

City of Brisbane

Agenda Report

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Elizabeth Macias, Chief of Police

SUBJECT: Response to the Grand Jury's Report of May 19, 2011 on TASERS

DATE: Meeting of July 5, 2011

City Council Goals:

To provide public service that assures the safety of property and citizens residing, working or visiting in Brisbane.

Purpose:

To review the recommendation made by the Grand Jury on their report of May 19, 2011 on Tasers, followed by the City of Brisbane's response.

Recommendation:


Staff recommends that the City Council approve the City of Brisbane's response to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations.


Fiscal Impact:

None

Attachments:

- A. Letter to Honorable Joseph E. Bergeron on the City of Brisbane's response to the Grand Jury's recommendations.
- B. Grand Jury Report of May 19, 2011 on TASERS – Standardizing to Save Lives and Reduce Injuries.


Elizabeth Macias, Chief of Police


Clayton Holstine, City Manager

CITY OF BRISBANE
POLICE DEPARTMENT



ELIZABETH MACIAS
CHIEF OF POLICE

July 6, 2011

Honorable Joseph E. Bergeron
Judge of the Superior Court
Hall of Justice
400 Old County Road
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

Dear Honorable Joseph E. Bergeron:

This letter is in response to the 2010/2011 Grand Jury report of May 19, 2011 which contained findings that pertain to the City of Brisbane. Listed below are the Jury's recommendations followed by the City of Brisbane response. The Brisbane City Council reviewed and approved the below recommendations at a public hearing on July 5, 2011. The City of Brisbane responds to the Grand Jury's findings, conclusions and recommendations as follows:

TASERS – Standardizing to Save Lives and Reduce Injuries

The San Mateo County 2010-2011 Grand Jury makes the following recommendations to the City Councils of the cities of San Mateo County:

1. Add a "Deployment Only" category to all Use of Force Reports and track the effect that this "Light Up" mode has in assisting deputies [Officers] to gain and maintain control over subjects.

RESPONSE: *The City of Brisbane agrees with the finding. The city agrees that adding a "Deployment Only" category will provide useful information in regards to the overall effectiveness of the use of Tasers in the field. The TASER Use Report has been modified to reflect this new category.*

2. Require uniformed officers to have TASER devices available to the same extent that the officers are required to have a firearm available for use.

RESPONSE: *The City of Brisbane agrees with the finding. The recommendation has been implemented and changes made to the department's policy manual requiring uniformed officers to carry their TASER.*

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the recommendations made by the Grand Jury.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elizabeth Macias".

Elizabeth Macias,
Chief of Police



Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
Hall of Justice and Records
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655

ATTACHMENT 2

COURT EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CLERK & JURY COMMISSIONER

(650) 599-1200
FAX (650) 363-4698
www.sanmateocourt.org

May 24, 2011

City Council
City of Brisbane
50 Park Place
Brisbane, CA 94005

Re: TASERS Standardizing to Save Lives and Reduce Injuries

Dear Councilmembers:

The 2010-2011 Grand Jury filed a report on May 24, 2011 which contains findings and recommendations pertaining to your agency. Your agency must submit comments, within 90 days, to the Hon. Joseph E. Bergeron. Your agency's response is due no later than August 22, 2011. **Please note that the response should indicate that it was approved by your governing body at a public meeting.**

For all findings, your responding agency shall indicate one of the following:

1. The respondent agrees with the finding.
2. The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

Additionally, as to each Grand Jury recommendation, your responding agency shall report one of the following actions:

1. The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action.
2. The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for implementation.
3. The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This time frame shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report.
4. The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation therefore.

Please submit your responses in all of the following ways:

1. Responses to be placed on file with the Clerk of the Court by the Court Executive Office.
 - Prepare original on your agency's letterhead, indicate the date of the public meeting that your governing body approved the response address and mail to Judge Bergeron.

Hon. Joseph E. Bergeron
Judge of the Superior Court
Hall of Justice
400 County Center; 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655.

2. Responses to be placed at the Grand Jury website.
 - Copy response and send by e-mail to: grandjury@sanmateocourt.org. (Insert agency name if it is not indicated at the top of your response.)
3. Responses to be placed with the clerk of your agency.
 - File a copy of the response directly with the clerk of your agency. Do not send this copy to the Court.

