

# Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado

## Calendar Year 2023 Report

Pursuant to 24-31-903, C.R.S.

**May 2025**

Prepared by

Morgan Jacobson, Statistical Analyst

Allison Rosenthal, Statistical Analyst

Katherine Hernandez, Statistical Analyst

Dana Reegen, Research Analyst

Courtney Leapley, Research Analyst

Jack Reed, Research Director

Office of Research and Statistics

### **Colorado Department of Public Safety**

Stan Hilkey, Executive Director

### **Division of Criminal Justice**

Matthew M. Lunn, Director

### **Office of Research and Statistics**

Jack K. Reed, Research Director

700 Kipling St.

Denver, Colorado 80215

<https://dcj.colorado.gov/dcj-offices/ors>



## Accessibility Statement

The State of Colorado is committed to providing equitable access to our services to all Coloradans. [View the Accessibility, Interpretation & Translation Support page](#). To report digital accessibility barriers or request accommodations, complete the [CDPS Issue Reporting, Accommodation and Translation Request Webform](#) and/or email: [cdps\\_dcj\\_pio@state.co.us](mailto:cdps_dcj_pio@state.co.us).

# Table of Contents

Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado Calendar Year 2023 Report .....	1
Accessibility Statement.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
List of Tables .....	4
Executive Summary.....	7
Introduction .....	10
Summary of Statute .....	10
Data Collection Process.....	10
Data Collection & Limitations .....	12
Summary of 2023 Contact Submissions.....	13
Results.....	15
Reason for Citizen Contact.....	15
Demographics of Citizens Contacted .....	17
Search and Seizure Information.....	31
Showup Identifications .....	38
Use of Force .....	39
Agency-level reporting.....	62
Conclusion.....	77
References: .....	78
Appendix A: Statutory Language of 24-31-901 & 24-31-903, C.R.S.....	79
24-31-901. Definitions. ....	79
24-31-903. Division of criminal justice report. ....	79

# List of Tables

Table 1: Citizen contacts: contact reason, 2023 .....	16
Table 2: Denver contacts incidents: contact reason, 2023.....	17
Table 3: Colorado population: race/ethnicity, 2023.....	18
Table 4: Citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023.....	19
Table 5: Citizen contacts: gender, 2023.....	19
Table 6: Citizen contacts: age, 2023 .....	20
Table 7: Citizen contacts: race/ethnicity and age, 2023.....	21
Table 8: Citizen contacts: contact type and race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	22
Table 9: Citizen contacts: contact type and gender, 2023.....	22
Table 10: Citizen contacts: contact type and age, 2023 .....	23
Table 11: Citizen contacts: contact reason and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	24
Table 12: Denver citizen contacts: contact reason and race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	25
Table 13: Citizen contacts: contact reason and gender, 2023.....	26
Table 14: Denver citizen contacts: contact reason and gender of citizen, 2023 .....	26
Table 15: Citizen contacts: contact reason and outcomes, 2023 .....	27
Table 16: Citizen contacts: outcomes and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	28
Table 17: Denver citizen contacts: outcomes and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023.....	29
Table 18: Citizen contacts: outcomes and age, 2023 .....	30
Table 19: Citizen contacts: outcomes and gender, 2023.....	30
Table 20: Denver citizen contacts: outcomes and gender, 2023.....	31
Table 21: Citizen searches: basis for search, 2023.....	32
Table 22: Citizen searches: basis for search and race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	32
Table 23: Citizen searches: basis for search and age, 2023.....	33
Table 24: Citizen searches: basis for search and gender, 2023 .....	33
Table 25: Citizen searches: search type, 2023 .....	34
Table 26: All citizen searches: search outcomes, 2023.....	34
Table 27: Citizen Contacts resulting in searches with contraband found, and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	35
Table 28: Contacts resulting in searches with contraband found, and age, 2023.....	36
Table 29: Citizen contacts whose property was entered: police entry type, 2023 .....	37
Table 30: Citizen contacts whose property was entered: police entry type and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	37

