Departmental Correspondence

Crystal Lake Police Department

To: Chief Black

From: Commander Neumann

CC: Deputy Chief Kotlowski, Deputy Chief Hyrkas

Date: January 22nd, 2018

Re: Response to Resistance Analysis – Calendar Year 2017 CALEA 1.3.13

An analysis of the response to resistance by officers in the performance of their official duties for the calendar year 2017 has been completed. During the year, any documented response to resistance was identified and reviewed by the officer's supervisor, the Training Coordinator, and the command staff to include the officer's Unit Commander, Deputy Chief, and the Chief of Police. The reviews consisted of comparisons of the officer's actions to the established policy of the Department on response to resistance, specifically:

> **300.3 RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE**
> Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.
>
> The reasonableness of force will be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene at the time of the incident. Any evaluation of reasonableness must allow for the fact that officers are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force that reasonably appears necessary in a particular situation, with limited information and in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving.
>
> Given that no policy can realistically predict every possible situation an officer might encounter, officers are entrusted to use well-reasoned discretion in determining the appropriate response to resistance in each incident.
>
> It is also recognized that circumstances may arise in which officers reasonably believe that it would be impractical or ineffective to use any of the tools, weapons or methods provided by the Department. Officers may find it more effective or reasonable to improvise their response to rapidly unfolding conditions that they are confronting. In such circumstances, the use of any improvised device or method must nonetheless be reasonable and utilized only to the degree that reasonably appears necessary to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.
>
> While the ultimate objective of every law enforcement encounter is to avoid or minimize injury, nothing in this policy requires an officer to retreat or be exposed to possible physical injury before applying reasonable force.

After reviewing the response to resistance employed by officers, I found that each situation was reasonable and in compliance with Department Policy.

Calls for Service and Arrests-
In 2017, the Department responded to 26,332 calls for service. Of these calls for service, 727 resulted in adult arrests. Additionally, 116 of the calls resulted in juvenile arrests. There were 843 total arrests for 2017. Therefore, approximately 3% of calls for service involved an arrest of an individual.

Purpose of Response to Resistance-
In 2017, Officers documented thirty-three (33) incidents involving a response to resistance involving thirty-five (35) different individuals. Twenty-three (23) of those incidents involved arrest, nine (9) involved the need of medical attention and hospitalization, and one (1) incident included the subject being released without charges. This equates to 2.7% of arrests requiring a type of response to resistance, or conversely, no type of response was used in 97.3% of arrests. In overall calls for service, a response to resistance was needed at a rate of 0.1%. Meaning, in 99.9% of the calls for service in 2017, no type of response to resistance was used.

Injuries Sustained-
During the thirty-three (33) responses to resistance, one (1) officer sustained injuries. That incident resulted in minor injuries being sustained to the officer's arm, hand, and finger. Additionally, one (1) offender sustained injuries during the responses. That injury was a self-inflicted head wound.

Demographics-
Of the response to resistance incidents, twenty-two (22) involved male offenders and eleven (11) involved female offenders. Seventy-five (75) male officers were involved in incidents, while seven (7) involved female officers.

A type of response to resistance was employed by eighty-two (82) officers during the thirty-three (33) incidents. Some officers used more than one type of response during an incident. The types of responses ranged from "Empty Hand Controls" to "Firearm Displayed". The frequency of those responses is as follows:

74 – Empty Hand Control
6 – Taser Displayed (Not fired)
2 – Firearm Displayed (Not fired)

Overall response to resistance incidents remained the same from 2016 to 2017. Empty hand controls is still the primary type of response used. Officer injuries related to the response to resistance has decreased from five (5) in 2016 to one (1) in 2017. Upon reviewing the documented response to resistance incidents it appears our officers are responding appropriately to encountered resistance. Those responses are within the law and their training.

Deadly force was not employed in 2017.

Twelve (12) of the documented response to resistance incidents occurred between 1400 hours and 2300 hours, which would coincide with heavier call volumes. Ten (10) of the documented response to resistance incidents occurred between 2300 hours and 0200 hours. The remaining incidents when a response to resistance was necessary occurred at various times throughout the day with no discernible pattern.

The incident reports and Response to Resistance Reviews for each incident are available for your review if desired.

01/22/18
Submitted Date

James Blank 01/23/18
Received Date