



AGENDA
Public Safety Commission
November 9, 2020 6:30 p.m. Meeting
ELECTRONIC MEETING

This meeting will be conducted electronically under the authority of MN State Statutes 13D.021 since an in-person meeting is not possible due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

To watch the meeting, visit www.newbrightonmn.gov or tune into CTV Channel 8023 (CenturyLink) or Channel 16 (Comcast).

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chair Geoff Hollimon | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Tanya Kessler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vice Chair Karen Wagner | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Stephanie Kitzhaber |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Robert Boyd | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Ache Wakai |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Amina Ghouse | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Jack Winkels |

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of October 12, 2020 Minutes

V. Presentations, Public Hearings, and Business Items

A. Use of Force Policy – Tony Paetznick, Director of Public Safety

VI. Reports and Updates

A. Allina Health – Dave Matteson

B. Public Safety Update – Tony Paetznick, Director of Public Safety

C. City Council Update – Graeme Allen, Councilmember

VII. Adjournment

** A quorum of the City Council may be present.*



MINUTES
Public Safety Commission
October 12, 2020 City Hall
Council Chambers 6:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Chair Hollimon. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic this meeting was held virtually.

II. Roll Call:

Members Present: Commissioners Robert Boyd, Amina Ghouse, Geoff Hollimon, Tanya Kessler, Stephanie Kitzhaber, Karen Wagner, and Jack Winkels.

Members Absent: Commissioner Ache Wakai.

Also Present: Director Tony Paetznick, Sergeant Ed Sypniewski, Council Member Graeme Allen and Dave Matteson (Allina Health).

III. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Kessler, seconded by Wagner to approve the October 12, 2020 agenda as presented. A roll call vote was taken. Motion carried 7-0.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Ghouse requested a change under Item V stating bullet point three needed to be edited to read city of residence.

Motion by Wagner, seconded by Kitzhaber to approve the September 14, 2020 minutes as amended. A roll call vote was taken. Motion carried 7-0.

V. Presentations and Public Hearings

A. De-escalation Training – Sergeant Ed Sypniewski

Director Paetznick stated the Commission requested further information regarding the Public Safety Departments de-escalation training. He explained he invited Sergeant Ed Sypniewski to speak on this matter.

Sergeant Sypniewski described the training the Public Safety Department received each year that focused on de-escalation. He indicated CIT (Crisis Intervention Team) training was now mandated for all peace officers. He explained he has been attending this training for the past

15 years. He commented he recently attended a de-escalation trainer course taught by the Force Science Institute. He reported de-escalation was something good officers have always been doing. He reviewed several graphics with the Commission from the recent training he attended and discussed the difference between information versus intelligence. He commented on the importance of officers having active listening skills which allows for an introduction, empathy, rapport building, influence and a behavioral change. The Azar-Dickens Police Assessment Matrix was then discussed with the Commission in further detail. He described how important it was for officers to gather information and problem solve situations in order to de-escalate situations so they do not have to use force.

Discussion included:

- The Commission encouraged officers to attend moral courage training. Director Paetznick reported the department would be receiving moral courage training in 2021 from Chad Weinstein.
- The Commission questioned what the relationship was between the Public Safety Department and social workers. Sergeant Sypniewski reported the department refers individuals in need to social workers or to other valuable resources. Director Paetznick discussed how the City partnered with a community advocate that worked for NYFS.
- The Commission asked how officers approach traffic stops. Sergeant Sypniewski stated all traffic stops were handled professionally. He explained he introduced himself to start all traffic stops and then explains why the individual was pulled over. Director Paetznick added that squad car and body cameras monitor how officers are speaking to the public.
- Sergeant Sypniewski commented further on how the Public Safety Department was using body camera video for training and teaching purposes.
- The Commission thanked Sergeant Sypniewski for his detailed and educational presentation.

VI. Reports and Updates

A. Allina Health – Dave Matteson

Dave Mattson commented on the de-escalation training EMS providers receive. He discussed how some people become anxious in the back of an ambulance. He reviewed the personnel leadership changes that occurred at Allina. He stated the street shifts have changed from 16 hours to 13 hours, 12 hours or 10 hours. He noted St. Joe's Hospital in St. Paul would be closing at the end of 2020. He described how this would impact admits in surrounding hospitals. He reviewed the number of calls for service and the response times in New Brighton from July through September. He commented on a recent hazmat/chemical case that occurred in another city. He discussed the process that was used to clean the rig after every call and at the end of each shift. He explained he has only had five staff members out with COVID to date. He provided an update on how the hospitals in the metro area were responding to COVID, noting there was a nursing shortage at this time.

B. Public Safety Update – Director Paetznick

Director Paetznick provided the Commission with an update on the virtual events that were held for National Night Out on Tuesday, October 6th. He stated he was pleased to report the

City had over 50 different virtual events and over 1,000 pounds of food and \$2,600 was collected for the Ralph Reeder Food Shelf. He thanked the community for their generosity in the midst of a global pandemic. He reported October was Fire Safety Prevention Month. He noted a neighborhood fire truck parade was being planned for Saturday, October 31st. He reviewed the crime statistics for the City and noted crime was up 25%. He was hopeful that with the seasonal turn in weather the crimes of opportunity and property crimes would be on the decline. He explained the City had 30 positive COVID cases in the last week. He noted the Public Safety Department has only had 2 positive cases since the pandemic began. He commented the department was working with the City Clerk to assure the upcoming election was safe. He reported the Commission would be addressing use of force at its November meeting.

The Commission encouraged the Public Safety Department to create a Zoom meeting or video for New Brighton children to view for Fire Safety Prevention Month.

C. City Council Update – Graeme Allen, Councilmember

Councilmember Allen provided the Commission with an update from the City Council. He thanked all of the Public Safety officers who participated in the virtual National Night Out events. He reported early voting had begun at the New Brighton Community Center and would be held weekdays through November 2nd. He explained residents could also opt to vote on election day on Tuesday, November 3rd. He thanked all of the individuals that would be serving as election judges. He noted the City was still in need of additional election judges and those interested in serving in this capacity should contact the City Clerk.