Table 31: Citizen contacts: police entry type and gender of citizen, 2023 .....	38
Table 32: Citizen contacts: police entry type and age of citizen, 2023.....	38
Table 33: Witness showups: racial concurrence of witness and suspect and witness identification outcome, 2023 .....	39
Table 34: Use of force incidents and citizen contacts involved, 2023 .....	40
Table 35: Citizen contacts and use of force counts and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	41
Table 36: Citizen contacts and use of force counts and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: gender, 2023 ..	42
Table 37: Citizen contacts and use of force counts rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: age, 2023.....	42
Table 38: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: before or after force was used, 2023 .....	43
Table 39: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: weapon type and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023 .....	44
Table 40: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: age, 2023 .....	45
Table 41: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon type and discharge status, 2023 .....	46
Table 42: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	48
Table 43: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023 .....	49
Table 44: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: age, 2023 .....	50
Table 45: Weapon used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and age of citizen, 2023 ..	51
Table 46: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizens: gender, 2023.....	52
Table 47: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and gender of citizen, 2023..	53
Table 48: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity, 2023 .....	53
Table 49: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	55
Table 50: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity and age, 2023 .....	56
Table 51: Injured citizen contacts involved in use of force incident: injury severity and gender, 2023 ....	56
Table 52: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status, transportation status and race/ethnicity, 2023.....	58
Table 53: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status, transportation status and age, 2023.....	59
Table 54: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status and gender, 2023...	60
Table 55: Complaints and outcomes, 2023.....	60

Table 56: Investigation and outcomes, 2023 .....	61
Table 57: Officer-involved civilian deaths: race/ethnicity, 2023 .....	62
Table 58: Officer-involved civilian deaths, gender, 2023.....	62
Table 59: Jurisdiction reporting: months of data submitted, contact incident count, citizens count, use of force count, force used on citizen count and force used on citizen rate per 100,000 citizen contacts, 2023 .....	64

## Executive Summary

The Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) completed the following report on *Colorado's Law Enforcement Integrity, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System* to continue the effort to gather information on officer-citizen contacts and use of force. This is the second report, but the first to contain a full year's worth of data and summarizes findings from law enforcement data submissions from January to December for calendar year (CY) 2023. One hundred eighty-two law enforcement agencies, comprising 72% of all agencies in Colorado, submitted at least one month of contacts and use of force data to the DCJ. This participation rate is a marked increase from 2022's rate of 57%. The more complete data presented in this second report suggests that the findings are a better representation of law enforcement interactions with the public. Despite this progress, the DCJ and law enforcement agencies have further opportunities to improve the completeness, consistency and standardization of contacts and use of force incidents to make future reports more informative and accurate.

In 2023, there were 676,970 contacts reported involving 754,666 citizens. The Denver Police Department and Denver Sheriff Department Denver were largely unable to submit their contacts data using the standard reporting system and submitted their contacts data separately to the DCJ; their combined 2023 contacts involved 38,923 citizens. The term "citizen" was used to designate the individual persons contacted during an event. In the context of this report, "citizen" does not indicate whether a person was born in the United States, a lawful permanent resident, an undocumented immigrant, or a refugee.

Highlights of the contact data include:

- Nearly three-fourths (70%) of the citizen contacts were the result of proactive officer-initiated activity, and approximately one-third (30%) resulted from a call for service/dispatch.
- Black/African-American NH (non-Hispanic) citizens were contacted due to officer-initiated activity 65% of the time relative to 71% of comparable White NH citizen contacts.
- Male citizens were contacted through officer-initiated activity 70% of the time, similar to female citizens (69%). Nonbinary citizens were contacted through officer-initiated activity 63% of the time.

- Citizens under 18 years of age were contacted due to officer-initiated activity 47% of the time compared to citizens aged 18 to 24, who were contacted due to officer-initiated activity 75% of the time.
- Traffic offenses were the most common reason for a contact, which is expected given that the Colorado State Patrol accounted for approximately one-third of all contacts reported.
- The most common outcomes from a contact were a citation (39%) or a warning (36%).
- The most common basis for a search was “an exception to the requirement for a search warrant” (57%), followed by inventory (31%) and consent (10%).
- Law enforcement officers uncovered contraband in 14% of all person searches, 22% of vehicle searches, and 35% of property searches.

There is uncertainty regarding the completeness of use of force reporting, particularly around the broad “use of force” definition adopted in 24-31-901, Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), which is different from the definitions previously utilized by agencies or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Additionally, there was a wide range of rates of force used against citizens, which could suggest inconsistent reporting among agencies.

Highlights of the use of force data include:

- In all jurisdictions excluding Denver, law enforcement reported the use of force on 4,481 citizens, accounting for 0.6% of all citizens contacted.
- Disparities were evident in force used against citizens. Citizen contacts were subject to force overall at a rate of 594 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts. However, use of force rates were highest against Black/African American NH, Multiracial H and White H, with rates ranging between 1.5 to three times higher than the overall rates. Males (725 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts) and in those perceived to be under the age of 18 (1,062 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts) also had elevated rates. Force used against citizen rates were lowest in White NH (349 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts), females (344 citizens per 100,000 citizens contacts), and in adults aged 65 and over (111 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts).
- Twenty-two percent of citizens who had force used against them were found to be armed with a weapon. It was reported that 403 citizens possessed a firearm where force was used.
- Roughly a quarter of contacts who had force used against required ambulance care.



