AN ANALYSIS OF 2010
USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS IN THE
MILWAUKEE POLICE DEPARTMENT

REPORT OF THE
FIRE AND POLICE COMMISSION

Prepared by:

Steven G. Brandl, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee,
Criminal Justice Department

Table of Contents

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to provide an analysis of use of force incidents recorded by the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD) from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010. This report is part of a continuing systematic effort that began in 2009 to provide an understanding of the nature, frequency, and circumstances of use of force incidents in the MPD. The report is divided into two main sections: (1) summary baselines and (2) situational characteristics of use of force incidents. The report concludes with recommendations as to how to improve the overall quality and usefulness of the data, as well as a summary of the findings.

The data analyzed here were obtained from the MPD AIM (Administrative Investigations Management) system, which were manually converted to PASW (Predictive Analytic SoftWare) format for analysis.[1] Additional data (e.g., arrest, traffic stop, and subject stop tallies) were obtained from other sources in the MPD. The data in the AIM system are based on the Use of Force Reports that are completed by supervisory officers when a use of force incident occurs. According to MPD General Order 2009-51:

> The *Use of Force Report* shall be completed by a supervisory officer when a Department member: discharges a firearm, uses a baton in the line of duty, discharges an irritant, chemical, or inflammatory agent, deploys an Electronic Control Device, Department canine bites a subject in the performance of their duty, [or] uses any other type of force which results in an injury to a person.

In addition, according to the Order, even if a subject claims to have been injured without those injuries being visible, a report is to be completed.

The database (and reports) contains a comprehensive list of variables on each use of force incident recorded by the MPD. Some data are related directly to the incident (e.g., date of incident, district of incident, number of officers involved in incident) but most of the data are related to the officers (e.g., officer race, officer rank, type of force used by officer, etc.) and

---

[1] This conversion required substantial work and knowledge of the intricacies of the AIM computer system and SPSS software. This conversion was performed by Kristin Kappelman of the Fire and Police Commission.

subjects (e.g., subject age, race, charge, etc.) involved in the incidents. There are separate

variables for each officer (up to five officers) and each subject (up to four subjects) involved in

the incident. To facilitate the analysis, additional variables were manually created based on the

report narratives that were contained within the AIM system.

Frequency of Use of Force Incidents: Summary Baselines

From January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010, there were 529 use of force incidents

recorded by the MPD. Of these 529 incidents, three were accidental discharges of weapons[2] and

15 were for the purpose of euthanizing an injured or diseased animal.[3] As these 18 incidents are

fundamentally different from other use of force incidents in the purpose and intent of the force,

these incidents are excluded from all subsequent analyses. Accordingly, 511 incidents are

analyzed in this report. In addition, of the 511 incidents, 35 involved force being used against

one or more dogs. These incidents are included in most of the aggregate totals analyzed in this

report and they are also analyzed separately (see p. 16).

One of the objectives of this study is to provide baseline statistics on use of force

incidents in order to allow one to monitor changes in patterns, trends, and frequency of use of

force incidents over time. On the basis of the AIM system and other departmental data, several

baseline measures were computed and are discussed here: (1) number of incidents by month, (2)

number of incidents by number of arrests, (3) number of incidents by number of traffic stops, (4)

number of incidents by number of subject stops, (5) number of incidents by city population, and

(6) number of incidents by police district and aldermanic district. Each is discussed below.[4]

---

[2] Two of these incidents involved the accidental discharge of a firearm, one involved an accidental discharge of a Electronic Control Device (ECD).

[3] All of the animals were deer and all of these incidents involved the use of a firearm.

[4] The baseline measures used here have been calculated in other police departments as well; however, comparing use of force baselines across departments is hazardous because practices of recording use of force incidents (as well

Baseline 1: Use of Force by Day/Month

With 511 incidents occurring from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010, there was an average of approximately 1.40 use of force incidents per day. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the incidents by month.

Table 1. Month of Incident

Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
50	30	51	33	53	35	60	31	34	45	52	37	511

Note: No missing data.

As seen in Table 1, there was variation in the frequency of incidents across month but no discernable monthly or seasonal pattern. The mean number of incidents per month was 42.6, with a high of 60 incidents in July and a low of 30 incidents in February. For comparison, in 2009, there were 459 use of force incidents, the equivalent of 1.26 use of force incidents per day.