VII. Adjournment

Motion by Kessler, seconded by Winkels to adjourn the meeting at 8:02 p.m. A roll call vote was taken. Motion carried 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anthony & Paetznick". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Anthony" and the last name "Paetznick" clearly distinguishable.

Tony Paetznick
Director of Public Safety

**USE OF FORCE AND DEADLY FORCE MODEL
POLICY**

MN STAT 626.8452

1) PURPOSE

It is the policy of the (law enforcement agency) to provide officers with guidelines for the use of force and deadly force in accordance with:

MN STAT 626.8452 DEADLY FORCE AND FIREARMS USE;
POLICIES AND INSTRUCTION REQUIRED;
MN STAT 626.8475 DUTY TO INTERCEDE AND REPORT;
MN STAT 609.06 AUTHORIZED USE OF FORCE;
MN STAT 609.065 JUSTIFIABLE TAKING OF LIFE; and
MN STAT 609.066 AUTHORIZED USE OF FORCE BY PEACE OFFICERS.

2) POLICY

It is the policy of this law enforcement agency to ensure officers respect the sanctity of human life when making decisions regarding use of force. Sworn law enforcement officers have been granted the extraordinary authority to use force when necessary to accomplish lawful ends. Officers shall treat everyone with dignity and without prejudice and use only the force that is objectively reasonable to effectively bring an incident under control, while protecting the safety of others and the officer.

Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

Officers should exercise special care when interacting with individuals with known physical, mental health, developmental, or intellectual disabilities as an individual's disability may affect the individual's ability to understand or comply with commands from peace officers.

The decision by an officer to use force or deadly force shall be evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable officer in the same situation, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time, rather than with the benefit of hindsight, and that the totality of the circumstances shall account for occasions when officers may be forced to make quick judgments about using such force.

This policy is to be reviewed annually and any questions or concerns should be addressed to the immediate supervisor for clarification.

This policy applies to all licensed peace officers and part-time peace officers engaged in the discharge of official duties.

Section (4) Procedure, paragraphs (g.1-2), are effective March 1, 2021 and thereafter.

3) DEFINITIONS

- a) **Bodily Harm:** Physical pain or injury.
- b) **Great Bodily Harm:** Bodily injury which creates a high probability of death, or which causes serious, permanent disfigurement, or which causes a permanent or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ or other serious bodily harm.
- c) **Deadly Force:** Force used by an officer that the officer knows, or reasonably should know, creates a substantial risk of causing death or great bodily harm. The intentional discharge of a firearm in the direction of another person, or at a vehicle in which another person is believed to be, constitutes deadly force.
- d) **De-Escalation:** Taking action or communicating verbally or non-verbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary. De-escalation may include the use of such techniques as command presence, advisements, warnings, verbal persuasion, and tactical repositioning.
- e) **Other Than Deadly Force:** Force used by an officer that does not have the purpose of causing, nor create a substantial risk of causing, death or great bodily harm.
- f) **Choke Hold:** A method by which a person applies sufficient pressure to a person to make breathing difficult or impossible, and includes but is not limited to any pressure to the neck, throat, or windpipe that may prevent or hinder breathing, or reduce intake of air. Choke hold also means applying pressure to a person's neck on either side of the windpipe, but not to the windpipe itself, to stop the flow of blood to the brain via the carotid arteries.
- g) **Authorized Device:** A device an officer has received permission from the agency to carry and use in the discharge of that officer's duties, and for which the officer has:
 - a. obtained training in the technical, mechanical and physical aspects of the device; and
 - b. developed a knowledge and understanding of the law, rules and regulations regarding the use of such a device.

4) PROCEDURE

a) General Provisions

1. Use of physical force should be discontinued when resistance ceases or when the incident is under control.
2. Physical force shall not be used against individuals in restraints, except as objectively reasonable to prevent their escape or prevent imminent bodily injury to the individual, the officer, or another person. In these situations, only the amount of force necessary to control the situation shall be used.

3. Once the scene is safe and as soon as practical, an officer shall provide appropriate medical care consistent with his or her training to any individual who has visible injuries, complains of being injured, or requests medical attention. This may include providing first aid, requesting emergency medical services, and/or arranging for transportation to an emergency medical facility.
4. All uses of force shall be documented and investigated pursuant to this agency's policies.

b) Duty to Intercede

Regardless of tenure or rank, an officer must intercede when:

- a. present and observing another officer using force in violation of section 609.066, subdivision 2, or otherwise beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances; and
- b. physically or verbally able to do so

c) Duty to Report

An officer who observes another officer use force that exceeds the degree of force permitted by law has the duty to report the incident in writing within 24 hours to the chief law enforcement officer of the agency that employs the reporting officer.

d) De-escalation:

1. An officer shall use de-escalation techniques and other alternatives to higher levels of force consistent with their training whenever possible and appropriate before resorting to force and to reduce the need for force.
2. Whenever possible and when such delay will not compromise the safety of another or the officer and will not result in the destruction of evidence, escape of a suspect, or commission of a crime, an officer shall allow an individual time and opportunity to submit to verbal commands before force is used.

e) Use of Other Than Deadly Force

1. When de-escalation techniques are not effective or appropriate, an officer may consider the use of other than deadly force to control a non-compliant or actively resistant individual. An officer is authorized to use agency-approved other than deadly force techniques and issued equipment in the following circumstances:
 - a. effecting a lawful arrest; or
 - b. the execution of legal process; or
 - c. enforcing an order of the court; or
 - d. executing any other duty imposed upon the public officer by law; or
 - e. defense of self or another.

f) Use of Certain Types of Force

1. Except in cases where deadly force is authorized as articulated in MN STAT. 609.066 to protect the peace officer or another from death or great bodily harm, officers are prohibited from using:
 - a. Chokeholds,
 - b. Tying all of a person's limbs together behind a person's back to render the person immobile, or;
 - c. Securing a person in any way that results in transporting the person face down in a vehicle.
2. Less than lethal measures must be considered by the officer prior to applying these measures.

