC	0.5	1.5	IC
Shrewsbury	85	0.49	1.40		0.7	1.5		0.4	1.3		0.6	1.4		0.1	1.1	IC

3. Search																
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Shutesbury	1	-0.30	0.00	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC
Somerset	28	-0.11	0.90	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	1.9	2.7	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	0.6	1.9	IC
Somerville	80	-0.17	0.85		0.6	1.6		-0.6	0.5		-0.2	0.8		0.0	1.0	IC
Somerville Housing Auth.	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Southampton	18	1.63	1.60	IC	30.6	12.3	IC	-2.7	0.0	IC	1.8	1.6	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC
Southborough	53	3.06	2.45	*	1.1	1.5		4.2	3.1	*	3.8	2.5	*	2.6	3.4	IC
Southbridge	58	1.14	1.50		0.8	1.3		1.4	1.6		1.7	1.7		-0.6	0.5	IC
Southwick	12	-1.47	0.00	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.5	0.0	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC
Spencer	59	3.95	2.71	*	2.5	2.1		5.2	3.3	*	3.4	2.2		2.9	3.2	IC
Springfield	222	0.93	2.20	*	1.2	2.5	*	0.8	2.0	*	1.4	2.8	*	0.6	2.0	*
State Fire Marshal	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
State Police (All)	5,869	1.01	1.92	*	1.2	2.1	*	1.5	2.3	*	1.1	1.8	*	0.8	1.9	*
Sterling	53	-0.90	0.76		-0.2	0.9		-1.5	0.6		-0.7	0.8		-0.7	0.7	IC
Stockbridge	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Stoneham	32	3.46	1.65	IC	21.5	5.2	IC	-1.7	0.7	IC	2.4	1.4	IC	5.6	2.2	IC
Stoughton	56	1.01	1.80	*	1.7	2.4	*	-0.6	0.6		0.7	1.4		0.8	2.0	IC
Stow	11	-0.55	0.85	IC	21.4	7.0	IC	-3.6	0.0	IC	-0.1	1.0	IC	1.8	2.1	IC
Sturbridge	77	0.72	1.33		1.7	1.8		0.1	1.1		0.2	1.1		0.2	1.2	IC
Sudbury	13	0.00	0.99	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	-0.1	0.8	IC	-0.4	0.5	IC	0.1	1.5	IC
Sunderland	13	2.06	2.87	IC	1.6	2.4	IC	6.6	6.9	IC	1.4	2.2	IC	2.4	4.0	IC
Sutton	38	2.13	1.99	IC	0.8	1.4	IC	4.6	3.1	IC	2.0	1.7	IC	1.2	1.9	IC
Swampscott	44	0.26	1.09	IC	-0.9	0.7	IC	1.3	1.4	IC	0.8	1.3	IC	0.2	1.1	IC
Swansea	48	-0.54	0.71	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	2.2	2.2	IC	-0.6	0.7	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC
Taunton	68	5.07	2.98	*	3.5	2.3	*	8.4	4.3		5.2	2.9	*	4.1	3.7	IC
Templeton	7	-0.97	0.00	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
Templeton Dev. Cent.	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Tewksbury	223	6.72	1.58	*	-4.4	0.6		9.8	1.9		7.1	1.6	*	5.3	1.5	*
Tisbury	26	0.80	1.34	IC	1.3	1.6	IC	0.8	1.3	IC	1.1	1.4	IC	1.3	5.3	IC
Tolland	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Topsfield	13	0.25	1.28	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	0.9	2.0	IC	0.3	1.3	IC	0.6	1.7	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Townsend	58	5.71	2.77	*	13.0	5.0	*	2.7	1.8		6.9	2.9	*	2.4	3.4	IC
Truro	17	-1.24	0.00	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC
Tufts Univ.	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
Tyngsborough	12	-1.16	0.00	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC
Tyringham	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	0.0	NA	IC
UMass Amherst	14	-0.05	0.93	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	2.5	4.5	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	-0.1	0.8	IC
UMass Boston	5	0.39	1.22	IC	-0.4	0.8	IC	4.4	3.3	IC	-0.4	0.8	IC	1.4	2.6	IC
UMass Dartmouth	23	19.74	3.35	IC	14.8	2.9	IC	25.5	4.2	IC	21.2	3.5	IC	17.8	3.9	IC
UMass Lowell	8	0.95	1.20	IC	10.7	4.0	IC	2.2	1.6	IC	2.3	1.6	IC	1.1	1.2	IC
UMass Worcester	8	14.61	6.77	IC	5.7	3.2	IC	22.4	9.6	IC	18.8	10.0	IC	9.8	4.6	IC
Upton	22	-0.35	0.73	IC	1.2	1.9	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.8	IC	0.4	1.6	IC
Uxbridge	19	0.57	1.21	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC	2.5	1.9	IC	1.0	1.3	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC
W. Boylston	29	1.92	2.35	IC	2.7	2.9	IC	1.2	1.8	IC	3.2	2.7	IC	0.8	1.6	IC
W. Bridgewater	128	2.23	1.58	*	2.4	1.6	*	1.6	1.4		2.1	1.5		1.4	1.8	*
W. Brookfield	19	-1.96	0.00	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.0	0.0	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC
W. Newbury	15	2.09	2.84	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	-1.1	0.0	IC	0.8	1.6	IC	2.9	4.2	IC
W. Springfield	21	0.40	1.57	IC	-0.1	0.9	IC	0.7	2.0	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
W. Stockbridge	4	-0.44	0.00	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.7	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC
W. Tisbury	9	-2.77	0.00	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC	-3.7	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC
Wakefield	22	0.76	1.48	IC	1.0	1.6	IC	1.3	1.8	IC	1.1	1.6	IC	2.3	5.6	IC
Wales	9	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Walpole	33	-0.71	0.58	IC	0.0	1.0	IC	-0.8	0.5	IC	-0.8	0.6	IC	-0.4	0.6	IC
Waltham	59	0.47	1.47		0.4	1.4	*	1.1	2.0		0.9	1.9	*	-0.1	0.9	IC
Ware	30	0.00	1.00	IC	1.4	2.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	0.4	1.3	IC	0.4	1.3	IC
Wareham	71	2.51	2.25	*	2.8	2.4		-2.0	0.0		2.7	2.2	*	1.6	2.2	IC
Warren	7	-3.30	0.00	IC	-3.3	0.0	IC	-3.3	0.0	IC	-4.1	0.0	IC	-2.8	0.0	IC
Warwick	2	-2.41	0.00	IC	-2.4	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	-3.4	0.0	IC	-2.5	0.0	IC
Washington	0	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC	NA	NA	IC
Watertown	18	0.09	2.10	IC	0.2	4.3	IC	0.1	2.4	IC	0.1	1.7	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Wayland	19	-2.04	0.00	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC	-2.1	0.0	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC
Webster	31	5.58	3.33	IC	0.6	1.3	IC	9.1	4.8	IC	7.4	3.6	IC	1.8	2.3	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Wellesley	28	0.20	1.54	IC	0.5	2.4	IC	0.3	1.8	IC	0.2	1.4	IC	0.2	3.0	IC
Wellfleet	30	0.41	1.23	IC	2.5	2.4	IC	-1.8	0.0	IC	0.7	1.4	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC
Wendell	7	15.24	4.20	IC	20.2	5.3	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	14.3	3.5	IC	15.8	4.8	IC
Wenham	12	10.18	9.19	IC	11.2	10.0	IC	14.5	12.6	IC	12.9	7.9	IC	5.9	6.9	IC
Westborough	25	0.13	1.15	IC	-0.9	0.0	IC	1.0	2.1	IC	0.3	1.2	IC	0.6	2.2	IC
Westfield	44	0.48	1.67	IC	0.9	2.2	IC	0.2	1.3	IC	0.4	1.5	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Westfield SC	9	18.80	4.03	IC	18.8	4.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC	41.9	6.2	IC	20.1	5.1	IC
Westford	40	-0.54	0.55	IC	2.3	2.9	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.6	IC	-0.6	0.3	IC
Westhampton	1	-0.18	0.00	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	-0.3	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Westminster	28	-0.03	0.98	IC	0.8	1.5	IC	0.1	1.0	IC	-0.2	0.9	IC	-0.3	0.7	IC
Weston	6	0.69	5.09	IC	2.2	13.7	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC	0.9	4.8	IC	0.2	3.0	IC
Westport	63	0.75	1.26		2.3	1.8		0.5	1.2		0.8	1.2		-1.7	0.0	IC
Westwood	2	-0.40	0.00	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.4	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.2	0.0	IC
Weymouth	119	0.14	1.09		1.4	1.9		-0.5	0.7		0.1	1.0		0.5	1.6	
Whitman	63	-0.25	0.79		0.3	1.3		-0.8	0.4		-0.1	0.9		0.5	1.6	IC
Wilbraham	36	2.28	2.65	IC	2.8	3.0	IC	2.1	2.6	IC	2.7	2.7	IC	1.9	2.7	IC
Williamsburg	10	4.71	11.18	IC	3.5	8.6	IC	-0.5	0.0	IC	5.7	11.8	IC	4.9	17.3	IC
Williamstown	15	0.20	1.16	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	-1.6	0.0	IC	0.7	1.7	IC
Wilmington	65	2.53	2.88	*	5.3	4.9	*	2.2	2.6		2.5	2.6	*	0.8	1.9	
Winchendon	71	3.93	1.46	IC	10.5	2.2	IC	-2.3	0.7	IC	7.5	1.9	IC	5.7	2.7	IC
Winchester	46	-2.40	0.46	IC	-4.5	0.0	IC	-1.0	0.8	IC	-4.7	0.2	IC	0.0	1.0	IC
Windsor	7	7.74	4.42	IC	17.7	8.8	IC	-2.3	0.0	IC	9.6	4.3	IC	8.5	6.7	IC
Winthrop	12	-1.43	0.00	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.4	0.0	IC	-1.7	0.0	IC	-1.2	0.0	IC
Woburn	89	0.31	1.27		-0.1	0.9		0.9	1.7		0.5	1.4		-0.2	0.7	
Worcester	107	0.66	3.17	*	0.4	2.4	*	0.9	4.0		0.8	3.1	*	0.3	4.0	IC
Worcester Co. Sheriff	4	0.42	1.41	IC	1.6	2.6	IC	0.1	1.1	IC	1.7	2.3	IC	0.4	1.4	IC
Worthington	1	-0.61	0.00	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.6	0.0	IC	-0.8	0.0	IC	0.0	0.0	IC
Wrentham	62	-1.11	0.74		-0.1	1.0		-1.7	0.6		-1.9	0.6		-0.2	0.9	IC
Yarmouth	40	1.32	2.01	IC	2.5	2.9	IC	-1.3	0.0	IC	0.8	1.5	IC	-0.2	0.7	IC

