

THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
ADMINISTRATIVE CODE CHAPTER 96A
Use of Force and Arrest Report per 96A.3
First Quarter 2017
January 1, 2017 to March 31, 2017

EXECUTIVE 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 (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, or age) 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 late-spring 2017.

As part of our continued efforts to rebuild the community's trust, the Department continues to train all sworn members in fair and impartial policing strategies focusing on procedural justice and implicit bias. Coupled with the updated training in use of force tactics that emphasize proportionality and the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) philosophy, officers are being equipped with the tools and knowledge to assess and de-escalate situations for the preservation of life.

As required under Administrative Code 96A, Law Enforcement Reporting Requirements, the Police Department is submitting this report under Sec. 96A.3, for the first quarter of 2017 (January, February, March). The report contains information relating to Arrests and Use of Force, including the following information:

Sec. 96A.3.

- (b) 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) 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

The Department continues 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 705 sworn and 19 non-sworn personnel, as well as four clinicians from the Department of Public Health in the updated training curriculum as of March 2017. Included in this number are probationary and veteran officers, as well as members of the Command staff. As the CIT program moves forward, the goal of the Department is to provide this 40-hour CIT training to all members, including recruit police officers after graduation from the Academy. The program focuses on a team deployment concept throughout all districts and instills the importance of the guardian mentality during public contacts. All field training sergeants and officers will complete this training by the end of June.

Following the creation and implementation in January 2017 of Department General Order 5.21, the Crisis Intervention Team Response to Person in Crisis Calls for Service, the Department continues to work in close partnership with City agencies and community stakeholders in the development of the CIT training program, including the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), The Mayors Officer on Disability Counsel, San Francisco Mental Health Association, the Homeless Coalition, District Attorney's Witness and Victim Program, and the San Francisco Public Defender's Office among other advocates and associations. The CIT policy can be viewed on our website at <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/dgo>.

In addition, in February 2017, officers began training in the Crisis Intervention, Use of Force, and De-escalation Field Tactics class which trains officers on the elements contained in the updated Department General Order, 5.01, Use of Force. Currently, 380 officers have completed this 20-hour course with the goal of training all members by the end of the year.

The Department recently established an agreement with the City's Department of Public Health (DPH) to provide support to officers in the field who are responding to crises where behavioral health concerns may be present. The DPH Behavioral Crisis Intervention Specialist Team was established as a result of an initiative from the Mayor's office. This collaboration currently is in the observation and training period as the two agencies coordinate the efforts, logistics, and protocols of deployment of the specialists to provide on-scene support during crisis situations.

Policy:

The use of force by members is regulated through policies established according to local, state, and federal mandates. Following an arduous and thorough process, in collaboration with community stakeholders, updated Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force, was approved by the Police Commission on December 21, 2016. The complete policy is available on our website at <http://sanfranciscopolice.org/dgo>.

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:

Officers shall strive to use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.

- A. *Low Level Force.*** The level of control necessary to interact with a subject who is or displaying passive or active resistance. This level of force is not intended to and has a low probability of causing injury.
- B. *Intermediate Force.*** This level of force poses a foreseeable risk of significant injury or harm, but is neither likely nor intended to cause death. Intermediate force will typically only be acceptable when officers are confronted with active resistance and a threat to the safety of officers or others. Case law decisions have specifically identified and established that certain force options such as OC spray, impact projectiles, K-9 bites, and baton strikes are classified as intermediate force likely to result in significant injury.
- C. *Deadly Force.*** Any use of force substantially likely to cause serious bodily injury or death, including but not limited to the discharge of a firearm, the use of an impact weapon under some circumstances, other techniques or equipment, and certain interventions to stop a subject's vehicle, such as vehicle deflections.

Force Options:

The force options authorized by the Department are physical controls, personal body weapons, chemical agents, impact weapons, extended range impact weapons, vehicle interventions, K-9 bites and firearms. These are the force options available to officers, but officers are not required to use these force options based on a continuum. While deploying a particular force option and when feasible, officers shall continually evaluate whether the force option may be discontinued while still achieving the arrest or lawful objective.

The following tools and techniques are not in a particular order nor are they all inclusive.

- Verbal Commands/Instructions/Command Presence
- Control Holds/Takedowns
- Impact Weapons
- Chemical Agents (Pepper Spray, OC, etc.)

