



City of East Grand Rapids
Department of Public Safety

Annual Analysis & Review for 2020

March 15, 2021

Table of Contents:

Introduction	2
Internal Affairs	2-5
Response to Resistance (Use of Force)	5-17
Vehicle Pursuits	17-19
Foot Pursuits	19-20

INTRODUCTION

Each year, the East Grand Rapids Department of Public Safety is required to conduct an “annual analysis and review” of all internal affairs complaints, response to resistance (use of force) incidents, vehicle pursuits, and foot pursuits required by the *Michigan Law Enforcement Accreditation Commission* standards in order to maintain accreditation status. The purpose of the (publicly available) written report is to ensure the Department:

- Always engenders and maintains the confidence and trust of the public, city commission, and other key stakeholders; and
- Guarantees transparency, fairness, and impartiality in critical services provided by the Department and its members.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The Internal Affairs Unit received and investigated three complaints involving members of the Department in 2020.

COMPLAINT SUMMARIES:

1. On May 29 at 9:25 p.m., Kent County Dispatch notified an on-duty sergeant that a citizen (approximately 50-years-old W/M) wanted to file a complaint regarding an on-duty PSO. The dispatcher advised the sergeant the complainant wanted to discuss his concerns. Both the on-duty staff sergeant and sergeant then contacted the complainant by phone from the sergeant’s office.

The complainant stated he contacted the officer – who was parked in the Middle School parking lot – and asked him if he was going to enforce social distancing violations at the soccer field. The officer indicated the Department was not enforcing social distancing guidelines. The complainant stated this was not the answer he expected and was upset we were unable to enforce the guidelines. At this time, the complainant also indicated the officer was arrogant in his response.

The staff sergeant then told the complainant the Department was advised by the Kent County Prosecutor to not formally enforce the social distancing guidelines. Instead, officers would be enforcing the City permitting process if a group of 20 or more individuals were using Mehney Field in violation. The staff sergeant then advised the complainant that he would send the officer back to Mehney Field to determine if 20 or more people were on the field. The officer returned to Mehney Field and advised the staff sergeant that all individuals had left the scene.

Investigative findings. A review of the incident indicated the member’s actions violated Manual of Policy & Procedure (MOPP) Section 3-11 D.10.c. which states:

“When any person applies for assistance or advice or makes complaints or reports, either by telephone or in person, all pertinent information shall be obtained in an official and courteous manner and shall be properly and judiciously acted upon consistent with established departmental guidelines.”

Corrective action. The disposition finding for this incident was SUSTAINED. The Department member received a COUNSELING MEMORANDUM. The officer did indicate he could have handled the incident better by checking the soccer field to determine if observable violations of the social distancing guidelines were occurring.

2. On June 6, a sworn member was involved in a single vehicle accident that involved police vehicle #202. While driving vehicle #202, the sworn member was maneuvering the car trying not to hit any people or vehicles using the lower level behind the Public Safety Department. The sworn member then got too close to the “No Parking” signpost by the dumpsters and scratched the patrol vehicle. The involved individual took a photo of the damage to vehicle #202, completed a memorandum regarding the incident, and forwarded it for review.

Investigative findings. A review of the incident indicated the member’s actions violated Manual of Policy & Procedure (MOPP) Section 8-10 C.2. which states:

“...In all other cases, officers shall be governed by traffic laws and the rules of the road. Officers will operate police vehicles in a safe, courteous manner.”

Corrective action. The disposition finding for this incident was SUSTAINED. The Department member received a WRITTEN REPRIMAND and was advised to drive with more care when using city vehicles. It is important to note that this incident was self-reported by the officer involved.

3. On June 19 at 1:25 p.m., a sworn member met a 55-year-old W/F in the lobby of the Public Safety Department to take a report about retrieving property from her ex-fiancé. The officer had previously dealt with the complainant in regard to this issue on Friday, June 12. After listening to her complaint, the officer explained to her that since she was not the owner of the residence, she would have to work with an attorney to resolve the matter since it was civil and not criminal in nature.

Later that day, the complainant returned and told the on-duty sergeant she wanted to file a complaint against the officer for being “sexist and rude.” She told the sergeant she felt the officer was hostile and rude. The sergeant then asked her how he was hostile and rude. The complainant stated the officer rudely replied, “Why did you put things in there that you are trying to get out.” And he was also rude when he stated, “Why are you here?” The sergeant indicated these were the only two examples given. The sergeant then attempted to review the officer’s in-car video but was unable to check the mobile digital computer as the cruiser’s accessories were temporarily out of power. The officer did indicate that he pushed the record button on his transmitter while in the station but was having issues with his transmitter.