Baseline 2: Use of Force and Arrests

Because most use of force incidents occur during arrests, it is necessary to consider the number of use of force incidents in relation to the number of arrests made. Further, in this calculation, it is important to include only the use of force incidents that also involved an arrest. Again, from January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010, there were 511 use of force incidents. Of these 511 incidents, 476 involved a person who could have potentially been arrested (the other 35 incidents involved only a dog). Of these 476 incidents where someone could have been

---

as arrests, traffic stops, etc.) are not standard across police departments. In addition, when appropriate, 2010 baseline data are compared to those of 2009.

arrested, in 445 of them, a subject was actually arrested. Also during this period, MPD officers

made a total of 38,641 arrests.[5] Accordingly, for each arrest where force was used, there were

86.8 arrests where force was not used (38,641/445 = 86.8). Overall, an average of approximately

1.15 percent of all arrests involved the use of force (445/38,641 * 100 = 1.15). In contrast, in

2009, approximately 1.07 percent of all arrests involved the use of force (there were 34,707

arrests and 370 of the arrests involved use of force). While there were more use of force

incidents in 2010 than in 2009, there were also more arrests in 2010 than in 2009. As a result,

the percentage of arrests that involved the use of force was essentially the same in 2010 as in

2009.

Interestingly, and as expected, there is a moderately strong correlation between the

number of use of force incidents that involved an arrest and the total number of arrests, by month

($r = .40$; see Table 2). In essence, one can reasonably (but not perfectly) predict the number of

use of force incidents that involved an arrest based on the total number of arrests that were made.

In other words, more arrests translate into more use of force incidents, fewer arrests translate into

fewer use of force incidents.

Table 2. Use of Force Arrest Incidents and Total Number of Arrests Made, by Month

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Number of Use of Force Incidents That Involved an Arrest	47	24	44	31	47	31	48	26	31	42	44	30	445
Total Number of Arrests Made	3048	2841	3902	3378	3521	3271	3479	3330	3154	3011	3037	2669	38641

Note: No missing data.

---

[5] Included here are arrests for felonies, misdemeanors, and ordinance violations.

Baseline 3: Use of Force and Traffic Stops

The third baseline compares the number of use of force incidents that resulted from traffic stops to the total number of traffic stops made by officers. As the overwhelming majority of traffic stops that involved force also involved at least one arrest, it must be understood that these traffic stop tallies are not independent of the arrest statistics discussed in Baseline 2.

In 2010, MPD officers made 192,230 traffic stops and 50 of them involved the use of force. There was minimal meaningful variation or patterns in traffic stops across month or by season. In total, there were 3,845 traffic stops for each traffic stop that involved the use of force (192,230 / 50 = 3,845). Overall, an average of approximately .03 percent of traffic stops involved the use of force (50 / 192,230 *100 = .03). While there was about the same number of traffic stops that involved the use of force in 2010 as in 2009 (50 versus 52), there were substantially more traffic stops in 2010 compared to 2009 (192,230 versus 140,342). For comparison, in 2009, an average of approximately .04 percent of traffic stops involved the use of force.

Baseline 4: Use of Force and Field Interviews

The fourth baseline compares the number of field interviews (subject stops) where force was used to the total number of field interviews conducted by officers. As with traffic stops, the overwhelming majority of field interviews that involved force also involved at least one arrest. As a result, once again, these field interview figures are not independent of the arrest statistics discussed in Baseline 2.

In 2010, MPD officers conducted 47,578 subject stops and 63 of them involved the use of force. Approximately 50 percent of all subject stops occurred in May through September. There were, on average, 755 subject stops for each stop that involved the use of force (47,578 / 63 = 755). Overall, an average of approximately .13 percent of subject stops involved the use of

5

force (63 / 47,578 * 100 = .13). While there were slightly more subject stops that involved the use of force in 2010 than in 2009 (63 versus 53), there were, overall, substantially more subject stops in 2010 compared to 2009 (47,578 versus 27,270). For comparison, in 2009, an average of approximately .19 percent of subject stops involved the use of force.

Based on these data, it is reasonable to conclude that use of force in subject stops is an extremely rare event, and the use of force in traffic stops is even more uncommon. In addition, the proportion of traffic stops and subject stops where force was used was greater in 2009 than it was in 2010.

