AN ANALYSIS OF 2013 USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS IN THE MILWAUKEE POLICE DEPARTMENT

REPORT OF THE
FIRE AND POLICE COMMISSION

200 East Wells Street
City Hall, Room 706A
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 286-5000

Website: http://www.milwaukee.gov/fpc

February 6, 2015

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, 2013 to December 31, 2013. 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. 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. The report is divided into two main sections: (1) summary baselines and (2) situational characteristics of use of force incidents. The report concludes with data recommendations and a summary of the findings.

The data analyzed here were obtained from the MPD Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) System database. The AIM system contains a comprehensive list of variables on each use of force incident recorded by the MPD. The data relate directly to the incident (e.g., date of incident, district of incident, types of force used in the incident) as well as the officers (e.g., officer race, officer rank) and subjects (e.g., subject age, race, charge) involved in the incident. There are separate variables for each officer and each subject involved in the incident. The AIM system data were manually converted to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis.[1]

Along with the entry of data into the AIM system for each use of force incident, narrative descriptions of each incident were also written by supervisory officers at the time of the incident. These reports contained information obtained from the officers involved as well as the subject and other witnesses, if available. In preparing this report, these narratives were reviewed and used to verify and, in some cases, supplement the AIM system data. The narratives for 2013

---

[1] This conversion was performed by Bridget Winters of the Fire and Police Commission and Sgt. Michelle Pagan of the Police Department.

comprised 2,156 pages of text. Additional data on the number of arrests, traffic stops, and

subject stops made by MPD officers were obtained separately from the MPD.

As noted, 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 Use

of Force policy 460.35:

> 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, to include non-contact spark display, contact stun, and probe deployment; Department canine bites a person; forcible blood draws requiring use of force to obtain a sample where a subject claims injury or is injured as a result of police action; uses bodily force that involves focused strikes, diffused strikes, or decentralizations to the ground; uses any type of force in which a person is injured or claims injury, whether or not the injury is immediately visible.

This policy was put into place January 1, 2013. Under this policy, incidents that involved

"bodily force only" without injury or complaint of injury from the subject are now required to be

documented, where previously they were not. As a result of this policy change, much of the data

analyzed here is not comparable to the data analyzed prior to 2013. Only when appropriate is

pre-2013 data compared to current 2013 data.

Frequency of Use of Force Incidents: Summary Baselines

From January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013, there were 930 use of force incidents

recorded by the MPD. Of these 930 incidents, 9 were accidental[2] and 26 were for the purpose of

euthanizing an injured or diseased animal.[3] As these 35 incidents are fundamentally different

---

[2] Five of these incidents involved the accidental discharge of a firearm, 3 involved an accidental discharge of an Electronic Control Device (ECD; Taser), and 1 involved a department canine biting a subject.

[3] Twenty-four of these incidents involved deer, 1 incident involved a raccoon, and 1 incident involved a dog. All of these incidents involved the use of a firearm.

from other use of force incidents in the purpose and intent of the force, these incidents are excluded from all subsequent analysis. Accordingly, 895 incidents are analyzed in this report. In addition, of the 895 incidents, 26 involved force being used against one or more dogs (two of these incidents also involved force being used against another subject). These incidents are included in most of the aggregate totals analyzed in this report and they are also analyzed separately (see p.18).

On the basis of the AIM system and other departmental data, several baseline measures were computed and are discussed here: (1) number of incidents per day and per month (2) number of incidents in relation to number of arrests, (3) number of incidents in relation to number of traffic stops, (4) number of incidents in relation to number of subject stops, (5) number of incidents in relation to city population, and (6) number of incidents in each police district and aldermanic district. Each is discussed below.[4]

Baseline 1: Use of Force by Day/Month

With 895 incidents occurring from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013, there was an average of approximately 2.45 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
77	72	77	95	93	95	84	74	60	62	65	41	895

Note: No missing data.

---

[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 defining and recording use of force incidents (as well as arrests, traffic stops, etc.) are not standard across police departments.

