

## 2017-2019 Use of Force Analysis

Between January 1, 2017 and December 31, 2019, the Upper Arlington Police Division engaged in 13 use of force incidents. Following each incident, a thorough investigation was conducted involving reviewing physical evidence, audio/video recordings, and conducting interviews with participants and witnesses. Of the 13 incidents, 12 resulted in arrests and all were determined to be reasonable. Officers of the UAPD make every attempt to be progressive in the use of force based on the Use of Force Continuum recommended by the Ohio Peace Officer Training Council (pictured on page 2). The following is a break-down of the data.

In the three (3) year period, the Division responded to 63,961 calls for service. In calculating this number, the crime analyst used the number of calls for service in the 2017 annual report and performed a CAD search for 2018 and 2019. When performing this search, she removed all miscellaneous calls like meal breaks, workouts, car washes, roll-calls, etc.

During the three year look-back, the Division engaged in a use of force incident in .0002% of our calls for service. While national statistics are not available, by comparison, a neighboring suburban police department\* engaged in 37,541 calls for service over a two (2) year period (2017-2018). During this time they experienced 22 use of force incidents which account for .0006% of all calls for service. Another nearby police department\* engaged in 39,922 calls for service in a three year period (2017-2019). During this type they experienced 53 use of force incidents which account for .0013% of similarly identified calls for service. The Upper Arlington Police Division is much less likely to engage in uses of force by comparison.

*\*Taken from agency annual reports*

Subject Actions		Officer Actions	
Verbal physical danger cues	11	Officer Presence	13
Not responding to commands	13	Verbal or physical commands	13
Refusing to move-Dead weight	NR	Assistance from other officers	12
Pulling away from officer	11	Escort position-Balance displacement	10
Pushing officer	NR	Joint manipulation - pressure points	9
Wrestling with officer	8	Take downs	10
Striking or kicking officer	2	Striking muscle groups	0
Life threatening weaponless assault	0	Baton restraints	0
Attempting to disarm officer	0	Aerosols (OC)	0
Weapons used against officer	2	Taser (ECD)	2
		Striking , punching, kicking	2
Other* (see report)	3	Baton techniques	0
		Deadly force	0
NR - not reported			
		Other* (see report)	4





- \*Other subject actions included striking a cruiser, kicking a cruiser, presenting naked in public upon our arrival, attempting to strangle a victim prior to our arrival.
- 11 of the 13 subjects were intoxicated and/or emotionally impaired at the time.
- 1 subject was believed to be a homicide suspect at the time she was briefly detained. During an active search for the homicide suspect, the subject was observed outside of the suspect’s residence engaging in suspicious activity and matching the suspect’s general description.
- \*Other officer actions included using a restraint chair, assisting medics to restrain on a medical gurney, applying a spit hood, one pointing of a firearm.

The demographic breakdown of the subjects are as follows:

Date	Gender	Race	Age
2/9/2017	m	w	16
11/26/2017	m	w	38
3/24/2018	m	w(h)	34
4/18/2018	m	b	20
7/5/2018	m	w	22
1/20/2019	m	w	63
2/5/2019	m	w(h)	62
3/8/2019	m	w	23
6/18/2019	m	b	47
11/24/2019	m	w	38
10/31/2019	f	w	68
11/17/2019	m	b	33
12/15/2019	m	w	37

- Two subjects were classified as White Hispanic.
- **Injuries to the subjects included:** Abrasions, cuts, scrapes, bruises, Taser probes, and an unknown leg injury.
- **Injuries to officers included:** Cuts and swelling.



**Findings:**

In reviewing the data and reading the reports from the three year reporting period, it is clear that each incident was thoroughly investigated and that the use of force applied was reasonable in every case. The number of incidents is relatively low based on the number of calls for service and the number of physical arrests made during this time.

Other than Not Responding to Commands, the most common actions by the subjects in the 13 incidents were:

Verbal/Physical Danger Cues	11
Pulling Away from the Officer	11
Wrestling with the Officer	8
Striking or Kicking the Officer	2
Weapons Used/Displayed	2

Other than Officer Presence and Verbal/Physical Commands, the most common applications of force in the 13 incidents are:

Escort Position/Balance Displacement	10
Take Downs	10
Joint Manipulation/Pressure Points	9
Taser	2
Strikes	2

**Recommendations:**

In the spring of 2020, the command staff revised the Use of Force policy to reflect current best practices and comply with the sixth edition standards required by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

In addition to the revision, a revision of the use of force reporting process is needed in order to more accurately record each action from the subjects as well as the officers involved. With the addition of the Division’s Crime Analyst in 2019, data collection will be used to further analyze our policies and procedures in the coming years.

It is further recommended that we continue to use the data and analysis to direct our training cadre in our curriculum development. Based on the analysis, our training should include the following:

- Continued training in de-escalation techniques
- Further training in Escort Positions/Balance Displacement
- Further training in take down techniques (individual and with multiple officers)
- Advanced training for instructors in de-escalation

As a CALEA Accredited agency, we provide required training in Mental Health and also Implicit Bias; however, in addition to these, we will continue our efforts to have every officer certified as a CIT Officer (Crisis Intervention Team).

07.01.2020