- There was no apparent injury in 52% of the use of force cases reported, with 16 deaths reported. These figures do not reflect all deaths due to limited agency reporting.
- The discharge of a firearm was reported in 1% of cases where a firearm was used, which includes brandishing/displaying the weapon to the citizen.
- Complaints of officer misconduct after use of force were most commonly under investigation (69%) or unfounded (16%).
- Investigations after officer use of force resulted in 36% of cases with charges filed, with 21% being sustained.

## Introduction

This second report from data collected through the *Colorado Law Enforcement Integrity, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System* continues the effort to gather information on officer-citizen contacts and use of force and contains a complete year of data. The data collection is unique in Colorado's history and will eventually allow for a deeper look into this important topic as the completeness of these data improves. The results will allow legislators, policy-makers, law enforcement agencies, and other stakeholders to make more informed decisions regarding how law enforcement officers interact with the citizens of Colorado. The Colorado Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) undertook the effort to accomplish this task in conjunction with the Colorado Bureau of Investigation (CBI), law enforcement agencies and vendors that supply the software to collect and host these data.

## Summary of Statute

The initial legislation that created this reporting requirement, Senate Bill 2020-217 (hereafter SB20-217), was signed in June 2020. The bill *Concerning Measures to Enhance Law Enforcement Integrity* outlined a variety of measures for law enforcement, including: requiring the use of body-worn cameras; changing certain laws regarding officer liability; requiring agencies to report on all contacts with citizens where a violation of the law was being investigated; and officer use of force. The follow-up bills, which attempted to clarify some of the uncertainty in SB20-217, House Bill (HB)21-1250 and HB21-1142 were signed in July 2021. The bills mandated DCJ to create a data reporting system that could be implemented by April 2022. The final statutes, 24-31-901 and 24-31-903, C.R.S., are in Appendix A.

## Data Collection Process

The Division of Criminal Justice gathered the requirements for the statute and solicited a vendor to create this reporting system. The vendor created specifications based on the statute, which were then shared with law enforcement agencies and their vendors for comment in April 2022. The final specifications for data collection were published in June 2022 with an expected roll-out of collection in August 2022. During this time, the DCJ engaged in communication with agencies and vendors. Whenever implementing a system of this scope, one can expect unique challenges, and these issues lead to some agency collection and reporting delays.

DCJ's vendor, which also built and maintains the CBI's National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) platform, modified the Crime Insight platform to house the contacts data. DCJ's vendor had a long history of working with the Colorado state government on law enforcement data collection projects. One of the advantages of utilizing the same vendor was that law enforcement agencies were able to use the same logon and similar processes for the NIBRS and contacts reporting system.

Additionally, when considering the optimal way to design the data collection platform, the DCJ chose to allow agencies to utilize their current records management system (RMS), a third-party vendor's application created for this purpose, or an application developed by the DCJ's vendor, which would be available at no cost to the agency. DCJ selected this "all of the above" approach to accommodate the approximately 260 agencies in Colorado that already had their own methods for collecting information for purposes of record-keeping and data reporting. If an agency's current data system met the specification requirements put forth by DCJ, then the method of that collection could be flexible. However, agencies who opted to work with their own RMS vendors or third-party vendors had to create or utilize an application and a process that would allow them to efficiently capture this data.

Agencies that decided to work with their RMS vendors faced substantial challenges due to the scale of required changes for data collection and submission. These agencies and RMS vendors were required to construct a new data capture system for their agency clients with very specific state requirements in a short timeframe.

The data collection began August 2022, with the expectation that files would be uploaded monthly to the system. The DCJ staff, CBI, and DCJ's vendor worked with agencies to ensure successful logons and proper file uploads. Again, this process was not without challenges due to the large number of agencies in Colorado that were required to participate in an entirely new method of data collection and reporting.

## Data Collection & Limitations

The report summarizes data from contacts submitted from January through December of 2023, by 182 agencies. This number represents 72% of all agencies that are required to report, which includes local police departments, sheriff's offices, and the Colorado State Patrol (CSP). The DCJ was not able to estimate the percentage of the Colorado population covered by these 182 agencies, in particular because some large agencies either provided limited data or did not report their data by the April 15, 2024 deadline. Monthly agency reporting levels will be described in more detail later on. As expected, more agencies reported their contacts and use of force data in 2023 than in 2022, which furthers the legislative goal to improve evidence-based decision-making concerning law enforcement.