For up to 45 days after the end of the term, the foreperson and the foreperson's designees are available to clarify the recommendations of the report. To reach the foreperson, please call the Grand Jury Clerk at (650) 599-1200.

If you have any questions regarding these procedures, please do not hesitate to contact Brenda B. Carlson, Chief Deputy County Counsel, at (650) 363-4760.

Very truly yours,



John C. Fitton
Court Executive Officer

JCF:ck
Enclosure

cc: Hon. Joseph E. Bergeron
Brenda B. Carlson

Information Copy: City Manager



Grand Jury
County of San Mateo

Hall of Justice
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063-1655
(650) 599-1200; Fax (650) 363-4698

VIA Facsimile

TO: City Council
City of Brisbane

FROM: Raymond W. Basso, Foreperson
2010-2011 Grand Jury

SUBJECT: Grand Jury Report

DATE: May 19, 2011

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05 (f), the San Mateo County Grand Jury shall make available to your agency a copy of the grand jury report relating to your agency on May 20, 2011, which is two working days prior to its public release on May 24, 2011. If your agency wishes to pick up a copy of the report, it will be available for pick up after 8:00 a.m. on Friday, May 20, 2011, at the Superior Court Executive Office located on the second floor (across the hall from Courtroom 2L) of the Hall of Justice in Redwood City. **Please note that Penal Code section 933.05 (f) prohibits any officer, agency, department, or governing body of a public agency from disclosing any contents of the report prior to the public release of this final report.**

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to call Charlene Kresevich at (650) 599-1200.

RWB:ck



TASERS

Standardizing to Save Lives and Reduce Injuries

Issue | Background | Findings | Conclusions | Recommendations | Responses | Attachments

Issue

Have the law enforcement agencies in San Mateo County adopted a standardized TASER® policy and, if so, is it effective?

Summary

This investigation focused on 20 uniformed police agencies of all cities/towns and the Sheriff's Department in San Mateo County, the California Highway Patrol, and BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) Police. It was found that only two cities, Menlo Park and East Palo Alto, currently do not employ TASER devices. Standardizing TASER device use policies and training would provide law enforcement agencies with a unified understanding of appropriate response to events within and across jurisdictions in the County. Of those agencies using TASER devices, the use of force policies and training requirements are sufficiently similar to consider them standardized, with the exception of the Sheriff's Use of Force policy.


The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Sheriff either adopt a Use of Force policy that is consistent with the other agencies in the County or reinstate the Sheriff's prior Use of Force policy dated April 10, 2008. It also recommended that uniformed officers across the County who are required to have a firearm while on duty carry this less-than-deadly force tool whenever they carry a firearm. It is further recommended that all agencies track the use of the TASER device to obtain control of subjects, even when the subject is not actually "tased."

Background

The TASER, a branded electronic control device (ECD), is a device manufactured by TASER International, Inc. that employs a high voltage, low amperage shock that is momentarily painful to the subject in a manner that causes the subject to lose muscle control and, if standing, fall to the ground. It works by the use of compressed gas to propel two barbs, attached by very thin wires, toward the subject. Once the barbs attach to skin or clothing, the shock is applied. It has an effective range of approximately 6 to 25 feet, thus allowing the officer to avoid immediate physical contact with the subject. The TASER device can also be used as a "stun gun" in what is called "drive stun" mode.¹ The TASER device is used by police officers to bring a subject under control, offering a less lethal option than a firearm.

¹ A TASER device can directly deliver an electrical shock from the device itself without the use of wires or barbs, but such requires physical contact with the subject. It does not incapacitate the subject, but uses momentary pain as the method of obtaining control. A "drive stun" is police terminology for approaching a subject to apply a TASER in the drive stun mode. The cartridge that is on the TASER device must be removed to use it in this way. This

The use of a TASER device in an instance where otherwise the officer would be required to use physical force to subdue a subject has been reported to reduce the incidence of officer injuries, and consequently the cost to taxpayers for insurance and disability payments.² The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), which provides the insurance pool for all of the police agencies except the Sheriff's department and California Highway Patrol, encourages the use of TASER devices and provides grants for departments to obtain them at no charge. TASER devices are used by uniformed police officers in all law enforcement agencies in San Mateo County with two exceptions, the cities of East Palo Alto and Menlo Park. Peace officers³ in the Coroner's Office, District Attorney and Probation Department do not use TASER devices. No police agency uses an ECD made by any other company.