- K-9 (Dog) Bite
- Vehicle Intervention (Deflection)
- Personal Body Weapons.
- Firearms
- Impact Projectile

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. Use of force reporting and evaluation forms have been redesigned to include all the elements and data fields required by state and local legislation. These forms were issued on January 9, 2017, and must be submitted by the end of watch following a use of force incident.

Staff assigned to the Risk Management Office (RMO) are responsible for tracking and maintaining all data relating to use of force incidents. They continue to review data by district stations and specialized units. RMO, which includes the Internal Affairs Division and the Early Intervention System Unit (EIS), collects and analyzes the use of force data, i.e., under what circumstance it was used, type/level of force, and subject/ officer demographics, which will be posted on the Department's website.

Detailed use of force reports, including by district and officer, are generated and forwarded to the Chief of Police and Deputy Chiefs for review. The final reports are provided to commanding officers for review with district captains and unit supervisors as a means to monitor and identify concerns immediately.

At the Chief's direction, work continues on developing a program which will expand on existing processes to audit station captains monthly on their unit's performance, use of force, stops, and other metrics with the intent of providing comprehensive and concise data in a timely manner.

The Department is currently looking to partner with a research/academic institution to perform in-depth analysis of the data.

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

To summarize the supporting data, during the first quarter of 2017, the Department responded to 161,648 calls for service. Of those contacts, force was used in 352 incidents representing less than 1 percent (0.22%) of total contacts. In total, there were 802 uses of force reported by 444 officers against a total of 427 subjects. This represents a 15.8 percent decrease in the number of reportable uses of force when compared to the first quarter of 2016. There were 5,764 arrests during the first quarter of 2017.

Uses of Force, First Quarter Comparison, 2016 vs. 2017

Month	Number of Uses of Force		Percent Change
	Jan - Mar 2016	Jan - Mar 2017	
January	289	207	-28.4%
February	396	314	-20.7%
March	267	281	+5.2%
Total	952	802	-15.8%

San Francisco Police Officers Assaulted, First Quarter Comparison, 2016 vs. 2017

Month	Officers Assault		Percent Change
	Jan - Mar 2016	Jan - Mar 2017	
January	27	13	-51.9%
February	31	14	-54.8%
March	22	17	-22.7%
Total	80	44	-45.0%

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (2) USE OF FORCE RESULTING IN DEATH

On March 11, 2017 Officers responded to a call of a male subject breaking windows and harming himself. When officers arrived, the subject was bleeding. Officers used physical control to detain the subject and perform life-saving actions. The subject was transported to SFGH. On March 24, 2017 the subject passed away. The Department is conducting an investigation to determine if the death was related to the use of force.

Incident: In-Custody Death

Case #	Victim Name	Race/Sex	Date	Time	Location
170-202-463	Margo-Carlos, A.	H/M	03/11/17	8:27 pm	2200 Market Street
Original Call:			Officers using force		Total # of Uses of Force
Altered mental status			3		3

Although not a requirement of Chapter 96A.3, the following incident occurred resulting in injury to a person on whom an officer used force. During this incident, two officers received non-life threatening injuries.

Incident: Firearm Discharge

Injury: Non-life threatening

Case #	Victim Name	Race/Sex	Date	Time	Location
170-014-484	S. Moore	B/M	01/06/17	3:51 am	515 Capitol Street, SF
Original Call:			Officers using force		Total # of Uses of Force
Noise complaint/Restraining order violation			4		5

SEC. 96A.3 (b) (3) USE OF FORCE BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND GENDER OF SUBJECT

In the first quarter of 2017, 36% of the total uses of force were against Black Male subjects who made up 31% of the arrestees, 21% of the total uses of force were against White Males who made up 24% of the arrestees, and 19% of the total uses of force were against Hispanic Males who made up 19% of the arrestees.