The Denver Police Department (DPD) and Denver Sheriff's Department (DSD) largely did not report 2023 data using Crime Insight, which is the application the DCJ uses to collect data from all agencies in Colorado. Although DPD and DSD submitted data directly to the DCJ, these data did not align with the DCJ data collection system. Thus, due to the lack of complete Denver data, the DCJ presents their data in a more limited set of tables. In December 2023, the DPD and DSD began reporting data through Crime Insight, and their December 2023 data were included in the statewide results. Future reports will include DPD and DSD data in the statewide contacts reporting system. Consequently, Denver's separate data submission complicated DCJ's ability to provide a complete statewide estimate of contacts or use of force cases.

The term "citizen" is used to designate the individual persons contacted during an event. In the context of this report, "citizen" does not indicate whether a person was born in the United States, a lawful permanent resident, an undocumented immigrant, or a refugee.

In addition to concerns about the completeness and representativeness of contacts data, the DCJ has faced challenges regarding the consistency and standardization of reporting across jurisdictions. There were uncertainties regarding several important definitional issues in 24-31-903, C.R.S., even with the subsequent bill revisions. This includes the definition of a contact, where there was still confusion regarding whether the statute intended agencies to report every citizen contact for the purposes of enforcing or investigating violations of the law or only those self-initiated by a peace officer. A consultation with the Attorney General's Office (AG) concluded that *all contacts* should be reported.

However, some agencies concluded that only self-initiated contacts were to be reported, based on the phrase, *“initiated by a peace officer,”* in statute.

“Contact” means an in-person interaction with an individual, whether or not the person is in a motor vehicle, initiated by a peace officer, whether consensual or non-consensual, for the purpose of enforcing the law or investigating possible violations of the law. (24-31-901(1), C.R.S.)

There is also uncertainty regarding the completeness of use of force reporting, particularly around the broad “use of force” definition adopted in 24-31-901 C.R.S., which is different from the definitions previously utilized by agencies or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Additionally, there was a wide range of rates of force used against citizens, which could suggest inconsistent reporting among agencies.

The DCJ, agency and vendor representatives, and the AG have worked to clarify additional definitional issues during the creation of data specifications and reporting processes. The need to further clarify definitions and modify data specifications was expected, given the novelty of this data collection. In contrast, already-established data collection system, such as NIBRS, have undergone decades of data discrepancy and definition resolution that have just begun in the process of implementing Colorado’s contacts and use of force reporting system. Agencies, vendors, DCJ, and the AG have continued to coordinate and resolve other inconsistent reporting practice.

Additional contacts and use of force details are also available in a data dashboard. DCJ updated this dashboard with 2023 data and is committed to annual updates as new reports are prepared. The dashboard can be found here: <https://dcj.colorado.gov/dcj-offices/ors/dashb-cp-cuf>

## Summary of 2023 Contact Submissions

All 2023 data were due to the DCJ by April 15, 2024. Of the 254 agencies required to report, 72% submitted some level of data for 2023, representing 87% of sworn law enforcement personnel in Colorado. For the DCJ’s first report period data from August – December of 2022, only 57% of agencies submitted data, which highlights the improvement in data completeness for this report. Compliance measures were communicated to agencies and were defined as follows:

- Fully compliant - successful data submissions for all 12 months of the year.
- Partially compliant - successful data submissions for 4-11 months of the year.

- Non-compliant - successful data submissions for 3 or fewer months of the year.

Of the agencies that submitted data for 2023, 42% of agencies were identified as fully compliant, 28% were partially compliant, and 28% were non-compliant under the measures indicated above. Monthly jurisdictional reporting totals are included later on in the report.

## Results

In 2023, law enforcement reported 676,970 contacts involving 754,666 citizens. The Denver Police Department (DPD) and Denver Sheriff's Department (DSD) were unable to report the majority of 2023 data using the standard reporting system, but were afforded a special, one-time option to submit data separately. By December 2023, DPD and DSD began submitting their contacts and use of force to the statewide system, and their 3,259 contact incidents from that month were included in the statewide results. DPD and DSD did have contact incidents reported separately in their spreadsheets from December 2023 which are summarized in Tables 2, 12, 14, 17, and 20. The term "citizen" is used to designate the individual persons contacted during an event. In the context of this report, "citizen" does not indicate whether a person was born in the United States, a lawful permanent resident, an undocumented immigrant, or a refugee.

