Defining the Disparity – A Project Analysis

In June 2000, the Racial Disparity Initiative (RDI) was launched with the vision of addressing racial inequalities in the criminal justice system through research, demonstration, and advocacy. One of the initial undertakings of RDI was a community-based research project to examine racial disparities in arrest rates as part of the Defining the Disparity Project. Now two years into the Initiative, the work on this project offers an opportunity to identify key learnings that may be useful to those who plan to engage communities in research efforts. This report details the research plan, research findings, and lessons learned along the way.

OVERVIEW OF THE RACIAL DISPARITY INITIATIVE

RDI is a multi-year project designed to combine research and advocacy to achieve policy changes in the Minnesota criminal justice system. RDI is a project of the Council on Crime and Justice (the Council). The Council is a private, non-profit organization that has introduced innovative programs in offender services, alternative sanctions, victims' rights, and restorative justice. For more than 40 years it has been committed to building community capacity to address the causes and consequences of crime and violence.

RDI plans to analyze the severity, causes, and consequences of racial disparities throughout the criminal justice system. The intent of RDI is to involve communities in project design, data collection, and reporting results. The goals of RDI are to:

- Produce quality information about the causes and consequences of racial disparities;
- Introduce policies and strategies that reduce racial disparities and the collateral effects of imprisonment;
- Create public awareness of racial disparities and action for change; and
- Build community capacity through real participation in research and policy making.

The last goal is particularly noteworthy. RDI was proposed to be different from other research endeavors in that the community would play a significant role in all aspects of the project, from initial planning to the dissemination of the findings. However, as illustrated in this report, RDI failed to appreciate the complexities involved in attempting community-based research. Given the highly political and sensitive nature of the research topic of this RDI project– racial disparities in arrest rates - power imbalances and a lack of respect for community expertise served as significant barriers throughout the course of the project.

RDI consists of two independent but interrelated categories of projects. Defining the Disparity projects focus on identifying the extent and causes of racial disparities in the criminal justice system. As mentioned, the project discussed in this report analyzed possible causes of the racial disparity in arrests. Future projects are currently being planned to examine the extent and causes of racial disparities in charging, plea negotiations, and imprisonment.

The second category of projects, Collateral Effects projects, looks to demonstrate the costs of the racial disparities. The costs are realized at various levels in various forms – individuals, families, and communities experience emotional, economic, and social effects. The current project focuses on the impact of prisoner mobility on families and communities. It will be conducted in neighborhoods in both Minneapolis and St. Paul.

OVERVIEW OF THE DEFINING THE DISPARITY PROJECT

The Defining the Disparity Project was designed to examine why people of color are represented much more often than Whites in the Minnesota criminal justice system. The starting point was the startling difference in arrest rates for Whites and for people of color and Nations. In 2000, for every 100,000 people, the arrest rate for Part 1 Crimes[1] was 5,006 for African Americans, 4,708 for Latinos, 3,096 for American Indians, 594 for Asians, and 408 for Whites. Compared to Whites, the arrest rate was twelve times higher for African Americans, eleven times higher for Latinos, seven times higher for American Indians, and almost twice as high for Asians.

The Defining the Disparity Project was designed to fill in a critical and missing piece of information by research—what explains these vast disparities? While many cite arrest rates as evidence that persons of color commit more crimes, we know that arrest rates can reflect factors that distort rates of arrest from the actual rates of criminal behavior. These factors include higher levels of enforcement in communities of color and surveillance for particular crimes. A study to determine rates of criminal offending separate from arrest data would be critical to both criminal justice system personnel and the community in determining how to address the current pattern of racial disparities. Such a study would have to be undertaken, however, in a way that would provide results that would be believed and accepted by both the system and the community.

As part of Defining the Disparity Project and in line with recommendations from the Creating A Safer Minnesota Byrne Advisory Committee report, RDI accepted a contract from the Minnesota Department of Public Safety to research racial/ethnic disparities in arrests in Minnesota. Council staff developed three different research components for the project: an analysis of arrest data, two surveys, and an examination of police incident reports. Statewide arrest data would be used to determine the geographic areas and types of crimes for which the arrest disparities are the widest. A victimization survey and a drug use survey would be used to help compare the actual involvement in certain crimes to the arrest rates for the same crimes and to determine whether people of color and Nations are arrested at a different rate than they are involved in crime. From the police incident reports it would be determined whether there are differences in reporting offenses to police in general and in those offenses cleared by arrest when the race/ethnicity of the suspect was known.