Race & Gender	Pointing of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERIW	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Total Uses of Force	%
Asian Female	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	<1%
Asian Male	26	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	4%
Black Female	35	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	45	6%
Black Male	204	59	12	1	9	1	0	1	287	36%
Hispanic Female	20	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	4%
Hispanic Male	105	38	9	0	1	0	0	0	153	19%
White Female	24	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	37	5%
White Male	81	74	7	3	2	1	1	0	169	21%
Unknown Female	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	<1%
Unknown Male	24	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	5	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	1%
Total	531	215	29	7	14	4	1	1	802	100%
Percent	66%	27%	4%	1%	2%	<1%	<1%	<1%	100%	

*Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander. **Includes ethnicity outside of DOJ definitions

***Unknown race or ethnicity was not documented in report for various reasons (i.e. suspect fled and race was not known)

Use of Force by Age of Subject, First Quarter Comparison 2016 vs. 2017

Age	Total Uses of Force		
	Jan - Mar 2016	Jan - Mar 2017	% change
Under 18	80	50	-38%
18-29	405	302	-25%
30-39	250	230	-8%
40-49	128	104	-19%
50-59	69	76	10%
Over 60	12	21	75%
Unknown	8	19	138%
Total	952	802	-16%

Uses of Force by Race/Ethnicity and Gender of Officer, First Quarter 2017

In comparing the race/ethnicity and gender of officer who used force during this period against the demographics of the Department, there is little variance.

Race & Gender	Officers Using Force			Total Uses of Force			Dept. Demographic
	Q1 2016	Q1 2017	% change	Q1 2016	Q1 2017	% change	
Asian Female ***	4	5	25%	11	10	-9%	43
Asian Male ***	59	66	12%	179	112	-37%	429
Black Female	3	5	67%	18	8	-56%	41
Black Male	9	30	233%	41	58	41%	149
Hispanic Female	8	4	-50%	14	4	-71%	54
Hispanic Male	45	68	51%	143	122	-15%	277
Other Female **	1	1	0	2	1	-0.5	6
Other Male **	5	15	200%	13	26	100%	22
White Female	14	23	64%	56	29	-48%	177
White Male	118	227	92%	475	432	-9%	916
Total	266	444	67%	952	802	-16%	2114

** 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.

Race & Gender	Number of Subjects			Total Uses of Force		
	Q1 2016	Q1 2017	% change	Q1 2016	Q1 2017	% change
Asian Female	5	3	-40%	21	4	-81%
Asian Male	19	22	16%	36	33	-8%
Black Female	29	22	-24%	66	45	-32%
Black Male	174	143	-18%	379	287	-24%
Hispanic Female	11	14	27%	36	31	-14%
Hispanic Male	85	84	-1%	198	153	-23%
Unknown Female	0	3	not calc	0	4	not calc
Unknown Male	9	12	33%	15	30	100%
White Female	18	18	0%	36	37	3%
White Male	85	98	15%	162	169	4%
Unknown Race & Gender	2	8	300%	3	9	200%
Total	437	427	-2%	952	802	-16%

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Officers Involved, First Quarter 2016 vs. 2017

Number of Officers Involved	Number of Incidents		% Change
	Jan - Mar 2016	Jan - Mar 2017	
1	175	177	1.1%
2	110	109	-0.9%
3	30	38	26.7%
4	18	13	-27.8%
5	8	7	-12.5%
6	5	3	-40.0%
7	2	3	50.0%
8	0	1	not calc.
9	0	1	not calc.
10	1	0	-100.0%
11	0	0	0.0%
12	1	0	-100.0%
Totals	350	352	

Uses of Force Incidents by Number of Subjects Involved, 1st Quarter 2016 vs. 2017

Number of Subjects Involved	Number of Incidents		% Change
	Jan - Mar 2016	Jan - Mar 2017	
1	288	297	3.1%
2	40	36	-10.0%
3	15	13	-13.3%
4	4	4	0.0%
5	1	1	0.0%
6	2	1	-50.0%
Totals	350	352	

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.

Types of Force by Call Type, First Quarter 2017

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 of Firearms	Physical Control	Strike by Object/Fist	OC	Impact Weapon	ERW	Vehicle Deflection	Firearm	Total	% of Calls
Part I Violent	102	54	9	3	9	1	0	0	178	22.2%
Part I Property	157	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	173	21.6%
Person with a Gun (221)	96	10	1	0	0	2	0	0	109	13.6%
Person with a Knife (219)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1.2%
Suspicious Person (311/811/601/603/916/917)	41	48	8	2	2	0	1	0	102	12.7%
Search Warrant/Warrant Arrest	39	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	49	6.1%
Restraining Order Violation	4	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	10	1.2%
Terrorist Threats (650)	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1.6%
Mental Health Related (5150/800/801)	9	28	4	0	1	1	0	0	43	5.4%
Homeless Related Call (915/919)	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.4%
Vandalism (594)	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0.7%
Alarm/Check on well-being (100/910)	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.4%
Traffic-Related	17	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	31	3.9%
Field Interview (909)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.2%
Disturbance Calls (415/417)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0.2%
Aided Case (520)	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	1.4%
Prostitution (647B)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.2%
Recovered Stolen Vehicle (853)	31	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	4.2%
Weapon, Carrying concealed with felony or narcotics conviction	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1.2%
Death Case (802)	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1.2%
Prisoner Transportation (407)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1%
Total	531	215	29	7	14	4	1	1	802	100%

Uses of Force by Reason, First Quarter 2017

Force is used most often to effect a lawful arrest.