Investigative findings. A review of the incident indicated the member's actions "failed to disclose sufficient evidence to prove the alleged conduct."

Corrective action. The disposition finding for this incident was NOT SUSTAINED. No disciplinary action taken. The sergeant documented the problems with the cruiser's power and forwarded the information to the Highway Department for repairs.

SUMMARY & ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATIONS

There were three formal internal affairs investigations in 2020. Two investigations involved citizen complaints. In the first incident, the officer received a counseling memorandum as the complaint was sustained. In the second incident, no discipline was given as the incident was not sustained. In the third incident, the involved officer received a written reprimand as the complaint was sustained for improperly backing a vehicle that caused minor damage. In the June 19 incident, the complainant did feel the officer involved was "sexist." Other than that, there was no race, national origin, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, or cultural group-based complaint during the year. In aggregate, there are no patterns or trends of serious misconduct, inappropriate actions, criminal behavior, or abuse by any member or shift of the Department.

RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE (USE OF FORCE)

The Department's "Incident Review Committee" formally evaluated nine response to resistance (use of force) incidents that involved Department members in 2020.

INCIDENT SUMMARIES:

1. On Monday, January 20 at 11:09 a.m., two PSOs responded to a GRPD request for assistance near the D&W store at 1814 Breton Road. When PSO #1 arrived, he observed two GRPD officers and three civilians holding a B/M (30 years old) subject on the ground attempting to handcuff him. PSO #1 approached the suspect, placed his knee on the subject's shoulder blade and took hold of his right arm and guided it into a position behind his back. One of the GRPD officers then took the suspect's left arm and placed it behind his back whereupon the suspect was successfully handcuffed.

At this time, PSO #2 arrived and assisted in holding the suspect's legs while a search incident to arrest was conducted. The suspect was actively resisting during the search, so he was rolled face down on the ground while PSO #2 grabbed one leg and PSO #1 grabbed the other leg and pulled them apart to complete the search. Once the search was completed, the suspect was rolled onto his back and helped to his feet. PSO #1 immediately retrieved his medical equipment from the cruiser and attempted to provide medical assistance to the suspect. He refused any and all treatment. The suspect was then turned over to GRPD for arrest and

transport to the Kent County Correctional Facility. One GRPD officer sustained significant injuries that required treatment at a local hospital.

Each officer completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officers' response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer(s) for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) both officers complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and were justified in their response to resistance; (2) the training received prepared the officers for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions.

2. On Saturday, February 29 at 1:29 p.m., PSO #1 initiated a traffic stop on a car for registration and equipment violations while travelling northbound on Lakeside Drive near Greenwood. In the 300 block of Lakeside, PSO #1's cruiser was positioned directly behind the car. He activated his overhead lights and siren as both approached Robinson Road. The officer then notified Kent County Dispatch that the driver was not stopping and turned eastbound on Robinson Road. At Mercer Drive, the PSO #1 activated a continuous siren. The vehicle did not stop although there were numerous safe stopping locations on Robinson Road. After driving approximately, a half-mile, the motorist turned left into the Mayflower Church entrance and drove to a parking space in the Church's backlot.

PSO #1 initiated a high-risk traffic stop, drew his weapon, and pointed it at the vehicle. PSO #1 then ordered the driver to toss out the keys and told the subjects to place their hands outside the car. Both the driver and passenger complied with this order. Once PSO #2 and PSO #3 arrived as backup, the driver (a 33-year-old B/M) and passenger (a juvenile B/M) were both ordered out of the car and secured by the officers. PSO #2, who had his sidearm in the low ready position, holstered his service pistol, handcuffed the juvenile and temporarily placed him in the backseat of his cruiser. PSO #2 told the juvenile he was not under arrest and that he was temporarily being detained until the officers could determine what was going on. PSO #1 then placed the driver under arrest for fleeing & eluding and no operator's license on person. The driver also had an unserved PPO in LEIN. The driver indicated that the passenger was his 13-year-old son. After approximately 5 minutes the juvenile was released to an adult from Mayflower Church. He was never identified and refused to speak with the officers. PSO #1

then arrested the driver and transported him to the Kent County Correctional Facility for lodging.