g) Use of Deadly Force

1. An officer is authorized to use deadly force if an objectively reasonable officer would believe, based on the totality of the circumstances known to the officer at the time and without the benefit of hindsight, that such force is necessary. Use of deadly force is justified when one or both of the following apply;
 - a. To protect the peace officer or another from death or great bodily harm, provided that the threat:
 - i. can be articulated with specificity by the law enforcement officer;
 - ii. is reasonably likely to occur absent action by the law enforcement officer; and
 - iii. must be addressed through the use of deadly force without unreasonable delay; or
 - b. To effect the arrest or capture, or prevent the escape, of a person whom the peace officer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe has committed or attempted to commit a felony and the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or great bodily harm to another person under the threat criteria in paragraph (a), items (i) to (iii), unless immediately apprehended.
2. An officer shall not use deadly force against a person based on the danger the person poses to self if an objectively reasonable officer would believe, based on the totality of the circumstances known to the officer at the time and without the benefit of hindsight, that the person does not pose a threat of death or great bodily harm to the peace officer or to another under the threat criteria in paragraph (1a), items (i) to (iii).
3. Where feasible, the officer shall identify themselves as a law enforcement officer and warn of his or her intent to use deadly force.

h) Training

1. All officers shall receive training, at least annually, on this agency's use of force policy and related legal updates.

2. In addition, training shall be provided on a regular and periodic basis and designed to
 - a. Provide techniques for the use of and reinforce the importance of de-escalation
 - b. Simulate actual shooting situations and conditions; and
 - c. Enhance officers' discretion and judgement in using other than deadly force in accordance with this policy.
3. Before being authorized to carry a firearm all officers shall receive training and instruction with regard to the proper use of deadly force and to the agency's policies and State statutes with regard to such force. Such training and instruction shall continue on an annual basis.
4. Before carrying an authorized device all officers shall receive training and instruction in the use of the device including training as it relates to its use in deadly force and/or other than deadly force situations. Such training and instruction shall continue on an annual basis.
5. Officers will carry and use only authorized devices unless circumstances exist which pose an immediate threat to the safety of the public or the officer requiring the use of a device or object that has not been authorized to counter such a threat.
6. With agency approval officers may modify, alter or cause to be altered an authorized device in their possession or control.

g) Recordkeeping Requirements

The chief law enforcement officer shall maintain records of the agency's compliance with use of force training requirements.

Policy 300 Use of Force

300.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This policy provides guidelines on the reasonable use of force. While there is no way to specify the exact amount or type of reasonable force to be applied in any situation, every member of this department is expected to use these guidelines to make such decisions in a professional, impartial, and reasonable manner (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452).

In addition to those methods, techniques, and tools set forth below, the guidelines for the reasonable application of force contained in this policy shall apply to all policies addressing the potential use of force, including but not limited to the Control Devices and Conducted Energy Device policies.

300.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy include:

Deadly force - Force reasonably anticipated and intended to create a substantial likelihood of causing death or very serious injury.

Feasible - Reasonably capable of being done or carried out under the circumstances to successfully achieve the arrest or lawful objective without increasing risk to the officer or another person.

Force - The application of physical techniques or tactics, chemical agents, or weapons to another person. It is not a use of force when a person allows him/herself to be searched, escorted, handcuffed, or restrained.

Imminent - Ready to take place; impending. Note that imminent does not mean immediate or instantaneous.

Totality of the circumstances - All facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time, taken as a whole, including the conduct of the officer and the subject leading up to the use of force.

300.2 POLICY

The use of force by law enforcement personnel is a matter of critical concern, both to the public and to the law enforcement community. Officers are involved on a daily basis in numerous and varied interactions and, when warranted, may use reasonable force in carrying out their duties.

Officers must have an understanding of, and true appreciation for, their authority and limitations. This is especially true with respect to overcoming resistance while engaged in the performance of law enforcement duties.

The New Brighton Department of Public Safety recognizes and respects the value of all human life and dignity without prejudice to anyone. Vesting officers with the authority to use reasonable force and to protect the public welfare requires monitoring, evaluation, and a careful balancing of all interests.

300.2.1 DUTY TO INTERCEDE AND REPORT

Any officer present and observing another law enforcement officer or a member using force that is clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall, when in a position to

do so, intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452; Minn. Stat. § 626.8475).

Any officer who observes another law enforcement officer or a member use force that is potentially beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall report these observations to a supervisor as soon as feasible (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452; Minn. Stat. § 626.8475).

300.2.2 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

An officer reporting a use of force by another law enforcement officer or member pursuant to this policy shall also make the report in writing to the Director of Public Safety within 24 hours (Minn. Stat. § 626.8475).

300.2.3 PERSPECTIVE

When observing or reporting force used by a law enforcement officer, each officer should take into account the totality of the circumstances and the possibility that other law enforcement officers may have additional information regarding the threat posed by the subject.

300.3 USE OF FORCE

Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

The reasonableness of force will be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene at the time of the incident. Any evaluation of reasonableness must allow for the fact that officers are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force that reasonably appears necessary in a particular situation, with limited information and in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving.

Given that no policy can realistically predict every possible situation an officer might encounter, officers are entrusted to use well-reasoned discretion in determining the appropriate use of force in each incident.

It is also recognized that circumstances may arise in which officers reasonably believe that it would be impractical or ineffective to use any of the tools, weapons, or methods provided by this department. Officers may find it more effective or reasonable to improvise their response to rapidly unfolding conditions that they are confronting. In such circumstances, the use of any improvised device or method must nonetheless be reasonable and utilized only to the degree that reasonably appears necessary to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

While the ultimate objective of every law enforcement encounter is to avoid or minimize injury, nothing in this policy requires an officer to retreat or be exposed to possible physical injury before applying reasonable force.

300.3.1 ALTERNATIVE TACTICS - DE-ESCALATION

When circumstances reasonably permit, officers should use non-violent strategies and techniques to decrease the intensity of a situation, improve decision-making, improve communication, reduce the

need for force, and increase voluntary compliance (e.g., summoning additional resources, formulating a plan, attempting verbal persuasion).

300.3.2 USE OF FORCE TO EFFECT AN ARREST

An officer may use reasonable force (Minn. Stat. § 609.06 and Minn. Stat. § 629.33):

- a. In effecting a lawful arrest.
- b. In the execution of a legal process.
- c. In enforcing an order of the court.
- d. In executing any other duty imposed by law.
- e. In preventing the escape, or to retake following the escape, of a person lawfully held on a charge or conviction of a crime.
- f. In restraining a person with a mental illness or a person with a developmental disability from self-injury or injury to another.
- g. In self-defense or defense of another.

An officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his/her efforts by reason of resistance or threatened resistance of the person being arrested; nor shall such officer be deemed the aggressor or lose his/her right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest or to prevent escape or to overcome resistance.

300.3.3 FACTORS USED TO DETERMINE THE REASONABLENESS OF FORCE

When determining whether to apply force and evaluating whether an officer has used reasonable force, a number of factors should be taken into consideration, as time and circumstances permit. These factors include but are not limited to:

- a. Immediacy and severity of the threat to officers or others.
- b. The conduct of the individual being confronted, as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time.
- c. Officer/subject factors (e.g., age, size, relative strength, skill level, injuries sustained, level of exhaustion or fatigue, the number of officers available vs. subjects).
- d. The effects of suspected drug or alcohol use.
- e. The individual's mental state or capacity.
- f. The individual's ability to understand and comply with officer commands.
- g. Proximity of weapons or dangerous improvised devices.
- h. The degree to which the individual has been effectively restrained and his/her ability to resist despite being restrained.

- i. The availability of other reasonable and feasible options and their possible effectiveness (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452).
- j. Seriousness of the suspected offense or reason for contact with the individual.
- k. Training and experience of the officer.
- l. Potential for injury to officers, suspects, and others.
- m. Whether the individual appears to be resisting, attempting to evade arrest by flight, or is attacking the officer.
- n. The risk and reasonably foreseeable consequences of escape.
- o. The apparent need for immediate control of the individual or a prompt resolution of the situation.
- p. Whether the conduct of the individual being confronted no longer reasonably appears to pose an imminent threat to the officer or others.
- q. Prior contacts with the individual or awareness of any propensity for violence.
- r. Any other exigent circumstances.

300.3.4 PAIN COMPLIANCE TECHNIQUES

Pain compliance techniques may be effective in controlling a physically or actively resisting individual. Officers may only apply those pain compliance techniques for which they have successfully completed department-approved training. Officers utilizing any pain compliance technique should consider:

- a. The degree to which the application of the technique may be controlled given the level of resistance.
- b. Whether the individual can comply with the direction or orders of the officer.
- c. Whether the individual has been given sufficient opportunity to comply.

The application of any pain compliance technique shall be discontinued once the officer determines that compliance has been achieved.

300.3.5 CAROTID CONTROL HOLD

A carotid control hold is a technique designed to control an individual by applying pressure to a person's neck on either side of the windpipe, but not to the windpipe itself, to stop the flow of blood to the brain via the carotid arteries (Minn. Stat. § 609.06, Subd. 3). The proper application of the carotid control hold may be effective in restraining a violent or combative individual. However, due to the potential for injury, the use of the carotid control hold is limited to those circumstances where deadly force is authorized and is subject to the following (Minn. Stat. § 609.06; Minn. Stat. § 609.066):

- a. At all times during the application of the carotid control hold, the response of the individual should be monitored. The carotid control hold should be discontinued when circumstances indicate that the application no longer reasonably appears necessary.

- b. Any individual who has had the carotid control hold applied, regardless of whether he/she was rendered unconscious, shall be promptly examined by paramedics or other qualified medical personnel and should be monitored until such examination occurs.
- c. The officer shall inform any person receiving custody, or any person placed in a position of providing care, that the individual has been subjected to the carotid control hold and whether the individual lost consciousness as a result.
- d. Any officer attempting or applying the carotid control hold shall promptly notify a supervisor of the use or attempted use of such hold.
- e. The use or attempted use of the carotid control hold shall be thoroughly documented by the officer in any related reports.

300.3.6 STATE RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF OTHER RESTRAINTS

Officers may not use any of the following restraints unless the use of deadly force is authorized (Minn. Stat. § 609.06; Minn. Stat. § 609.066):

- a. A chokehold. For purposes of this policy, a chokehold only refers to the method of applying sufficient pressure to an individual to make breathing difficult or impossible, and includes but is not limited to any pressure to the neck, throat, or windpipe that may prevent or hinder breathing, or reduce intake of air.
- b. Tying all of an individual's limbs together behind the person's back to render the person immobile.
- c. Securing an individual in any way that results in transporting the person face down in a vehicle.

300.3.7 USE OF FORCE TO SEIZE EVIDENCE

In general, officers may use reasonable force to lawfully seize evidence and to prevent the destruction of evidence. However, officers are discouraged from using force solely to prevent a person from swallowing evidence or contraband. In the instance when force is used, officers should not intentionally use any technique that restricts blood flow to the head, restricts respiration or which creates a reasonable likelihood that blood flow to the head or respiration would be restricted. Officers are encouraged to use techniques and methods taught by the New Brighton Department of Public Safety for this specific purpose.

300.4 DEADLY FORCE APPLICATIONS

When reasonable, the officer shall, prior to the use of deadly force, make efforts to identify him/herself as a peace officer and to warn that deadly force may be used, unless the officer has objectively reasonable grounds to believe the person is aware of those facts.

Use of deadly force is justified only if an objectively reasonable officer would believe, based on the totality of the circumstances known to the officer at the time and without the benefit of hindsight, that such force is necessary (Minn. Stat. § 609.066):

- a. To protect the officer or another from death or great bodily harm.

- b. To effect the arrest or capture, or prevent the escape, of an individual whom the officer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe has committed or attempted to commit a felony and the officer reasonably believes that the person will cause death or great bodily harm to another person unless immediately apprehended.

In both scenarios, the use of deadly force is only authorized provided that the threat (Minn. Stat. § 609.066):

- a. Can be articulated with specificity by the officer.
- b. Is reasonably likely to occur absent action by the officer.
- c. Must be addressed through the use of deadly force without unreasonable delay.

An officer shall not use deadly force against an individual based on the danger the individual poses to self unless the use of deadly force is justified (Minn. Stat. § 609.066).

300.4.1 MOVING VEHICLES

Shots fired at or from a moving vehicle involve additional considerations and risks, and are rarely effective.

When feasible, officers should take reasonable steps to move out of the path of an approaching vehicle instead of discharging their firearm at the vehicle or any of its occupants.

