

A Report of Officer Involved Shootings in Colorado: 2010-2016 Pursuant to Senate Bill 15-217

Prepared for the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate

March 1, 2017



Colorado Department of Public Safety

Division of Criminal Justice

Office of Research and Statistics

700 Kipling St., Denver, Colorado 80215

<https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/dcj-ors>

A Report of Officer Involved Shootings in Colorado: 2010-2016 Pursuant to Senate Bill 15-217

March 1, 2017

Prepared by

Ernesto Munoz
Kim English



Stan Hilkey, Executive Director, Department of Public Safety

Jeanne M. Smith, Director, Division of Criminal Justice

Kim English, Research Director, Office of Research and Statistics

Acknowledgements

The Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics, is extremely grateful to the group of law enforcement representatives who, at the onset of this project, met with researchers to discuss the data elements required in Senate Bill 15-217 and assist in the development of the data collection instrument. Many thanks to Dave Holdren from the Mesa County Sheriff's Office, Paul Quimby and Carl Winterbower from the Grand Junction Police Department, David Rogers from the Boulder County Sheriff's Office, Chris Wyckoff and Stephanie Lord from the Denver Police Department, Bernadette Rankin from the Golden Police Department, and Kim Kinion from the Golden Police Department.

We also thank the law enforcement agencies that provided the data presented in this report.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	6
Executive Summary.....	8
Introduction and Methods.....	9
Findings	10
Description of officers and citizens.....	11
Basis for contact and shooting.....	14
Citizens: Searches, contraband and weapons	17
Injury outcome of shooting.....	19
Arrests and citations for those who survived	22
Conclusions	23
Appendix A	24
Data Collection Instrument.....	24
Appendix B	29
Law enforcement agencies with incidents in 2015-2016	29
Appendix C	30
Reporting law enforcement agencies	30

Executive Summary

In 2015, the Colorado General Assembly passed Senate Bill 15-217, which mandated that state and local law enforcement agencies report specific information to the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) in the Department of Public Safety in the event that the agency “employs a peace officer who is involved in an officer-involved shooting that results in a person suspected of criminal activity being shot at by the officer.”¹ S.B.15-217 mandated DCJ to analyze and report the data on an annual basis. This second annual report, as specified in S.B. 15-217, documents findings based on officer involved shootings that occurred during a 6½ year period between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016.

During the time period under study, 48 law enforcement agencies reported 259 shooting incidents involving 463 officers and 294 citizens.² The majority of the citizens and officers were White (56% and 83%, respectively) but the citizen group included 29% Hispanics and 14% Blacks. As a group, the citizens were younger, on average, than the officers. Among the citizens, Blacks were youngest, compared to Hispanics and Whites.

Over half (55%) of the incidents were originated by a call for service. Agencies reported that in nearly two-thirds (62%) of shooting incidents, officers perceived an imminent threat to officers or citizens, and in another 20% of incidents, a shot was fired at the officer. The officer perceived some level of threat in 13% of incidents, and four incidents (2%) involved preventing an escape. In 76% of the cases, a verbal warning was issued before the incident. In nearly half of incidents (41%), there was some indication of intoxication with alcohol, drugs or a combination of those.

Agencies reported that a weapon was involved in at least 79% of incidents, and most often that weapon was a handgun (46%) followed by a motor vehicle that was perceived by the officer to be used as a weapon (12%) and a knife/cutting instrument (9%). Firearms (including handguns, rifles, and shotguns) were present in 56% of incidents. Black citizens were significantly more likely to have a firearm (76%) compared to Whites (54%) and Hispanics (51%).

At least seventy-eight percent (78%) of officers were neither injured or killed compared to 20% of citizens. Nearly half (45%) of citizens were killed and another 34% were wounded. Citizens who were killed or wounded were likely to be perceived by the officer as an imminent threat.

Among citizens who survived these encounters, 86% were arrested or cited for a crime (with little difference across race/ethnicity). The most common charge was attempted first degree murder followed by first degree assault. Other common charges included felony menacing, criminal mischief, and assault on a peace officer.

Note that the data reported here represent information provided by 75 law enforcement agencies, 48 of which reported officer-involved shootings between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016. *It is not possible to know if every incident was reported to the Division of Criminal Justice.*

¹ C.R.S. 24-33.5-517(1).

² During the period under study, 75 agencies completed and submitted the data collection instrument. To encourage reporting from agencies that had no incidents, DCJ provided a “No Incidents” data collection instrument, which was used by 27 agencies. Approximately 279 agencies meet the reporting requirements of S.B. 15-217.

