



**MARICOPA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**  
Traffic Stops Quarterly Review  
Supervisor Review Findings and Recommendations

The background image for the title section shows a modern building with a prominent, large, triangular structure made of perforated metal. The building has large glass windows and is set against a clear blue sky. The title text is overlaid on a dark green rectangular background.

Authors: Emma Wohl | Bridgette Bryson | Benjamin Carleton | Zoë Thorkildsen



MAY 2020



This document contains the best opinion of CNA at the time of issue.

**CNA Analysis Team:**

Zoë Thorkildsen, Project Director; Emma Wohl, Deputy Project Director; Bridgette Bryson, Analyst; Benjamin Carleton, Analyst; Brittany Cunningham, Analyst; Jennifer Lafferty, Analyst; James R. Coldren, Jr., Advisor; Hildy Saizow, Advisor

**Suggested citation:**

Wohl, E., Bryson, B., Carleton, B., & Thorkildsen, Z. (2020). Maricopa County Sheriff's Office Traffic Stops Quarterly Review: Supervisor Review Findings and Recommendations. Phoenix, AZ: Maricopa County Sheriff's Office.

**Distribution**

Distribution unlimited.

**May 2020**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Background and purpose of supervisor traffic stop review analysis	1
Methodology	1
Organization of this report.	2
Summary of our findings and recommendations	2
<b>Findings and Recommendations</b>	<b>3</b>
Policy review	3
General.	4
Review procedures	6
Review follow-up.	9
Technology	10
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>12</b>

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**

# INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF SUPERVISOR TRAFFIC STOP REVIEW ANALYSIS

CNA conducted this review in order to understand how Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (MCSO) supervisors conduct their traffic stop reviews and to offer recommendations to ensure that reviews are comprehensive, relevant, and responsive to the aim of the Order. MCSO noted that supervisors have historically received some training on reviewing vehicle stop contact forms and traffic stop body-worn camera (BWC) footage, but that more formalized, standardized, or frequent training may be necessary to ensure consistent understanding across the Office. Additionally, in the new traffic stop intervention process, supervisors must discuss potential indicia of biased behavior with their assigned deputies. It is important that supervisors across MCSO are reviewing traffic stops in a way that is thorough, efficient, and understandable by deputies, Maricopa County residents, and the Monitors. Additionally, supervisors must buy in to the traffic stop review and intervention process and be able to identify and understand potential indicia of biased behavior. This quarterly report will describe the traffic stop review process, policies, and attitudes in MCSO and offer recommendations to the Office.

## METHODOLOGY

CNA conducted a review of MCSO's policies and met with MCSO supervisors to observe the traffic stop review process and conduct interviews. Most observation and interview activities took place at MCSO headquarters, except one observation and interview that took place in the field due to the

supervisor's schedule and shift obligations. CNA also collected written explanations of the traffic stop BWC footage randomization process from MCSO district administrative deputies.

For this quarterly report, a CNA analyst with knowledge of MCSO operations reviewed the paragraphs of the First Order that specifically apply to traffic stop analysis and the following eight MCSO policies:

- CP-8, Preventing Racial and Other Bias-Based Profiling;
- EB-1, Traffic Enforcement, Violator Contacts, and Citation Issuance;
- EB-2, Traffic Stop Data Collection;
- EB-4, Traffic Records;
- EB-7, Traffic Control and Services;
- GB-2, Command Responsibility;
- GH-4, Bureau of Internal Oversight; and
- GJ-35, Body-Worn Cameras.

Our review of the selected policies specifically focused on traffic stop review expectations that were contradictory, unclear, or unmentioned across policies. Based on our review, we generated findings and recommendations pertaining to MCSO's policies governing the traffic stop review process.

CNA conducted observations with and interviewed 12 supervisors, and we conducted only observations with 6 additional supervisors. CNA had reached saturation of interview responses after conducting the 12 interviews, so interviewing the 6 additional supervisors was unnecessary for this analysis. The interview questions sought information on both the vehicle stop contact form review and the traffic stop BWC footage review. The interviews also included

questions on the supervisor's process for reviewing and understanding MCSO policies, as well as his or her thoughts on improvements needed in policy, procedure, or training.