An officer should only discharge a firearm at a moving vehicle or its occupants when the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the imminent threat of the vehicle, or if deadly force other than the vehicle is directed at the officer or others.

Officers should not shoot at any part of a vehicle in an attempt to disable the vehicle.

300.5 REPORTING THE USE OF FORCE

Any use of force by a member of this department shall be documented promptly, completely, and accurately in an appropriate report, depending on the nature of the incident. The officer should articulate the factors perceived and why he/she believed the use of force was reasonable under the circumstances.

To collect data for purposes of training, resource allocation, analysis, and related purposes, the Department may require the completion of additional report forms, as specified in department policy, procedure, or law. See the Report Preparation Policy for additional circumstances that may require documentation.

300.5.1 NOTIFICATIONS TO SUPERVISORS

Supervisory notification shall be made as soon as practicable following the application of force in any of the following circumstances:

- a. The application caused a visible injury.
- b. The application would lead a reasonable officer to conclude that the individual may have experienced more than momentary discomfort.

- c. The individual subjected to the force complained of injury or continuing pain.
- d. The individual indicates intent to pursue litigation.
- e. Any application of the TASER® device or control device.
- f. Any application of a restraint device other than handcuffs, shackles, or belly chains.
- g. The individual subjected to the force was rendered unconscious.
- h. An individual was struck or kicked.
- i. An individual alleges unreasonable force was used or that any of the above has occurred.

300.5.2 STATE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Director of Public Safety shall provide for:

- a. The filing of a report with the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) on a monthly basis and in the form required by BCA (Minn. Stat. § 626.5534).
- b. The collection and submission of data as required by Minn. Stat. § 626.8457 and consistent with the use of force reporting requirements as determined by POST (Minn. Stat. § 626.8457).

300.6 MEDICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Once it is reasonably safe to do so, medical assistance shall be obtained for any person who exhibits signs of physical distress, has sustained visible injury, expresses a complaint of injury or continuing pain, or was rendered unconscious. Any individual exhibiting signs of physical distress after an encounter should be continuously monitored until he/she can be medically assessed. Individuals should not be placed on their stomachs for an extended period, as this could impair their ability to breathe.

Based upon the officer's initial assessment of the nature and extent of the individual's injuries, medical assistance may consist of examination by an emergency medical services provider or medical personnel at a hospital or jail. If any such individual refuses medical attention, such a refusal shall be fully documented in related reports and, whenever practicable, should be witnessed by another officer and/or medical personnel. If a recording is made of the contact or an interview with the individual, any refusal should be included in the recording, if possible.

The on-scene supervisor or, if the on-scene supervisor is not available, the primary handling officer shall ensure that any person providing medical care or receiving custody of a person following any use of force is informed that the person was subjected to force. This notification shall include a description of the force used and any other circumstances the officer reasonably believes would be potential safety or medical risks to the subject (e.g., prolonged struggle, extreme agitation, impaired respiration).

Individuals who exhibit extreme agitation, violent irrational behavior accompanied by profuse sweating, extraordinary strength beyond their physical characteristics, and imperviousness to pain (sometimes called "excited delirium"), or who require a protracted physical encounter with multiple officers to be brought under control, may be at an increased risk of sudden death. Calls involving these persons should be considered medical emergencies. Officers who reasonably suspect a medical emergency should request medical assistance as soon as practicable and have medical personnel stage away.

See the Medical Aid and Response Policy for additional guidelines.

300.7 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITIES

A supervisor should respond to a reported application of force resulting in visible injury, if reasonably available. When a supervisor is able to respond to an incident in which there has been a reported application of force, the supervisor is expected to:

- a. Obtain the basic facts from the involved officers. Absent an allegation of misconduct or excessive force, this will be considered a routine contact in the normal course of duties.
- b. Ensure that any injured parties are examined and treated.
- c. When possible, separately obtain a recorded interview with the individual upon whom force was applied. If this interview is conducted without the individual having voluntarily waived his/her *Miranda* rights, the following shall apply:
 1. The content of the interview should not be summarized or included in any related criminal charges.
 2. The fact that a recorded interview was conducted should be documented in a property or other report.
 3. The recording of the interview should be distinctly marked for retention until all potential for civil litigation has expired.
- d. Once any initial medical assessment has been completed or first aid has been rendered, ensure that photographs have been taken of any areas involving visible injury or complaint of pain, as well as overall photographs of uninjured areas.
 1. These photographs should be retained until all potential for civil litigation has expired.
- e. Identify any witnesses not already included in related reports.
- f. Review and approve all related reports.
- g. Determine if there is any indication that the individual may pursue civil litigation.
 1. If there is an indication of potential civil litigation, the supervisor should complete and route a notification of a potential claim through the appropriate channels.
- h. Evaluate the circumstances surrounding the incident and initiate an administrative investigation if there is a question of policy noncompliance or if for any reason further investigation may be appropriate.

In the event that a supervisor is unable to respond to the scene of an incident involving the reported application of force, the supervisor is still expected to complete as many of the above items as circumstances permit.

300.7.1 SHIFT SERGEANT RESPONSIBILITY

The Shift Sergeant shall review each use of force by any personnel within his/her command to ensure compliance with this policy and to address any training issues.

300.8 TRAINING

Officers will receive training on this policy, including the learning objectives as provided by POST, at least annually (Minn. Stat. § 626.8452, Subd. 3).

Subject to available resources, officers should receive periodic training on:

- a. Guidelines regarding vulnerable populations, including but not limited to children, elderly, pregnant persons, and individuals with physical, mental, or intellectual disabilities.
- b. De-escalation tactics, including alternatives to force.

300.8.1 PROHIBITED TRAINING

Warrior-style training, as defined in Minn. Stat. § 626.8434, whether provided directly by the Department or through a third party, is prohibited (Minn. Stat. § 626.8434).

300.9 USE OF FORCE ANALYSIS

At least annually, the Patrol Deputy Director should prepare an analysis report on use of force incidents. The report should be submitted to the Director of Public Safety. The report should not contain the names of officers, suspects, or case numbers, and should include:

- a. The identification of any trends in the use of force by members.
- b. Training needs recommendations.
- c. Equipment needs recommendations.
- d. Policy revision recommendations.