Introduction and Methods

Background. In 2015, the Colorado General Assembly passed Senate Bill 15-217, which mandated that state and local law enforcement agencies report specific information to the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) in the Department of Public Safety in the event that the agency “employs a peace officer who is involved in an officer-involved shooting that results in a person suspected of criminal activity being shot at by the officer.”³ As specified in the bill, state and local law enforcement agencies include the Colorado State Patrol, the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, a county sheriff’s office, a municipal police department, the Division of Parks and Wildlife, or a town marshal’s office.

S.B. 15-217 asked that the following information be collected from law enforcement agencies:

- a) The age, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and medically-documented physical or mental disability of the suspect;
- b) The age, gender, race, and ethnicity of the peace officer;
- c) The officer’s basis for the contact or stop that led to the officer-involved shooting;
- d) The officer’s basis for the shooting, and whether the officer or any other officer responding to the scene issued a verbal warning before shooting;
- e) Whether the officer or any other officer responding to the scene conducted a search and, if so, whether the search was conducted pursuant to probable cause, with consent, or pursuant to any other lawful exception to the warrant requirement, and whether contraband was found and, if so, the nature of the contraband; and,
- f) Whether the officer or any other officer responding to the scene arrested or issued a citation to anyone and, if so, the crimes charged as a result of the arrest or citation.

S.B.15-217 mandated DCJ to analyze and report the data on an annual basis. This second annual report, as specified in S.B. 15-217, documents findings based on officer involved shootings that occurred during a 6½-year period between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016.

Organization of this report. This report is organized as follows: This section provides an overview of the study; the following section presents the findings and conclusions.

Study Methods

Stakeholder group convened. Following the passage of S.B. 15-217, the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics (ORS), convened a small group of law enforcement officers and crime analysts from eight agencies to discuss the collection of the data mandated in the bill. This group assisted in the development of response categories that were incorporated into the electronic data collection instrument that was posted on the Division’s web site for agencies to use (see Appendix A).

³ C.R.S. 24-33.5-517(1).

This group also determined that the following additional data elements should be included in the data collection instrument.

- Location and date of the incident
- A narrative of the incident
- Whether the citizen had a weapon and if so what type of weapon
- Whether the citizen was wounded or killed and
- Whether the peace officer was wounded or killed

Data Collection. The Division of Criminal Justice worked with the state police chiefs' and sheriffs' associations to outreach to law enforcement agencies regarding the reporting requirements of S.B. 15-217. Additionally, DCJ emailed agencies directly to provide the data collection instruments and instructions and to remind them of the mandate.

The data collection instrument consisted of a series questions about the incident, another group of questions about the suspects, and a third block of questions about the officers (see Appendix A). To capture all citizens involved in an incident, the instrument allowed for data to be collected on up to five different citizens.⁴ Similarly, the form allowed documentation of up to five different officers involved in an incident. If more citizens or officers were involved, the agencies were to append that information.

S.B.15-217 required any state and local agency that employs a peace officer to report on officer-involved shootings that occurred between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016. The agencies mandated to report include county sheriff offices, municipal police departments, town marshal's offices, the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, the Colorado State Patrol, and the state Division of Parks and Wildlife in the Department of Natural Resources.

Seventy-five agencies, out of approximately 279 agencies that meet the reporting requirements of S.B. 15-217, reported data to DCJ in the period between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016. To encourage reporting by agencies without incidents, DCJ developed a "No Incidents" data collection instrument and this was submitted by 27 agencies. Thus, 48 agencies reported incidents. For 12 incidents, two or more agencies reported the same incident since multiple agencies were on the scene. These reports were merged taking into consideration the date of the incident, the location and the narrative in the reports.

It is unknown if the incidents reported here represent all officer-involved shootings during the time period of study.

Findings

Seventy-five agencies⁵ reported a total of 259 incidents that occurred between January 2010 and June 2016. Figure 1 shows the number of incidents by year with 2016 data available only through the month

⁴ DCJ also provided a spreadsheet format that allowed for reporting an unlimited number of officers and citizens.

⁵ Approximately 279 agencies in Colorado meet the reporting requirements in S.B. 15-217.

of June. From 2011 through 2015 the number of incidents increased somewhat every year reaching 52 in 2015.

These 259 incidents involved 463 officers and 294 citizens.⁶ As shown in Table 1, in 90% of the incidents there was only one citizen. In 51% of incidents there was only one officer and one citizen, and in 55% of incidents, there was one officer and up to five citizens.