CNA observed the supervisors review one to three vehicle stop contact forms and two to four traffic stop BWC videos. Trained CNA analysts took notes while observing each supervisor's process, demeanor, and additional comments on the review. The analysts then reviewed and expanded upon their notes, when appropriate, after observation.

CNA reviewed the written explanations of the traffic stop BWC footage randomization process from MCSO administrative deputies in all seven patrol districts to understand how processes are consistent or divergent across districts. CNA generated findings and recommendations regarding the randomization process using these descriptions.

CNA used the data collected from interviews, observations, and the written randomization processes to generate additional findings and recommendations regarding the traffic stop review process. Our analysis of the notes taken during interviews and observations supports these findings and recommendations.

## ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

CNA presents a summary of our findings and recommendations below. The "Findings and Recommendations" section presents a more comprehensive explanation of the findings, analysis, and recommendations. This section contains subsections for findings and recommendations generated from policy review, general findings and recommendations, and findings and recommendations pertaining to review procedures, review follow-up, and technology. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the implications of these findings and recommendations for MCSO and for the court-ordered traffic stop review process.

## SUMMARY OF OUR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CNA overall noted that MCSO supervisors conduct comprehensive reviews of vehicle stop contact forms and traffic stop BWC footage. However, MCSO supervisors across the Office take different approaches to reviewing, documenting, and discussing the traffic stop reviews. Additionally, supervisors are unclear on MCSO's exact expectations for conducting traffic stop reviews. CNA recommends that MCSO develop and disseminate specific expectations and guidance for traffic stop review procedures. Although MCSO supervisors do a successful job reviewing traffic stops, they, MCSO deputies, and MCSO executive staff would benefit from the consistency, efficiency, and clarity that specific review expectations would provide. Note that these recommendations are based solely on the policies, procedures, interviews, and observations CNA analyzed and do not take into account in-progress or anticipated MCSO initiatives. MCSO must review these recommendations to determine whether they are fully or partially implementable and if existing initiatives satisfy the recommendations. MCSO may also find it necessary to conduct further data collection and information-gathering activities to guide the specific implementation of and responses to these recommendations.

# FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## POLICY REVIEW

### FINDING 1

*Several of the MCSO policies appear to use the terms “bias-based profiling,” “bias-based policing,” “racial profiling,” and “discriminatory policing” interchangeably. The terms do not all mean the same thing.*

Many of MCSO’s policies stress that discriminatory behaviors by deputies, whether based on race, ethnicity, age, religion, etc., are unacceptable. To do so, the policies regularly use the terms “bias-based profiling,” “bias-based policing,” “racial profiling,” and “discriminatory policing” to describe behaviors that will not be tolerated. Although the inclusion of such content in MCSO’s policies is critical, MCSO leadership and deputies should understand that these terms have different meanings and that policy cannot refer to them interchangeably. For example, the term “bias-based profiling” is inclusive of “racial profiling” behaviors, but the term “racial profiling” does not include all elements of “bias-based policing.” Inconsistent and inaccurate use of the abovementioned terms may lead to confusion and misunderstanding of MCSO’s policies by deputies and community members alike. Eliminating ambiguity can ensure that MCSO holds all deputies accountable to a consistent standard.

### RECOMMENDATION 1

MCSO should ensure that policies use the terms “bias-based profiling,” “bias-based policing,” “racial profiling,” and “discriminatory policing” consistently.

MCSO should define each term and then apply the term that best fits in the context of the policy.