3. Search																	
Agency	Total Searched	Non-White % Diff	Non-White Ratio	Sig	Black Diff in %	Black Ratio	Sig	Hispanic Diff in %	Hispanic Ratio	Sig	Non-White Male Diff %	Non-White Male Ratio	Sig	Non-White Diff % No Arrest	Non-White No Arrest Ratio	Sig
Boston Districts																
Boston (All)	872	0.4		*	0.5		*	0.5			0.6			0.3		*
Boston Area A	51	-0.3			0.3			-1.2			-0.3			-0.1		IC
Boston Area B	102	0.8		*	1.2			-0.1			0.9		*	0.4		
Boston Area C	90	1.3		*	1.3			1.2		*	1.8		*	0.6		IC
Boston Area D	51	0.7		*	0.5			1.9		*	0.7		*	0.5		IC
Boston Area E	36	-1.0		IC	-0.2			-2.2		IC	-1.1		IC	-1.1		IC
Boston Area F	48	1.3		IC	1.1			1.2		IC	0.9		IC	0.8		IC
Boston Area G	126	3.1		*	2.6			3.9		*	3.0		*	2.0		*
Boston Area H	159	0.4		*	0.5			0.2			0.6		*	0.2		
Boston Area J	31	0.2		IC	0.3			0.1		IC	0.2		IC	0.2		IC
Boston Area K	21	-0.3		IC	-0.4			-0.1		IC	-0.2		IC	-0.3		IC
Boston Area L	112	0.0			0.0			-0.4			0.1			-0.1		
Boston Special OPS	44	0.1		IC	0.1			0.0		IC	0.1		IC	0.0		IC
State Police																
State Police (All)	5,869	1.0		*	1.2		*	1.5		*	1.1		*	0.8		*
SP Other	327	2.1		*	2.5		*	2.5		*	2.6		*	1.2		
SP Troop A	1,199	0.9		*	1.2		*	1.3		*	1.1		*	0.8		*
SP Troop B	1,214	1.2		*	1.3		*	1.4		*	1.3		*	1.0		*
SP Troop C	1,567	1.1		*	1.5		*	1.5		*	1.1		*	0.9		*
SP Troop D	682	1.2		*	1.4		*	1.3		*	1.4		*	0.8		*
SP Troop E	150	0.1		*	0.2		*	0.0		IC	0.2		*	0.1		*
SP Troop F	12	0.5		IC	-1.3		IC	3.2		IC	0.7		IC	-0.3		IC
SP Troop H	717	1.1		*	1.4		*	1.3		*	1.2		*	0.9*		*
SP Troop I	1	3.0		IC	-3.3		IC	-3.3		IC	-4.0		IC	0.0		IC

4. Summary Table Citations vs. Warnings

Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Statewide	807,791	542,195	265,596	6.1	1.1	*	4.1	1.1	*	9.3	1.2	*	4.7	1.1	*
Abington	932	348	584	9.6	1.2	*	9.0	1.2		17.6	1.5		8.8	1.2	
Acton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Acushnet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adams	587	210	377	9.5	1.2		20.3	1.6		-18.6	0.5		1.0	1.0	
Agawam	1,253	454	799	6.1	1.1		14.3	1.4		4.7	1.1		3.5	1.1	
Amesbury	1,618	845	773	14.4	1.4	*	8.3	1.2		11.3	1.2		8.1	1.1	
Amherst	2,434	563	1,871	-4.1	0.9		-7.2	0.7		3.1	1.1		-3.1	0.9	
AMTRAK	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andover	3,606	2,279	1,327	14.0	1.6	*	3.3	1.1		19.4	1.3	*	11.5	1.2	*
Aquinnah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arlington	2,659	709	1,950	10.3	1.2	*	15.2	1.6	*	14.9	1.6	*	10.5	1.4	*
Ashburnham	898	310	588	-7.0	0.9		-20.7	0.4		5.0	1.1		-14.7	0.6	
Ashby	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ashfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Ashland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Athol	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Attleboro	3,199	2,747	452	-1.0	0.9		-1.5	1.0		-0.6	1.0		-0.4	1.0	
Auburn	1,763	1,375	388	6.0	1.4	*	1.2	1.0		8.4	1.1		2.3	1.0	
Avon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ayer	1,508	597	911	-1.1	1.0		-5.9	0.9		7.9	1.2		6.1	1.1	
B&M Railroad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barnstable	5,512	3,015	2,497	4.5	1.1	*	3.2	1.1		6.4	1.1		0.7	1.0	
Barre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Becket	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bedford	2,181	1,081	1,100	5.1	1.1		-4.6	0.9		2.1	1.0		1.2	1.0	
Belchertown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bellingham	1,928	1,215	713	15.0	1.6	*	17.8	1.3	*	11.4	1.2	*	12.8	1.2	*
Belmont	4,285	2,216	2,069	3.7	1.1		5.5	1.1		13.5	1.3	*	3.6	1.1	
Berkley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Berlin	226	142	84	21.1	2.1	*	-9.8	0.8		32.2	1.5	*	22.0	1.3	