As seen in Table 1, April, May, and June had the largest number of incidents. There was also a notable decline in incidents beginning in September and continuing through the end of the year. The mean number of incidents department-wide was 74.6 per month.

Given the decline in use of force incidents during the September to December timeframe, additional analyses were conducted to see if this same pattern existed across each of the seven police districts. Table 2 shows the number of use of force incidents by month and by district.

Table 2. Use of Force Incidents by Month, by District

Month	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Total
Jan	1	9	17	10	6	5	28	76
Feb	1	8	11	8	18	6	20	72
March	2	8	11	11	13	6	25	76
April	1	14	15	10	13	6	35	94
May	2	20	18	9	12	6	26	93
June	2	17	16	7	23	5	24	94
July	3	18	20	5	14	3	21	84
Aug	7	14	19	2	15	4	13	74
Sept	3	9	9	8	11	3	17	60
Oct	4	12	13	8	11	5	9	62
Nov	3	5	15	4	15	4	16	62
Dec	4	4	10	2	7	5	8	40
Total	33	138	174	84	158	58	242	887

Note: Missing data (8 cases; unknown district) are excluded from the analyses.

Inspection of Table 2 shows that were, on average, fewer use of force incidents each month from September through December, compared to January through August, in each police district except for District 1. The greatest decline (mean difference calculated as a percentage) was in District 7 (from January through August there were, on average, 24 incidents a month; from September to December there were 12.5 incidents per month). The smallest decline

4

occurred in District 6. It is not clear why District 7 experienced a larger decline than the other districts.

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, 2013 to December 31, 2013, there were 895 use of force incidents. Of these 895 incidents, 871 involved a person who could have potentially been arrested (24 incidents involved only a dog; 2 incidents involved a subject and a dog). Of these 871 incidents where someone could have been arrested, in 851 of them a subject was actually arrested. Also during this period, MPD officers made a total of 30,542 arrests (for felonies, misdemeanors, and ordinance violations). Accordingly, for each arrest where force was used, there were approximately 36 arrests where force was not used (30,542/851 = 35.9). Overall, an average of 2.79 percent of all arrests involved the use of force (851/30,542 * 100 = 2.79).

Interestingly, and as expected, there is a strong correlation between the number of force incidents that involved an arrest and the total number of arrests, by month ($r = .68$; see Table 3). In essence, one can reasonably (but not perfectly) predict the number 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. Not only were there, on average, fewer force incidents in the last quarter of the year (Tables 1 and 2), but also fewer arrests, especially in December (Table 3). A likely explanation for the overall decline in force incidents and arrests (and also likely crime incidents) is the unusually cold weather during those months.

Table 3. 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	77	69	73	88	87	91	83	69	55	62	60	37	851
Total Number of Arrests Made	2761	2561	2680	2742	2885	2508	2547	2831	2747	2503	2081	1696	30542

Note: No missing data.

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 2013, MPD officers made 187,814 traffic stops and 67 of them involved the use of force. In total, there were approximately 2,803 traffic stops for each traffic stop that involved the use of force (187,814 / 67 = 2,803.2). Overall, an average of approximately .04 percent of traffic stops involved the use of force (67 / 187,814 *100 = .04).

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 2013, MPD officers conducted 61,429 subject stops and 117 of them involved the use of force. There were, on average, 525 subject stops for each stop that involved the use of force (61,429 / 117 = 525.0). Overall, an average of approximately .19 percent of subject stops involved the use of force (117 / 61,429 * 100 = .19). 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.

Baseline 5: Officers Involved in Use of Force Incidents

The 895 use of force incidents that occurred in 2013 involved 668 different MPD officers. In 2013, the MPD employed 1,829 sworn officers. As such, approximately 37 percent of all MPD officers (668 / 1829 * 100 = 36.5) were involved in at least one use of force incident in 2013. In other words, approximately 63 percent of all sworn officers were not involved in any use of force incidents in 2013.

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 895 incidents of force in relation to the population of the city, there was, on average, one incident of force for every 665 Milwaukee residents in 2013.