Each officer completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officers' response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officers for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) the officers complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and were justified to draw and display their sidearms based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident.

3. On Friday, March 6 at 11:06 p.m., 2 PSOs were dispatched to 2249 Wealthy – the Professional Building – after the on-duty security officer called Kent County Dispatch and told the dispatcher that an unknown subject was possibly in the building. Earlier in the day, the security officer found an unknown B/M in the building and advised him to leave. She notified dispatch when she was unsure the subject left.

Upon arrival, the PSOs found a bicycle by an outside door that had been propped open by a notebook. The PSOs immediately notified the on-duty staff sergeant of the incident circumstances. The PSOs then requested the assistance of a GRPD canine team. Once on scene, the officers and canine team entered and began searching the building. Just after moving into the hallway, the PSOs observed a B/M (later determined to be 17 years old) near the main stairwell. PSO #1 pointed his sidearm at the suspect and told him to put his hands up. He then ordered the suspect to face away from him. The subject complied by turning around. PSO #1 then ordered the subject to walk back to him; which he did. The subject was then handcuffed by PSO #2 and taken into custody. After conferring with the staff sergeant, the subject was transported to his residence and released to his mother.

Each officer completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officers' response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer(s) for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) both officers complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and PSO #1 was justified to draw and point his sidearm at the suspect based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident.

4. On Wednesday, April 8 at 7:44 p.m., PSO #1 and PSO #2 were dispatched to a domestic involving a father and his 16-year-old, W/M, son in the 300 block of Arlington Drive. When the officers arrived on-scene, the father said his son started throwing objects around the house because he would not give him his cell phone charger. When the father tried to stop his son from taking the cell phone chargers, the son pushed him into some drawers causing bumps on his head and right forearm. The 16-year-old suspect then fled the scene with a baseball bat.

PSO #2 then began searching for the suspect in his cruiser with the assistance of Kent County Sheriff's Office deputies and a GRPD K-9 team. After a few minutes, PSO #2 located the suspect walking southbound on the boardwalk in the 4000 block of Reeds Lake Blvd. As he pulled up to the suspect, PSO #2 observed he was carrying a silver baseball bat in his righthand. The suspect immediately turned around and ran southbound on Reeds Lake Blvd. PSO #2 exited his cruiser and told the suspect to stop and drop the bat. As the suspect ran by, the officer drew his sidearm and again told the suspect to drop the bat since the suspect had started to raise the bat over his head. The suspect immediately dropped the bat but continued running southbound. PSO #2 then holstered his sidearm and chased the suspect on foot losing sight of him in the area of Duchess and Lake Ct.

PSO #3 was notified by Kent County dispatch that the suspect was outside of a residence on Bonnell Ave. S.E. PSO #3 arrived at the residence and took the suspect into custody without incident. The suspect was returned home and turned over to the custody of his parents (**Note:** The Kent County Juvenile Detention Facility refused to lodge the suspect due to COVID-19 restrictions). The Kent County Juvenile Prosecutors office authorized a charge for domestic violence 1st.

PSO #2 completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing sergeant completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officers' response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer(s) for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) the officer complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and was justified to draw his sidearm as the suspect displayed a potentially deadly weapon based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any officers or the 16-year-old suspect in this incident as the result of use of force.

5. On Friday, August 7 at 4:11 a.m., four PSOs responded to Blodgett Emergency to assist Spectrum Security Police and medical staff with an aggressive 25-year-old B/M patient. The patient had been unresponsive but became aggressive once responsive. His 23-year-old B/F girlfriend was also present.

Upon their arrival, hospital staff were restraining the patient. His girlfriend was hindering their actions indicating she would not leave. PSO #1, PSO #2, and PSO #3 began talking to the female in an effort to deescalate and control the situation. Spectrum Security police wanted her to leave the room since she was not a patient, was becoming aggressive, and not helping the situation. She then refused to leave after being requested to do so by both Spectrum police and EGR PSOs. PSO #1 then placed his hand on her shoulder in an attempt to gain her attention as she was ignoring him. She told PSO #1 not to touch her. PSO #1 told her she needed to leave whereupon she replied she would not. PSO #2 then held the female subject's arm behind her back while PSO #3 held her other shoulder. All three PSOs then escorted the female subject out of the room while trying to calm her down. She started struggling with PSO #3 in an attempt to return to the hospital room. Since she was not cooperative and escalating in her response, PSO #2 temporarily handcuffed her for protective detention. Once she calmed down the handcuffs were removed by PSO #2 and the attending physicians allowed her to stay with the patient once he was safely secured.