[1] Part 1 Crimes include murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, auto theft, and arson. Statistics are calculated from 1999 Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension and 2000 U.S. Census Bureau data.

The goals of the project were to:

- Calculate the arrest disparities by race/ethnicity for Minnesota counties;
- Conduct a victimization survey to estimate the actual involvement in certain crimes committed against persons by race/ethnicity of the offender;
- Conduct a drug use survey to estimate the frequency and patterns of drug-related crimes by race/ethnicity;
- Analyze the difference between actual involvement in crime and arrest rates by race/ethnicity;
- Analyze police incident reports by the race/ethnicity of the suspect—calculate racial/ethnic disparities in reported offenses and in cleared offenses; and
- Analyze differences in actual offending, reported incidents to police, and arrests by race/ethnicity.

As mentioned previously, community involvement was viewed as essential to the success of the project. At the same time, the Council was focused on following the standards of traditional research. As a result, the methodology for the three components of the research was developed based on traditional standards before the community was ever approached. RDI staff identified this project as a community based research project – that is, one in which research is conducted around a community problem with limited or pre-defined involvement of community members. With the Defining the Disparity Project, the intent was to seek community input into refining the research methods, interpreting results, disseminating information, and formulating and enacting policy change. While this approach may be appropriate for research in some social arenas, it is now clear that community based participatory research – a model that has the active engagement and influence of community members at all levels of the research process – was appropriate for this research project. This overall lesson is illustrated in the sections that follow where community involvement and the implementation of the project are chronicled.

GAINING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Beginning in June 2000, the Community Relations Department of RDI was formed. Initially, two Community Relations staff began outreach and education in the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. A strong effort was made to inform the community of the problem of racial disparity in the criminal justice system in Minnesota. The outreach targeted the overall community, including legislators, systems personnel, community leaders, community organizations, the impacted community, and other key stakeholders.

It was discovered in outreach efforts that the beliefs about the nature of arrest disparities differed drastically. Systems personnel and the general community were unaware of the disparity, or were of the belief that people of color committed more crimes and should therefore be incarcerated at a higher rate than Whites. On the other hand, communities of color and Nations were keenly aware of the problem of arrest disparities, but failed to believe anyone would care, or that any change would result from RDI. The most common response heard from people of color was, “The last thing we need is another study. We have been studied time and time again, and things are still the same.” This skepticism was coupled with a lack of overall trust in RDI’s anticipated efforts.

In order to gain the involvement of members of the impacted communities and stakeholders from the criminal justice system, RDI formed two committees, the Community Advisory Board (CAB) and the Advisory Council. CAB was comprised of representatives from impacted communities of color and Nations: African Americans, American Indians, Latinos, and Asians. The members were chosen for their work or involvement in their communities. The members were from Minneapolis and St. Paul, as well as Greater Minnesota. The Advisory Council consisted of criminal justice system stakeholders, academic researchers, and heads of community groups.

At the onset, this separation of the groups set up a feeling of suspicion, on the part of the communities of color. It was felt that the Advisory Group would have all the power, and CAB was there to cosign the larger group's efforts. In fact, CAB referred to the Advisory Council as the "big board," and consistently questioned what was happening in the big group. The chair of CAB was the liaison between the two groups; this didn't seem to quell the suspicions of the communities of color. CAB also mistrusted the motives of RDI for other reasons including: one of the major funding sources of the project was the MN Department of Public Safety - thus, CAB felt the research would be biased in favor of the criminal justice system, the Council's reputation with communities of color and Nations was not the best, the Council is seen as a "White" organization with all the privileges thereof, and the President of the organization is the former Hennepin County Attorney with the perception that "he locked up most of the people we are addressing in the study." Given the resulting mistrust, the separation of the governing bodies only created additional skepticism on the part of the impacted communities of color and Nations.

The challenge of RDI was to convince communities of color and Nations that this project was to be different in that the community was to be involved from the beginning; the community would have input into how the research was to be conducted and how the findings would be used. In recruiting members for the CAB, members were told of expectations of serving on the CAB. Those expectations included making recommendations and suggestions to the research team, reviewing printed materials, making suggestions for outreach strategies, and holding RDI accountable. The latter being the most important; CAB was to hold RDI accountable for meeting the needs of the community. To accomplish this, the Council had to have a willingness to share decision-making power with individual community members as well as community-based agencies that would be willing to collaborate.