### FINDING 2

*Policy Number GB-2, when describing warning signs or other indicators of possible misconduct, racial profiling, unlawful detentions and arrests, or improper enforcement of immigration-related laws, refers to “other indications of racial or ethnic bias in the exercise of official duties.” This does not take into account other bias-based profiling mentioned in MCSO policies, including bias regarding immigration status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, economic status, age, cultural group, or any other identifiable group characteristic.*

The Early Identification System (EIS) Data Review section in MCSO’s Policy Number GB-2 describes “[i]dentification of warning signs or other indicia of possible misconduct,” such as the following:

- Failure to follow any of the documentation requirements mandated by Office policy;
- Racial and ethnic disparities in the deputy’s traffic stop patterns;
- Evidence of extended traffic stops or increased inquiries and/or investigations involving driver or passengers belonging to a protected category;
- A citation rate for traffic stops that is an outlier when compared to data of a deputy’s peers, or a low rate of seizure of contraband or arrests following searches and investigations; or
- Complaints by members of the public or other employees.

The policy mentions racial and ethnic bias but does not take into account other bias-based profiling mentioned in MCSO policies, including bias regarding immigration status, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, economic status, age, cultural group, or any other identifiable group characteristic. Although racial or ethnic bias may be easier forms of bias to

identify, the absence of other indicators of bias-based profiling is problematic. It should be clear that MCSO considers all forms of bias-based profiling when looking for warning signs of possible misconduct.

## RECOMMENDATION 2

Policy Number GB-2, when describing warning signs or other indicators, should include all indicators that MCSO identifies in its definition of “bias-based profiling.”

## GENERAL

### FINDING 3

*MCSO supervisors are diligently reviewing traffic stop BWC footage for officer safety concerns, policy violations, and evidence of potential bias.*

MCSO supervisors made verbal or sometimes written notes during BWC footage review of officer safety concerns, policy violations, and evidence of potential bias. These notes included whether deputies approached a vehicle safely, whether deputies introduced themselves and stated the reason for the stop as directed by policy, and whether deputies displayed differences in behavior towards drivers of different demographics. Supervisors identified these concerns quickly and accurately. If supervisors did not make a mental, verbal, or written note of whether the deputy introduced himself or herself, stated the reason for the stop, or conducted appropriate checks on the driver and vehicle, many supervisors re-watched parts of the video to determine if policies were followed. Supervisors verbally described how they would discuss any issues identified during BWC footage review with the deputy and document them in BlueTeam.

## RECOMMENDATION 3

MCSO should continue to train supervisors to look for these issues during reviews.

### FINDING 4

*MCSO supervisors do not know the Office's exact expectations for traffic stop reviews. MCSO supervisors expressed the desire for additional training on expectations and procedures for both vehicle stop contact form reviews and traffic stop BWC footage reviews.*

MCSO supervisors expressed confusion over several aspects of the traffic stop review process, including whether they need to watch the full BWC footage, whether they should use the Traffic Stop Review Matrix, and what information they should document in their reviews. When MCSO supervisors were unclear on traffic stop review expectations, they often included unneeded information or conducted unnecessary further review. Although this additional detail contributes to a comprehensive traffic stop review, supervisors may be completing more work than MCSO requires or expects. Also, some MCSO supervisors continue to hold beliefs or assumptions about the traffic stop review and analysis process that are no longer correct, such as that all stops longer than a particular number of minutes by a deputy require justification or will receive additional scrutiny by MCSO. MCSO supervisors noted that they received no formal training on the traffic stop review process.

## RECOMMENDATION 4

MCSO should create a training curriculum that instructs supervisors on expectations and procedures for vehicle stop contact form reviews and traffic stop BWC footage reviews. MCSO should deliver this curriculum to newly promoted supervisors (and to current supervisors as a “catch up”).



## FINDING 5

*MCSO supervisors know that policy requires regular BWC footage reviews, but they want guidance on policies governing these reviews.*

MCSO supervisors are aware that policy requires them to conduct two BWC footage reviews per deputy per month. However, they are not aware of any policy that dictates how to conduct BWC footage reviews or the required elements of the reviews. MCSO supervisors noted that they received no formal explanation of policies related to the traffic stop review process.

## RECOMMENDATION 5

MCSO should clarify expectations for traffic stop BWC footage reviews and ensure that supervisors are familiar with expectations and policies. MCSO should provide separate guidance on specific procedural expectations for the footage review, as described in Recommendation 11.