Although the TASER device is less lethal than a firearm, *no use of force is without lethal risk*. In the last two years in San Mateo County, TASER devices have been used approximately 130 times⁴ with no reported loss of life or serious injury attributable to the device. One agency reported an instance in which a TASER device was used under circumstances which, had it not been available and successfully activated, deadly force would have been used. The use of the TASER device likely saved the life of the subject.

The TASER device has a laser light that is used for aiming. This light is visible to a subject and when an officer "lights up" a subject with the laser light, this alone is often sufficient for the officer to gain the subject's immediate compliance.⁵

TASER devices can be misused by officers, just as any other use of force can be misused. The Grand Jury is unaware of any reported abuses by any of the law enforcement agencies in San Mateo County in the past 2 years which is the time frame studied here. The law enforcement agencies that use TASER devices have chosen to require extensive training, multi-level

practice is usually employed when the barbs of the TASER fail to attach, or when the officer is too close to use the TASER device at a distance.

² See Reduction in Injuries charts from several police agencies at http://www.taser.com/pages/le_overview.aspx

³ Sworn peace officers, as specified by statute, are authorized to use deadly force if needed.

⁴ See Appendix A.

⁵ For the purpose of this report we are calling this "deployment." "Activation" is when the officer actually uses, or attempts to use, the TASER device on a subject.

supervisory review, and reporting of any activation of the TASER device. The California Penal Code provides for criminal sanctions for the misuse of TASER devices.⁶

All of the law enforcement agencies in San Mateo County, except the Sheriff's Office, use TASER protocols established by Lexipol, LLC of California. These protocols define the procedures for device deployment (use of force), activation, subject follow-up, reporting, and review policies. Lexipol is a private company that contracts by subscription service for the development and updating of policies with police departments across the United States. Lexipol defends its policies in court as meeting the "standard of care" when litigation regarding their use by local law enforcement agencies arises.⁷ The Sheriff's Office does not use Lexipol and has developed its own comprehensive policies.

The Sheriff's Office provides law enforcement services for much of the County, including the unincorporated areas of the County and now including, by contract, the cities of San Carlos and soon Half Moon Bay, which previously had their own TASER device policies. The officers working for these cities are, or soon will become Sheriff's Deputies.

On February 22, 2010, the Sheriff's department modified its policy to require a higher threshold for deployment and activation of TASER devices by deputies.


Sheriff's Department Use of Force Ladder		
	<u>April 10, 2008</u>	<u>February 22, 2010</u>
1	Officer presence	Officer presence
2	Verbal commands	Verbal commands
3	Light touch	Light touch
4	Physical controls (restraint holds)	Physical controls (restraint holds)
5	Aerosol pepper projection	Aerosol pepper projection
6	Taser Electronic Control Device (ECD)	Impact weapons (ASP/Baton, flashlight)
7	Impact weapons (ASP/Baton, flashlight)	Specialty Impact Munitions (SIMs)
8	Specialty Impact Munitions (SIMs)	Taser Electronic Control Device (ECD)
9	Carotid Control	Carotid Control
10	Deadly force	Deadly force

The Sheriff's Office employs a Use of Force Ladder (see diagram on previous page) that requires a deputy to use a baton or flashlight prod and Specialty Impact Munitions (e.g., rubber bullets) before deployment and activation of the TASER unless the deputy can articulate a reason to use the higher level of force presumably represented by the TASER. The Sheriff's Use of Force Policy, dated April 10, 2008, placed the threshold for TASER devices use immediately prior to the use of a baton or flashlight prod, providing an opportunity to avoid physical contact with a subject. The Sheriff's current Use of Force policy places the use of a TASER device after both the physical contact use of a baton or flashlight prod and the use of SIMS.

⁶ California Penal Code section 244.5.

⁷ More information about Lexipol can be found at <http://www.lexipol.com>.