Figure 1. Number of officer involved shooting incidents by year. *Note 2016 represents the first 6 months of the year.

Table 1. Composition of citizens and officers in 264 incidents

Number of Officers (n=463)	Number of citizens (n=294)						Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
1	<1%	51%	3%	<1%	0%	<1%	55%
2	0%	24%	2%	1%	<1%	0%	27%
3	0%	8%	1%	<1%	0%	0%	9%
4	0%	5%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	5%
5	0%	1%	<1%	0%	0%	<1%	2%
6	0%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%
7	0%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%
9	0%	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<1%
Total	<1%	90%	7%	2%	<1%	<1%	100%

Description of officers and citizens

Most of the officers and most of the citizens were male. Table 2 shows the distribution of males and females among officers and citizens. For officers, 95% were male and 5% were female. The proportion of

⁶ Please note that in the tables that follow, the number (n) of cases will vary depending on whether the analysis is focused on incidents, officers or citizens.

females among citizens was larger than the proportion of females among officers. For citizens, approximately 7 out of every 100 citizens were female.

Table 2. Gender of officers and citizens

Gender	Citizens	Officers
N	294	463
Male	93%	95%
Female	7%	5%
Total	100%	100%

Table 3 shows the distribution of race/ethnicity for officers and citizens.⁷ Four out of five officers were White (83%), 10% were Hispanic, 5% were Black and 2% were other or unknown. The group of citizens was 56% White, 29% Hispanic, 14% Black, and 1% other or unknown.

Table 3. Race/Ethnicity of officers or citizens

Race/Ethnicity	Citizens	Officers
N	294	463
White	56%	83%
Hispanic	29%	10%
Black	14%	5%
Other or Unknown	1%	2%
Total	100%	100%

According to the state Demographer’s Office, between 2011 and 2014, the race/ethnicity of the state population was as follows:

- White non-Hispanic 70%
- Hispanic 21%
- Black 4%
- Asian 3%
- American Indian 1%

Figure 2 shows the number of individuals falling into five-year age categories. Citizens tended to be younger than the officers. Nearly half (41%) of citizens were between the ages of 20-29. Officers were older, with only 16% between the ages of 20-29, and 43% of officers between the ages of 35-44. The

⁷ Because there were few cases of Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders and “unknown”, these categories were combined into “other/unknown.”

mean age of the citizens was 33 and the mean age of the officers was 38 (data not presented). White citizens were older and Black citizens were younger with 39% of Black citizens between the ages of 20 and 24.




Figure 2. Number of officers or citizens for various age categories.

Table 4 shows the age distribution by race/ethnicity of citizens. Two-thirds (66%) of Black citizens were in their 20s compared to 49% of Hispanics and 30% of Whites.

Table 4. Age and race/ethnicity of citizens

Age	White	Hispanic	Black	Other or Unknown	Total
N	164	86	41	3	294
15-19	5%	1%	12%	0%	5%
20-24	15%	27%	39%	0%	22%
25-29	15%	22%	27%	67%	19%
30-34	13%	16%	7%	0%	13%
35-39	13%	19%	7%	0%	14%
40-44	10%	3%	5%	0%	7%
45-49	10%	3%	2%	0%	7%
50-54	8%	3%	0%	0%	5%
55-59	5%	1%	0%	0%	3%
60-64	4%	1%	0%	0%	3%
65+	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Missing	0%	1%	0%	33%	<1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Among the requested information in S.B. 15-217 was the sexual orientation of the citizens. Based on the responses tabulated in Table 5, the sexual orientation of most citizens (89%) was unknown. Sexual orientation was identified as “straight” for 11% of citizens.

Table 5. Sexual orientation of citizens

Sexual orientation	N	%
Unknown	263	89%
Straight	31	11%
Lesbian	N/A	N/A
Gay	N/A	N/A
Total	294	100%

As shown in Table 6, a mental/physical disability was not evident in 73% of incidents and unknown in another 16%. Officers reported a mental disability in 8% of cases and a physical disability in 1% of cases. Note that the statute requires reporting on mental and physical disability but these are not defined.

Table 6. Disability of citizens

Disability	N	%
Not evident	214	73%
Unknown	47	16%
Mental	23	8%
Missing data	7	2%
Physical	3	1%
Total	294	100%

Basis for contact and shooting

S.B. 15-217 asked for information on the officer’s basis for the contact or stop of the citizen and the officer’s basis for the shooting. As shown in Table 7, a call for service was the most frequent basis for the contact (in 55% of incidents) that led to the officer-involved shooting. A law enforcement investigation was the basis of contact in 12% of incidents, and a traffic stop was the basis in 13% of cases. These three types of initial contact (call for service, investigation, and traffic stop) accounted for 80% of the incidents.