### Reason for Citizen Contact

Law enforcement officers may proactively initiate a contact based on their observations of illegal activity, suspicious activity, to question an individual for another purpose, as a follow-up of a previous investigation, and a number of other reasons. Alternatively, an officer may also contact a citizen in response to a call for service (CFS) directing them to a particular location to investigate activity. Overall, approximately two-thirds (64%) of citizen contacts in 2023 were for traffic stops, followed by the "other" category accounting for 15% of citizens contacted (Table 1). The significant proportion of traffic stop contacts aligned with the activities of the single largest reporter, the Colorado State Patrol (CSP), which provided data on roughly one-third (31%) of reported citizen contacts (count = 235,024). The "other" category also encompassed contacts marked as "other" in the contacts reporting system, as well as bystander contacts (count = 3), and mass demonstrations (count = 36), which were too small to report separately. Approximately 10% of citizen contacts involved unlawful activity, 5% resulted from suspicious activity, and 4% resulted from routine patrol other than a traffic stop. The remaining categories – follow-up investigation, warrant service, court order and curfew – represented fewer than 3% of reported contact incidents.

**Table 1: Citizen contacts: contact reason, 2023**

Contact Reason	Citizen Count	Percent
Traffic stop	483,074	64.0%
Other	112,395	14.9%
Unlawful activity	73,312	9.7%
Suspicious activity	40,641	5.4%
Routine patrol	27,499	3.6%
Follow-up investigation	8,312	1.1%
Warrant service	6,845	0.9%
Court order	1,700	0.2%
Curfew	888	0.1%
Total	754,666	100.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Table 2 displays contact reasons for DPD's and DSD's contact incidents. Due to the different categorizations of Denver's data, the DCJ was not able to combine their data with the statewide contacts reporting system, and as shown in below, Denver did not report on contacts related to routine patrol, follow-up investigations, and curfews. Additionally, the DCJ might have overestimated the number of contact incidents due to incomplete contact identification in Denver's data files. Like the statewide contacts reporting system, Denver law enforcement most frequently encountered citizens during traffic stops, which represented 75% of all contact incidents. The next highest contact reason category was "other" (9%), followed by unlawful activity (7%) and court activity (7%). Court activity was only reported by DSD and it accounted for 88% of DSD's contacts, which reflects their role in enforcing court orders and maintaining security for court staff.



**Table 2: Denver contacts incidents: contact reason, 2023**

Contact Reason	Count	Percent
Traffic stop	29,260	75.2%
Other	3,479	8.9%
Court activity	2,823	7.3%
Unlawful activity	2,738	7.0%
Suspicious activity	385	1.0%
Warrant service	238	0.6%
Total	38,923	100%

Source: Denver Police Department & Denver Sheriff's Department, Contacts and Use of Force, CY 2023.

## Demographics of Citizens Contacted

As required by statute, the collection of race, ethnicity, gender, and age data is based on “the perceived demographic information of the person contacted...and other available data” collected by the officer (24-31-903 (2) (a) (II), C.R.S.). Consequently, the demographic characteristics perceived by law enforcement and how a citizen self-identifies may have differed. Officers might have been unable to discern or request race/ethnicity information directly from citizens, which could have resulted in unreliable demographic data.

Race and ethnicity were considered separate concepts in the data schema, but the DCJ presents them together in the analyses below. The seven racial categories in the contacts reporting system are: Asian, Black/African American, Multi-racial, Native American, Other, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and White. In this analysis, the DCJ combined the Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander groups into one racial category due to small numbers in those respective groups. Ethnicity was defined as Hispanic/Latino and Non-Hispanic. To increase the sample size in certain race/ethnicity categories, the DCJ also collapsed Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Hispanic and Black Hispanic into a single Other Hispanic category. The use of “NH” in the data tables of this report denotes that the officer perceived the citizen as not being of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. The use of “H” in these tables denotes that the officer perceived the citizen as being of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.

Given the lack of full agency participation in the contacts reporting system, DCJ was unable to produce population rates per 100,000 by race/ethnicity. Population data at the agency jurisdiction-level was not

available, and using the state population as the denominator would have potentially produced unrepresentative rates. Additionally, since the Colorado State Patrol covers the entire state, but does not regularly work on roads in many cities, calculating a rate without full statewide participation is not a valid way to present these data. The DCJ chose instead to compare the percentages of citizen contacts by perceived race/ethnicity to statewide population figures, which despite its drawbacks, was the preferable option.

Table 3 displays the racial/ethnic distribution of Colorado’s residents. The racial/ethnic percentages of citizens contacted were comparable to state population figures. The state population percentages (Table 3) compared to the percentages of citizen contacts (Table 4) were 66% vs 64% for White NH, 20% vs 25% for White H, 4% vs 6% for Black NH, and 1% vs 1% for Native American NH (Colorado Department of Local Affairs, 2024). The state sum of the Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH categories for Colorado equated to 4%, which was similar to the percentage of the perceived Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander among citizen contacts (2%).