Baseline 7: Use of Force and Geographic Location of Incidents

Two variables are related to the geographic location of the incidents: police district (Table 4) and aldermanic district (Table 5). As seen in Table 4 and as noted earlier, there was substantial variation in the number of use of force incidents across police district. By far, similar to previous years, the largest proportion of use of force incidents occurred in District 7 (27.3%), while the smallest proportion occurred in District 1 (3.7%). As for aldermanic district, District

15 and District 7 had the largest share of use of force incidents (14.1% each), while District 3

had the smallest share of incidents (2.0%) (see Table 5).

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

Police District	Frequency	Percentage
1	33	3.7
2	138	15.6
3	174	19.6
4	84	9.5
5	158	17.8
6	58	6.5
7	242	27.3
Total	887	100.0

Note: Missing data (8 cases) are excluded from the analyses.

Table 5. Location of Use of Force Incidents: Aldermanic District

Aldermanic District	Frequency	Percentage
1	65	7.4
2	60	6.8
3	18	2.0
4	78	8.8
5	23	2.6
6	111	12.6
7	125	14.1
8	40	4.5
9	34	3.8
10	49	5.5
11	20	2.3
12	86	9.7
13	20	2.3
14	30	3.4
15	125	14.1
Total	884	99.9

Note: Missing data (11 cases) are excluded from the analyses; percentage does not sum to 100 due to rounding.

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 6 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 6. 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	1221	29	42.1	33	47807	1449
2	5309	128	41.5	138	85671	620
3	5909	169	35.0	174	82030	471
4	3893	78	49.9	84	94295	1123
5	5041	150	33.6	158	67841	429
6	2484	53	46.9	58	114117	1968
7	6035	236	25.6	242	102336	423
Total	29892	843	--	887	594097	--

Notes: (a) Total arrests made excludes 650 arrests because the arrest could not be placed in a district due to the address of the arrest being unknown or unmatched; (b) 8 missing cases (unknown district); (c) 8 missing cases (unknown district); (d) Population based on 2010 U.S. Census data as reported in the "Milwaukee Police District Statistics" web site, the total district population does not equal the city population reported by the 2010 U.S. Census; (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., police districts that have more arrests would also have more force incidents; police districts that have more population would have more force incidents). Clearly, as shown in Table 6, 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. In previous years, the figures for District 7 clearly stood out from the other districts; in District 7, the "number of arrests for each use of force arrest" and the "number of residents for each use of force incident" was substantially higher than in the other districts. However, in the present analyses it is seen that the figures that correspond to District 7 are not substantially different from those of Districts 3 and 5, although District 7 still shows the greatest number of use of force incidents in relation to number of arrests and number of residents. Nevertheless, in an absolute and relative sense, the use of force in arrest situations is a very uncommon event, even in Districts 3, 5, and 7.

To further explore this issue, additional analyses were conducted. Table 7 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 7. 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	1121	358	1479	33	22.31
2	13824	6179	20003	138	6.90
3	31784	9239	41023	174	4.24
4	24997	10835	35832	84	2.34
5	23387	10204	33591	158	4.70
6	30744	9017	39761	58	1.46
7	21529	6268	27797	242	8.71
Total	147386	52100	199486	887	7.24 (mean)

Notes: (a) 40,428 missing cases (the stop could not be placed in a district due to the address of the stop being unknown or unmatched); (b) 9,329 missing cases (the interview could not be placed in a district due to the address of the stop being unknown or unmatched); (c) 8 missing cases (unknown district).

Table 7 shows that, in relation to traffic stops and field interviews, use of force is most frequent in District 1 (22.31 use of force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts) compared to other districts. District 7 ranks second on this basis with 8.71 force incidents per 1,000 police-citizen contacts. However, the substantial number of missing cases for traffic stops and field interviews limits the ability to draw valid conclusions from these data.

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) other characteristics of use of force incidents, and (4) force used against dogs.