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Bernardston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beverly	1,364	808	556	5.7	1.2		5.7	1.1		12.4	1.2		4.6	1.1	
Billerica	2,593	1,635	958	17.3	1.8	*	0.6	1.0		24.6	1.4	*	12.9	1.2	*
Blackstone	1,231	560	671	17.9	1.5	*	2.3	1.1		27.4	1.6	*	12.4	1.3	
Blandford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bolton	676	122	554	6.7	1.1		-2.3	0.9		16.0	1.9		4.4	1.2	
Boston (All)	92,879	55,668	37,211	11.0	1.3	*	10.1	1.2	*	12.2	1.2		10.0	1.2	*
Bourne	1,174	347	827	69.5	70.5		0.7	1.0		20.5	1.7		0.5	1.0	
Boxborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boxford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boylston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Braintree	3,031	1,028	2,003	8.3	1.1	*	3.3	1.1		19.4	1.6	*	4.8	1.1	
Brewster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bridgewater	5,565	1,419	4,146	12.3	1.2	*	10.9	1.4	*	21.6	1.9	*	10.2	1.3	*
Bridgewater SC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brimfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brockton	6,982	5,495	1,487	-1.6	0.9		-0.7	1.0		-4.5	0.9		-0.7	1.0	
Brookfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brookline	11,934	6,056	5,878	2.9	1.1	*	-2.8	0.9		7.1	1.1	*	1.9	1.0	
Buckland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bunker Hill CC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burlington	4,760	2,248	2,512	3.5	1.1		-4.8	0.9		9.9	1.2		-3.2	0.9	
Cambridge	12,446	5,245	7,201	6.0	1.1	*	5.6	1.1	*	8.4	1.2	*	4.6	1.1	*
Canton	2,253	945	1,308	2.8	1.1		-1.7	1.0		18.3	1.4	*	-1.4	1.0	
Carlisle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Charlemont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Charlton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chatham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chelmsford	2,261	1,254	1,007	3.6	1.1		2.2	1.0		-1.0	1.0		2.8	1.0	
Chelsea	4,403	3,547	856	3.9	1.2	*	-2.7	1.0		5.5	1.1	*	3.2	1.0	*

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Cheshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chesterfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chicopee	3,818	2,145	1,673	11.9	1.4	*	12.5	1.2	*	11.7	1.2	*	9.2	1.2	*
Chilmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clarksburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cohasset	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colrain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CSX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cummington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dalton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Danvers	3,574	1,537	2,037	0.6	1.0		0.1	1.0		2.6	1.1		-1.3	1.0	
Dartmouth	1,122	717	405	5.4	1.2		3.8	1.1		13.2	1.2		9.0	1.1	
Dedham	3,358	1,577	1,781	1.0	1.0		-1.8	1.0		9.2	1.2	*	-0.3	1.0	
Deerfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dennis	1,975	770	1,205	3.9	1.1		2.0	1.1		13.5	1.3		1.3	1.0	
Dighton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Douglas	1,225	391	834	0.4	1.0		-8.0	0.7		1.5	1.0		-11.5	0.7	
Dover	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dracut	2,151	518	1,633	11.3	1.2	*	9.7	1.4		19.6	1.9	*	9.1	1.3	
Dudley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dunstable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Duxbury	1,702	291	1,411	9.1	1.1		11.3	1.7		16.6	2.0		7.7	1.4	
E. Bridgewater	1,118	639	479	14.7	1.5	*	14.0	1.2		19.9	1.4		13.9	1.2	
E. Brookfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E. Longmeadow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eastham	2,554	941	1,613	1.7	1.0		-1.7	1.0		-4.3	0.9		-0.4	1.0	
Easthampton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Easton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Edgartown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Egremont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Environmental PD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Erving	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Essex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Everett	2,644	1,870	774	4.6	1.2	*	-0.6	1.0		9.0	1.1	*	2.1	1.0	
Fairhaven	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fall River	9,801	8,527	1,274	1.5	1.1		-2.6	1.0		4.2	1.0		1.9	1.0	
Falmouth	4,999	1,196	3,803	5.7	1.1	*	6.9	1.3	*	1.9	1.1		3.1	1.1	
Ferneld State School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fitchburg	2,428	917	1,511	9.9	1.2	*	-9.9	0.7		15.3	1.4	*	11.0	1.3	*
Foxborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Framingham	6,027	3,454	2,573	5.1	1.1	*	-4.1	0.9		9.7	1.2	*	5.0	1.1	*
Franklin	2,683	967	1,716	5.5	1.1		-6.2	0.8		16.7	1.5	*	8.3	1.2	
Freetown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gardner	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgetown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gloucester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goshen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grafton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Granby	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Granville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greenfield	1,127	604	523	1.6	1.0		13.3	1.2		4.5	1.1		5.4	1.1	
Groton	653	249	404	-0.7	1.0		-9.5	0.8		6.3	1.2		-7.0	0.8	
Groveland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gt. Barrington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hadley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Halifax	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hamilton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Hampden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hanover	1,685	990	695	0.2	1.0		-7.3	0.9		9.5	1.2		-0.3	1.0	
Hanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hardwick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harvard	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harwich	1,146	330	816	4.4	1.1		7.1	1.2		-1.2	1.0		5.2	1.2	
Hatfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haverhill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hingham	1,741	617	1,124	8.3	1.1		10.5	1.3		13.3	1.4		5.7	1.1	
Hinsdale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Holbrook	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Holden	1,794	646	1,148	3.6	1.1		6.9	1.2		14.3	1.4		-4.3	0.9	
Holland	191	51	140	40.6	2.2		73.9	3.8		73.9	3.8		71.1	3.5	*
Holliston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Holyoke	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hopedale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hopkinton	1,231	649	582	1.5	1.0		-6.8	0.9		5.3	1.1		-3.0	0.9	
Hubbardston	576	247	329	5.4	1.1		-5.1	0.9		24.1	1.6		3.8	1.1	
Hudson	1,830	497	1,333	15.3	1.3	*	-7.8	0.7		25.1	2.0	*	11.2	1.4	*
Hull	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Huntington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ipswich	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kingston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakeville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lancaster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lanesborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lawrence	7,735	5,385	2,350	5.7	1.2	*	-1.8	1.0		6.0	1.1	*	5.4	1.1	*
Lee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Leicester	1,022	549	473	15.2	1.5	*	13.7	1.3	*	19.1	1.4	*	8.2	1.2	
Lenox	1,738	719	1,019	6.1	1.1		4.7	1.1		18.2	1.4		1.0	1.0	