POLICE USE OF FORCE

SAFER COMMUNITIES THROUGH
SOUND POLICIES

AUGUST 2020

Incumbent upon every law enforcement agency is the mission to support community safety while respecting individual rights. Comprehensive, best practice agency policy is essential to fulfilling that mission.

At Lexipol, we have been engaged in the challenging and inspiring work of creating law enforcement policies for nearly two decades. During this time, the national dialogue on police policy, especially as it pertains to use of force, has evolved and increased in intensity. Today, that conversation includes voices calling for reform to address systemic bias and excessive force as well as voices advocating for guidance that reflects the realities of police work.

For law enforcement policy to be effective, it must be applicable, practicable and functional. With more than 2,075 years of combined public safety experience, Lexipol's policy developers and attorneys carefully craft policy to include state and federal legislation and case law, but also to reflect the dynamic nature of the policing profession. This is not always an easy process; policy is rarely black and white. We employ a rigorous yet collaborative development and review process to ensure diverse perspectives—internal and external to our company—are considered. Finally, recognizing that each agency must own its policy, we encourage our customers to thoroughly review and customize our policies as needed to account for community needs and agency-specific factors.

Following are summaries of our policy positions on key issues related to law enforcement use of force. For more detailed information, please visit our [Police Use of Force website](#).

Carotid Restraint

Medical evidence supports the carotid control hold as safer compared to other control techniques or the use of impact weapons, and research does not support categorizing a properly applied vascular neck restraint as lethal force. However, there is considerable confusion among the public between respiratory and vascular restraints and in several jurisdictions, one or both techniques have been either entirely prohibited, criminalized, or limited to when deadly force is authorized. Accordingly, Lexipol's best practice policy has been recently amended to clearly define the carotid control hold and to limit the technique to instances where deadly force is authorized. The section is removed from states where the technique is criminalized. (The manual mandates officers to follow the law and therefore does not specifically delineate crimes in policies.) Finally, Lexipol also guides agencies to customize content if the technique is prohibited by the agency or where the agency lacks the resources to train individual officers in this technique.

De-Escalation

While there is no Supreme Court holding requiring de-escalation, the legal landscape is varied and unsettled; some lower courts have considered de-escalation as a factor in determining whether the force used was objectively reasonable. In practice, most police officers recognize they should use de-escalation tactics in situations where they can be safely and effectively applied. Some departments have adopted policies or procedures directing officers to use non-violent strategies and techniques to decrease the intensity of the situation and decrease the need for force when circumstances permit.

Lexipol has traditionally addressed de-escalation in its policies covering the incidents where the techniques are most commonly effective—civil commitments, crisis intervention incidents, conducted energy device deployments (e.g., TASER®) and civil disputes. In addition, Lexipol's Use of Force policy guided officers to consider whether there are other reasonable options when determining whether to even apply force. In July 2020, Lexipol decided to emphasize de-escalation with a requirement and specific examples. The Use of Force Policy now includes a standalone section on de-escalation that requires officers to consider and use non-violent strategies and techniques to decrease the intensity of a situation when time and circumstances permit. These techniques should be used to improve communication with the goal of increasing voluntary compliance. These tactics include crisis intervention techniques, requesting appropriate backup, and alternative strategies to reduce the need for force.

Exhausting All Reasonable Alternatives Before Deadly Force

A common concept in police reform efforts is the need to require officers to exhaust *all* alternatives before resorting to deadly force. In practice, this is an unrealistic expectation that fails to account for the split-second decisions officers may have to make and rapidly evolving incidents. There is no general law that every alternative must be exhausted before using deadly

force. Instead, courts have settled on the finding by the Supreme Court in *Graham v Connor* (1989)—that the force used by an officer should be “objectively reasonable” given the totality of the circumstances known to the officer. Lexipol applies the same *Graham* reasonableness standard to all uses of force, including deadly force. This does not mean, however, that officers shouldn’t consider other alternatives before using deadly force when they can—they should, and Lexipol policy supports doing so. Lexipol policies make it clear that officers may only use reasonable force, and, in a number of situations, recommend or prescribe actions and alternatives that make it less likely an officer will need to use deadly force.

Warning Before Deadly Force

Best practice regarding warnings before deadly force reflects both legal precedent and historical experience—generally, officers are expected to provide verbal warnings in deadly force situations whenever it is feasible and safe to do so. However, some police reform groups recommend requiring a verbal warning in every instance where deadly force might be used. The Supreme Court has addressed verbal warnings in the context of *fleeing felons*, but not before every use of force. In *Tennessee v. Garner*, the Court required a verbal warning before the use of deadly force to stop a fleeing felon under certain circumstances where the verbal warning was “feasible.” Some lower courts consider whether verbal warnings were used prior to the application of deadly force when determining whether force is “objectively reasonable,” but none explicitly require the use of verbal warnings prior to the use of deadly force.

Lexipol policy has traditionally aligned with Supreme Court precedent, stating that a verbal warning should precede the use of deadly force to stop a fleeing subject, where feasible. Recognizing this could be read to imply that warnings aren’t appropriate in other circumstances, Lexipol amended the policy in July 2020 to clarify that warnings should be used whenever reasonable before deploying deadly force. Ultimately, training is vital to lower the likelihood of death or serious injury to officers, suspects, and other citizens in any encounter.

Duty to Intervene

Police officers throughout the U.S. are entrusted with making ethical decisions every day. In some instances, the ethical decision involves whether to intervene during a colleague’s use of force. This decision requires moral and ethical courage, something that policy can influence only to a certain degree. Yet, clear policy establishes the expectations, defines the conditions, and describes the responsibilities. Police reformers have called for agencies to adopt duty to intervene policies as a way to reduce excessive force.

Lexipol has long included duty to intercede in its Use of Force Policy, focusing on two essential elements—stopping unreasonable force from happening and reporting it afterwards, even if the second officer was not able to intervene. In the spirit of continuous quality improvement, in

July 2020 Lexipol expanded the duty to intercede to situations where a law enforcement officer observes unreasonable force by any other law enforcement officer, within or outside the agency, as well as by members of the agency. This language goes beyond current case law requirements while taking into account the realities of policing. Lexipol policy also requires any member who witnesses an unreasonable use of force, regardless of whether an intercession occurred, “to promptly report these observations to a supervisor.” Lexipol also added a section to advise officers that other officers may have additional information and different perspectives of the ongoing situation, and to consider these possibilities when deciding whether to intervene.