## FINDING 6

*MCSO supervisors have inconsistent expectations for deputies' notes and comments on vehicle stop contact forms and commentary in BWC footage.*

MCSO supervisors take a variety of approaches to vehicle stop contact form comments and commentary in BWC footage. Some supervisors ask their deputies to write comments on each traffic stop, while others require comments only when a traffic stop has circumstances or outcomes outside of the deputy's norm. Similarly, some supervisors appreciate when deputies narrate their traffic stop BWC footage, while others feel it is unnecessary or unwelcome.

## RECOMMENDATION 6

MCSO should continue to allow supervisors to require deputies to include additional information in the vehicle stop contact forms beyond baseline requirements.

## FINDING 7

*MCSO supervisors are well versed in traffic stop procedures and can identify deputies' irregularities, successes, and challenges through the vehicle stop contact form and BWC footage review.*

MCSO supervisors easily identified instances in which deputies exhibited good or bad officer safety practices, technological challenges such as printer or scanner issues, and policy violations such as failing to introduce oneself. Additionally, supervisors were so familiar with traffic stop procedures that they knew when deputies conducted driver and vehicle checks without seeing the deputy's screen on the BWC footage, and they could identify what information the deputy was entering into TraCS at a given moment in the footage. This familiarity ensures that supervisors can comprehensively review the footage and easily and accurately identify any areas in which deputies need further training on traffic stop procedures.

## RECOMMENDATION 7

MCSO should continue to ensure that supervisors are well versed in traffic stop procedures and are aware of the particular factors they should examine during reviews.

## REVIEW PROCEDURES

### FINDING 8

*MCSO administrative deputies use relatively consistent processes to randomize traffic stop BWC footage selection. However, administrative deputies do not prepare material for or communicate the selected traffic stops consistently across MCSO.*

All MCSO administrative deputies had a similar process for randomly selecting the traffic stop BWC footage for review. This process involves assigning each traffic stop for each deputy in the prior month a number and then using a random number generator to select the two stops for review. Some administrative deputies also select two alternate stops for supervisors to review if the two primary stops are not appropriate for review, such as incidents when a BWC malfunctions, the deputy forgets to activate his or her BWC, or the footage is otherwise unavailable for review. The administrative deputies identify which selected stops are the primaries and alternates. When administrative deputies do not initially select alternate stops for review, supervisors must follow up with the administrative deputy to select an additional stop if needed. Supervisors review the alternate traffic stops only when one or more of the primary traffic stops is not appropriate for review. Administrative deputies had various processes for communicating the selected stops to supervisors. Some administrative deputies selected the stops and then saved them in a file for supervisors to access. Other administrative deputies selected the stops, emailed the list of selected stops to supervisors, and saved the associated vehicle stop contact forms and warning or citation forms in a folder for supervisors to access.

### RECOMMENDATION 8A

MCSO should set consistent expectations for how administrative deputies randomize and prepare materials for traffic stop BWC footage review.

### RECOMMENDATION 8B

MCSO should develop guidelines for administrative deputies on automatically selecting or not selecting alternate stops for review.

### RECOMMENDATION 8C

MCSO should require that the administrative deputies conduct the traffic stop BWC footage selection, not supervisors.

### FINDING 9

*MCSO supervisors do not use consistent processes for vehicle stop contact form reviews.*

MCSO supervisors take different approaches to the vehicle stop contact form review process. Some MCSO supervisors are meticulous about reviewing each field of the vehicle stop contact form, while others quickly scan the form to ensure that the information required for traffic stop analysis is present. Additionally, MCSO supervisors reference different systems to double-check information, such as iNet Viewer, Praxis, or no system at all. Due to the inconsistent processes, some supervisors may take additional time for review.

### RECOMMENDATION 9

MCSO should decide whether to implement a standardized approach to vehicle stop contact form reviews. In either case, MCSO should ensure that supervisors continue to conduct comprehensive reviews, regardless of process.