Table 7. Basis for initial contact

Basis for contact	N	%
Call for service	143	55%
Traffic stop	34	13%
Investigation	32	12%
Warrant	22	8%
Other	16	6%
Tactical team call	11	4%
Citizen flag down	1	<1%
Total	259	100%

Table 8 shows the basis for initial contact by the race/ethnicity of the citizens. In Table 8, Hispanics were more likely to be involved in traffic stops and investigations compared to Whites. Blacks were more frequently involved in a traffic stop and tactical team call as the basis for the initial contact.

Table 8. Basis for initial contact by race/ethnicity of citizens

Basis for contact	White	Hispanic	Black	Other or Unknown	Total
N	164	86	41	3	294
Call for service	56%	50%	49%	33%	53%
Traffic stop	13%	20%	22%	0%	16%
Investigation	10%	16%	10%	33%	12%
Warrant	10%	8%	5%	0%	9%
Other	7%	3%	7%	33%	6%
Tactical team call	4%	2%	7%	0%	4%
Citizen flag down	<1%	0%	0%	0%	<1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As shown in Table 9, agencies reported that in two-thirds (62%) of shooting incidents, officers perceived an “imminent threat” to an officer or a citizen. In another 20% of incidents the officer was shot by the citizen. In 13% of the incidents the officer perceived a less-than-imminent threat to the officer, another officer or a citizen. The remaining eleven incidents involved preventing an escape, conducting an arrest, and five incidents that fell into the other category. An analysis of the basis for shooting across race/ethnicity found no differences (data not presented).

Table 9. Basis for officer shooting by incident

Basis for shooting	N	%
Imminent threat	161	62%
Shot fired at officer	53	20%
Perceived threat	34	13%
Other	5	2%
Preventing an escape	4	2%
Conducting an arrest	1	<1%
Missing data	1	<1%
Total	259	100%

In 76% of the incidents, a verbal warning was issued before the incident (see Table 10). In one out of every five incidents, no verbal warning was issued. This corresponds generally to the information presented in Table 9 which shows that, for 20% of incidents, the basis for the officer-involved shooting was that a shot was fired at the officer.

Table 10. Officer issued verbal warning during incident

Officer verbal warning	N	%
Yes	197	76%
No	58	22%
Missing data	4	2%
Total	259	100%

At the request of the law enforcement representatives convened by DCJ after the passage of S.B. 15-217, the data collection instrument included questions regarding intoxication of the citizen. As reflected in Table 11, this information was unknown in 44% of incidents. For an additional 14% there was no evidence of intoxication. In nearly half of incidents (41%), there was some indication of intoxication with alcohol, drugs or a combination of those.

Table 11. Intoxication of citizens

Under influence of	N	%
Unknown	130	44%
Drugs	43	15%
Alcohol	42	14%
No evidence of intoxication	40	14%
Alcohol and drugs	34	12%
Missing data	5	2%
Total	294	100%

Citizens: Searches, contraband and weapons

Table 12 shows that 90% of citizens represented in these officer-involved shootings were *not* searched for contraband prior to the incident, according to the data provided by law enforcement agencies. Six percent of citizens were searched with probable cause, 4% involved a warrant, and 2% occurred with consent.

Table 12. Type of search of citizen

Type of Search	N	No	Yes	Missing	Total
Conducted search	294	90%	9%	1%	100%
Probable cause	294	92%	6%	2%	100%
With consent	294	95%	2%	3%	100%
Warrant	294	94%	4%	2%	100%

S.B. 15-217 requires law enforcement agencies to report whether contraband was found on the citizen. In response to this question, agencies reported that no contraband was found in about half (46%) of citizens (see Table 13). Also, in response to this question, agencies reported that 25% of citizens had a weapon. Drugs and drug paraphernalia combined with weapons were noted in another 15% of cases.

Table 13. Nature of contraband

Contraband	N	%
No contraband	135	46%
Weapon as contraband	73	25%
Missing data	30	10%
Drugs/paraphernalia and weapons	26	9%
Drugs/paraphernalia	19	6%
Other	11	4%
Total	294	100%

Please note that the information regarding weapons presented in Table 13 differs from that shown in Table 14 because the tables reflect answers to two different questions. Table 13 reflects the presence of a weapon(s) “as contraband” and this was reported for 25% of citizens whereas Table 14, reflecting agency responses to the question about weapons possessed by citizens (which includes motor vehicles as a weapon), shows only 9% of citizens did NOT have a weapon.

