

**THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT  
ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 96A  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
Use of Force and Arrest Report per 96A.3  
July 1, 2016 – September 30, 2016  
Third Quarter**

**SUMMARY**

As part of the national conversation on police reform, including accountability and transparency in law enforcement, accurate data collection has taken center stage. In the forefront is whether specific identifying characteristics (race, gender, ethnicity) play a role in the outcome of encounters between law enforcement officers and members of the public especially as it relates to the level of force used, the rate of arrest, and/or the propensity to search an individual.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the reforms undertaken by the San Francisco Police Department (the Department), and more importantly, to ensure procedural justice is evenly applied throughout all neighborhoods within our city, the Department has done a thorough analysis of the processes in place for collecting data as required by recently passed legislation (California AB 953 and San Francisco Administrative Code 96A). Although the data collection continues to involve manually inputting use of force data directly from incident reports, the goal is to have the process fully automated by spring 2017.

As required under Administrative Code 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements, the Police Department is submitting this report under Sec. 96A.3, for the third quarter of 2016 (July, August, September). The report contains information relating to Arrests and Use of Force, including the following information:

Sec. 96A.3.

- (b) For Use of Force
  - (1) The total number of Uses of Force;
  - (2) The total number of Uses of Force that resulted in death to the person on whom an Officer used force; and
  - (3) The total number of Uses of Force broken down by race or ethnicity, age, and sex.
  
- (c) For arrests:
  - (1) The total number; and
  - (2) The total number broken down by race or ethnicity, age, and sex.

This quarterly report will be available to the public on the Department's website as part of an ongoing commitment to transparency. Once the process is fully automated, the datasets used to generate the reports will be published alongside the report to provide the information in a searchable format.

## **SEC. 96A.3(b) - USE OF FORCE**

Over the past two years, the Department has redirected much of its efforts and resources to what is referred to as the reengineering of the use of force. This past quarter, the Department continued to focus on training its officers on the importance of the proportionality of the use of force (using only that force which is reasonable to perform one's duties), as well as effective communication and de-escalation techniques with an emphasis on safeguarding the sanctity of life, dignity, and liberty of all persons.

The Department continues to expand its commitment to the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) concept and has trained 652 sworn personnel in the updated training curriculum as of October 2016. Included in this number are probationary officers, veteran officers, and members of the Command Staff. The Crisis Intervention Department General Order (DGO) governing the CIT program is complete and will soon be submitted to the Commission for adaption and implementation. The Department continues to work in close partnership with other City agencies and major stakeholders in the development of the CIT DGO and CIT training program, including the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), The Mayor's Office on Disability Counsel, San Francisco Mental Health Association, the Homeless Coalition, District Attorney's Witness and Victim Program, and the San Francisco Public Defenders Office among other advocates and associations). This model will enable officers to formulate more thoughtful plans in order to assist persons in crisis.

As the CIT program moves forward, the goal of the Department will be to provide additional CIT training to all members, provide additional hours of crisis intervention training to recruit police officers, deploy the team concept throughout all district stations, and instill in all officers the importance of the guardian mentality.

### ***Circumstances where Use of Force may be necessary:***

The use of force must be for a lawful purpose. Officers may only use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties in the following circumstances:

- To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search.
- To overcome resistance or to prevent escape.
- To prevent the commission of a public offense.
- In defense of others or in self-defense.
- To gain compliance with a lawful order.
- To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself. However, an officer is prohibited from using lethal force against a person who presents only a danger to himself/herself and does not pose an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer.

### ***Levels of Force:***

It is the policy of the Department that the degree of force shall be restricted to circumstances authorized by law and to the degree minimally necessary to accomplish a lawful police task. The current force options are:

- Verbal Persuasion
- Physical Control (e.g., passive resister, bent wrist control, excluding the carotid restraint)
- Liquid Chemical Agent (Mace/Oleoresin Capsicum/Pepper Spray)
- Carotid Restraint
- Department Issued Impact Weapons
- Vehicle Deflection
- Firearm Intentionally Pointed at a Person
- Firearm

In addition to improving and reengineering the use of force through training, beginning in December 2015, the pointing of a firearm was designated through Department Bulletin 15-255 as a “reportable” use of force. Prior to this time, only the discharge of a firearm was considered reportable.