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Leominster	1,541	762	779	8.7	1.2	*	1.4	1.0		12.7	1.3	*	11.2	1.2	*
Leverett	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lexington	2,344	1,379	965	11.8	1.4	*	0.6	1.0		4.1	1.1		9.3	1.2	*
Leyden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lincoln	1,599	764	835	12.9	1.3	*	11.8	1.3		18.4	1.4	*	9.0	1.2	
Littleton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Longmeadow	1,217	289	928	4.3	1.1		0.7	1.0		18.4	1.8	*	3.7	1.1	
Lowell	4,073	3,291	782	-0.1	1.0		-4.0	1.0		3.2	1.0		-1.4	1.0	
Ludlow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lunenburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lynn	10,334	6,493	3,841	2.2	1.1	*	21.4	1.6		28.3	1.7	*	3.8	1.1	*
Lynnfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA Maritime Police	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manchester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mansfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marblehead	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marlborough	4,227	2,489	1,738	12.1	1.4	*	8.6	1.2	*	14.8	1.3	*	9.4	1.2	*
Marshfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mashpee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massasoit CC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mattapoisett	776	178	598	6.6	1.1		-4.2	0.8		25.0	2.1	8	3.9	1.1	
Maynard	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MBTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medfield	518	88	430	8.3	1.1		16.5	2.0		8.2	1.5		3.6	1.2	
Medford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Medway	1,582	311	1,271	21.6	1.4	*	24.5	2.4	*	22.1	2.2	*	21.5	2.0	*
Melrose	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mendon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Merrimac	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Methuen	2,580	1,486	1,094	9.6	1.3	*	1.5	1.0		10.4	1.2	*	7.8	1.1	*
Metro Police Lwr. Basin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Metro Police Marine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middleborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middleton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milford	1,686	443	1,243	15.5	1.3	*	5.9	1.2		26.4	2.1	*	14.0	1.5	*
Millbury	415	226	189	**13.1**	**1.4**		13.3	1.2		21.6	1.4		18.7	1.3	
Millis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Millville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monroe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montague	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monterey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mt Wachusett CC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N. Adams	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N. Andover	2,846	1,896	950	11.7	1.5	*	6.0	1.1		15.0	1.2	*	8.6	1.1	*
N. Attleborough	2,452	1,649	803	0.8	1.0		-19.5	0.7		10.4	1.2	*	-3.2	1.0	
N. Brookfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N. Reading	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nahant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nantucket	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Natick	4,959	3,496	1,463	6.5	1.3	*	4.0	1.1		7.1	1.1	*	2.6	1.0	
Needham	1,517	422	1,095	9.2	1.1	*	2.8	1.1		15.4	1.6	*	13.6	1.5	*
New Bedford	2,669	1,926	743	6.9	1.3	*	4.2	1.1		12.3	1.2	*	4.5	1.1	
New Braintree	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Marlborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Salem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Newbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Newburyport	1,961	782	1,179	13.9	1.3	*	-3.8	0.9		6.7	1.2		1.1	1.0	
Newton	9,301	2,918	6,383	1.9	1.0		-4.9	0.8		6.3	1.2	*	2.9	1.1	