## FINDING 10

*MCSO supervisors do not use consistent processes for BWC footage reviews. Use of the Traffic Stop Review Matrix varies by supervisor.*

MCSO supervisors take different approaches to the BWC footage review process. MCSO supervisors reference different systems to double-check information, such as iNet Viewer, Praxis, or the vehicle stop contact form. Some of the supervisors use the Traffic Stop Review Matrix, while others do not (though they still conduct a comprehensive review). Some supervisors print the Matrix, vehicle stop contact form, and warning or citation form to reference during the BWC footage review, while others reference the forms on their computer in TraCS. Some supervisors take written notes as they conduct BWC footage reviews, while others make mental or verbal notes. Some supervisors begin completing the Matrix or their BlueTeam entry while watching the BWC footage, particularly when the footage shows the deputy in his or her vehicle not interacting with community members, while others wait until the end of the BWC footage to ensure they have noted all relevant behavior and outcomes during the stop. Although supervisors conduct comprehensive BWC footage reviews, inconsistent processes may lead to confusion or differences in traffic stop expectations.

## RECOMMENDATION 10A

MCSO should decide whether to implement a standardized approach to BWC footage reviews. In either case, MCSO should ensure that supervisors continue to conduct comprehensive reviews, regardless of process.

## RECOMMENDATION 10B

MCSO should determine how supervisors are to use the matrix and then provide formal guidance on these expectations. If MCSO decides to require use of the matrix, MCSO should establish auditing procedures to ensure supervisors use the matrix appropriately.

## FINDING 11

*Other supervisor responsibilities often interrupt traffic stop BWC footage reviews. Many MCSO supervisors explained the difficulty of reviewing footage because of frequent interruptions.*

Many MCSO supervisors expressed concern that supervisory duties interrupt their BWC footage reviews and disrupt their process. Supervisors lack sufficient time to conduct BWC footage reviews without interruptions, which cause them to restart the BWC footage from the beginning or attempt restarting from where they left off to avoid missing details. Interruptions can require supervisors to invest more time in reviews and risk them missing officer safety concerns, policy violations, and evidence of potential bias. The need to invest more time in BWC footage reviews can make it difficult for supervisors to complete other supervisory duties on time.

## RECOMMENDATION 11

MCSO should develop a procedure that gives supervisors the time they need to review traffic stop BWC footage. MCSO should develop procedures to minimize distractions while supervisors complete BWC footage reviews or at least acknowledge the presence of distractions and suggest mitigation strategies or guidance for how to proceed after interruptions.

## FINDING 12

*MCSO supervisors feel that traffic stop BWC footage review is time consuming. They would benefit from additional guidance about expectations when reviewing traffic stop BWC footage. For example, should they review the full content of the video or solely the parts involving interactions with community members?*

MCSO supervisors explained that reviewing each video is time consuming due to pausing for interruptions, checking other systems to verify information, and not knowing specifically what to look for. Some supervisors watch the entirety of the footage at regular speed, without dividing their attention. Other supervisors will approach footage that shows the deputy in his or her vehicle not interacting with the community member differently than the rest of the video, including multitasking, playing the footage at a faster speed, or listening but not watching. One supervisor stated that he watches the entirety of BWC footage, including the arrest, while others stated they watch only the vehicle stop portion of the footage, not the subsequent arrest or other investigative activities. Supervisors expressed a desire for a consistent process and set of expectations for BWC footage review. Formalizing this process will allow the supervisors to more efficiently complete their supervisory duties.

## RECOMMENDATION 12

MCSO should provide formal guidance on expectations for supervisors to review each minute of traffic stop BWC footage or to skip or otherwise deprioritize certain portions.