**Table 3: Colorado population: race/ethnicity, 2023**

Race/Ethnicity	Population Count	Population Percent
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	222,494	3.8%
Black/African American NH	245,400	4.2%
Multiracial H	52,545	0.9%
Multiracial NH	153,196	2.6%
Native American H	61,798	1.1%
Native American NH	36,771	0.6%
Other H	52,606	0.9%
White H	1,169,733	19.9%
White NH	3,881,814	66.1%
Total All	5,876,357	100%

Source: Colorado Department of Local Affairs, 2024.

Note: “H” and “NH” in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

**Table 4: Citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Citizen Percent</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	16,254	2.2%
Black/African American NH	48,672	6.4%
Multiracial H	2,905	0.4%
Multiracial NH	3,566	0.5%
Native American H	716	0.1%
Native American NH	3,903	0.5%
Other H	5,932	0.8%
Other NH	3,657	0.5%
White H	187,951	24.9%
White NH	481,110	63.8%
Total All	754,666	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: “H” and “NH” in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

Table 5 presents citizen contacts and gender categories. Roughly one-third of contacts were perceived to be female (34%), two-thirds were perceived to be males (65%), and less than 1% of all citizen contacts were perceived to be nonbinary. The population of Colorado is approximately equally distributed between males and females, so the distribution of contacts indicates an over-representation of males which is similar to other types of criminal activity.

**Table 5: Citizen contacts: gender, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Citizen Percent</b>
Female	259,824	34.4%
Male	493,492	65.4%
Nonbinary	1,350	0.2%
Total	754,666	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

The perceived age groups of citizen contacts are displayed in Table 6. Citizens perceived to be in the 25-34 age bracket were the most involved in law enforcement contacts, comprising 26% of citizens contacted. The second largest proportion of citizen contacts were those in the 35-44 age bracket (21%). The least frequent age brackets involved in contacts were citizens perceived to be under 18 (6%) and those perceived to be 65 and over (6%).

**Table 6: Citizen contacts: age, 2023**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Citizen Percent</b>
Under 18	41,917	5.6%
18 – 24	129,647	17.2%
25 – 34	198,692	26.3%
35 – 44	160,608	21.3%
45 – 54	105,195	13.9%
55 – 64	70,235	9.3%
65 and over	48,372	6.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>754,666</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

In Table 7, the DCJ compared the racial/ethnic and age distributions of citizen contacts. Certain racial/ethnic groups— Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH, White NH— had very similar age groupings compared to all citizen contacts. However, in certain racial/ethnic groups, citizen contacts skewed younger. Multiracial H and Other H had higher proportions of 18–24-year-olds, (22% and 21%, respectively) compared to all contacts (17%). Additionally, Black/African American NH, Multiracial H and NH, Other H and NH, and White H all had 30% or more of their contacts in the 25-34 age range, which was higher than the proportion of 25-34-year-olds among all contacts.

**Table 7: Citizen contacts: race/ethnicity and age, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Under 18</b>	<b>Percent 18 – 24</b>	<b>Percent 25 – 34</b>	<b>Percent 35 – 44</b>	<b>Percent 45 – 54</b>	<b>Percent 55 – 64</b>	<b>Percent 65 and over</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	16,254	4.5%	16.8%	27.5%	21.1%	15.6%	9.2%	5.1%
Black/African American NH	48,672	5.0%	18.0%	33.6%	22.7%	11.6%	6.7%	2.4%
Multiracial H	2,905	7.0%	22.1%	31.3%	21.9%	10.9%	4.9%	1.8%
Multiracial NH	3,566	6.7%	20.1%	31.8%	22.3%	11.4%	5.3%	2.4%
Native American H	716	5.7%	20.3%	27.0%	22.1%	12.2%	9.5%	3.4%
Native American NH	3,903	2.8%	18.9%	27.0%	23.9%	12.8%	10.1%	4.4%
Other H	5,932	5.9%	21.1%	31.4%	21.0%	12.5%	5.7%	2.5%
Other NH	3,657	4.4%	16.1%	31.1%	24.0%	14.2%	6.9%	3.3%
White H	187,951	6.5%	21.7%	30.2%	21.2%	12.1%	5.9%	2.4%
White NH	481,110	5.3%	15.2%	23.9%	21.1%	14.9%	11.0%	8.6%
Total All	754,666	5.6%	17.2%	26.3%	21.3%	13.9%	9.3%	6.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

In the following tables, DCJ examined demographic differences in the origination of the contact, i.e., whether it was initiated by the officer (proactive) versus a call for service (CFS). Overall, 70% of contacts were proactive and 30% of contacts stemmed from a CFS. Table 8 shows the contact type and race/ethnicity. Officers more frequently contacted Black/African American NH (35%), Native American H (43%) and Native American NH (41%) based on a CFS compared to all contacts. Within the proactive contact category, this contact type was more common among other race/ethnic categories (for example, Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH [75%], and Other NH [74%]).