All three officers completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing sergeant completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officers' response to resistance;

- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer(s) for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) all three officers complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and were justified to use appropriate control methods based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officers for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by the officers or the female subject in this incident as a result of use of force by the officers.

6. On Saturday, August 22 at 6:24 p.m., one sergeant and two PSOs were requested by GRPD to respond as backup units on high-risk traffic stop in the area of Fisk and Benjamin. The original call indicated the suspect, a 32-year-old B/M, brandished a handgun at the complainant after the complainant asked the subject not to drive erratically in the neighborhood.

Upon arrival, the sergeant deployed his patrol rifle while the PSOs each unholstered their sidearms as they exited their police cruisers. All three sworn members then approached the suspect vehicle. The sergeant never raised his rifle; both officers had their sidearms in the low ready position. The on-scene GRPD officers indicated the suspect was in custody and they were in the process of clearing the vehicle. The arresting officer indicated the suspect tossed the handgun out the window during the stop. GRPD officers advised the sergeant and two PSOs it was okay to clear the scene.

All three sworn members completed "Response to Resistance Reports" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the sergeant's response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the sergeant for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) all three sworn members complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and were justified based to draw their weapons based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared each sworn member for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome;

and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident.

7. On Wednesday, September 2 at 10:58 p.m., four PSOs responded to assist GRPD on a “shots fired” call. The suspect, a 28-year-old B/M, crashed his vehicle in the area of Wealthy and Gladstone and immediately fled the scene on foot. While responding in his cruiser, PSO #1 observed a figure in dark clothing run across the street and fall to the ground in the vicinity of Lake Drive and Glenwood. The officer then called out to the suspect and told him to stop. The suspect knelt on the ground on the sidewalk on Glenwood and spread his hands out. Due to the original nature of the “shooting” call, PSO #1 drew his sidearm and aimed it directly at the suspect who was still on the ground. When PSO #2 and PSO #3 arrived, they approached the suspect – weapons not drawn – and assisted by handcuffing him. The officers then searched the area for weapons. PSO #1 searched the suspect incident to arrest before placing him in the backseat of his cruiser.

While in the backseat of the cruiser, the suspect indicated he was having difficulty breathing. PSO #1 turned on the air conditioning and assisted the suspect out of the cruiser and sat him by the curb as he was beginning to vomit. PSO #1 then placed the suspect in a seated position as he was still vomiting. PSO #1 allowed the suspect to “sit back on his leg” for steadiness. The suspect thanked PSO #1 for his help. PSO #3 then walked to the nearby gas station, purchased a bottle of water, and gave it to the suspect. The suspect was turned over to GRPD since the incidents occurred in Grand Rapids.

PSO #1 completed a “Response to Resistance Report” and the reviewing supervisor completed a “Response to Resistance Supervisory Report” according to policy.

An “Incident Review Committee” was formed to:

- Review PSO #1’s response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department’s training programs adequately prepared the officer for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The “Incident Review Committee” determined: (1) the officer complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and was justified to draw his weapon based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident.

8. On Thursday, October 1 at 11:38 p.m., one sergeant and two PSOs responded to a suicidal subject – 24-year-old W/M – with a knife call. While enroute to the address, Kent County Dispatch advised the responding officers that the subject had put the knife down and retreated to his downstairs bedroom.

Upon arrival, the subject's father stated the subject cut himself with a knife and said he wanted to kill himself. PSO #1 and PSO #2 entered the residence. PSO #1 called to the subject downstairs and asked him to come upstairs. The subject complied and came upstairs. Once upstairs, the subject started waving his arms and stated that he wanted to kill himself. PSO #1 then asked the subject if he had any weapons on his person. He stated that he did not. PSO #1 then conducted a "Terry Pat Down" search after which he told the subject to sit down until the ambulance arrived. The subject then stated he was not going to the hospital, stood up and started to walk away. PSO #1 and PSO #2 grabbed his arms and tried to sit him back down as he was trying to pull away. The PSOs then took the subject to the ground while he was holding his arms against his body. The officers rolled him onto the ground, freed his right arm from underneath his body and placed him in handcuffs. At no time did the officers place any of their knees or body weight on the subject's head, neck, or back. When the ambulance arrived, the paramedics told the officers it was okay to remove the subject's handcuffs. Once they were removed the subject entered the ambulance and was transported to Blodgett Hospital.