Shooting at Moving Vehicles

Shooting at moving vehicles, whether in an attempt to disable the vehicle or neutralize the driver, is often ineffective and dangerous. It typically does not stop the vehicle, fails to mitigate the threat to the officer, jeopardizes uninvolved people, and injures or kills occupants. Lexipol policy acknowledges the ineffectiveness and danger of this tactic, guiding officers to “move out of the path of an approaching vehicle instead of discharging their firearm at the vehicle or any of its occupants” and prohibiting discharging their weapon unless “the officer reasonably believes there are no other reasonable means available to avert the threat of the vehicle.” This guidance has been in Lexipol policy for over a decade.

Recently, police reformers have initiated a movement to ban police from shooting at moving vehicles altogether. This position does not align with Supreme Court case law as well as numerous cases in federal circuits that found shooting at vehicles is reasonable under certain circumstances where an individual or the vehicle itself was posing a deadly threat to the officer. Further, the position is not practical. There may be occasions where officers must shoot at a moving vehicle to stop the infliction of death or serious injury (e.g., vehicle attacks against crowds). Given that shooting at moving vehicles involves several real-time considerations (e.g., what precipitates the need for deadly force, the potential for striking someone or something beyond the target), it is prudent for agencies to address this issue through robust training in accordance with policy.

Use of Force Continuum

The concept of a use of force continuum is not new to the law enforcement profession. Recently, several groups have advocated law enforcement agencies adopt a use of force continuum as a means of addressing concerns of excessive force and to reduce the types of force used by law enforcement professionals. Proponents of a use of force continuum assert it “restricts the most severe types of force to the most extreme situations and creates clear policy restrictions on the use of each police weapon and tactic.”

As numerous legal and police professionals have noted, however, use of force continuums are difficult to apply because they cannot encompass all the variables present in use of force

incidents, which are often unpredictable and dynamic. The inconsistencies and discrepancies within continuum models also create risks by mandating that officers use a level of force that may be far greater or far less than what is reasonable in a given situation. A use of force continuum is not a panacea for guiding officers through actual force situations and fails to take into account, as the Supreme Court has noted, that the use of force occurs in “tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving” situations. Neither case law nor state legislation requires the adoption of use of force continuums within policy. Accordingly, Lexipol’s Use of Force Policy does not include a continuum, instead following precedent set by the Supreme Court in *Graham v. Connor* that force must be “objectively reasonable.”

Comprehensive Reporting

Transparency and accountability are critical to ethical policing. Without these two factors, the public rightfully becomes mistrustful of and cynical toward the law enforcement profession. Comprehensive reporting of police use of force, including threats to use force, is a key component of transparency and accountability, which is why police reform advocates have made reporting a focus of their efforts.

Lexipol policy requires documenting any use of force, as well as additional related situations that may not constitute an actual use of force, in a written report. These situations include when a person is restrained and released without an arrest, deployment of a pepper projectile system (whether or not the launcher was used), any application of a control device, any discharge of a Conducted Energy Device (including pointing the device at a person, laser activation and arcing the device), and pointing of a firearm. Lexipol policy also requires notification of a supervisor in many circumstances in which force is used or threatened. These policies not only prescribe comprehensive reporting of individual use of force events, but also provide the basis for the agency to track uses of force, identify force and resistance trends, monitor individual officer trends, develop responsive training programs, adjust deployment strategies in response to data, and share data with their community in an effort to remain transparent.

Use of Force Trend Analysis

Law enforcement uses of force are routinely analyzed at the incident level. But evaluation of trends in use of force within an agency is also important. Such analysis is critical to ensure transparency, accountability, and, when necessary, remediation through training or other actions. It is up to individual law enforcement agencies to enshrine collection and analysis expectations in policy. Lexipol provides agencies with guidance to do just that. Lexipol’s Use of Force Policy directs the division commander to prepare an annual analysis on use of force incidents. Several related policies also outline data collection and analysis requirements. The stated goal is to determine whether various uses of force were proper and effective and whether improvements could be made. This policy guidance supports agency efforts to understand use of force trends and improve the law enforcement profession.

The Role of Supervisors

The role of the law enforcement supervisor is to provide leadership to officers and effectively manage all types of incidents. With regard to uses of force, a supervisor's responsibilities range from on-scene management to post-incident investigation and evaluation. For more than a decade, Lexipol's best practice has been to delineate specific responsibilities to supervisors in policy and reinforce the importance of involving supervisors in responding to, investigating, and reporting certain uses of force for additional review.

To that end, Lexipol's Use of Force Policy lists specific types of incidents that require an officer to notify a supervisor (e.g., an individual was struck or kicked) and outlines numerous responsibilities for supervisors upon notification of a use of force. At least five related policies highlight additional responsibilities for supervisors responding to uses of force. In July 2020, acknowledging that the role of supervisors has become even more vital in this regard, Lexipol added specific mandates requiring supervisors to respond to any use of force incident where there has been a visible injury. Additionally, Lexipol expanded reporting requirements for members to notify supervisors of any potential excessive use of force. This clear and effective policy guidance regarding the role of supervisors helps ensure incidents where force is used are effectively managed, properly investigated and accurately documented.

Providing Medical Aid After a Use of Force

For more than a decade, Lexipol's policies, training, and publications have educated and guided law enforcement officers to promptly render medical aid following uses of force when it is safe to do so. Our Use of Force Policy requires members to secure medical assistance for anyone who "exhibits signs of physical distress, has sustained visible injury, expresses a complaint of injury or continuing pain, or was rendered unconscious." Members are expected to continuously monitor any person who exhibits signs of physical distress after an encounter with law enforcement until the person can be medically assessed. As part of our commitment to continuous improvement, the policy now cautions officers not to place subjects on their stomach for an extended period, as this could impair their ability to breathe.