The CAB met eleven times to provide input into not only the Defining the Disparity Project but other RDI research components as well. One barrier for the CAB was its ever-changing membership. Recruitment was ongoing. Members tended to come and go, which created a disconnect between new members and members that had been present from the beginning. The recruitment was necessary to keep a balance of communities of color represented and a balance of ideas and input.

IMPLEMENTING THE DEFINING THE DISPARITY PROJECT

Working from the initial research proposal that had been submitted to the Minnesota Office of Public Safety, RDI project staff undertook a process of refining the methods for the project. As is common in community-based research initiatives, the parameters of scientific validity, community validity, and project resources were considered in this period of method refinement.

Recognizing that the findings from this study would be controversial and subject to a high level of scrutiny, staff perceived a need to develop a methodology where the science of the project could be defended among academics within criminal justice as well as with systems personnel. This led to an emphasis on rigorous scientific parameters for sampling, instrumentation, and data collection. For example, it was determined that a population-based approach to sampling would be needed in the two proposed surveys in order to allow for generalizations back to the population of interest. While alternative non-random or community based sampling approaches may have yielded interesting information, these approaches were perceived as falling short of the rigor in method required if results were to be used to impact policy changes. At the same time, staff recognized that the community representatives advising the project would need to perceive the methodology as valid to the community. In other words, would the community believe that the findings were arrived at in ways that were free of bias, could be trusted, and would be used in a way that would help to meaningfully address the problem of disparities in arrest? This would be critical if the community was to not only believe the findings, but also participate in enacting policy changes based on the study findings. Finally, the resource constraints of time and money needed to be considered in making methodology decisions. Staff recognized that the study had a defined budget and timeline that would serve to limit the final determination of methodology.

With these parameters in mind, staff undertook as a first step in this refinement period, the analysis of arrest data by race/ethnicity. Staff analyzed 1999 arrest data by race/ethnicity for all of Minnesota's 87 counties. These preliminary findings were to be used to limit the victimization and drug use surveys to selected geographic areas. This analysis of arrest data identified several potential geographic areas with significant racial disparities in arrests that could be included in the crime victimization and drug use surveys, although the results of this analysis were of interest to the community and system stakeholders in and of themselves.

This analysis resulted in a count and percentage of arrests by race/ethnicity of arrestee for each county for Part I Violent, Part I Property, Part I Total, Part II Offenses and Total Arrests. These data illustrated a continuing pattern of disparity whereby racial/ethnic minorities were arrested at a much higher rate than were Whites. (A sample of these findings is presented in Appendix A.) For example, in Ramsey County, African Americans comprise 52.9% of Part I violent arrests but represent only 6.3% of the adult population. In Beltrami County, American Indians who comprise 15.4% of the adult population represent 63.3% of Part I violent arrests. In Blue Earth County, Latinos who comprise 1.4% of the adult population represent 37.5% of Part I violent arrests.

Having completed this first step, staff then turned their attention to developing the specific survey methods that would be used to estimate actual involvement in certain crimes committed against persons by race/ethnicity of the offender. This process proved difficult on the study parameters of science, community, and research resources.

Arrest rates and reported crimes likely distort the actual occurrence of criminal behavior in the population. Certain crimes are more likely to be reported to law enforcement and result in arrest. As a result certain individuals are more likely to be arrested. The victimization and drug use survey was originally proposed as the method of choice to compare the actual involvement in certain crimes to the arrest rates for the same crimes and to determine whether people of color and Nations are arrested at a different rate than they are involved in crime.

It was recognized that asking individuals to self-report criminal behavior was not likely to yield accurate or valid information. The alternative approach proposed by the Council would survey crime victims to ask them to report the race/ethnicity of the perpetrator who had committed the crime against them. The rate of crimes committed by individuals of an identified race/ethnicity as reported by crime victims would be compared to arrest rates by race/ethnicity. A victimization survey that allowed for estimates of the characteristics of the state's offender population would provide a means of examining such differences independent of the practices of police, courts and the criminal justice system itself.

Drug use, which is a large source of the disparity in arrest rates, is considered a victimless crime. The rationale behind the proposed drug use survey was that individuals might be more willing to self-report their use of drugs (as compared to self-reporting other criminal behavior). This premise was supported in part by a substantial body of survey work that has been conducted both nationally and statewide assessing self-reported drug use. This work demonstrates that people will self-report drug use although they may underreport it. Self-reported drug use would be compared to arrest rates for drug violations to determine whether people of color are arrested at a different rate than they are involved in drug crimes. The proposed drug survey for this study, however, would go further than previous studies in asking respondents to report information on where they obtained illegal drugs, where they used them, how they administered them (e.g., by injection) and other parameters which would have a bearing on whether or not someone actually using illegal drugs would be arrested for a drug use violation. This information was perceived as critical in understanding possible explanations for the disparities in actual drug use and drug-related arrests. For example, certain groups may be arrested more often for drug violations because they are more likely to purchase drugs in public rather than in private or from strangers rather than from people they know.