PSO #1 and PSO #2 each completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officer's response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) the officers complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and were justified to use physical force based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident once the officers arrived on scene.

9. On Wednesday, October 7 at 3:36 a.m., three PSOs responded to a possible home invasion in progress call in the 1800 block of Lake Drive. Kent County Dispatch advised the responding officers that the caller was in the basement, listened to a door open on the main level of the

house and heard someone walking around. The caller also advised that his parents were in their bedroom on the 2nd floor.

Upon arrival, the officers located an open outside door. All three PSOs unholstered their duty sidearms and kept them at the low ready position. PSO #1 announced "Police, come out with your hands up." The three officers then entered and began to systematically search the residence.

While clearing the second floor, PSO #1 announced officer presence again and the bedroom door slowly began to open. PSO #1 aimed the duty weapon at the subject and told the individual to show their hands when coming out. Once it was confirmed that the subject was the homeowner, PSO #1 returned the duty weapon to the low ready position. The homeowner was then informed about the situation and told to return to her bedroom until the house was cleared. Once the house was secured all officers holstered their sidearms. A brief investigation determined the door was most likely opened due to the wind.

PSO #1 completed a "Response to Resistance Report" and the reviewing supervisor completed a "Response to Resistance Supervisory Report" according to policy.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the officer's response to resistance;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) PSO #1 complied with applicable response to resistance policies and procedures and was justified to draw and display the sidearm based on the totality of the circumstances; (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident. (**Note:** PSO #2 and PSO #3 did not complete Response to Resistance Reports as their weapons were not visible to the public.)

SUMMARY & ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE INCIDENTS

East Grand Rapids Department of Public Safety personnel responded to 3,574 calls for service, arrested 100 individuals for Part I, II, and III Crimes, and made 539 citizen contacts in 2020. There were no injuries to citizens, residents, non-residents, other community members or officers as a result of the use of force in any incident by a member of the East Grand Rapids Department of Public Safety. The

race and gender of individuals in response to resistance incidents were 5 B/Ms, 2 W/Ms, 1 B/F, and 1 W/F. Force or display of force was used only nine times:

- During 3754 calls for service, 9 (**0.24%**) resulted in use of force. In other words, force was not used in **99.76%** of calls for service; and
- In 100 Part I, II, and III arrest incidents in East Grand Rapids, 5 (**5%**) resulted in use of force. Put another way, force was not used in **95%** of arrest situations.

Force is rarely applied by East Grand Rapids officers. In the vast majority of incidents – including arrests – both the officer and citizen/victim/suspect are respectful and courteous to one another and the events are peacefully resolved.

For 2020, these incidents were categorized as:

- *Weapons drawn or displayed in East Grand Rapids – 4;*
- *Weapons displayed while backing up an agency outside of our city – 2;*
- *Hands on in East Grand Rapids – 2; and*
- *Hands-on while backing up an agency outside of our city 1.*

The review included an analysis of the officers involved in response to resistance situations. There are no patterns of any specific officer being involved in an alarming number of incidents. *All force used was determined to be within policy.*

Additionally, there were no race, national origin, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, or cultural group-based response to resistance (use of force) complaints during the year. There are no patterns or trends of serious misconduct, inappropriate actions, criminal behavior, or use of force abuse by any member or shift of the Department.

Areas for Improvement:

- Three “Response to Resistance Reports” used were old versions.

Recommendation: Remove all outdated “Response to Resistance Report” forms.

VEHICLE PURSUITS

In 2020, one vehicle pursuit occurred that involved a sworn member of the Department.

1. On Saturday February 29 at 1:30 p.m., a PSO attempted to stop a vehicle which became a low-speed pursuit.

While driving northbound on Lakeside Drive, the PSO ran the car's license plate, after it crossed the double yellow center line. It came back expired as of February 9, 2020. Additionally, a Secretary of State check showed there was no insurance on the car which also had a defective brake light on the driver's side. The car continued northbound on Lakeside. As the PSO closed on the car on Lakeside near Durant, he activated his overhead lights just north of Lakeside and Durant. The car did not stop so the PSO activated his siren briefly. The car continued northbound on Lakeside travelling about 30-35 mph in a 25-mph zone. The vehicle briefly traveled into the left turn lane at Lakeside and Robinson before turning e/b on Robinson.