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Norfolk	900	177	723	-1.5	1.0		-7.2	0.6		10.3	1.5		0.6	1.0	
Northampton	1,989	1,134	855	7.6	1.2	*	6.9	1.1		7.9	1.1		7.3	1.1	
Northborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northbridge	2,137	326	1,811	2.0	1.0		-5.8	0.6		12.1	1.8		1.2	1.1	
Northfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norton	840	308	532	-6.2	0.9		-1.6	1.0		-5.5	0.9		-4.4	0.9	
Norwell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norwood	3,259	1,192	2,067	9.4	1.2	*	6.3	1.2		19.5	1.5	*	9.8	1.3	*
Oak Bluffs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oakham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orange	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orleans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Otis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oxford	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palmer	1,772	746	1,026	11.7	1.3	*	8.3	1.2		40.1	2.0	*	11.0	1.2	
Paxton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peabody	3,141	1,709	1,432	12.7	1.4	*	3.3	1.1		18.3	1.3	*	7.7	1.1	*
Pelham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pembroke	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pepperell	1,105	275	830	4.8	1.1		-24.5	0.0		14.0	1.6		0.1	1.0	
Peru	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Petersham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phillipston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pittsfield	1,950	1,165	785	-2.2	0.9		-11.0	0.8		18.2	1.3	*	-1.1	1.0	
Plainfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plainville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plymouth	5,211	1,373	3,838	8.4	1.1	*	4.2	1.2		23.1	1.9	*	8.8	1.3	*
Plympton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Princeton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Provincetown	364	149	215	12.6	1.3		13.3	1.3		-7.2	0.8		18.1	1.4	
Quincy	4,014	837	3,177	8.3	1.1	*	4.7	1.2		16.6	1.9	*	6.6	1.3	*

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Randolph	1,909	1,219	690	9.1	1.3	*	8.2	1.1	*	13.1	1.2	*	8.7	1.1	*
Raynham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reading	1,995	164	1,831	5.3	1.1		4.0	1.5		5.8	1.7		4.5	1.4	
Registry of MV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rehoboth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revere	2,973	2,133	840	19.3	2.5	*	17.9	1.3	*	21.2	1.3	*	15.6	1.2	*
Rochester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rockland	1,769	1,032	737	14.1	1.5	*	5.6	1.1		29.0	1.5	*	13.5	1.2	*
Rockport	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rowe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rowley	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Royalston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rutland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S. Hadley	489	253	236	12.2	1.3		17.3	1.7		-5.6	0.8		-3.5	0.9	
Salem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salisbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandisfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sandwich	655	170	485	6.7	1.1		-4.0	0.8		-20.7	0.0		1.4	1.1	
Saugus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Savoy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scituate	454	93	361	-3.9	1.0		-29.1	0.5		2.8	1.0		-15.0	0.8	
Seekonk	2,142	1,258	884	-12.5	0.8		-31.0	0.6		-31.0	0.6		-27.5	0.7	
Sharon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sheffield	227	181	46	-30.8	0.4		8.6	1.2		5.8	1.1		3.2	1.1	
Shelburne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sherborn	996	418	578	5.9	1.1		2.9	1.1		4.2	1.2		3.9	1.2	
Shirley	489	105	384	4.5	1.1		11.9	1.2	*	22.7	1.5	*	10.2	1.2	*
Shrewsbury	3,444	1,763	1,681	15.6	1.4	*	4.1	1.1		27.1	1.8	*	6.8	1.2	
Shutesbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somerset	2,056	681	1,375	11.8	1.2	*	0.0	1.0		6.8	1.1	*	3.0	1.0	
Somerville	2,368	1,812	556	3.8	1.2	*	5.8	1.1		16.5	1.3		10.6	1.2	

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Somerville Housing Auth.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Southampton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Southborough	1,509	581	928	1.4	1.0		-3.4	0.9		9.5	1.2	*	-2.8	0.9	
Southbridge	950	584	366	-2.3	0.9		-6.2	0.9		1.5	1.0		-0.9	1.0	
Southwick	485	175	310	34.0	2.1	*	40.0	2.1		22.1	1.6		31.7	1.8	
Spencer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Springfield	10,471	6,409	4,062	10.8	1.3	*	7.6	1.1	*	13.9	1.2	*	9.6	1.2	*
State Fire Marshal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Police (All)	346,137	297,615	48,522	-0.2	1.0		-2.0	1.0		0.2	1.0		-0.7	1.0	
Sterling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stockbridge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stoneham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stoughton	1,717	1,370	347	4.1	1.2		-1.8	1.0		14.8	1.2	*	2.8	1.0	
Stow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sturbridge	1,595	1,080	515	13.6	1.7	*	2.5	1.0		16.8	1.3	*	11.1	1.2	*
Sudbury	2,629	692	1,937	12.6	1.2	*	4.5	1.2		18.1	1.7	*	12.2	1.4	*
Sunderland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sutton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Swampscott	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Swansea	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taunton	1,342	816	526	3.4	1.1		4.2	1.1		2.5	1.0		1.6	1.0	
Templeton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Templeton Dev. Cent.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tewksbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tisbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tolland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Topsfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Townsend	1,145	351	794	4.6	1.1		2.9	1.1		12.5	1.4		0.0	1.0	
Truro	590	303	287	21.6	1.7	*	32.0	1.7	*	1.0	1.0		21.5	1.4	*
Tufts University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tyngsborough	1,134	574	560	-1.1	1.0		-0.4	1.0		-0.4	1.0		3.3	1.1	

