

TRAINING MEMORANDUM 14-035

DATE: April 12, 2013
TO: Chief Linda Stump
FROM: Lieutenant Mitchal J. Welsh
CC: Deputy Chief Tony Dunn, Office of Professional Standards, file
SUBJECT: Annual Analysis of Response to Resistance for 2013 Calendar Year

In the 2013 calendar year, a total of eight response to resistance incidents were reviewed. There were five incidents in which the officers drew their firearms, one incident in which a Taser was deployed, one incident in which a hard empty hand technique was used, and one incident in which a RIPP-hobble restraint was applied.

For comparison:

| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| TOTAL REVIEWS | 18 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 8 |
| Firearm discharged | | 1 | | | |
| Firearm displayed | 11 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Taser deployed | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| OC deployed | | | 1 | 1 | |
| Baton strike | | | | | |
| Hard hand control | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Less Lethal Impact | | | | | |
| Ripp Hobble | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Suspect injured | 1 | | | 1 | |

Further analysis of 2013 data revealed that of the eight incidents where response to resistance was initiated, five occurred at incidents where officers were responding to a call for service, two occurred during a traffic stop, and one occurred while assisting the Gainesville Police Department. Data further revealed that the eight subjects involved in the response to resistance events did not affiliate to the University as students. Other factors that were noted in the reports included that three incidents involved drugs or alcohol, three incidents escalated due to a physical fight or disturbances, and three of the incidents involved a suspect with a weapon or an implied weapon.

An analysis of the five incidents where officers displayed their firearms revealed the following information: one involved the suspicious actions of the suspect during a traffic stop (driver ran from the vehicle and the passenger concealed himself in the floorboard), one involved a reported armed domestic disturbance at Lake Wauburg, one involved a report of armed disturbance at Shands South ER, one involved a suspicious death investigation, and one involved a report of possible shots fired in the area of PK Yonge in which officers assisted the GPD with a felony stop of a suspicious vehicle.

Comparison of 2012 and 2013 incident factors:

| INCIDENT FACTORS | 2012 (12) | 2013 (8) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| UF Student | 3 | 0 |
| Call for Service | 9 | 5 |
| Proactive Response | 2 | 0 |
| Traffic Stop | 1 | 3 |
| Stolen Vehicle | 1 | 0 |
| Burglary Response | 0 | 0 |
| Fighting | 2 | 3 |
| Drugs/Alcohol | 5 | 3 |
| Excited Delirium | 0 | 0 |
| Weapons | 3 | 0 |

A review of the application of force patterns over the last five years showed a slight increase from 2008 through 2009. However, in 2010 there was a dramatic decrease in the number of incidents. Since 2010 we had seen a slight increase each of the next two years; however, in 2013 we saw a decrease again. The factors that cause an increase or decrease in the number of response to resistance events may never be fully known but the following may give insight as to variables that affect the numbers.

1. This decrease in 2013 may be explained due to the decrease in calls for service this year. There was an estimated overall decrease of increase of 11,089 calls for service when compared to last years numbers. This can be seen in the number of events that occurred during a call for service as opposed to those that occurred as a result of proactive police work. There were 5 events that occurred as a result of a call for service and only 3 events that occurred as a result of proactive police work.
2. Additionally, the department saw a decrease in the overall crime rate for this year as compared to last year. The decrease was 1.27% with a decrease in violent crimes from 18 in 2012 to 10 in 2013. This decrease in crime rate could result in a decrease of opportunities for officers to be involved in calls that could lead to a response to resistance event.

Taser deployments had increased through 2007, and then started to decline in 2008. The decline in Taser deployments has continued through the 2013 calendar year. This decline appears to be a result of the change in the department's policy in 2007, which changed the level of resistance that must be presented prior to the use of the Taser. The current policy requires that the suspect be demonstrating aggressive physical resistance or transferring from active physical resistance to aggressive physical resistance. The department's policy appears to be in line with current law enforcement standards.

Additionally, in 2009 the department started to track incidents when the Taser was only drawn but was not actually deployed. In 2013, there were two incidents in which the Taser was drawn but not deployed. In both incidents, the suspect either stopped offering resistance or reduced his/her level of resistance level; therefore Taser deployment was not necessary. I believe that

this is indicative of the officers' knowledge and understanding of the current Department policy regarding the use of the Taser. Additionally, I believe that citizens are now more familiar with the Taser and understand that they are best served by following the instructions of the officers in these situations.

In each of the eight Response to Resistance incidents reviewed the officers involved were found to have been acting within the department's policies, procedures, and directives; and it appears that the officers were well prepared and made proper decision in dispensing the appropriate level of force for the resistance level that was encountered. However, during the review process, there were issues identified where increased training would be of benefit to officer including: use of cover and concealment, empty hand techniques, Taser, baton, OC spray and continued training on the department's Response to Resistance policy. The training of current and new law enforcement officers concerning response to resistance and related issues continues to be a priority of the Training Division.

Use of Taser Statistics 2001-2013

| METHOD | TOTAL | | TOTAL | TOTAL | |
|--------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------------|
| | 2001 - 2011 | 2012 | | 2013 | 2001 - 2013 |

| UF Students | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--------|
| Drive Stun | 5 | 0 | | 0 | | 55.56% |
| Darts Fired | 4 | 0 | | 0 | | 44.44% |
| FACTORS DOCUMENTED FOR TASER INCIDENT | | | | | | |
| Active Resistance | 7 | 0 | | 0 | | 77.78% |
| Fighting | 3 | 0 | | 0 | | 33.33% |
| Suicidal | 2 | 0 | | 0 | | 22.22% |
| Drugs | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0.00% |
| Alcohol | 3 | 0 | | 0 | | 33.33% |
| Weapon | 4 | 0 | | 0 | | 44.44% |
| | | | | | | |
| Excited Delirium | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0.00% |
| Injuries | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0.00% |

| Non-Students | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|--------|
| Drive Stun | 11 | 1 | | 0 | | 54.55% |
| Darts Fired | 8 | 1 | | 1 | | 45.45% |
| FACTORS DOCUMENTED FOR TASER INCIDENT | | | | | | |
| Active Resistance | 16 | 0 | | 0 | | 72.73% |
| Fighting | 9 | 1 | | 1 | | 50.00% |
| Suicidal | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0.00% |
| Drugs | 5 | 0 | | 0 | | 22.73% |
| Alcohol | 7 | 0 | | 0 | | 31.82% |
| Weapon | 1 | 1 | | 0 | | 9.09% |
| | | | | | | |
| Excited Delirium | 1 | 0 | | 0 | | 4.55% |
| Injuries | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0.00% |

Agency Comparisons

| | 2012 | | | 2013 | | |
|---|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| | UFPD | GPD | ACSO | UFPD | GPD | ACSO |
| CALLS FOR SERVICE | 45,155 | 135,774 | 100,482 | 34,066 | 125,371 | 97,022 |
| <i>Factor over UFPD</i> | | 3.0 | 2.2 | | 3.7 | 2.8 |
| USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS | 5 | 106 | 72 | 2 | 85 | 122 |
| <i>Factor over UFPD</i> | | 21.2 | 14.4 | | 42.50 | 61.00 |
| Firearm | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Taser | 2 | 45 | 50 | 1 | 36 | 76 |
| Baton | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| OC Spray | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hard Empty Hand | 2 | 42 | 17 | 1 | 29 | 33 |
| K-9 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 11 |
| <i>For compatibility purposes these figures do not include the drawing of a firearm, or use of Hobble restraints.</i> | | | | | | |