## FINDING 13

*Most MCSO supervisors identify evidence of potential implicit bias during traffic stops by comparing the deputy's decisions and behavior during the stop to their understanding of the deputy's baseline decisions and behavior (i.e., internal guidelines). MCSO supervisors are able to identify instances in which their deputies make choices outside of their baseline decisions and behavior.*

When conducting BWC footage review, MCSO supervisors compare the stop outcome to their understanding of the deputy's typical traffic stop behavior. MCSO supervisors are familiar with each deputy's typical traffic stop behavior and can identify evidence of potential implicit bias by a deputy. If a stop outcome appears to fall outside of a deputy's normal behavior, the supervisor will ask the deputy to explain his or her decision-making. Supervisors often only hold these conversations if they are unable to determine why the deputy deviated from the norm based on the circumstances of the traffic stop or the deputy's comments in the vehicle stop contact form. For example, a supervisor may notice that a deputy who usually issues citations for a particular violation instead issues a warning to an out-of-state driver.

## RECOMMENDATION 13A

MCSO should encourage supervisors to continue gaining a strong understanding of their deputies' baseline decision-making and behavior and using this information to identify evidence of potential implicit bias during traffic stops. MCSO should ensure deputies communicate their baseline decisions and behavior to their supervisors.

## RECOMMENDATION 13B

MCSO should identify other indicators of potential implicit bias that supervisors should evaluate during stops and produce guidance on these indicators, if applicable.

## REVIEW FOLLOW-UP

### FINDING 14

*MCSO supervisors would benefit from additional guidance on the requirement to discuss all traffic stops with their deputies during the vehicle stop contact form review process. MCSO supervisors usually do not discuss traffic stop BWC footage reviews with deputies aside from addressing officer safety concerns, policy violations, and evidence of potential bias.*

MCSO supervisors stated that they did not receive guidance on the goals or content of their required discussions with deputies during the vehicle stop contact form review process. Although all supervisors fulfill the requirement to discuss all traffic stops with their deputies, many of these conversations are short or informal. In many cases, supervisors simply ask the deputy if there was anything unusual about the stop or anything they would like to discuss. One interviewed supervisor notes that he asks his deputies to call him after each traffic stop. Other supervisors will call deputies while reviewing the vehicle stop contact form to ask any clarifying questions. Other supervisors check-in via phone or in-person each shift to ask deputies if they have made any traffic stops that day. Virtually all supervisors discuss traffic stop BWC footage with deputies only if there are issues of officer safety, policy violations, or evidence of potential bias. Supervisors are consistent about having these conversations when there are necessary issues to address.

### RECOMMENDATION 14A

MCSO should set expectations for vehicle stop contact form review discussions, especially expectations for discussing each individual stop with deputies producing high volumes of stops; MCSO should provide formal guidance for these expectations.

### RECOMMENDATION 14B

MCSO should set expectations for whether supervisors must discuss all traffic stop BWC footage reviews with deputies.

### FINDING 15

*MCSO supervisors supply different information in traffic stop BWC footage review BlueTeam entries.*

MCSO supervisors are not consistent across the Office in the information they enter into BlueTeam after traffic stop BWC footage review. Some supervisors record entries that are only a few sentences, while others record multiple paragraphs for each deputy. Some supervisors stated that their entry lengths vary from month to month based on the relative complexity of the traffic stops reviewed. Additionally, supervisors consistently stated that they did not receive guidance on the information that should be included in the BlueTeam entries, were unsure what information must be included, and only knew to revise their entries when their own supervisors requested more information.

### RECOMMENDATION 15

MCSO should develop templates or other guidance about its expectations for the BlueTeam narrative entries and attachments. MCSO should provide formal guidance on these expectations.

### FINDING 16

*Some MCSO supervisors note positive performance by deputies during their traffic stop BWC footage reviews and share this feedback with deputies or include it in their BlueTeam notes.*

Many supervisors verbally noted positive performance by their deputies in following policy and practicing good officer safety strategies. However, not all supervisors documented this positive feedback in their

BlueTeam notes. One supervisor stated that he generally does not document when his supervisees meet expectations on policies and procedures. Policy GB-2, Command Responsibility, does state that supervisors will record a BlueTeam entry that “reflect[s] the employee’s positive traits and accomplishments and any observed shortcomings” at least monthly, though this is not specific to the traffic stop review process.

## RECOMMENDATION 16

MCSO should encourage supervisors to document positive performance during their reviews.