The PSO reactivated his siren and the car did not stop. The car continued eastbound on Robinson and then turned into the Mayflower Church Parking Lot. The car traveled north through the parking lot. After it passed two sections of parking lot it continued north east through the Mayflower Church property on a driveway. When the vehicle reached another section of parking lot it pulled into a parking space near the entry of the church. The PSO then conducted a high-risk traffic stop because the car failed to yield to the officer's use of lights and siren. (**Note:** For additional details on the response to resistance, see the "Response to Resistance" summary outlined on pages 5-6 of this report.)

The PSO completed a "Pursuit Report." The reviewing supervisor completed the "Supervisor Report" portion of the report per policy and submitted a supplemental report for review to the Captain.

The Captain submitted his written findings to the Director to:

- Review the officer's pursuit decision;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officer for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The pursuit review determined: (1) the PSO complied with applicable pursuit policies and procedures and was justified in his actions. The vehicle never gained speed or attempted evasive maneuvers. The officer indicated he was about to pull over to the side of the road when the car turned into the Mayflower Church parking lot and stopped. (2) the training received prepared the officer for the response to resistance resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this incident.

Comments. This particular incident highlights the difficulty of determining when does an attempted traffic stop become a pursuit. At some point, regardless of the safe driving of the officer and suspect driver, the incident does become a pursuit if the driver does not stop.

SUMMARY & ANALYSIS OF VEHICLE PURSUITS

The Department has had a no pursuit policy, unless exceptional circumstances exist, since the late 1990s. Officers routinely disengage from following non-stopping traffic violators before the situation becomes a pursuit. There are no patterns of individuals or shifts engaging in unwarranted pursuits.

FOOT PURSUITS

In 2020, one-foot pursuit occurred that involved one sworn member of the Department.

1. On Wednesday, April 4 at 7:44 p.m., a PSO was in the 4000 block of Reeds Lake Blvd. checking the area for a subject involved in a domestic dispute when he observed the suspect (a 16-year-old W/M) walking southbound on the boardwalk area. Once the subject saw the PSO, he immediately turned around and started back northbound. As the PSO pulled up next to him, the officer saw he was holding a long silver object in his right hand that appeared to be a baseball bat. He then made an immediate 180 degree turn and started to run southbound. The PSO exited his cruiser and told the suspect to stop and drop the bat. As the subject cleared the rear passenger side of his cruiser, still running southbound, he started to raise the bat up with his right arm. At this time, the PSO drew his duty weapon and started to bring it to a lower ready position and again told him to drop the bat. The subject immediately dropped the bat and continued running southbound on Reeds Lake Blvd. with the officer in foot pursuit. The subject then turned and ran westbound up Dutchess from Reeds Lake Blvd. As the officer reached the top of the hill near the intersection of Dutchess and Lake Ct., he lost sight of the subject and discontinued his pursuit. The suspect was arrested a few minutes later by other officers on Bonnell.

The involved PSO completed a "Foot Pursuit Report." The reviewing supervisor completed the "Supervisor Report" portion of the report per policy and submitted a supplemental report for review to the captain.

An "Incident Review Committee" was formed to:

- Review the circumstances surrounding the incident;
- Determine whether the Department's training programs adequately prepared the officers for the circumstances encountered and determine changes to the in-service curriculum if a deficiency is identified; and
- Make recommendations as to policy revisions or amendments, if necessary.

Findings. The "Incident Review Committee" determined: (1) the officer complied with applicable foot pursuit policies and procedures and was justified to engage in the foot pursuit based on the totality of the circumstances. (2) the training received prepared the officers for the foot pursuit

resulting in a safe and effective outcome; and (3) current policy standards require no revisions. No injuries were sustained by any involved party in this foot pursuit.

SUMMARY & ANALYSIS OF FOOT PURSUITS

As a part of the MLEAC accreditation process, the Department is required to have a foot pursuit policy. The Department enacted its first foot pursuit policy in 2018. There are no patterns of individuals or shifts engaging in unwarranted foot pursuits.

On February 16, 2021, the Department modified the foot pursuit policy by having the captain conduct a review of the incident instead of an incident review committee. His report is then submitted to the director for final review.