Lexipol uses a toolbox⁸ approach, allowing the officer to use their best judgment based on the subject's behavior. The California Highway Patrol calls this the Use of Force Option Wheel. *See diagram at right.*



Copied from the Highway Patrol Manual 706, page 2-2

Investigation

The Grand Jury collected information regarding the extent of standardization, the use of TASER devices and the use of Lexipol in San Mateo County using a survey, analyzed reports and documents, and conducted interviews with several Police Chiefs, the Sheriff and other personnel within their respective agencies.

Officers who had actually deployed and activated a TASER in making an arrest were also interviewed. A chart summarizing information collected is provided in Appendix A.

To help understand the effectiveness and limitations of the TASER device, a local police agency conducted a demonstration of a TASER device deployment and activation for the Grand Jury. Among the documents reviewed were the *Use of Force* manuals published by the Police Department of each city, sample post-incident *Use of Force Reports*, Lexipol generic standards and protocols, and other relevant documents.

Findings

The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury finds:

1. The Sheriff's Department has a Use of Force policy that is different than the standardized policies of the other uniformed law enforcement agencies in San Mateo County. The Sheriff Department's policy requires a deputy to make physical contact with subjects who are violent or threatening prior to the deployment and/or activation of the TASER device unless the deputy can identify and articulate a reason to move up the ladder to the TASER device use. Once engaged in physical contact, TASER use is limited to the "drive stun" mode.
2. Law Enforcement agencies often respond to calls outside their jurisdiction for mutual aid and joint task force operations, such as the San Mateo County Gang Task Force and Drug Task Force. In these joint operations the protocols for Taser use by the Sheriff are not the same as the other agencies in the county which also use TASERS.
3. Of the 18 uniformed police agencies using TASER devices in San Mateo County that the Grand Jury reviewed, the primary provider of Use of Force policies and TASER use

⁸ Many interviewees stated that "the TASER device is a use of force tool," that should be used appropriately just like any other tool available to officers.

policies is Lexipol, LLC. Fifteen cities, BART and the CHP use Lexipol, or have policies that are similar, if not identical, to Lexipol.

4. All agencies using TASER devices require training prior to the issuance of a TASER to individual officers; require annual or more frequent retraining; require a "Use of Force Report" when a TASER device is activated;⁹ and require medical evaluation for a subject who has been "tased."
5. No agency requires reporting when a TASER device has been used in the "light up" deployment mode, but not activated.
6. No agency requires that an officer who has been issued a TASER device actually keep it on his/ her person. The TASER device may be kept secured in the patrol car for those officers on patrol duty.
7. The cities of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto are the only San Mateo County police agencies that do not supply TASER devices to their officers and therefore TASERS are not available as an alternative to lethal force.

Conclusions

The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury concludes:

1. TASER devices can be a use of force alternative to the lethal force of a firearm.
2. With the exception of the Sheriff's Office, of those agencies using TASER devices, the use of force deployment and activation policies are sufficiently similar to consider them to be standardized.
3. Without standardized use of force policies across San Mateo County with respect to activation and deployment of TASER devices, police officers and Sheriff's deputies do not have a consistent approach in responding to potential use of force events. In addition, a lack of common policies (and training) could set inconsistent expectations with the public and law enforcement officers alike as to when and how TASER devices will be deployed and activated.
4. Lexipol, LLC provides the most-used set of standards for Use of Force policies in San Mateo County.
5. All agencies that are using TASER devices have adequate training, supervision, reporting, review, and medical evaluation of the subject when TASER devices are used.
6. TASER devices that are deployed, but not activated, are not included in Use of Force reports. This understates the effectiveness of Tasers because "lighting up" a subject with the laser light is often sufficient for the officer to gain the subject's immediate compliance. The absence of this reporting can result in future decision-makers not having sufficient information about the utility of carrying and deploying this device.
7. An officer who is trained in the use of TASER devices cannot make use of the device if he or she is not carrying it when it is needed.

⁹ Please see attached sample Use of Force report attached as Appendix B

8. The use of a TASER device, before being required to physically subdue a subject, would result in fewer injuries to both officers and subjects. When an officer goes “hands on” with a subject, in the form of the use of a baton, flashlight prod, or other device that can cause physical injury, it places the officer and the subject into a position where physical injury is more likely.