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Tyringham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Univ Of Mass Amherst	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Univ Of Mass Boston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Univ Of Mass Dartmouth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Univ Of Mass Lowell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Univ Of Mass Worcester	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Upton	1,287	468	819	15.1	1.3	*	5.4	1.2		25.6	1.7	*	8.7	1.2	
Uxbridge	920	159	761	4.2	1.1		5.0	1.3		7.8	1.5		11.1	1.6	
W. Boylston	867	409	458	1.3	1.0		-1.7	1.0		9.5	1.2		-7.3	0.9	
W. Bridgewater	1,482	914	568	9.7	1.3	*	5.0	1.1		15.4	1.3	*	7.8	1.1	
W. Brookfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
W. Newbury	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
W. Springfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
W. Stockbridge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
W. Tisbury	488	64	424	17.5	1.2	*	15.2	2.3	*	54.6	5.5	*	19.6	2.4	*
Wakefield	1,122	372	750	14.4	1.3	*	17.4	1.5		34.1	2.0	*	26.7	1.7	*
Wales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Walpole	1,375	516	859	17.8	1.4	*	6.8	1.2		36.6	2.0	*	11.7	1.3	
Waltham	7,919	2,617	5,302	5.1	1.1	*	1.9	1.1		9.6	1.3	*	4.6	1.1	*
Ware	663	345	318	4.1	1.1		12.3	1.2		5.1	1.1		1.5	1.0	
Wareham							5.3	1.1		1.5	1.0		3.0	1.0	
Warren	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Warwick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Watertown	8,799	6,018	2,781	5.7	1.2	*	4.4	1.1	*	9.9	1.1	*	3.3	1.0	*
Wayland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Webster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wellesley	4,618	2,207	2,411	9.0	1.2	*	4.0	1.1		12.4	1.3	*	7.3	1.1	*
Wellfleet	1,371	571	800	-2.9	1.0		-12.8	0.7		13.9	1.3		-7.9	0.8	
Wendell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wenham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
Westborough	2,923	1,101	1,822	3.0	1.1		-5.1	0.9		10.1	1.3	*	5.1	1.1	
Westfield	2,730	1,410	1,320	6.8	1.2	*	5.1	1.1		7.8	1.2		5.8	1.1	
Westfield SC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Westford	2,284	1,021	1,263	3.4	1.1		-10.9	0.8		9.4	1.2		-3.5	0.9	
Westhampton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Westminster	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weston	1,781	812	969	3.2	1.1	*	8.0	1.2		14.8	1.3	*	3.0	1.1	
Westport	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Westwood	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weymouth	5,109	2,797	2,312	9.1	1.2	*	6.7	1.1		8.0	1.1		6.8	1.1	*
Whately	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wilbraham	1,507	619	888	-3.0	1.0		-1.0	1.0		-7.4	0.8		-9.0	0.8	
Williamsburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Williamstown	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wilmington	3,081	1,394	1,687	2.2	1.0		2.2	1.0		7.7	1.2		1.9	1.0	
Winchendon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Winchester	1,678	325	1,353	2.4	1.0		-1.1	0.9		1.5	1.1		2.8	1.1	
Windsor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Winthrop	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Woburn	3,815	2,465	1,350	2.2	1.1		-2.0	1.0		5.9	1.1		0.4	1.0	
Worcester	11,106	9,400	1,706	5.7	1.5	*	2.4	1.0	*	7.6	1.1	*	5.2	1.1	*
Worcester Co. Sheriff	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Worthington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wrentham	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yarmouth	903	405	498	11.4	1.3	*	19.2	1.4	*	1.8	1.0		7.9	1.2	
Boston Police Department Districts															
Boston (All)	92,879	55,668	37,211	11.0	1.3	*	10.1	1.2	*	1.2	*	26.2		*	
District A1 and A15	5,513	2,431	3,082	3.1	1.1	*	5.6	1.1	*	1.0		0.9			
District B2	4,468	2,578	1,890	4.9	1.1	*	2.5	1.0		1.2	*	5.9			