## TECHNOLOGY

### FINDING 17

*MCSO supervisors do not have consistent technological knowledge or ability regarding the Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS).*

MCSO supervisors did not display a consistent level of comfort and ability with TraCS, which affected their traffic stop review process. Some supervisors were not aware that TraCS allows users to open multiple forms at one time, and thus opened the vehicle stop contact form and warning or citation form separately. Since supervisors must ensure that the information in these two forms is consistent, opening each separately introduces the possibility that the supervisor may fail to accurately match the information. Some supervisors used saved searches to filter TraCS data to only their supervisees or to relevant date ranges, while other supervisors seemed unaware of this feature. Using saved searches can reduce errors due to typos and other user input mistakes.

## RECOMMENDATION 17A

MCSO should continue to provide training on the traffic stop review technology to individuals on an as-needed basis.

## RECOMMENDATION 17B

MCSO should ensure that changes to TraCS system functionality (for example, the ability to open multiple forms simultaneously) are clearly communicated to supervisors through multiple methods. If possible, help text or reminders should be incorporated directly into TraCS.

### FINDING 18

*Technical challenges affect reviews of vehicle stop contact forms and traffic stop BWC footage—including BWC footage that lacks an event number or is linked to an inaccurate location. These challenges are out of the supervisors’ control and may make their reviews more challenging or time consuming.*

Supervisors access BWC footage by the associated event number. However, the BWC footage is sometimes missing the corresponding event number, and supervisors must search for BWC footage by deputy name, date, and time. Although MCSO supervisors are aware of the process for finding the BWC footage that corresponds to the correct event number, this process is more time consuming, particularly for supervisors of deputies with a high volume of stops, and produces opportunity for error in supervisors selecting and reviewing the wrong video. Additionally, several MCSO supervisors noted that the BWC footage records often contain inaccurate locations, many of which are not even in the United States. Supervisors gain useful context for BWC footage reviews from the stop location, and the location data can provide useful verification of information in the vehicle stop contact form.

## RECOMMENDATION 18

MCSO should explore technological solutions or procedures to ensure that supervisors can easily find traffic stop BWC footage and that the footage location data are accurate.

---

## FINDING 19

*MCSO supervisors note that the change from head-mounted to chest-mounted BWCs has made some aspects of traffic stop BWC footage review more difficult.*

MCSO transitioned from head-mounted to chest-mounted BWCs to resolve issues with using head-mounted BWCs. Although the chest-mounted BWCs provide a better user experience, MCSO supervisors note that the footage may not capture the full scene of a traffic stop. In most cases, the chest-mounted BWCs do not capture evidence of the traffic violation, and supervisors cannot see the particular violation in footage. MCSO created the Traffic Stop Review Matrix while deputies were using head-mounted BWCs and included a checkbox asking if supervisors saw the traffic violation. This is increasingly unlikely with the new BWCs. Additionally, supervisors noted that if a deputy or a vehicle is particularly tall, the BWC footage may not capture an image of the driver or other passengers in the vehicle. Thus, it may sometimes be difficult to verify the race or gender of the driver using BWC footage.

## RECOMMENDATION 19

MCSO should be mindful of BWC realities when developing expectations and guidelines for traffic stop BWC footage reviews.

---

## CONCLUSION

MCSO's willingness to participate in this process demonstrates their commitment to improving the traffic stop review process for both supervisors and the Office as a whole. MCSO has implemented significant improvements in traffic stop policy, procedures, and data collection since the creation of the First and Second Orders. The 19 findings and associated recommendations in this report indicate the necessity for MCSO to continue making improvements in their traffic stop review process. MCSO should consider the appropriateness and feasibility of these recommendations. MCSO deputies, supervisors, and executive staff will benefit from greater clarity and efficiency in the traffic stop process, and MCSO will continue to fulfill their obligation to the Maricopa County community.





3003 Washington Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22201

[www.cna.org](http://www.cna.org) | 703-824-2000

CNA is a not-for-profit research organization that serves the public interest by providing in-depth analysis and result-oriented solutions to help government leaders choose the best course of action in setting policy and managing operations.

CNA