Baseline 5: Officers Involved in Use of Force Incidents

The 511 use of force incidents that occurred in 2010 involved 408 different MPD officers. In 2010, the MPD employed 1,924 sworn officers (1,762 were police officers, detectives, or sergeants). As such, approximately 21 percent of all MPD officers (408 / 1924 * 100 = 21.2) were involved in at least one use of force incident in 2010. Stated differently, approximately 79 percent of all sworn officers were not involved in any use of force incidents in 2010. In 2009, 80 percent of sworn officers were not involved in any use of force incidents.

Baseline 6: Use of Force and City Population

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the City of Milwaukee had a population of 594,833. Considering the 511 incidents of force in relation to the population of the city, there was, on average, one incident of force for every 1,164 Milwaukee residents in 2010. For comparison, in 2009 there was one incident of force for every 1,259 Milwaukee residents.

Baseline 7: Use of Force and Geographic Location of Incidents

Two variables in the AIM system are related to the geographic location of the incidents: police district (Table 3) and aldermanic district (Table 4). As seen in Table 3, there was substantial variation in the number of use of force incidents across police district. By far, similar to 2009, the largest proportion of use of force incidents occurred in District 7 (31.3%), the smallest proportion occurred in District 1 (2.4%). As for aldermanic district, District 7 had the largest share of use of force incidents (15.3%), while District 11 had the smallest share of incidents (2.2%) (Table 4).

Table 3. Location of Use of Force Incidents: Police District

Police District	Frequency	Percentage
1	12	2.4
2	79	15.7
3	81	16.1
4	71	14.1
5	59	11.7
6	44	8.7
7	158	31.3
Total	504	100.0

Note: Missing data (7 cases) are excluded from the analyses.

Table 4. Location of Use of Force Incidents: Aldermanic District

Aldermanic District	Frequency	Percentage
1	37	7.4
2	41	8.2
3	13	2.6
4	30	6.0
5	15	3.0
6	52	10.4
7	77	15.3
8	20	4.0
9	26	5.2
10	12	2.4
11	11	2.2
12	58	11.6
13	18	3.6
14	16	3.2
15	76	15.1
Total	502	100.0

Note: Missing data (9 cases) are excluded from the analyses.

Given the wide variation in the number of use of force incidents across police district, it is necessary to explore possible corresponding variation in population and arrests across districts. Table 5 shows the total number of arrests, the number of arrests that involved force, the total number of force incidents, and the population of each police district. From these figures, the number of arrests for each use of force arrest and the number of residents for each use of force incident is calculated.

Table 5. Arrests, Population, and Use of Force by Police District

Police District	Total Arrests Made (a)	Number of Use of Force Incidents That Involved an Arrest (b)	Number of Arrests for Each Use of Force Arrest	Total Number of Use of Force Incidents (c)	Population (d)	Number of Residents for Each Use of Force Incident (e)
1	1411	12	117.6	12	42775	3565
2	6302	66	95.5	79	82631	1046
3	7530	73	103.2	81	88155	1088
4	4220	61	69.2	71	94118	1326
5	6469	52	124.4	59	72857	1235
6	2586	37	69.9	44	110944	2521
7	6601	138	47.8	158	105494	668
Total	35119	439	80.0	504	596974	1184

Notes: (a) Total arrests made excludes 3,522 arrests because the arrest could not be placed in a district due to the address of the arrest being unknown or unmatched; (b) 6 missing cases (unknown district); (c) 7 missing cases (unknown district); (d) Population based on 2000 U.S. Census data; (e) figures are rounded.

If use of force incidents were simply and completely a function of arrests made and the size of the population served, one would expect there to be minimal variation across districts in the total number of arrests for each use of force arrest, as well as minimal variation in the number of residents for each use of force incident (i.e., districts that have more arrests would also have more use of force arrests). Clearly, as shown in Table 5, this is not the case; there is substantial variation across police districts in the number of arrests for each use of force arrest, and the number of residents for each use of force incident. Most notable are the figures that correspond to District 7 and District 1. In District 7, there were, on average, 48 arrests for each arrest that involved the use of force (i.e., 2.09% of arrests involved the use of force), and 668 residents for each use of force incident. Contrast these figures with District 1 where there were approximately 118 arrests for each use of force arrest (i.e., .85% of arrests involved the use of

force), and 3,565 residents for each use of force incident. Still, in an absolute and relative sense, the use of force in arrest situations is a very uncommon event, even in District 7.