Additional policies, including the Medical Aid and Response Policy, Handcuffing and Restraints Policy, Control Devices Policy, and Conducted Energy Device Policy, provide additional medical aid guidelines for specific types of incidents. Through these policies and related training content, Lexipol urges law enforcement officers to err on the side of caution when it comes to providing medical aid in the use of force context. As Lexipol co-founder Gordon Graham states, providing medical care "shouldn't be a tough call" and is "the right thing to do."

Performance History Audits

Police reformers and law enforcement professionals agree on the need to identify potentially problematic behavior patterns and address them promptly to reduce the chances of unlawful or dangerous behavior on the part of the officer. Performance history audits (also known as early warning systems) provide an important tool for law enforcement agencies to compile and analyze patterns of behavior in an officer's conduct. Lexipol has long embraced the use of performance history audits to flag potential training issues and other behavior before the officer's on-the-job conduct becomes a problem. Our Performance History Audits Policy identifies specific data (performance indicators) that should be considered in the performance history audit. This data includes use of force incidents, personnel complaints, canine bite incidents, prior vehicle collisions, and claims and civil suits against the officer. The policy provides for quarterly audits of every officer and defines levels of remediation, potential disciplinary action, and follow-up monitoring.

Police Service Dogs

Efforts to restrict the use of police service dogs to "find and bark" tactics (vs. "find and bite") and to limit their deployment to on-lead applications are impractical and contrary to virtually all modern training and legal standards. Agencies effectively deploying well-trained police canine teams recognize their unparalleled value in not only saving officer resources and increasing officer safety, but safely and quickly locating missing persons, evidence, contraband, and concealed or fleeing suspects.

While police service dogs can theoretically be trained to "find and bark" in a training environment, studies have shown that when deployed in real-world incidents, "find and bark" dogs may actually overreact, resulting in more bites than a properly trained and deployed "find and bite" canine team. Historically, the ratio of bites inflicted by so-called "find and bite" dogs is low compared to the number of well-executed deployments in which suspects elect to ignore clear warnings. Courts have consistently recognized that "find and bite" is constitutional when objectively reasonable under the totality of circumstances of each case.

2020 Use of Force - By Month

	<u>#</u>	<u>YTD</u>
January	11	11
February	2	13
March	7	20
April	3	23
May	6	29
June	6	35
July	7	42
August	4	46
September	7	53
October		
November		
December		

Use of Force Statistics

September

<u>Year</u>	<u># for Month</u>	<u>Year-to-Date</u>
2020	7	53
2019	3	51
2018	7	38
2017	5	42
2016	5	31

CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
PART I OFFENSES
(Actual and Attempts)

MONTH OF: September 2020	Cases This Month	This Month Clearances	Cases Year-to-Date	Cases Last Year-to-Date
Homicide	0	0	0	1
Rape	0	0	2	3
Robbery	0	0	9	7
Agg. Assault	0	0	13	13
Burglary	3	1	43	32
Theft (includes shoplifting and bike)	42	3	308	256
Auto Theft	6	0	37	25
Arson	0	0	0	2
TOTALS	51	4	412	339

TRAFFIC ACTIVITY

	This Month	Year-to-Date	Last Year-to-Date
Motor Vehicle Crashes:	25	190	293
Property Damage	22	174	265
Personal Injury	3	16	28
Fatal	0	0	0
DWI	14	86	117
Parking Violations	5	144	301
Hazardous Moving Violations	49	318	365
Non-Hazardous Moving Violations	42	344	492
Traffic Stops – No Citation	118	1,011	1,805

MISCELLANEOUS POLICE ACTIVITY

	This Month	This Month Last Year	Year-to-Date	Last Year-to-Date
CFS by Complaint Number	752	827	7,035	7,431
CFS by Officers' Response	1,221	1,446	11,799	12,976
Adult Arrests (not including traffic)	34	42	266	291
Juvenile Arrests (not including traffic)	0	0	7	10
Warrant Arrests	1	8	33	66
Non-Traffic Citations	13	22	110	135

Incident Type Report (Summary)

Incident Type	Total Incidents	Total Incidents % of Incidents	Total Property Loss	Total Content Loss	Total Loss
Incident Type Category: 1 - Fire					
111 - Building fire	1	4.2%	200	200	400
113 - Cooking fire, confined to container	2	8.3%			
Total: 3	Total: 12.5%	Total: 200	Total: 200	Total: 400	
Incident Type Category: 3 - Rescue & Emergency Medical Service Incident					
311 - Medical assist, assist EMS crew	1	4.2%			
342 - Search for person in water	1	4.2%			
352 - Extrication of victim(s) from vehicle	1	4.2%			
370 - Electrical rescue, other	1	4.2%			
Total: 4	Total: 16.7%	Total: 0	Total: 0	Total: 0	
Incident Type Category: 4 - Hazardous Condition (No Fire)					
412 - Gas leak (natural gas or LPG)	1	4.2%			
442 - Overheated motor	1	4.2%			
444 - Power line down	1	4.2%			
460 - Accident, potential accident, other	1	4.2%			
Total: 4	Total: 16.7%	Total: 0	Total: 0	Total: 0	
Incident Type Category: 5 - Service Call					
520 - Water problem, other	1	4.2%			
550 - Public service assistance, other	1	4.2%			
Total: 2	Total: 8.3%	Total: 0	Total: 0	Total: 0	
Incident Type Category: 6 - Good Intent Call					
651 - Smoke scare, odor of smoke	3	12.5%			
Total: 3	Total: 12.5%	Total: 0	Total: 0	Total: 0	
Incident Type Category: 7 - False Alarm & False Call					
715 - Local alarm system, malicious false alarm	1	4.2%			
735 - Alarm system sounded due to malfunction	2	8.3%			
740 - Unintentional transmission of alarm, other	1	4.2%			
745 - Alarm system activation, no fire - unintentional	4	16.7%			
Total: 8	Total: 33.3%	Total: 0	Total: 0	Total: 0	
Total: 24	Total: 100.0%	Total: 200	Total: 200	Total: 400	

Report Filters

Basic Incident Date Time: is between '09/01/2020' and '09/30/2020'

Agency Name: is equal to 'NEW BRIGHTON'

Report Criteria

Incident Type (Fd1.21): Is Not Blank