When first approached about these two surveys, the CAB had mixed feelings about the victimization survey. They were quick to point out, however, that the drug use survey was of such a high sensitivity that the utility of conducting it was questionable. Doubt was expressed that community members would provide truthful information about these potentially illegal behaviors, and in particular would refuse or provide false information

when questioned about where drugs were purchased and used. Indeed, the skepticism on the part of CAB is supported by the research literature that identifies a higher rate of underreporting of illegal behaviors, including drug use, among racial minorities when compared to Whites.[2]

From a scientific standpoint as well, the drug use survey was problematic in that self-reported drug use in the general population is a relatively rare phenomenon, and reaching sufficient numbers of reported drug users to make comparisons across racial/ethnic groups would be prohibitive for drug categories other than marijuana. A 1996-1997 survey conducted by the Minnesota Department of Human Services (MDHS) found 4.1% of a sample of 7,500 – or 307 respondents - reporting marijuana use in the last year. Percentages for other drug categories were even lower. While MDHS did report annual drug use by race/ethnicity among Minnesota adults (See Appendix B), these percentages are based on small numbers, limiting the ability to test for between group differences. Clearly, any effort on the part of RDI to come up with reliable estimates of drug use by race/ethnicity would require even more extensive sampling efforts than those required in the MDHS survey.

The initial concern among CAB about the drug use survey was compounded when presented with the proposed method for the collection of data. Council staff conducted a review of the literature to determine the benefits and limitations of different survey methods. While there are benefits and limitations to the various methods of data collection, there is strong evidence to support in-person methods for collecting data. For example, the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse collects data through in-person interviews that are conducted by the interviewer asking the questions and the respondent answering on a computer program. This approach maximizes trust between the interviewer and interviewee while maintaining confidentiality of the information provided.

Project staff recognized that in-person methods would have been preferable to either telephone or mail survey methodologies. However, the need for a substantial number of respondents coupled with insufficient resources needed to conduct in-person interviews appeared to limit the data collection options to either telephone or mail surveys.

Both of these methods – a telephone survey and mail survey – were presented to CAB and as expected, neither of these methods held validity with them. CAB argued that community members would not disclose sensitive information about either their

---

[2] Johnston, L.D. & O'Malley, P.M. 1997. "The Recanting of Earlier Reported Drug Use by Young Adults." In The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates. Harrison, L., & Hughes, A. (Eds.) Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

Magura, S & Kang, S.Y. 1997. "The Validity of Self-Reported Cocaine Use in Two High-Risk Populations." In The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates. Harrison, L., & Hughes, A. (Eds.) Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

experience as a crime victim or their use of illegal substances to an anonymous individual over the phone no matter what assurances of confidentiality were provided. Recording this information on a mail survey was seen as equally threatening. Furthermore, the phone survey would not reach people without phones, the mail survey would exclude individuals with low levels of English literacy, and both would exclude individuals who do not speak or understand English. It was clear at this stage that the science, the community, and the resources were at a crossroads.

In light of the concerns CAB was bringing to the table, Council staff began the process of reconsidering the proposed methodology. Based on CAB's input in conjunction with resource and scientific concerns, staff agreed to drop the drug use survey entirely. Instead, an analysis of existing drug use surveys was planned and completed. [See *Taking A Closer Look: Do Drug Use Patterns Explain Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Drug Arrests in Minnesota* by RDI] The decision was made to go ahead with the victimization survey with the hope that a compromise could be reached with CAB in finalizing a methodology.

Council staff decided to gain further information on the basic issues involved in sampling criminal victimization in Minnesota in hopes of narrowing in on an approach that could then be presented to CAB. It soon became clear to staff, that scientific considerations would be paramount in the decision-making process for the crime victimization survey. For example, the survey would need to include only those crimes where offenders had visual contact with their victims. These crimes by their very nature are likely to represent violent crimes. The survey would also need to include crimes that occur frequently enough to be reported by survey respondents in order to allow for statistically valid comparisons by race/ethnicity. This led the project to focus in on a narrow subset of crimes that included theft from person, sexual assault, and assault.