### ***Documenting the Use of Force:***

Members are required by policy to immediately notify supervisors following a use of force incident, which is then documented and evaluated by the supervisor on scene.

Staff have been working to redesign use of force reporting forms to include all the elements and data fields required by state and local legislation. Once these forms are developed and issued, the Department expects to automate the data collection. One of the key changes beside the automation of the process is that the data/information will be submitted no later than three business days following a use of force incident, compared to the current system which requires reporting on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of every month.

Members of the Risk Management Office (RMO), the unit responsible for tracking and maintaining all data relating to use of force incidents, continue to review data by district stations and specialized units. RMO, which includes staff assigned to the Internal Affairs and the Early Intervention System (EIS) Unit, will review and generate reports relating to the use of force, i.e., under what circumstance was it used, type/level of force, and subject/officer demographics.

Beginning this quarter, detailed use of force reports, including by district and officer, will be generated and forwarded to the Chief of Police and Deputy Chiefs for review. The final reports will be provided to commanding officers for review with district captains and unit supervisors as a means to monitor and identify concerns immediately. The Department is currently looking to partner with university research facilities to conduct analysis of the data when sufficient data exists to conduct comparisons and to look for any trends. The Chief also is developing a program which will allow him to audit station captains monthly on their units’ performance, use of force, stops, and other metrics.

**SEC. 96A.3(b)(1) - TOTAL NUMBER OF USES OF FORCE**

The vast majority of police contacts with members of the public do not result in a use of force. In the third quarter of 2016, the Department responded to 162,150 calls for service. Of the 162,150 contacts during this timeframe, force was used in 318 incidents which represents less than one percent (0.20%) of the Department’s total contacts. During these 318 incidents, 460 Officers reported using force on 430 Subjects resulting in 915 individual documented uses of force.

Uses of Force	July	Aug.	Sept.	Total	Percent
Pointing of Firearms	264	205	161	630	68.8%
Physical Control	50	46	60	156	17.1%
Strike by Object/Fist	24	21	20	65	7.1%
OC	0	3	4	7	0.7%
Impact Weapon	11	5	6	22	2.4%
ERIW	12	3	0	15	1.6%
Carotid	2	2	2	6	0.7%
Vehicle Deflection	0	0	3	3*	0.4%
Firearm	0	0	0	0	0%
Other**	6	3	2	11	1.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*There was one incident of “vehicle deflection” in which there were three occupants of the vehicle

\*\* Other may include being struck by an object, such as a door, or other object

Pointing of a firearm became a reportable use of force beginning in December 2015. During the third quarter of 2016, this type of force accounted for 630 of the total 915 uses of force employed. Pointing of a firearm is only a reportable force option when the weapon is pointed directly at a subject.

During this quarter, six of the 318 incidents occurred outside the city of San Francisco as indicated in the below chart.

<b>Outside SF Use of Force Incidents, 2016 Quarter 3</b>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Call Type</b>	<b>Outside Location</b>
7/12/16	Search Warrant	Pittsburg
7/14/16	Search Warrant	Oakland
9/6/16	Search Warrant	Vallejo
8/2/16	Theft (487/488)	Daly City
8/18/16	Search Warrant	Pinole
9/26/16	Search Warrant	South San Francisco

**SEC. 96A.3(b)(2) Use of Force Resulting in Death**

- During this reporting period, there were **no** incidents where firearm discharges resulted in death to a member of the public or a sworn officer.
  
- Although not a requirement of Chapter 96A.3, the Department will report any intentional discharge of a firearm.
  - During this reporting period, there were no such incidents.

**SEC. 96A.3(b)(3) Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity of Subject**

In evaluating the data for the third quarter of 2016, there were 460 officers who used force in 318 incidents for a total of 915 reportable uses of force. There are several reasons for this including the number of critical incidents in which multiple officers were on scene, such as the July 6 incident on Market and Jones, detailed below, which resulted in 32 reportable uses of force.