Recommendations

The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the Sheriff:

1. Adopt either the Lexipol standard policies and decision toolbox approach, establish similar policies, or reestablish the prior Use of Force policy dated April 10, 2008.
2. Add a “deployment only” category to all Use of Force Reports and track the effect that this “light up” mode has in assisting deputies to gain and maintain control over subjects.
3. Require uniformed deputies to have TASER devices available to the same extent that the officers are required to have a firearm available for use.

The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the City Councils of the cities of Menlo Park and East Palo Alto:

1. Implement the use of TASER devices for their uniformed police officers.
2. Adopt Use of Force policies that are consistent with other San Mateo County cities.
3. Implement policies that require training, supervision, reporting, multi-level supervisory review, and medical evaluation of subjects when TASER devices are used as well as “deployment only” tracking for in-field incidents.
4. Require uniformed officers to have TASER devices available to the same extent that the officers are required to have a firearm available for use.

The 2011 San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the City Councils of all cities other than Menlo Park and East Palo Alto:

1. Add a “deployment only” category to all Use of Force Reports and track the effect that this “light up” mode has in assisting deputies to gain and maintain control over subjects.
2. Require uniformed officers to have TASER devices available to the same extent that the officers are required to have a firearm available for use.

Appendix A

Survey Results on Tasers

Standardized Taser use and Training Policies Survey results	Is the agency using Tasers	Are they using Lexipol? Directly or leveraging their policies?	# of incidents of Taser use in past 2 years	Frequency of taser training?	Any authorized use by non-Peace Officers?
Police Dept:					
Atherton	YES	YES	0	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
BART	YES	YES	17 (although unclear from response whether this is in SMCO or across entire BART system)	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
Brisbane	YES	YES	2	Unknown	NO
Broadmoor	YES	YES	0	Unknown	"Some officers do." Unclear what this actually means.
Burlingame	YES	YES	4	Unknown	NO
CHP (Redwood City)	YES	NO	15	quarterly review	NO
Colma	YES	NO	2	annually; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
Daly City	YES	NO	26	annually	NO
East Palo Alto	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foster City	YES	YES	drawn 5 times, never fired	initial 8 hr training, then periodic throughout the year; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
Hillsborough	YES	YES	drawn, never fired	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
HMB	YES	YES	fired 4 times, with 2 misses	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
Millbrae	YES	YES	2	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO
Menlo Park	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pacifica	YES	NO	14	initial training	NO
Redwood City	YES	NO	1	initial training	NO
San Bruno	YES	NO	12	initial training	NO
San Mateo	YES	NO	8	initial basic ops & policy subsequent on as needed basis	NO
Sheriff	YES	NO	14	initial followed by use review for trng needs	NO
South SF PD	YES	YES	11	initial training; repeated if lapse of 6 months	NO

Appendix B

REPORT#	DATE	TIME
---------	------	------

SUSPECT INFORMATION Arrested: Yes No, 5150 Hold

Name: _____ Home ph#/Work #: _____

Home/Wk Address: _____

OFFICERS INVOLVED

Officer/Id#: _____ Officer/Id#: _____

Officer/Id#: _____ Supervisor/Id#: _____

WITNESSES (Name, Home/Bus, address, Home/Wk ph#)

FORCE RESPONSE *(check the appropriate boxes)*

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Verbal | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - Chemical agent | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 - Police Canine | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 - Carotid Control |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Control hold | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 - Taser* | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 - Flashlight | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 - Firearm |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - Body force | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 - Baton | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 - Extended Range Impact Projectile | <input type="checkbox"/> 12 - Other instrument |

RESTRAINTS USED *(check the appropriate boxes)*

- | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Handcuffs/Leg Irons | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Flex cuffs | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 - Wrap | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 - Medical restraints |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|

Injuries sustained by Officer: _____

Injuries sustained by Suspect: Yes No Describe: _____

MEDICAL TREATMENT: Yes* No Refused by suspect * treated at the scene by: Fire Eng#: _____ Ambulance#: _____

Transported to:

- SMCo General Mills/Peninsula Sequoia Kaiser/RWC Kaiser/SSF Stanford SF General Other: _____