To further explore this issue, additional analyses were conducted. Table 6 shows the number of traffic stops, field interviews, total police-citizen contacts (traffic stops and field interviews combined), the number of use of force incidents, and the calculated rate of use of force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts (i.e., number of use of force incidents / total police-citizen contacts x 1,000).

Table 6. Use of Force Incidents and Police-Citizen Contacts by Police District

Police District	Traffic Stops (a)	Field Interviews (b)	Total Number of Police-Citizen Contacts	Total Number of Use of Force Incidents (c)	Use of Force Incidents per 1,000 Police-Citizen Contacts
1	12923	3702	16625	12	.72
2	32688	10035	42723	79	1.85
3	33117	9324	42441	81	1.91
4	21231	6500	27731	71	2.56
5	32004	8115	40119	59	1.47
6	22086	2440	24526	44	1.79
7	37110	7413	44523	158	3.55
Total	191159	47529	238688	504	2.11

Notes: (a) 1,071 missing cases (the stop could not be placed in a district due to the address of the stop being unknown or unmatched); (b) 49 missing cases (the interview could not be placed in a district due to the address of the stop being unknown or unmatched); (c) 7 missing cases (unknown district).

Once again, as with Table 5, it is seen that the use of force is the least frequent in District 1 (.72 use of force incidents per 1,000 police citizen contacts) and most frequent in District 7 (3.55 use of force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts). Overall, there were 2.11 use of force incidents per 1,000 police–citizen contacts. For comparison, in 2009, District 7 had 6.05 use of force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts and overall, there were 3.09 use of force

incidents per 1,000 police–citizen contacts. In this regard, the frequency of use of force incidents in relation to police-citizen contacts substantially declined from 2009 to 2010.

Despite the decline in frequency in use of force in relation to police-citizen contacts, and the overall rarity of use of force incidents, on the basis of the analyses presented in Table 5 and Table 6, it appears that in District 7: (a) force is more frequently used in arrest situations, (b) force is more frequently used in relation to the number of persons who reside in the district, compared to other districts, and (c) force is more frequently used in relation to the number of police-citizen contacts, compared to other districts. The possible reasons for this disparity cannot be determined definitively with the data analyzed here.[6]

Situational Characteristics of Use of Force Incidents

Along with providing baseline measures of use of force, the other purpose of this study is to provide an understanding of the circumstances of use of force incidents. The following characteristics of use of force incidents are discussed here: (1) characteristics of officers and subjects involved in use of force incidents, (2) types of force used, (3) citizen complaints resulting from use of force incidents, (4) other characteristics of use of force incidents, and (5) force used against dogs.

Characteristics of Officers and Subjects Involved in Use of Force Incidents

The 511 use of force incidents involved 408 officers. Most incidents (376 out of 511; 73.6%) involved one officer, 29 incidents (out of 511; 5.7%) involved three or more officers. With regard to the number of officers involved in the incidents, 251 officers (61.5%) were

---

[6] Some possible explanations may be that (1) the 3,522 arrests that could not be assigned to districts were not equally distributed across districts, (2) that force is more likely to be used in certain types of arrests (e.g., robbery vs. shoplifting) and that districts vary in terms of the types of arrests made, (3) that citizens are more likely to be combative or resistive in some districts than in others, (4) that officers are more likely to use force in some districts than in others, and/or (5) that force is more likely to be reported by officers in some districts than in others.

involved in just one incident, 94 officers (23.0%) were involved in two incidents, 35 officers (8.6%) were involved in three incidents, and 28 officers (6.9%) were involved in more than three incidents. The most incidents an officer was involved in were eight. These figures are very similar to 2009.

In 93 percent of the incidents, the first officer[7] involved was male, in 73 percent the officer was white, in 95 percent of incidents the officer was in uniform, in 99 percent of the incidents the officer was on duty, and in 85 percent of incidents the officer was assigned to squad patrol. The average (mean) age of the first officer was 35 and the average length of service was nine years. In 16 percent of the incidents, an officer involved in the incident was injured. These characteristics are similar to those in 2009.

