Departmental Correspondence

Crystal Lake Police Department

To: Chief Black

From: Commander Neumann

CC: Deputy Chief Hyrkas, Deputy Chief Kotlowski

Date: January 8th, 2021

Re: Response to Resistance Analysis – Calendar Year 2020 CALEA 4.2.4

An analysis of the response to resistance by officers in the performance of their official duties for the calendar year 2020 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.

Employees will use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force when it is safe and feasible to do so based on the totality of the circumstances. This includes continually assessing the situation and modifying the use of force as circumstances change and in ways that are consistent with officer safety, including stopping the use of force when it is no longer necessary. Examples of de-escalation techniques include but are not limited to:

a. providing a warning and exercising persuasion and advice prior to the use of force.
b. determining whether the employee may be able to stabilize the situation through the use of time, distance, or positioning to isolate and contain a subject.
c. requesting additional personnel to respond or make use of specialized units or equipment including crisis intervention team trained officers, as necessary and appropriate.

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 2020, the Department responded to 18,557 calls for service. Of these calls for service, 550 resulted in adult arrests. Additionally, there were sixty-one (61) juveniles arrested. Therefore, approximately 3.3% of calls for service involved an arrest of an individual.

Purpose of Response to Resistance-
In 2020, Officers documented thirty-one (31) incidents involving a response to resistance involving thirty-one (31) different individuals. Twenty-four (24) of those incidents involved the subjects being involved in criminal activity. Four (4) of those incidents involved subjects who were in need of medical attention and hospitalization. This equates to approximately 3.9% of arrests requiring a type of response to resistance, or conversely, no type of response was used in 96.1% 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 total calls for service in 2020, no type of response to resistance was used.

Injuries Sustained-
During the thirty-one (31) incidents involving a responses to resistance, no officers sustained any injuries. Three (3) offenders sustained injuries during the incident responses. One offender sustained a minor scrape to their knee. Another offender sustained minor lacerations to both wrists. The third offender suffered a self-inflicted cut to the throat.

Demographics-
Of the response to resistance incidents, twenty-four (24) involved male offenders and seven (7) involved female offenders. Seventy-one (71) male officers were involved in incidents, while seven (7) incidents involved a female officer.

A type of response to resistance was employed by seventy-eight (78) officers during the thirty-one (31) 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:

Empty Hand Control	63
WRAP Deployed	3
Taser Displayed (not fired)	4
Taser Deployed	2
Baton Used	1
Firearm Displayed (not fired)	2

Overall response to resistance incidents have continued to decrease from thirty-nine (39) in 2018, to thirty-four (34) in 2019, and thirty-one (31) in 2020. Deadly force was not employed in 2020. Empty hand controls is still the primary type of response used. In 2020, no officers were injured during response to resistance incidents, which is a decrease from 2019 when one (1) officer sustained an injury. 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.

Twenty-five (25) of the incidents resulting in a response to resistance occurred between 1400 hours and 2300 hours, which would coincide with heavier call volumes. Three (3) of the documented response to resistance incidents occurred between 2300 hours and 0400 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.

01/08/2021
Submitted Date

01/12/21
Received Date