Characteristics of Officers and Subjects Involved in Use of Force Incidents

The 895 use of force incidents involved 668 officers. Most incidents (547 out of 895; 61.1%) involved one officer, 262 incidents (29.3%) involved two officers, and 86 incidents (9.6%) involved three or more officers. With regard to the number of officers involved in the incidents, 328 officers (of the 668 officers; 49.1%) were involved in just one incident in 2013, 169 officers (25.3%) were involved in two incidents, 92 officers (13.8%) were involved in three incidents, and 79 officers (11.8%) were involved in more than three incidents. The most incidents an officer was involved in was 13. Previous analyses show that the best predictor of the number of use of force incidents an officer is involved in is the number of arrests made by that officer.

In 92 percent of the incidents, the first officer[5] involved was male, in 73 percent the

officer was white, in 97 percent of incidents the officer was in uniform, in 99 percent of the

incidents the officer was on duty, in 95 percent of incidents the officer was the rank of police

officer, and in 82 percent of incidents the officer was assigned to squad patrol. The average

(mean) age of the first officer was 36 and the average length of service was 10 years. In 13

percent of the incidents, an officer involved in the incident was injured. These characteristics are

similar to previous years.

The 871 incidents involved 872 different subjects.[6] Most incidents (97.6%; 850 out of

871) involved just one subject, 19 of 871 incidents (2.2%) involved two or more subjects.

Twenty-one subjects were involved in multiple incidents in 2013.

In 82 percent of the incidents, the first subject involved was male, in 78 percent the

subject was Black, in 37 percent the subject was under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, the

average age of the first subject was 30 years (with a range of 13 to 73), and in 63 percent of

incidents the subject was injured, with the greatest proportion (27%) of these injuries classified

as "minor." In 4 incidents, the injuries sustained by the subject were fatal. In 13 percent of

incidents, the subject was armed with a weapon (not including personal weapons such as fists or

feet). In 73 percent of the incidents the subject had a previous criminal record. In 86 percent of

incidents, the officer noted that the subject resisted arrest. Except for the proportion of subjects

injured, these characteristics are similar to those in previous years (in previous years, a greater

proportion of subjects were injured; this was due to "subject injury" being a reporting

requirement prior to the 2013 policy change).

---

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

[6] In 2 cases the name of the subject was unknown or not provided. Excluded from these
analyses are the 24 incidents that only involved a dog.

Type of Force Used by Officers

With regard to the type of force used, it is seen in Table 8 that the vast majority of
incidents involved "bodily force only."

Table 8. Type of Force Used

Type of Forced Used	Frequency	Percentage
Bodily Force Only	658	73.5
ECD Only	57	6.4
Chemical Agent Only (OC)	34	3.8
Firearm Only	39	4.4
Baton Only	4	.4
Bodily Force and OC	49	5.5
Bodily Force and ECD	23	2.6
Bodily Force, OC, Baton	3	.3
Police Canine	3	.3
Bodily Force, ECD, OC	3	.3
Bodily Force and Police Canine	2	.2
Bodily Force and Baton	1	.1
ECD and Police Canine	1	.1
Firearm and ECD	1	.1
Other Combination (no firearm)	17	1.8
Total	895	99.9

Note: No missing data.

In total, 40 incidents (4.5%) involved the use of a firearm alone or in combination with another
form of force[7] and, as discussed in more detail below, 26 of these incidents involved a dog.
Clearly, in a relative and absolute sense, the use of a firearm in a use of force incident was an
uncommon event.

Additional analyses were performed to examine patterns in the types of force used over
time (Table 9). These analyses are limited to incidents that involved the use of a chemical agent

---

[7] Pointing or aiming a firearm (or ECD) without discharging the weapon was not a reportable
use of force category.

(OC Spray), an ECD (Taser), or a firearm.[8] First, it is seen that there has been a steady but

uneven decline in police use of firearms over time. Of the five years under examination, 2012

and 2013 had the fewest number of incidents that involved the police discharge of a firearm

(either at a person or a dog). Second, police use of an ECD increased in frequency to 2011, and

has declined in 2012 and 2013. This is a clear pattern but has no obvious explanation. Finally,

with regard to the use of OC spray, another clear pattern is evident: a rather steady decline from

2009 to 2013.