The 476 incidents involved 491 subjects.[8] Most incidents (96%; 457 out of 476; 2 cases had missing data) involved just one subject, 19 out of 476 incidents (4.0%) involved two or more subjects. Based on an analysis of subjects' names, eight subjects were involved in multiple incidents.

In 87 percent of the incidents, the first subject involved was male, in 76 percent the subject was Black, in 40 percent the subject was under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, the average age of the first subject was 29 years, and in 92 percent of incidents the subject was injured with the greatest proportion of these injuries classified as "minor." In four incidents, the injuries sustained by the subject were fatal. In 23 percent of incidents, the subject was armed with a weapon. In 79 percent of the incidents the subject had a previous criminal record. In 92 percent of incidents, the officer noted that the subject resisted arrest. These characteristics are similar to those in 2009.

---

[7] Due to the structure of the data, most descriptive statements regarding the officers and subjects relate only to the first officer or subject involved.

[8] Excluded from these analyses are the 35 incidents that involved a dog.

Type of Force Used by Officers

With regard to the type of force used, it is seen in Table 7 that the largest proportion of incidents involved bodily force only, followed by the use of an ECD only, chemical agent only, bodily force and chemical agent, firearm only, and bodily force and ECD.

Table 7. Type of Force Used

Type of Forced Used	Frequency	Percentage
Bodily Force Only	181	35.4
ECD Only	91	17.8
Chemical Agent Only	83	16.2
Firearm Only	44	8.6
Baton Only	2	.4
Bodily Force and Chemical	56	11.0
Bodily Force and ECD	25	4.9
Firearm and ECD	1	.2
Firearm and Chemical	1	.2
Other Combination (no firearm)	27	5.3
Total	511	100.0

Note: No missing data.

In total, 46 incidents (9.0%) involved the use of a firearm,[9] and as discussed below, 34 of these incidents involved a dog (the other incident that involved a dog involved the use of a chemical agent). Clearly, in a relative and absolute sense, the use of a firearm in a use of force incident was a rare event. The most notable changes from 2009 with regard to the type of force used were that the use of chemical agents (as a single category or in combination with other types of force) declined as did the use of a firearm.[10] The use of an ECD (by itself or in combination with other forms of force) increased.[11]

It is worthwhile to note that certain forms of force were more likely than others to lead to "major" or fatal injuries to subjects. Eleven incidents (of the 476 incidents that involved a

---

[9] Pointing or aiming a firearm (or ECD) without discharging the weapon was not a reportable use of force category.
[10] In 2009, 54 incidents (11.8%) involved the use of a firearm. 141 incidents (31%) involved the use of a chemical agent.
[11] In 2009, 65 incidents (14%) involved the use of an ECD.

subject, not a dog) resulted in 11 subjects sustaining major or fatal injuries. Five of these

incidents involved police use of a firearm, 3 involved bodily force, 1 involved a firearm and an

ECD, 1 involved bodily force, a chemical agent, and a baton, and 1 involved bodily force, a

chemical agent, an ECD, and a baton. Analyses also reveal that certain forms of force were more

likely than others to lead to officer injuries. Specifically, officers were more likely to be injured

when using bodily force than when using a chemical agent or an ECD. In addition, the more

officers involved in the incident, the more likely more forms of force were used in the incident

and the more likely that more officers were injured in the incident.

Table 8 shows how firearms were used in use of force incidents. In the rare instance that

a firearm was used, it was most commonly used for the purpose of neutralizing a dog.

Table 8. Incidents Where the Force Used was a Firearm

Target of Firearm	Frequency	Percentage	Result
Dog(s)	34	73.9	31 dogs hit
Subject	12	26.1	8 subjects hit
Total Number of Incidents	46	100.0	--

Note: No missing data.