Table 14 reflects the type of weapon possessed by citizens, including motor vehicles. Overall, about 83% of citizens had a weapon, according to the data provided by law enforcement agencies. The percentage of citizens that had no weapon was 7%, and in 7% of cases the presence of a weapon was unknown. In about half of the cases (46%) the weapon was a handgun. The second most common weapon was classified as a motor vehicle (12%).

Table 14. Weapon in possession by citizen

Weapon	N	%
Handgun	136	46%
Motor vehicle	34	12%
Knife/cutting instrument	27	9%
No weapon	21	7%
Unknown	20	7%
Rifle	15	5%
Other	11	4%
Shotgun	9	3%
Missing data	8	3%
Blunt object	6	2%
Other firearm	4	1%
Multiple Weapons	2	1%
Fire/Incendiary device	1	0%
Total	294	100%

To better understand these incidents, the weapons were collapsed into the following broad categories: Firearm, not a firearm, and other/unknown, as shown in Table 15. Handgun, rifle, shotgun, and any other firearm were included in the in the firearm category. “Not a firearm” includes motor vehicle, knife/cutting instrument, blunt object and fire/incendiary device.

Based on these broader categories, 56% of citizens had a firearm. Another 23% of citizens had one of the other listed weapons that was not a firearm.

Table 15. Weapon (generic) in possession by citizen

Weapon	N	%
Firearm	164	56%
Not a firearm	68	23%
Other or unknown	33	11%
No weapon	21	7%
Missing data	8	3%
Total	294	100%

Table 16 shows these broad categories of weapons by the race/ethnicity of the citizens. Three out of four Blacks (76%) had a firearm compared to approximately half of Whites and Hispanics. Slightly more than one-quarter of Whites (27%) and 22% of Hispanics had a non-firearm weapon. Hispanics were least likely to be armed.

Table 16. Weapon by race/ethnicity of citizen

Weapon	White	Hispanic	Black	Other or Unknown	Total
N	164	86	41	3	294
Firearm	54%	51%	76%	33%	56%
Not a firearm	27%	22%	7%	67%	23%
Other or unknown	12%	12%	7%	0%	11%
No weapon	5%	12%	5%	0%	7%
Missing data	2%	3%	5%	0%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Injury outcome of shooting

Table 17 shows whether the incident resulted in death or injury for either the officer or the citizen. Most of the officers (78%) were neither killed nor wounded as part of the incident. However, of those reports that included officer injury, in one incident the officer was killed. The number of killed or wounded citizens was substantially higher for citizens than for officers: 45% were killed and 34% were wounded during the shooting incidents reported here. Figure 3 presents the extent of injury by year; note that 2016 represents the first six months of the calendar year.

Table 17. Extent of shooting injury for officers and citizens

Injury	Citizens	Officers
N	294	463
Killed	45%	<1%
Wounded	34%	7%
Neither	20%	78%
Missing data	1%	14%
Total	100%	100%

*Denver Police Department did not provide this information on 67 officers between 2010 and 2015 which was not required in S.B. 15-217.




Figure 3. Citizen injury by year. *2016 represents the first six months of the year.

Table 18 presents the extent of injury by the race/ethnicity of the citizens. In 20% of incidents there was no death or injury.

Table 18. Injury of citizen by race/ethnicity of citizen

Race/Ethnicity	N	Killed	Wounded	Neither	Missing	Total
White	164	43%	36%	21%	0%	100%
Hispanic	86	56%	29%	15%	0%	100%
Black	41	29%	41%	24%	5%	100%
Other or Unknown	3	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Total	294	45%	34%	20%	1%	100%

Table 19 shows citizen injury by the agency's description of the basis for the shooting. Imminent threat refers to an immediate, forthcoming threat, whereas perceived threat refers to becoming aware of a threatening situation.

Two-thirds (67%) of those killed were perceived by the officer(s) to represent an imminent threat (see Table 19). Of those wounded, almost three-fourths (72%) were perceived by the officer(s) to represent an imminent threat. Table 20 shows that officers issued a verbal warning a majority of the time to those citizens that were killed (79% of the time) or wounded (72% of the time).