It was this narrowing of the crimes of interest that concerned CAB more than any previous stage of method refinement. CAB was concerned that the entire question of whether or not people of color and Nations committed more crimes would be answered on the basis of a few, violent crimes. CAB perceived that this focus on a narrow piece of the crime continuum, would present a skewed picture of reality than if a broader range of criminal behavior were to be examined. If indeed the study did reveal that people of color and Nations committed more of these crimes, CAB was concerned that the entire study would be used to blame people of color and Nations for the disparity in arrests. Knowing that many in the dominant culture already believe that the disparity in arrest and incarceration reflects the fact that people of color commit more crimes, CAB members were reluctant to engage in an endeavor that would reinforce this belief.

Nonetheless, given RDI's commitment to the contract with the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Council staff proceeded forward in developing a draft victimization instrument. From a scientific perspective, it was important to use previously developed and tested items that would allow for comparisons with data from other victimization surveys. Staff also saw the survey as an opportunity to collect information about opinions about police work and criminal courts in your community; traffic stops; crime

and the community. It is important to note that CAB did perceive usefulness in these opinions items as they represented an opportunity to gather information about community members' experiences with the police and courts, rather than focusing on the behavior of communities of color and Nations.

Still, CAB's concerns about the survey continued to grow. The community overwhelmingly felt that the victimization survey's overarching question of, "do communities of color commit more crimes," placed blame within the community, rather than in the system or a sharing of both. They recommended restating the research question as, "What practices create the racial disparity in the criminal justice system?" Then there was the additional concern from the CAB: dissemination of findings. CAB distrusted the motives for the research and to what end the findings would be used. The feeling was that the results would be used to the detriment of the community. Furthermore, complexities in the sampling design for the crime victim survey and resource constraints led to the recommendation to limit the racial/ethnic minority subgroups. First, there were insufficient funds to conduct enough surveys to include a representative sample of all racial/ethnic groups. Second, there was evidence that different approaches would be needed to most effectively gather information from different racial/ethnic groups. The choice to focus on a certain racial/ethnic group (African Americans) concerned CAB with the sense that some groups were being excluded while another, when examined alone, was being overly scrutinized.

Negotiations with survey vendors were initiated with the Council asking for estimates for doing the survey by telephone or by mail. Initial estimates for either approach were high as many households would need to be screened to find minority respondents. It was even clearer at this point that resource constraints would further limit the ability to complete the study as originally proposed and in ways that would significantly address the concerns about the study that has been raised by CAB.

At this point, representatives from CAB presented a formal list of their concerns to RDI. Community members felt unheard, marginalized, and, in general, exploited. It was hard to keep community members at the table. Several members were threatening to walk out on the project. They felt that RDI wanted to use them to gain the respect of funders and others when their names were attached to the research. The staff responded to the CAB's needs by canceling the victimization survey. This helped build CAB's respect for staff as CAB felt that their concerns were heard, taken seriously, and acted upon.

LESSONS LEARNED

Two of the three research components of this project were completed as planned: the analysis of arrest data by race/ethnicity by county and the police incident analysis. The drug survey was not completed but a secondary analysis of existing drug studies was and it provided useful information on the disparities between reported drug usage and drug-related arrests by race/ethnicity. Despite the information gained from these project components, the inability to complete the victimization survey left RDI short of its intended goal of answering the question of why people of color and Nations are arrested much more often. While failing to accomplish this objective, the lessons learned in the

process of engaging the community in this research project serve as a useful product in and of themselves. Our experiences on this project offer an opportunity for researchers, community organizers, and system stakeholders to improve the process of working together to generate knowledge that can be used to effect social change in ways that build collaboration, trust and capacity among all partners involved in the process.

Chances for success in implementing this research project would have been greatly enhanced by adopting a community based participatory research model. This model would have facilitated collaboration and equitable involvement of all partners at all phases. Instead of asking members of the Community Advisory Board to endorse a research project in which they had little true power, they should have been brought into the process at the very beginning to have equal say in determining research questions and methodologies. This level of community participation would have avoided the conflicts between science, community, and resources as all of these study parameters would have been considered and balanced simultaneously by all the partners in the process.

This level of community involvement is essential as members of the impacted community have the right to participate and help define research conducted within their own communities. Failure to involve the community at this level further contributes to the very social inequities being researched. This level of involvement is also essential because only the community can inform how the research will be viewed and interpreted by the community. This is the essence of community validity – if the community does not trust, accept, or believe in the results of a study, all efforts at scientific rigor become irrelevant. Finally, this level of involvement is essential because the community has the right to participate in developing policy from research findings.