EMERGENCY ROOM INFORMATION

Attending Physician: _____ Nurses name: _____

Medical reports available? Yes No Photos taken? Yes No By whom: _____

Describe medical treatment: _____

Medical Waiver - Signed by suspect Suspect Refused

SUPERVISOR'S REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

- | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| Incident report completely reviewed? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Photo's of ofc's injuries? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Need for City Attorney notification? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Dispatch/Radio CD's | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Use of force properly documented | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Administrator notified | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Copy of Report sent to Defensive Tactics Instructor | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | * Taser X26 Use Report | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Photo's of suspect | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Policy followed? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Photo's of Scene | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Use of force justified? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

SUPERVISORY INVESTIGATION CHECKLIST

- Detective notified when injury is life threatening, fatal or police firearm is used
- Ensure immediate medical attention is rendered to all injured parties and photographs taken of suspect, involved officer and scene.
- Ask involved Officer "What happened? Are there any outstanding suspects? Are there any outstanding injured citizens or suspects?"
- Locate, identify and secure the scene, witnesses, suspects and related evidence.
- Begin independent interviews and obtain statements from victims, witnesses and/or suspects.
- Start area canvass for other witnesses or unaccounted people, etc.....
- Interview injured parties at hospital, obtain additional photographs. Obtain required medical information for report and medical waiver signed if possible.
- Interview involved officer for complete statement of incident (Within guidelines of Government Code § 3300 - 3400. Fatal or life-threatening only!)
- Collect information and thoughts to begin report.
- Complete Resistance Management Survey.
- Complete the body of the investigation (Non-lethal use only)
- Attach a copy of the police report to the investigation and route to the Division Captain and Chief of Police.

Notes: _____

Investigating Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Division Commander: _____ Date: _____

Chief of Police: _____ Date: _____

Sergeant/ Supervisor upon completion, note time in hours spent on entire investigation _____

Police Administration (Captain and Chief) upon completion, note time in hours spent on entire investigation _____

Report #: _____	Charge: _____
------------------------	----------------------


Subject: _____

Address: _____

Age: _____ Sex: _____ Height: _____ Weight: _____ DL: _____

APPLICATION AREAS

Please place "X's" on the points of contact



Comments: _____

Officer: _____ Date: _____

Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Report #:	Charge:	
<p>Did dart contacts penetrate the subject's skin?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Did the application cause injury?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, was the subject treated for the injury?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Incident Type:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Civil Disturbance <input type="checkbox"/> Suicidal <input type="checkbox"/> Violent Subject <input type="checkbox"/> Assaulted Officer <input type="checkbox"/> Barricaded <input type="checkbox"/> Warrant Service <input type="checkbox"/> Resisting Arrest <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> <p>General Appearance:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Neat <input type="checkbox"/> Casual <input type="checkbox"/> Unkempt <input type="checkbox"/> Dirty <input type="checkbox"/> Sweaty</p> <p>Demeanor</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nervous <input type="checkbox"/> Angry <input type="checkbox"/> Violent <input type="checkbox"/> Under Influence <input type="checkbox"/> Irrational <input type="checkbox"/> Combative</p>	<p>Speech</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Normal <input type="checkbox"/> Quiet <input type="checkbox"/> Slow <input type="checkbox"/> Talkative <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Accent <input type="checkbox"/> Stutter <input type="checkbox"/> Slurred <input type="checkbox"/> Incoherent</p> <p>Influences</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PCP <input type="checkbox"/> Cocaine <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Methamphetamine <input type="checkbox"/> Other Drug: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Emotionally Disturbed <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown</p> <p>Threat Level</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Verbal Non-Combative <input type="checkbox"/> Defensive Resistance <input type="checkbox"/> Active Aggression / Assaultive <input type="checkbox"/> Deadly Force Assault / Weapon</p> <p>Suspect Weapons</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Blunt Weapon <input type="checkbox"/> Edged Weapon <input type="checkbox"/> Firearm</p>	<p>Clothing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Jacket / Coat <input type="checkbox"/> Heavy <input type="checkbox"/> Light <input type="checkbox"/> Cloth <input type="checkbox"/> Nylon <input type="checkbox"/> Leather <input type="checkbox"/> Shirt <input type="checkbox"/> T-Shirt <input type="checkbox"/> Tank top <input type="checkbox"/> Dress Shirt <input type="checkbox"/> Pants /Trousers <input type="checkbox"/> Jeans <input type="checkbox"/> Dockers <input type="checkbox"/> Slacks <input type="checkbox"/> Shorts <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>