Table 9. Type of Force Used, by Year

Type of Force Used	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Firearm Alone or with Other	53	46	51	40	40
ECD Alone or with Other	85	125	144	101	85
OC Alone or with Other	150	154	137	115	89

It is worthwhile to note that certain forms of force were more likely than others to lead to

"major" or fatal injuries to subjects. Not surprisingly, the use of a firearm was most likely to

cause "major" or fatal injuries to a subject (79%) followed by the use of a baton (50%). Keep in

mind, however, that these weapons were infrequently used. A very small proportion of bodily

force incidents resulted in "major" injuries to a subject (1.6%). 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 multiple forms of force

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

---

[8] The 2013 use of force reporting policy change does not preclude an analysis of weapon use
across years but it does preclude an analysis of "bodily force only" incidents. Prior to the policy
change of 2013, all incidents that involved the use of a weapon were required to be reported.
That requirement continues. However, because the pre-2013 policy did not require all bodily
force incidents to be reported, an analysis of "bodily force only" incidents across years would not
be valid.

Table 10 shows how firearms were used in force incidents. In the rare instance that a firearm was used, it was most commonly used for the purpose of neutralizing a dog.

Table 10. Incidents Where the Force Used was a Firearm

Subject of Firearm	Frequency	Percentage	Result
Dog(s)	26	65.0	24 dogs hit
Subject	14	35.0	11 subjects hit
Total Number of Incidents	40	100.0	--

Note: No missing data.

Of the 14 incidents that involved the intentional use of a firearm against a subject, 4 involved fatal injuries and 7 involved non-fatal injuries. In 2 of the 14 incidents, a subject was shot at but not struck. In one incident, it was unknown if the subject was actually struck by gunfire (he fled after the officer fired at him). All 14 incidents involved a subject who was armed (11 with a gun, 2 with a knife, 1 with an iron pipe). These 14 incidents involved a variety of situations; most frequent were armed robbery related, subject stops, and "subject with gun" calls. Two of the incidents involved off-duty officers (both incidents involved attempted robberies of the officers).

Table 11 shows the frequency of incidents where dogs and subjects were the focus of the firearm from 2009 to 2013. It is seen that there has been a steady but uneven decline in the number of firearm incidents that involve a dog, while the number of incidents that involve firearm force against a person has been in a relatively narrow range from 2009 to 2013.

Table 11. Subject of Police Use of a Firearm, by Year

Target of Firearm	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Dog(s)	39	34	36	31	26
Person	14	12	15	9	14

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 12, 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. Much of the "other" category was simply identified in the database as "effecting arrest." 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. In addition, approximately equal proportions of use of force incidents occurred at night as during daylight. Finally, most incidents occurred outdoors. These findings are generally similar to those of previous years.

Table 12. Other Characteristics of Use of Force Incidents

_____

Characteristic	freq	%

_____

Activity That Led to Incident (a)	889	100.0
Investigation/Call for Service	249	28.0
Subject Stop	117	13.2
Traffic Stop	67	7.5
Other	456	51.3
Time/Lighting of Incident (b)	894	100.0
Dark/Night	423	47.3
Light/Daytime	416	46.5
Dusk/Dawn	55	6.2
Location of Incident (c)	886	100.0
Indoors	235	26.5
Outdoors	651	73.5

_____
Notes: (a) 6 missing cases; (b) 1 missing case; (c) 9 missing cases.

Force Used Against Dogs

Of the 895 incidents of force that occurred in 2013, 26 involved force being used against at least one dog.[9] All of these incidents involved the use of a firearm. Two incidents also involved force being used against a subject. These 26 incidents involved 27 dogs (one incident involved two dogs). Twenty-four of the dogs were stuck by gunfire, 3 were shot at but not hit. In total, of the 27 dogs upon which force was used, 17 died.

Of the 27 dogs, 20 (74.16%) were Pit Bulls, 3 (11.1%) were Rottweilers, and 3 (11.1%) were other breeds. Similar to previous years, the most common circumstances in which force was used against dogs was when officers were responding to a loose dog complaint (see Table 13). In 2 of the 26 incidents, an officer was bit by the dog prior to force being used against the dog (in each instance the officer was bit in the upper leg).