.   *Citizen Complaints Resulting From Use of Force Incidents*

Of the 511 use of force incidents that occurred in 2010, 22 (4.3%) resulted in a formal

complaint being filed by a citizen with the MPD and/or the Fire and Police Commission. This

compares to 28 complaints (6.1%) in 2009. Statistical tests performed on the data (i.e., Chi-

Square, t-tests, and ANOVA) reveal that complaints were significantly more likely ($p < .05$) to

be filed when the incident involved:

- a person (no complaints were filed in incidents that involved a dog)

- more than one officer

- officers using bodily force

- a traffic stop or an arrest

- a subject who sustained major or fatal injuries as a result of the incident

Other Characteristics of Use of Force Incidents

Along with the situational characteristics of use of force incidents that have already been discussed, three additional characteristics are worthy of mention.   First, as seen in Table 9 (p. 16), most often use of force incidents occurred as a result of officers conducting investigations or while at calls for service, followed by subject stops and traffic stops. As discussed earlier, given the absolute volume of police-citizen contacts in these and other situations, the relative rarity of use of force incidents is significant. Second, the largest proportion of incidents occurred on the street or sidewalk; the overwhelming majority of incidents occurred outside. This is not surprising as most police activity is oriented to the streets. As such, most of these incidents may have occurred in areas accessible to potential eye-witnesses. Finally, approximately equal proportions of use of force incidents occurred at night as during daylight. All of these characteristics are similar to the incidents in 2009.

Table 9. Other Characteristics of Use of Force Incidents

Characteristic	freq	% (a)
Activity That Led to Incident (b)	319	100.0
Investigation/Call for Service	169	53.0
Subject Stop	63	19.7
Traffic Stop	50	15.7
Other	37	11.6
Location of Incident (c)	506	100.0
Street/Sidewalk	230	45.5
Inside-Dwelling	100	19.8
Outside-Yard	67	13.2
Outside-Field/Parking Lot	34	6.7
Outside-Alley	18	3.6
Inside-Public Place	30	5.9
Other	27	5.3
Time/Lighting of Incident (d)	505	99.9
Dark/Night	241	47.7
Light/Daytime	232	45.9
Dusk/Dawn	32	6.3

Notes: (a) Percentages may not tally to 100 due to rounding; (b) 192 missing cases; (c) 5 missing cases (d) 6 missing cases.

Force Used Against Dogs

Of the 511 incidents of force that occurred in 2010, 35 involved force being used against at least one dog. These 35 incidents involved 37 dogs. Thirty-six of the 37 dogs were shot (or were shot at; one was sprayed with a chemical irritant). In total, of the 37 dogs upon which force was used, 27 died.

Of the 37 dogs, the breed of the dog was specified for 35 of them. Of the 35 where the breed was specified, 33 (94%) were Pit Bulls, one (3%) was a Doberman Pinscher and one (3%) was a Bull Mastiff.

16

With regard to the circumstances in which force was used against dogs, the most common was when officers were responding to a call for service, followed by a loose dog complaint, a search warrant situation, and while on patrol (see Table 10). In addition, similar to other use of force incidents, most often one officer used force in the incident (31 of 35 incidents; 88.6%). In two of the 35 incidents, an officer was bit by the dog.

Table 10. Circumstance of Incidents Where Force was Used against Dogs

Circumstance	Frequency	Percentage
Call for Service/Investigation	20	57.1
Loose Dog Complaint	10	28.6
Search Warrant	3	8.6
On Patrol	2	5.7
TOTALS	35	100.0

Unfortunately, it is difficult to put these incidents into perspective as no reliable estimates of the number of dogs, by breed, in Milwaukee were located, nor are there statistics that indicate the number of dogs that are confronted by MPD officers but are not shot.

Data Recommendations

The Use of Force Reports and the AIM system provide a good method for recording and storing details on use of force incidents. Since 2009, numerous significant improvements have been made that enhance the value and usefulness of these data. In particular, the amount of missing data in the file has decreased substantially and the completeness of the narratives associated with the reports has greatly improved. However, several additional changes could be made to enhance the usefulness of the data for analysis purposes. These recommendations pertain only to specific data collection procedures and do not suggest or identify any department policy or procedural recommendations concerning the broader scope of how or when officers should use force.

First, that the database was organized with the use of force incident as the unit of analysis caused certain challenges when attempting to analyze the characteristics of officers and subjects. For example, through the manual manipulation of the data, it was possible to determine the number of officers who were involved in multiple incidents; however, with regard to the characteristics of officers, the analyses were usually limited to the officer identified as the "first officer" in the database. That is because each officer (and the characteristics of each officer) involved in the incident was coded as a separate variable (e.g., officer 1, officer 2, officers 3, etc.). In one incident, a particular officer may have been listed as officer 1, in another incident that same officer might have been listed as officer 2, and in another incident that officer might have been listed as officer 3, etc. As a result, when analyzing the data, it would be possible for a single officer (and the characteristics of that officer) to be represented multiple times in summary statements. That, of course, would lead to inaccurate conclusions. Accordingly, it would be worthwhile to construct and analyze a separate database with officers as the unit of analysis (as opposed to incidents as the unit of analysis). In such a database, every officer in the department would be listed and associated data on each officer would be included. The data would include background characteristics of the officers along with the number of use of force incidents each officer was involved in during the year, number and type of arrests each officer made, the district/shift to which the officer was assigned, and any other pertinent data related to the officer.