Table 19. Injury of citizen by basis for shooting

Basis for shooting	Killed	Wounded	Neither	Missing	Total
N	132	101	59	2	294
Imminent threat	67%	72%	37%	100%	63%
Shot fired at officer	15%	19%	27%	0%	19%
Perceived threat	13%	6%	31%	0%	14%
Other	2%	2%	3%	0%	2%
Preventing an escape	2%	<1%	2%	0%	1%
Conducting an arrest	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Missing data	<1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 20. Injury of citizen by verbal warning from officer

Officer verbal warning	Killed	Wounded	Neither	Missing	Total
N	132	101	59	2	294
Yes	79%	72%	73%	100%	76%
No	20%	28%	25%	0%	23%
Missing	2%	0%	2%	0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 21 shows the extent of injury by the basis for initial contact. The most deadly outcomes resulted when tactical teams were involved in the incident. Traffic stops as the basis for the contact most often resulted in neither injury nor death (40%).

Table 21. Injury of citizen by contact basis

Basis for contact	N	Killed	Wounded	Neither	Missing	Total
Call for service	156	46%	38%	17%	0%	100%
Traffic stop	47	17%	40%	40%	2%	100%
Investigation	35	57%	26%	17%	0%	100%
Warrant	25	48%	36%	16%	0%	100%
Other	19	63%	11%	21%	5%	100%
Tactical team call	11	82%	18%	0%	0%	100%
Citizen flag down	1	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Total	294	45%	34%	20%	1%	100%

Table 22 shows extent of citizen injury by weapon. Nearly half (49%) of citizens killed in the officer-involved shootings described here had a firearm; another 35% with a firearm were wounded. Only 15%

of citizens who possessed a firearm were neither killed nor wounded. Almost half (47%) of citizens with non-firearm weapons (including motor vehicle, knife/cutting instrument, blunt object, or fire/incendiary device) were killed and 35% were wounded.

Table 22. Injury of citizen by presence of weapon

Weapon	N	Killed	Wounded	Neither	Missing	Total
Firearm	164	49%	35%	15%	1%	100%
Not a firearm	68	47%	35%	18%	0%	100%
Other or unknown	33	39%	24%	36%	0%	100%
No weapon	21	14%	43%	43%	0%	100%
Missing	8	38%	25%	25%	13%	100%
Total	294	45%	34%	20%	1%	100%

Arrests and citations for those who survived

S.B. 15-217 requested information on arrests and citations that resulted from the officer-involved shooting. Here we report this information for the 160 citizens who survived the officer-involved shooting incident.

Table 23 shows that 86% of those involved in these incidents were either arrested or issued a citation, and all of these were charged with a crime(s). There were minimal differences across race/ethnicity (Table 24). The most common charge was attempted first degree murder, followed by first degree assault. Other common charges included felony menacing, criminal mischief, first degree murder and assault on a peace officer. A few cases were charged with aggravated robbery and attempted murder of a peace officer (data not presented).

Table 23. Citizens arrested or cited (those who survived)

Arrested or cited (who survived)	N	%
Yes	137	86%
No	19	12%
Missing	4	3%
Total	160	100%

Table 24. Race/ethnicity by arrest or citation for citizens who survived

Arrested or Cited (who survived)	White	Hispanic	Black	Other or Unknown	Total
N	94	38	27	1	160
Yes	87%	84%	85%	0%	86%
No	12%	11%	11%	100%	12%
Missing	1%	5%	4%	0%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions

The data reported here represent information provided to the Division of Criminal Justice by 75 law enforcement agencies, 48 of which reported officer-involved shootings, between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2016. It is not possible to know if every officer-involved shooting incident was reported to the Division of Criminal Justice.

During the six and a half year study period, 75 agencies reported 259 shooting incidents involving 463 officers and 294 citizens. The majority (55%) of incidents originated with a call for service, and in 62% of shooting incidents, officers perceived an imminent threat. At least 79% of citizens had a weapon. Firearms (including handguns, rifles, and shotguns) were in possession by 56% of citizens. Blacks were significantly more likely to have a firearm (76%) compared to Whites (54%) and Hispanics (51%). Twenty percent of encounters resulted in neither death nor injury. Among citizens who survived these encounters, 86% were arrested or cited for a crime. The most common charge was attempted first degree murder followed by assault.

Senate Bill 15-217 requires the Division of Criminal Justice to annually report the information presented here to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. The next report will cover the period of January 1, 2010 through June 30, 2017.