**Table 8: Citizen contacts: contact type and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Call for service</b>	<b>Percent Proactive contact</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	16,254	25.3%	74.7%
Black/African American NH	48,672	34.9%	65.1%
Multiracial H	2,905	32.6%	67.4%
Multiracial NH	3,566	27.7%	72.3%
Native American H	716	42.5%	57.5%
Native American NH	3,903	41.4%	58.6%
Other H	5,932	31.1%	68.9%
Other NH	3,657	25.7%	74.3%
White H	187,951	29.4%	70.6%
White NH	481,110	29.3%	70.7%
Total All	754,666	29.6%	70.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: “H” and “NH” in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

Those identified as female or male were contacted at similar levels proactively at 69% and 71%, respectively and contacted at similar levels because of calls for service at 31% and 29%, respectively (Table 9). Alternatively, citizens identified as nonbinary experienced proactive contact at a relative lower frequency of 63% versus contact through call for services at a relatively higher rate at 37%; these differences between cisgender and nonbinary contacts might be due to the smaller number of perceived nonbinary citizen contacts.

**Table 9: Citizen contacts: contact type and gender, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Citizens count</b>	<b>Percent Call for service</b>	<b>Percent Proactive contact</b>
Female	259,824	31.1%	68.9%
Male	493,492	28.9%	71.1%
Nonbinary	1,350	36.7%	63.3%
Total	754,666	29.6%	70.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Citizen contacts over the age of 25 had similar rates of encountering law enforcement via calls for service, with these values ranging from 28%-32% (Table 10). However, over half of encounters with citizens under 18 originated from a call for service (53%), which was the highest rate among all age groups. In contrast, citizens between the ages of 18-24 were less likely to encounter law enforcement from a call for service (25%).

**Table 10: Citizen contacts: contact type and age, 2023**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Call for service</b>	<b>Percent Proactive contact</b>
Under 18	41,917	53.1%	46.9%
18 – 24	129,647	25.2%	74.8%
25 – 34	198,692	27.8%	72.2%
35 – 44	160,608	30.0%	70.0%
45 – 54	105,195	28.6%	71.4%
55 – 64	70,235	28.6%	71.4%
65 and over	48,372	31.5%	68.4%
Total	754,666	29.6%	70.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

As shown in Table 11, citizen contacts are shown alongside race/ethnicity and contact reasons. Traffic stop contacts were more prevalent in some race/ethnic categories (for example, Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH; 71%; Other NH, 70%) and less prevalent in others (for example, Native American H/NH; 49%/48%). There were other noticeable differences within, for example, response to unlawful activity. This contact type comprised 18% of contacts involving Native American NH and 16% of contacts Black/African American NH, which were 1.9 and 1.7 times higher, respectively, than the overall rate among all citizens contacts.

**Table 11: Citizen contacts: contact reason and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizens Count</b>	<b>Percent Suspicious activity</b>	<b>Percent Unlawful activity</b>	<b>Percent Routine patrol</b>	<b>Percent Traffic stop</b>	<b>Percent Other</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	16,254	3.2%	6.5%	3.0%	71.4%	16.0%
Black/African American NH	48,672	6.5%	16.4%	4.2%	57.3%	15.7%
Multiracial H	2,905	9.3%	14.9%	4.2%	59.0%	12.6%
Multiracial NH	3,566	6.8%	12.6%	4.2%	65.7%	10.7%
Native American H	716	7.3%	14.5%	3.6%	49.0%	26.8%
Native American NH	3,903	9.0%	18.4%	3.7%	47.7%	21.2%
Other H	5,932	5.9%	10.1%	2.6%	65.7%	15.8%
Other NH	3,657	5.0%	8.6%	1.7%	70.4%	14.3%
White H	187,951	5.5%	10.3%	3.5%	63.9%	16.8%
White NH	481,110	5.2%	8.8%	3.7%	64.6%	17.7%
Total All	754,666	5.4%	9.7%	3.6%	64.0%	17.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

As shown in Table 12 and Table 14, Denver law enforcement had a lower prevalence of citizen contacts due to suspicious and unlawful activity (1% & 7%, respectively) compared to the statewide estimates (5% & 10%, respectively). Conversely, Denver also had a higher proportion of traffic stops compared to the state (73% versus 64%). Table 11 also shows contact reason categories crossed with citizen race/ethnicity categories for Denver; however, DCJ's ability to interpret these differences is compromised by the small number in many of the racial/ethnic categories and the high amount of missing data. Just under one-fifth (19%, count = 7,491) of Denver citizen contacts were missing race/ethnicity data. Bearing in mind these limitations, certain racial/ethnic citizen groups had higher rates of traffic stops such as Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH (84%) and Other NH (89%) compared to citizen contacts overall. Additionally, White H had higher rates of contact with law enforcement due to court activity (21%) compared to White NH (6%).