Table 13. Circumstance of Incidents Where Force was Used against Dogs

Circumstance	Frequency	Percentage
Loose Dog Complaint	10	38.5
Welfare Check	3	11.5
While on Patrol	3	11.5
Search Warrant	1	3.8
Other or Not Specified	9	34.6
TOTALS	26	99.9

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.

---

[9] For comparison, in 2012 there were 32 incidents that involved at least one dog. In 2011, there were 38 such incidents, in 2010, there were 35 such incidents, and in 2009 there were 43 such incidents. Note that Table 11 only includes those incidents where a firearm (versus other forms of force) was used against a dog.

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, and as recommended, numerous significant improvements have been made that enhance the value and usefulness of these data. In particular, the data appear complete and the narratives associated with the reports are much improved. However, the AIM system is not particularly well suited for the analysis of data. The process of converting the AIM system data to a format for statistical analyses is labor intensive and time consuming.

In addition, several additional items of information regarding use of force incidents should be captured and coded in order to better understand the effects of force. In particular:

- During the incident, was an officer assaulted (i.e., was an officer intentionally hit, kicked, bit, shot, stabbed, or spat upon)? (0) no, (1) yes.

- If an officer was injured as a result of the incident, what was the nature of those injuries?

- If an officer was injured as a result of the incident, did the officer receive medical treatment at or before the time of the use of force report was completed? (0) no, (1) yes.

- If injured, did the subject receive medical treatment at or before the time of the use of force report was completed? (0) no, (1) yes

These improvements may allow for a more complete understanding of use of force incidents 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 895 reportable use of force incidents that occurred between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013, the following summary statements can be made:

- The MPD policy for reporting use of force incidents changed on January 1, 2013. This change affected the number of incidents recorded; in particular, the number of "bodily force only" incidents that did not involve injury to the subject.

- There were 895 use of force incidents in 2013.

- There was an average of 2.45 use of force incidents per day in 2013.

- There were 35.9 arrests for every one arrest that involved the use of force.

- Approximately 2.79 percent of arrests involved the use of force in 2013.

- There were 2,803 traffic stops for each traffic stop that involved the use of force.

- Approximately .04 percent of traffic stops involved the use of force.

- There were 525 subject stops for each subject stop that involved force.

- Approximately .19 percent of subject stops involved the use of force.

- Approximately 37 percent of MPD sworn officers were involved in at least one use of force incident in 2013.

- There was one incident of force for every 665 persons in Milwaukee in 2013.

- The largest proportion of use of force incidents in 2013 occurred in Police District 7 (27.3%) and in Aldermanic Districts 7 and 15 (14.1% in each).

- Similar to previous years, there was 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 (traffic stops and field interviews). In spite of this variation, use of force was a rare event in all districts.

- The 895 use of force incidents involved 668 officers. Approximately 49 percent of these officers were involved in just one incident; approximately 12 percent of the officers were involved in more than three incidents.

- The most common type of force was "bodily force only" (73.5%) followed by "ECD only" (6.4%). Compared to previous years (2009 to 2012), the use of a chemical agent has steadily declined in frequency; the use of an ECD increased to 2011 and then declined; the use of a firearm has also declined from 2009 to 2013.

- Forty incidents (4.5%) involved a firearm; in 26 of these incidents (65.0%) the firearm was used to shoot (or shoot at) a dog.

- The number of incidents where a dog was shot, or shot at, has declined compared to previous years (2009-2012). The number of incidents where a subject was shot, or shot at, has remained in a relatively narrow range during this time frame.

- Approximately 3 percent of incidents (26 of 895) involved force being used against one or more dogs (all of which involved a firearm). Most of the dogs were Pit Bulls and the largest proportion these incidents related to a loose dog complaint.

Based on the analyses conducted here, and similar to previous years, the typical use of force incident:

- Involved one uniformed police officer and one subject. The officer was a white male, 36 years old, with 10 years of service. The officer was not injured as a result of the incident. The subject was a Black male with a previous criminal 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 outdoors.

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.