Appendix A: Data Collection Instrument

Peace Officer-Involved Shooting Reporting Format

Reporting Requirements for C.R.S. 24-33.5-517 (Senate Bill 15-217)

This data collection requires any state or local law enforcement agency that employs a peace officer who is involved in an officer-involved shooting that results in a person suspected of criminal activity being shot at by the officer to report the information described below. The statute defines a law enforcement agency as the following: a municipal police department, county sheriff's office, town marshal's office, the Colorado State Patrol, the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, and the state Division of Parks and Wildlife. These agencies must report to the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) by September 1, 2015 on all officer-involved shootings that occurred between January 1, 2010 and June 30, 2015. These agencies must also report by September 1, 2016 any officer-involved shootings that occur between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016. Agencies must report subsequent fiscal year data to DCJ by September 1 following the end of the fiscal year.

One form should be completed for each officer-involved shooting event. "Shoot Teams" may complete the form on behalf of the agency or agencies involved, however the name(s) of the agency or agencies employing the peace officer(s) must be clear. ***Shoot Teams who report data for other agencies are urged to allow agencies named in the report to review the data prior to submission to DCJ.***

All persons involved in the shooting event who are either shot at or charged with criminal activity are referred to below as "Subjects" in this data collection, and information must be collected on each.

Method of Data Collection

DCJ, in consultation with law enforcement representatives, has developed two reporting methods, a PDF format and an Excel spreadsheet (available at <https://www.colorado.gov/dcj-ors/officer-involved-shooting>). The PDF form can be used to submit one incident at a time; the spreadsheet can be used to submit a single or multiple incidents. Agencies with few incidents may find the PDF format the easier to use, while agencies with multiple incidents may find the spreadsheet more useful.

Data may be submitted to DCJ/ORS via email. If you have any questions please contact either Peg Flick at peg.flick@state.co.us or Laurence Lucero at laurence.lucero@state.co.us. Please send PDF forms and spreadsheets to cdps_dcj_ors_sb217@state.co.us

Spreadsheet Format

A spreadsheet template is available at <https://www.colorado.gov/dcj-ors>. **Please use the template provided. If you create a spreadsheet from scratch please use the format specified below.**

A submitted spreadsheet should contain 3 sheets: **Incident Information**, **Subjects**, and **Peace Officers**, in that order. Each sheet should contain the columns specified below. Some columns require specific values to be used. Please see the **Notes** for the specific values to submit.

Sheet 1 - Incident Information

Column	Column Name	Notes
A	Agency Name	Name of Reporting Agency
B	Agency ORI	To track back to Judicial District and County
C	Agency Incident number	This number will be used to link Subjects and Peace Officers to this incident
D	Incident Date	Format: MM/DD/YYYY
E	Incident Time	Format: HH:MM AM/PM
F	Incident Location	Address or other location information
G	<u>Primary</u> basis for the initial contact	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for service • Traffic stop • Citizen flag down • Warrant • Tactical team call • Investigation • Off duty • Other
H	<u>Primary</u> basis for the shooting	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officer shot at • Perceived threat to officer/civilian • Imminent threat to officer/civilian • Conducting an arrest • Preventing an escape • Other
I	Peace Officer(s) issued a verbal warning prior to shooting	Yes/No
J	Incident Narrative	Optional additional narrative. Maximum of 255 characters.

Sheet 2 - Subject(s) Shot at/Involved

Any person either shot at or charged with criminal activity must be reported. Each row in this sheet contains information for one Subject. One or more Subjects may be entered on this sheet. The **Agency Incident Number** will link **Subjects** listed on this sheet with the **Incident Information** on Sheet 1.

Column	Column Name	Notes
A	Agency Incident number	Incident Number from Sheet 1
B	Age	Age of subject
C	Gender	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male • Female • Transgender • Unknown

Column	Column Name	Notes
D	Sexual Orientation	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesbian or gay • Straight • Bisexual • Unknown
E	Race	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian • Black or African American • American Indian or Alaska Native • Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander • White • Unknown
F	Ethnicity	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic • Non-Hispanic • Unknown
G	Physical or Mental Disability	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical • Mental • Both • Not Evident
H	Explain Physical or Mental Disability	Optional text to explain physical or mental disability
I	Subject was armed with	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handgun • Rifle • Shotgun • Other firearm • Knife/cutting instrument • Blunt object • Motor vehicle • Explosives • Fire/Incendiary device • Unknown • Multiple weapons • Other • None
J	Subject wounded or killed	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wounded • Killed • Neither
K	Subject was under the influence of	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alcohol • Drugs • Alcohol and Drugs