Reason for Use of Force	Jan	Feb	Mar	Total
To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, or to prevent escape	140	232	217	589
To gain compliance with a lawful order	48	66	56	170
In defense of others or in self-defense	13	8	2	23
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	6	6	5	17
To prevent the commission of a public offense	0	2	1	3
Total	207	314	281	802

SEC. 96A.3(c) ARRESTS

Arrests that occurred within the City and County of San Francisco by SFPD members are shown below.

SEC. 96A.3(c) (1) – TOTAL NUMBER OF ARRESTS (BY DISTRICT)

District	January - March 2016	January - March 2017	% change
Co. A - Central	722	643	-10.9%
Co. B - Southern	744	851	14.4%
Co. C - Bayview	503	541	7.6%
Co. D - Mission	813	908	11.7%
Co. E - Northern	544	559	2.8%
Co. F - Park	260	221	-15.0%
Co. G - Richmond	140	242	72.9%
Co. H - Ingleside	360	458	27.2%
Co. I - Taraval	314	395	25.8%
Co. J - Tenderloin	1049	895	-14.7%
Outside SF*	106	51	-51.9%
Total	5555	5764	3.8%

*Arrests made by SFPD officers as part of an SFPD case, i.e., search warrant. Jurisdictions include Oakland, Vallejo, Antioch, San Leandro, Fremont, and South San Francisco.

SEC. 96A.3(c) (2) – ARREST BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND GENDER.

First Quarter Comparison, 2016 vs. 2017

Race and Gender	January - March 2016	January - March 2017	% change
Asian Female***	82	91	11.0%
Asian Male***	299	282	-5.7%
Black Female	412	424	2.9%
Black Male	1778	1791	0.7%
Black Unknown	3	3	0.0%
Hispanic Female**	144	215	49.3%
Hispanic Male**	932	1069	14.7%
Hispanic Unknown	0	3	not calc.
White Female	341	324	-5.0%
White Male	1390	1374	-1.2%
White Unknown	1	2	100.0%
Unknown Male	137	151	10.2%
Unknown Female	25	27	8.0%
Unknown Unknown	11	8	-27.3%
Total	5555	5764	3.8%

** Includes ethnicity outside DOJ definitions and American Indian/ *** Asian includes Asian and Pacific Islander

SEC. 96A.3(c) (2) – ARRESTS BY AGE**Arrests by Age, First Quarter Comparison, 2016 vs. 2017**

Age	January - March 2016	January - March 2017	% change
Under 18	155	244	57.4%
18-29	1954	2119	8.4%
30-39	1550	1590	2.6%
40-49	1034	966	-6.6%
50-59	622	614	-1.3%
Over 60	240	229	-4.6%
Unknown	0	2	not cacl.
Total	5555	5764	3.8%

SEC. 96A.3(c) (1) – TOTAL NUMBER OF ARRESTS AT San Francisco INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

It is important to note that arrests made by SFPD members at San Francisco International Airport are reported as part of San Mateo County data and are therefore not included in the City totals. However, during this quarter, Department members made 87 arrests at the Airport which are investigated by San Mateo. Details are summarized below.

Airport Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, First Quarter 2017

Race	Total	%
Asian	19	21.8%
Black	25	28.7%
Hispanics	4	4.6%
White	30	34.5%
Other	9	10.3%
Total	87	100%

Airport Arrests by Gender, First Quarter 2017

Gender	Total	%
Females	24	27.6%
Males	63	72.4%
Total	87	100%

Airport Arrests by Age, First Quarter 2017

Age	Total	%
Under 18	0	0%
18-29	20	23%
30-39	28	32%
40-49	17	20%
50-59	12	14%
Over 60	10	11%
Unknown	0	0%
Total	87	100%

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.