4. Citations & Warnings Agency	Total	Citations	Warnings	Non-White Disparity	Non-White Ratio	Sig.	Black Disparity	Black Ratio	Sig.	Hispanic Disparity	Hispanic Ratio	Sig.	NW Male Disparity	NW Male Ratio	Sig.
District B3	4,347	2,207	2,140	-1.7	1.0		-2.6	1.0		1.1		-2.6			
District D4	8,535	3,897	4,638	11.6	1.2	*	11.6	1.3	*	1.4	*	10.9			
District E5	8,364	773	7,591	1.3	1.0	*	4.3	1.5	*	1.9	*	3.7			
District C6	4,315	1,487	2,828	12.4	1.2	*	9.8	1.3	*	1.5	*	15.5			
District A7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.0			
District C11	8,905	5,127	995	5.2	1.3	*	4.0	1.1	*	1.1	*	4.5			
District E13	4,232	2,165	2,067	11.1	1.2	*	6.6	1.1	*	1.4	*	12.1			
District D14	6,386	2,361	4,025	7.3	1.1	*	-0.2	1.0		1.2	*	6.3			
District E18	5,799	4,002	1,797	7.5	1.3	*	5.4	1.1	*	1.2	*	9.2			
BPD Special Ops	32,015	26,454	5,561	2.4	1.2	*	0.3	1.0		1.1	*	2.5			
Massachusetts State Police Units															
State Police (All)	346,137	297,615	48,522	-0.2	1.0		-2.0	1.0		1.0					
SP Other (All)	14,582	12,656	1,926	-1.8	0.9		-6.0	0.9		1.1	*				
SP Troop A (All)	53,629	48,026	5,603	1.2	1.1	*	-0.5	1.0		1.0	*				
SP Troop B (All)	49,228	39,904	9,324	0.3	1.0		-1.4	1.0		1.0					
SP Troop C (All)	64,418	54,459	9,959	-0.4	1.0		-2.8	1.0		1.0					
SP Troop D (All)	53,793	43,930	9,863	-1.6	0.9		-2.7	1.0		1.0					
SP Troop E (All)	66,546	60,152	6,394	-2.0	0.8		-3.0	1.0		1.0					
SP Troop F (All)	281	168	113	16.0	1.6	*	21.8	1.4	*	1.2					
SP Troop H (All)	43,630	38,320	5,310	-0.7	0.9		-2.2	1.0		1.0					
SP Troop I (All)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA				

FULL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Name	Title	Organization
Community:		
Lenny Alkins	President	NAACP-Boston Chapter
Mary Bonauto	Civil Rights Director	Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders
Jeffrey Brown	Pastor & Founder	Union Baptist Church/Boston Ten-Point Coalition
Al Cardarelli	Professor	UMASS-Boston
Lee Charlton	President	NAACP - New Bedford Chapter
Ray Hammond	President	Boston Ten Point Coalition
Rob Leikind	Executive Director	Anti-Defamation League of New England
John T. Lu	Associate Justice	Boston Municipal Court Department
Jacinta Ma	Legal and Advocacy	Civil Rights Project at Harvard University
Ron Madnick	Executive Director	ACLU-Worcester, Massachusetts
Janina Mollett	President	NAACP- Springfield Chapter
William Newman	Executive Director	ACLU-Northampton, Massachusetts
John Reed	President	NAACP - Cape and Islands Chapter
Lisa Riddick	President	NAACP-Merrimack Valley Chapter
William Rodriguez	Executive	La Alianza Hispana and Director Co-Chair of Institute on Race and Justice Advisory Board
Carol Rose	Executive Director	ACLU- Massachusetts (Boston)
Martin Rosenthal	Attorney	Brookline, Massachusetts
Henry M. Thomas, III	President & CEO	Urban League of Springfield
Juan Vega	Executive Director	Center Latino Chelsea
Darnell L. Williams	President & Chief	Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts
Samuel Williams	Director of Transitional Employment	Youth Opportunity Boston and Co-Chair of Institute on Race & Justice Advisory Board
District Attorneys:		
Andrea Cabral	Sheriff	Suffolk County Sheriff
Dan Conley	District Attorney	Suffolk County District Attorney
Sandra Edwards	Assist. District Attorney	Plymouth County District Attorney
Michael O'Keefe	First Assistant	Cape and Islands District Attorney

Federal Government

Michael J. Sullivan	US Attorney	United States Attorneys Office

Law Enforcement:

Kelly Apt	Chief	New Bedford Police Department
Christina Beaumud	Legal Advisor	Cambridge Police Department
Joseph Carter	Chief	MBTA Police Department
Edward F. Davis, III	Chief	Lowell Police Department
Ann Marie Doherty	Superintendent	Boston Police Department
Paul Evans	Commissioner	Boston Police Department
John Finnegan	Chief	Barnstable Police Department
Tom Foley	Col.	Massachusetts State Police
Paula Meara	Chief	Springfield Police Department
Kevin Mearn	Chief	Milton Police Department
Merrick Association	President	Massachusetts Police Chiefs
Daniel C. O'Leary	Chief	Brookline Police Department
Peter Scott	Captain	Brookline Police Department
Ronnie Watson	Commissioner	Cambridge Police Department

Legislators

Stanley Rosenberg	Senator	Hampshire/Franklin District
Byron Rushing	State Representative	9th Suffolk District
Reed Hillman	State Representative	1st Hamden District
Diane Wilkerson	Senator	2nd Suffolk District
		Commonwealth of Massachusetts

State Government Officials

Erin Devoney	Legal Council	Registry of Motor Vehicles
Kimberly Hinden	Registrar	Registry of Motor Vehicles
Mary Ann Mulhall	Director	Registry of Motor Vehicles and Merritt Rating Board