On July 6, 2016, a total of thirty two officers had a reportable use of force at one incident (one subject) in the area of Market and Jones Streets. Officers responded to a report of a person experiencing a mental crisis who was armed with a gun. Although the subject displayed the gun on several occasions throughout the eight hour stand-off, officers used less-lethal options, while negotiators engaged the subject. During this one 8-hour incident, thirty two officers documented a reportable use of force, including pointing of a firearm, physical control, and the use of an ERIW.

Race	Pointing Firearm	Physical Control	Strike Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Carotid	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Other	Total
A - Asian or Pac. Islander	35	11	10	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	59
B - Black	340	44	27	4	8	12	2	2	0	9	448
H - Hispanic	100	50	13	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	170
W - White	139	44	15	2	7	2	2	1	0	2	214
U - Unknown	16	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>915</b>
Percent	69%	17%	7%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	

\*\*\*Unknown subjects includes race/ethnicity which was not documented in the report for various reasons, i.e., subject fled, would not provide information.

**Uses of Force by Gender of Subject**

Gender	Pointing Firearm	Physical Control	Strike Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Carotid	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Other	Total
Female	106	20	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	131
Male	519	136	63	5	21	15	6	3	0	11	779
Unknown	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>915</b>
Percent	69%	17%	7%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	

### Uses of Force by Age of Subject

The data indicates that force is used more often on persons between the age of 18 and 29. Force was used 41 times on persons under the age of 18, a statistic the Department will evaluate to ensure the appropriate level of force was used.

Age Group	Pointing Firearm	Physical Control	Strike Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Carotid	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Other	Total
Under 18	29	8	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	<b>41</b>
18-29	250	48	37	3	9	0	2	3	0	5	<b>357</b>
30-39	135	49	10	1	3	13	4	0	0	5	<b>220</b>
40-49	94	31	10	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	<b>140</b>
50-59	82	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>102</b>
Over 60	34	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	<b>39</b>
Unknown	6	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	<b>16</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>915</b>
Percent	69%	17%	7%	1%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	

### Uses of Force by Age of Officer

Age	Officers Using Force	Total Uses of Force	Dept. Demographic
Unknown	1	3	0
22-29	122	239	265
30-39	218	468	636
40-49	93	165	738
50-59	25	39	445
60 and Over	1	1	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>2114</b>

### Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Officer

In comparing the race/ethnicity and gender of officers who used force during this period against the demographics of the Department, there is little variance. Officers may use force more than once in the quarter which explains why the uses of force are higher than the number of officers using force.

Race & Gender	Officers Using Force	Percent	Total Uses of Force	Percent	Dept. Demographic	Percent
Asian Female ***	9	2%	13	1.4%	43	2%
Asian Male ***	81	18%	183	20.1%	429	20%
Black Female	5	1%	7	0.8%	41	2%
Black Male	33	7%	63	6.9%	149	7%
Hispanic Female	8	2%	14	1.5%	54	3%
Hispanic Male	66	14%	124	13.5%	277	13%
Other Female **	1	0%	3	0.3%	6	0%
Other Male **	13	3%	21	2.3%	22	1%
White Female	22	5%	47	5.1%	177	8%
White Male	222	48%	440	48.0%	916	43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2114</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*\* Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and American Indian

\*\*\* Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

### **Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Subject upon whom Force was used**

The number of subjects upon whom force was used is less than the total number of force reported as officers may use more than one type of force on a subject. Example; An officer may first point a firearm at a subject believed to be armed. Once the subject drops the weapon, the officer may then have to resort to physical force to effect the arrest of the subject. Males are more likely to be involved in an incident in which force is used.

<b>Race &amp; Gender</b>	<b>Number of Subjects</b>	<b>Total Uses of Force</b>
Asian Female	7	12
Asian Male	26	47
Black Female	29	51
Black Male	171	397
Hispanic Female	16	32
Hispanic Male	78	138
Unknown Female	1	2
Unknown Male	7	17
White Female	18	34
White Male	76	180
Unknown Race & Gender	1	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>915</b>

### **Uses of Force by Number of Officers and Number of Subjects Involved**

In this quarter, most of the uses of force involved only one subject. However, in incidents where officers anticipate a resistive subject, they will request assistance or wait for additional officers to arrive on scene before attempting to take the subject into custody.

