

Office of Internal Affairs

Annual Use of Force Report 2011



Prepared by:
Officer Matthew Faulk
Administrative Officer
Office of Internal Affairs
February 29, 2012


Use of Force Summary

During 2011, there were **632** Use of Force incidents reported to the Office of Internal Affairs.


The **632** Use of Force incidents were then broken down by the level of force used:

- Deadly Force: **7**
- Intermediate Force: **245**
- Hard Control: **438**


Annual Use of Force Comparison




Use of Force Comparison



Citywide Use of Force



Use of Force By Division



As per *General Order 2020*:

Deadly Force is defined as “A use of force that is likely to cause serious injury or death. Use of a firearm is not the only means of employing deadly force. It may become necessary for officers to protect themselves or others with means other than a firearm.”

Intermediate Force is defined as “The use of authorized less lethal weapons, including canines, impact weapons, chemical and OC agents, flex-batons, and other specialized less lethal munitions. These provide a method of controlling subjects when deadly force is not justified and when empty hand control techniques are either not sufficient or not tactically the best option for the safety of others, the suspect and/or officer. When intermediate weapons are used, injury is likely and appropriate medical care shall be provided.”

Empty Hand Control, which is defined as “Techniques that cover a number of subject control methods. These may be as simple as gently guiding a subject’s movement or more dynamic techniques such as strikes.” is broken into two categories, **Soft Control** and **Hard Control**. *It should also be noted that as of the 2nd Quarter of 2006 it was determined that it was no longer necessary to count **Soft Control** as it was causing the number of Use of Force Incidents to be artificially inflated.

Hard Control is defined as “Techniques that might cause minimal injury, i.e. striking techniques using the hands or feet. “Take-downs,” that is the forceful direction of the suspect to the ground, are also considered under this use of force category. Generally, these are used to counter defensive resistance, active aggression, or aggravated active aggression (deadly force). These techniques are applied when lesser forms of control

have failed or are not applicable because the subject’s initial resistance is at a heightened level. In such situations, officers may risk injury to themselves or may have to utilize higher levels of force (such as intermediate weapons) if hard empty control techniques are not used.”


Intermediate Force was further broken down by weapon type:

- OC: 47
- Baton: 16
- Flex Baton: 8
- Canine: 27
- Pepperball: 32
- Taser: 144¹
- Flashlight: 1
- 40 MM Munitions: 2
- Arwen: 1
- CS Gas: 1


*It should also be noted that in some incidents there were multiple intermediate weapons utilized.

¹Of the 144 total Taser uses, the Taser was displayed, but not used during 44 incidents. During 12 of the total uses, the Taser was activated (the Taser was allowed to cycle) but was not physically deployed.

Intermediate Weapon Use By Division



Citywide Breakdown of Intermediate Weapon Use



During 2011, there were **37** Use of Force incidents that were referred for additional investigation. Those receiving “additional review” were reviewed per *General Orders* as a result of a citizen complaint, Internal Investigation or a Board of Inquiry.

The dispositions of those **37** incidents were:

7 Use of Force incidents involved the use of a **Firearm**

- Justified, Within Departmental Policy: **5**
- Pending Board of Inquiry: **2**

*Use of force incidents involving the use of a firearm include external complaints with use of force allegations, Internal Investigations involving the dispatching of an animal, Boards of Inquiry, as well as Internal Investigations stemming from Boards of Inquiry.

Total number of members using of Firearms during those **7** incidents was **18**

12 Use of Force incidents involved **Striking**

- OIA Closure: **3**
- Exonerated: **4**
- Unfounded: **3**
- Contact: **2**

5 Use of Force incidents involved **Handcuffing**

- OIA Closure: **4**
- Unfounded: **1**
- Exonerated: **1**


*It should also be noted that incidents may have included more than one member applying use of force per incident

9 Use of Force incidents involved Other Use of Force issues

- OIA Closure: **1**
- Exonerated: **2**
- Unfounded: **4**
- Pending Internal Investigation: **2**

*Note that there are multiple findings due to multiple types of force used, as well as multiple officers for an investigation.

Use of Force Investigations and Outcomes



■	OIA Closure (9)
■	Unfounded (10)
■	Exonerated (8)
■	Justified, Within Departmental Policy (12)
■	Justified, Tactical/Training Improvement Opportunity (1)
■	Justified, Policy Violation (2)
■	Not Justified, Not Within Departmental Policy (3)
■	Still Open-Pending Board of Inquiry (2)
■	Still Open-Pending Internal Investigation (3)

*OIA Closure is a method of closure used when a review of all information available shows that nothing that has been alleged or described amounts to a violation of law, Department General Orders, Policies, or Procedures by a member of the department.

When considering the total number of calls for service during the year 2011, the Use of Force incidents per 1,000 dispatched calls for service is as follows:

- City Wide **2.10** per 1,000 calls (300,821 total calls for service)
- ODS **2.39** per 1,000 calls (51,451 total calls for service)
- ODW **2.66** per 1,000 calls (50,094 total calls for service)
- ODM **2.52** per 1,000 calls (55,867 total calls for service)
- ODE **2.40** per 1,000 calls (54,903 total calls for service)
- ODD **2.60** per 1,000 calls (38,781 total calls for service)

*Calls for service obtained from the CFS Monthly Call Statistics Report published monthly.