What approaches would have been taken if a true community-based participatory model of research had been used? This is difficult to answer until you actually engage the community in defining a study to answer the question of why people of color are arrested much more often. The strength of all partners joining together, however, would have likely yielded alternatives that were not apparent in our efforts. It is likely that the community would have not chosen to focus exclusively on individual behavior in answering this question but included an analysis of systemic factors contributing to this racial disparity. It is also likely that the community would have held the project accountable in considering how race/ethnicity impacts the design of a study. Additionally, the community may have identified community-based approaches that would have been effective in answering the questions of interest.

Research of this nature clearly needs to be based on a partnership. Both researchers and community partners must recognize each other's expertise and be prepared to learn from each other. Expectations need to be clarified up front and trust and respect to be built ahead of time. This process, however, takes time and should be planned for accordingly. Participatory research also needs to allow for a high degree of flexibility and a high level

of contact and on-going communication between community and researchers.[3] More than just an effective model of research, increasingly communities of color and Nations are demanding a participatory model of research that allows their voices to be heard in the research process.

CONCLUSIONS

Racial disparity within our justice system affects the perception and the reality of justice for a large, and growing, portion of our citizens. Clearly there is a need for information to make informed decisions and develop effective solutions to address these inequities. The lessons learned from attempting the Defining the Disparity Project, however, reveal that the process of generating this information is as important as the information itself. Researchers must be prepared to work with the community to explore these questions in ways that promote honest and informed dialogue. For this to work:

- Researchers must take time to build trust and rapport with the community
- Researchers must partner with community members on all aspects of the project from research design to the dissemination of findings,
- Researchers must share power with community members. Community members need to have the authority to help decide what questions the research will address, how they will be addressed, and how the findings will be used,
- Research must be designed to represent community as well as scientific needs and interests, and
- Findings must be used in ways that benefit not only science, but also the community.

These guidelines are critical to conducting research that will result in solutions that will benefit both science and the community, that will alleviate rather than exacerbate inequalities, and that will allow for future productive relationships between systems stakeholders, researchers, and the community.

[3] Gardiner, P, Baezconder-Garbananti, L., Oto-Kent, D., & Severson, H. 2001. Conducting Tobacco Control Research in Ethnically Diverse Communities, National Conference on Tobacco or Health, New Orleans.

Appendix A

Percent of Arrests Compared to Percent of Population by Race/Ethnicity for Select Counties, 1999

Latino

Counties	*Adult Arrests*			
	% of Part I Violent Arrests	% of Part I Property Arrests	% of Narcotics Arrests	% of Adult Population
Blue Earth	37.5%	13.0%	18.3%	1.4%
Rice	27.8%	23.2%	3.5%	4.5%
Scott	20.8%	14.9%	7.0%	2.3%
Kandiyohi	19.6%	10.8%	1.2%	5.8%

African American

Counties	*Adult Arrests*			
	% of Part I Violent Arrests	% of Part I Property Arrests	% of Narcotics Arrests	% of Adult Population
Ramsey	52.9%	40.0%	46.2%	6.3%
Hennepin	51.5%	33.3%	58.7%	7.4%
Dakota	12.1%	6.3%	3.2%	2.0%
Washington	4.6%	2.6%	1.4%	1.7%

American Indian

Counties	*Adult Arrests*			
	% of Part I Violent Arrests	% of Part I Property Arrests	% of Narcotics Arrests	% of Adult Population
Beltrami	63.3%	51.9%	32.5%	15.4%
Mille Lacs	25.9%	10.2%	17.9%	3.7%
St. Louis	18.5%	12.2%	7.0%	1.7%
Hennepin	5.6%	3.3%	2.6%	0.9%

Appendix B

Minnesota Adult Household Survey Results: Percent of Adults Reporting Past Year Drug Use by Race/Ethnicity, 1996-1997

	White	African American	Latino	American Indian	Asian
Any Drug	4.1	7.6	7.7	13.7	2.0
Marijuana	3.9	7.3	6.3	12.7	1.6
Cocaine	0.3	0.4	1.3	2.0	0.3
Hallucinogens	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.9	0.2
Stimulants	0.5	0.3	0.7	1.2	0.1
Sedatives	0.3	<0.1	1.0	<0.1	0.4

Note: Population 18 or older