Second, several modifications should be made to how the data are coded. With regard to officer and subject injuries, for each officer and subject injured in each incident, separate variables/fields that specify the nature of the most serious injury sustained should be included.[12] With regard to the force used in the incident, the first and last type of force used in the incident should be specified as separate variables/fields. These additions will allow for an examination of

---

[12] Nature of the most serious injury could be defined with the following values: (1) sprain/strain (2) tore ligaments/tendons (3) other muscle/joint pain (4) cut, puncture, abrasion, laceration (5) bruise, black eye, contusion (6) broken bones, dislocations, broken teeth (7) other pain (8) eye/ respiratory issues, (9) human bite (10) dog bite (11) contact with infectious disease (12) knife wound (13) gun shot wound (14) other.

the efficacy of the various forms of force in relation to officer and suspect injuries. Also for analysis purposes, it would be useful to have accurate and up-to-date data on officer height and weight, and more complete data on subject height and weight. These improvements could allow for a more complete and detailed understanding of use of force in the MPD.

Summary

This report is part of a continuing effort to better understand use of force incidents in the Milwaukee Police Department. Based on an analysis of the 511 incidents that occurred between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2010, the following summary statements can be made:

- There was an average of 1.40 use of force incidents per day in 2010.

- There were 86.8 arrests for every one arrest that involved the use of force.

- Approximately 1.15 percent of arrests involved the use of force.

- There were 3,845 traffic stops for each traffic stop that involved the use of force.

- Approximately .03 percent of traffic stops involved the use of force.

- There were 755 subject stops for each subject stop that involved force.

- Approximately .13 percent of subject stops involved the use of force.

- Approximately 21 percent of MPD sworn officers were involved in at least one use of force incident in 2010.

- There was one incident of force for every 1,164 persons in Milwaukee in 2010.

- The largest proportion of use of force incidents in 2010 occurred in Police District 7 (31.3%) and in Aldermanic District 6 (10.4%).

- There was substantial variation across police districts in the number of arrests for each use of force arrest, in the number of residents for each use of force incident, and in the number of use of force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts. In spite of this variation, use of force was a rare event in all districts.

- The 511 use of force incidents involved 408 officers. Approximately 62 percent of these officers were involved in just one incident; approximately nine percent of the officers were involved in three or more incidents.

- The most common type of force was bodily force only (35.4%) followed by ECD only (17.8%) and chemical agent only (16.2%).

- Forty-six incidents (9%) involved a firearm; in 34 of these incidents (73.9%) the firearm was used to shoot a dog(s).

- Of the 511 use of force incidents, in 22 a complaint was filed. Complaints were more likely to be filed when a person was involved, more than one officer was involved, where bodily force was used, when the subject sustained major or fatal injuries, and when the incident resulted from a traffic stop or an arrest.

- Approximately seven percent of incidents (35 of 511) involved force being used against one or more dogs. Most of the dogs were Pit Bulls and the largest proportion of incidents were related to a call for service.

Based on the analyses conducted here, the typical use of force incident:

- Involved one uniformed police officer and one subject. The officer was a white male, 35 years old, with nine years of service. The officer was not injured as a result of the incident. The subject was a Black male with a previous record. The subject was not armed with a weapon. The subject resisted arrest and sustained "minor" injuries as a result of the incident.

- The incident most likely involved the officer using "bodily force only" against the subject. The incident related to a call for service/investigation and occurred on the street/sidewalk at night. The incident did not result in a complaint being filed with the MPD or the Fire and Police Commission.

This study provides information for understanding and interpreting the nature, frequency, and circumstances of use of force incidents in the MPD. The study also provides useful information on data collection practices concerning use of force incidents. These data can be used to compare baseline metrics to monitor use of force incidents.