Column	Column Name	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown • No evidence of intoxication
L	Subject was arrested or cited	Yes/No
M	Subject was charged with	C.R.S. of <u>most serious charge</u>
N	Prior to shooting officer(s) conducted a search	Yes/No
O	Prior to shooting officer(s) conducted search <u>pursuant to probable cause</u>	Yes/No
P	Prior to shooting officer(s) conducted search <u>with consent</u>	Yes/No
Q	Prior to shooting officer(s) conducted search <u>pursuant to a warrant</u>	Yes/No
R	Contraband found	Yes/No
S	Nature of contraband found	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drugs/Paraphernalia • Weapons • Drugs/Paraphernalia and Weapons • Other

Sheet 3 - Peace Officer (s)

Each row in this sheet contains information for one **Peace Officer**. One or more Peace Officers may be entered on this sheet. The **Agency Incident Number** will link **Peace Officers** listed on this sheet with the **Incident Information** on Sheet 1.

Column	Column Name	Notes
A	Agency Incident number	Agency Incident number from Sheet 1.
B	Officer Agency	Name of employing agency
C	Officer Agency ORI	ORI of employing agency
D	Age	Age of officer
E	Gender	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male • Female
F	Race	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian • Black or African American • American Indian or Alaska Native • Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander • White • Unknown
G	Ethnicity	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic • Non-Hispanic • Unknown

Column	Column Name	Notes
H	Officer wounded or killed	Select one: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wounded• Killed• Neither

PDF Format

The PDF data collection instrument contains the same information as the spreadsheet above, but is limited to five Peace Officers and 5 Subjects in a single incident.

Appendix B: Law enforcement agencies with incidents in 2015-2016

Table B-1. Law enforcement agencies that employ peace officers involved in shooting incidents between June 30, 2015 and July 1, 2016.

Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office
Aurora Police Department
Boulder Police Department
Broomfield Police Department
Central City Police Department
Chaffee County Sheriff's Office
Colorado Springs Police Department
Colorado State Patrol
Denver Police Department
Durango Police Department
El Paso County Sheriff's Office
Fort Collins Police Services
Fountain Police Department
Golden Police Department
Greeley Police Department
Gunnison County Sheriff's Office
Gunnison Police Department
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office
Lakewood Police Department
Larimer County Sheriff's Office
Longmont Police Department
Loveland Police Department
Mesa County Sheriff's Office
Northglenn Police Department
Pueblo Police Department
Thornton Police Department
Westminster Police Department

Appendix C: Reporting law enforcement agencies

Table C-1. Law enforcement agencies that reported incidents or no-incidents between January 2010 and June 2016.

Agency
Adams County Sheriff's Office
Alamosa County Sheriff's Office
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office
Archuleta County Sheriff's Office
Arvada Police Department
Auraria Campus Police Department
Aurora Police Department
Boulder Police Department
Brighton Police Department
Broomfield Police Department
Buena Vista Police Department
Castle Rock Police Department
Central City Police Department
Chaffee County Sheriff's Office
Cheyenne County Sheriff's Office
Clear Creek County Sheriff's Office
Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Colorado Springs Police Department
Colorado State Patrol
Commerce City Police Department
Conejos County Sheriff's Office
Cortez Police Department
Costilla County Sheriff's Office
Custer County Sheriff's Office
Delta County Sheriff's Office
Denver Police Department
Douglas County Sheriff's Office
Durango Police Department
Eagle County Sheriff's Office
El Paso County Sheriff's Office
Elbert County Sheriff's Office
Englewood Police Department
Federal Heights Police Department
Fort Collins Police Services
Fountain Police Department

Frederick Police Department
Fremont County Sheriff's Office
Fruita Police Department
Garfield County Sheriff's Office
Golden Police Department
Grand Junction Police Department
Greeley Police Department
Gunnison Police Department
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office
Kit Carson County Sheriff's Office
Lake County Sheriff's Office
Lakewood Police Department
Larimer County Sheriff's Office
Leadville Police Department
Logan County Sheriff's Office
Longmont Police Department
Loveland Police Department
Mesa County Sheriff's Office
Mineral County Sheriff's Office
Moffat County Sheriff's Office
Montrose County Sheriff's Office
Northglenn Police Department
Otero County Sheriff's Office
Parker Police Department
Pitkin County Sheriff's Office
Prowers County Sheriff's Office
Pueblo County Sheriff's Office
Pueblo Police Department
Rio Blanco County Sheriff's Office
Routt County Sheriff's Office
Saguache County Sheriff's Office
Sterling Police Department
Summit County Sheriff's Office
Teller County Sheriff's Office
Thornton Police Department
University of Colorado Denver Police
Weld County Sheriff's Office
Westminster Police Department
Wheat Ridge Police Department
Woodland Park Police Department