<b>Number of Subjects Involved</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Number of Officers Involved</b>	<b>Total</b>
1 Subject	519	1 Officer	172
2 Subjects	145	2 Officers	249
3 Subjects	80	3 Officers	128
4 Subjects	109	4 Officers	71
5 Subjects	16	5 Officers	42
6 or More Subjects	46	6 or More Officers	253
<b>Total</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>915</b>

## Uses of Force by Call Type

To further evaluate why officers use force, the Department collected data on the type of call for service to which an officer was responding wherein force was used.

Type of Call	Pointing Firearm	Physical Control	Strike Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Carotid	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Other	Total
Part I Violent	168	30	27	1	3	5	3	0	0	4	241
Part I Property	200	16	3	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	224
Person with a Gun	117	6	3	0	0	10	0	0	0	4	140
Person with a Knife	5	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Suspicious Person	46	61	21	0	6	0	1	3	0	2	140
Search Warrant/ Warrant Arrest	58	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	61
Restraining Order Violation	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Terrorist Threats	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Disturbance Calls	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health Related	10	7	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	24
Aided Case	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeless Related Call	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vandalism	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Field Interview	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alarm/ Check on well- being	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Citizen Holding Prisoner	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Demonstration	0	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	10
Person yelling for help	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Traffic-Related	8	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>915</b>

## Uses of Force by Reason

Force is used most often to effect a lawful arrest.

Reason for Use of Force	July	Aug.	Sept.	Total
In defense of others or in self- defense	23	7	1	31
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape	243	215	147	605
To gain compliance with a lawful order	62	66	77	205
To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself, when the person also poses an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury to another life or officer	41	0	33	74
<b>Total</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>915</b>

**SSEC. 96A.3(c) ARRESTS**

The San Francisco Police Department made a total of 5,138 arrests between July 1 and September 30, 2016.

**Sec. 96A.3(c)(1) - Total Number of Arrests****Arrests by District, July-September 2016**

<b>District</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>Aug.</b>	<b>Sept.</b>	<b>Total</b>
Central	228	195	219	642
Southern	217	235	289	741
Bayview	142	140	188	470
Mission	240	277	317	834
Northern	176	185	148	509
Park	50	82	64	196
Richmond	38	76	67	181
Ingleside	88	84	120	292
Taraval	69	100	112	281
Tenderloin	316	337	294	947
Outside SF	21	8	16	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>1719</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>5138</b>

**Sec. 96A.3(c)(2) - Arrest by Race/Ethnicity, Sex, and Age:**

The arrest breakdown is as follows. Unknown is when a subject refused to provide information or information was unavailable.

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>July</b>	<b>Aug.</b>	<b>Sept.</b>	<b>Total</b>
American Indian	10	9	12	31
Asian	112	119	115	346
Black	676	649	711	2036
Hispanic	285	341	400	1026
White	458	555	539	1552
Other	7	7	14	28
Unknown	37	39	43	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>1719</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>5138</b>

### Arrests by Gender, July – September 2016

Gender	July	Aug.	Sept.	Total
Female	303	315	344	962
Male	1274	1399	1477	4150
Other	8	5	13	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>1719</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>5138</b>

### Arrests by Age, July – September 2016

Age	July	Aug.	Sept.	Total
Under 18	61	55	53	169
18-29	566	635	700	1901
30-39	434	451	492	1377
40-49	280	293	298	871
50-59	188	210	218	616
Over 60	49	69	63	181
Missing	7	6	10	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>1585</b>	<b>1719</b>	<b>1834</b>	<b>5138</b>

This executive summary only contains the quarterly totals for the data required by the Administrative Code 96A. For monthly totals by both District Station Use of Force, and Arrests, please see the entire report.