**Table 12: Denver citizen contacts: contact reason and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizens Count</b>	<b>Percent Suspicious Activity</b>	<b>Percent Unlawful Activity</b>	<b>Percent Traffic Stop</b>	<b>Percent Court Activity</b>	<b>Percent Other</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	703	1.0%	4.1%	84.1%	6.1%	4.7%
Black/African American NH	6,498	1.8%	8.9%	66.6%	9.4%	13.3%
Multiracial H	24	0%	12.5%	70.8%	0%	16.7%
Multiracial NH	140	1.4%	3.6%	68.6%	15.0%	11.4%
Native American H	7	0%	42.9%	42.9%	0%	14.3%
Native American NH	130	6.2%	33.8%	38.5%	0%	21.5%
Other H	218	0%	4.6%	10.6%	58.7%	27.1%
Other NH	5,687	0%	0.4%	88.9%	9.2%	1.6%
White H	2,750	1.2%	4.4%	65.8%	20.7%	7.9%
White NH	15,275	0.9%	8.8%	72.6%	6.1%	11.6%
Total All	31,432	1.0%	6.8%	73.4%	9.0%	9.8%

Source: Denver Police Department & Denver Sheriff's Department, Contacts and Use of Force, CY 2023.

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively. The N may be different from other tables in the report due to missing and/or incomplete data for the different categories. There were 7,491 citizen contacts with missing race/ethnicity information.

As seen in Table 13, males and females had similar rates for all contact reasons, with the highest difference being in the Other category where 19% of females were contacted while 16% of males were contacted for the general reason of Other. Nonbinary citizens were contacted 15% of the time due to perceived unlawful activity, compared to 10% of males and 9% of females. Nonbinary (54%) citizens had the lowest rate of traffic stops, ten percentage points less than males, females, and the overall rate. Differences between cisgender and nonbinary contacts might be due to the smaller number of perceived nonbinary citizen contacts.

**Table 13: Citizen contacts: contact reason and gender, 2023**

Gender	Citizens Count	Percent Suspicious activity	Percent Unlawful activity	Percent Routine patrol	Percent Traffic stop	Percent Other
Female	259,824	4.9%	9.1%	3.1%	64.0%	18.9%
Male	493,492	5.6%	10.0%	3.9%	64.0%	16.4%
Nonbinary	1,350	8.1%	15.0%	3.3%	54.0%	19.6%
Total	754,666	5.4%	9.7%	3.6%	64.0%	17.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

As displayed in Denver-only Table 14, 8% of males were contacted for suspected unlawful activity, while 6% of females and less than 1% of nonbinary citizens were contacted for the same reason. Females had the highest rate of contact for court activity at 11%, less than males (6%) and nonbinary citizens (2%). Ninety-seven percent of contacts involving nonbinary citizens were for a traffic stop, compared to 74% for both males and females.

**Table 14: Denver citizen contacts: contact reason and gender of citizen, 2023**

Gender	Citizens count	Percent Suspicious Activity	Percent Unlawful Activity	Percent Traffic Stop	Percent Court Activity	Percent Other
Female	11,853	0.8%	5.8%	74.4%	10.8%	8.2%
Male	24,945	1.2%	8.2%	73.7%	6.0%	10.9%
Nonbinary	2,125	0%	0.5%	96.8%	1.9%	0.8%
Total	38,923	1.0%	7.0%	75.2%	7.3%	9.5%

Source: Denver Police Department & Denver Sheriff's Department, Contacts and Use of Force, CY 2023.

The contacts reporting system also provides information on the results of the incident, and Table 15 shows the variation in the prevalence of different outcome categories by the contact reason for citizens. Citizens might have experienced more than one outcome (i.e. – had their property seized and were arrested), and thus, the totals for the contact reason row percentages might sum to over 100. Overall, the top outcomes after police contact were citations (39%) and warnings (36%) (see Table 14). A citation (49%) was the most common outcome in traffic stops (the largest contact reason category

[count=483,074]), followed by a warning (47%). Additionally, only 2% of citizens involved in traffic stops were arrested, which was the lowest arrest rate among citizen contact reasons. Conversely, 26% of citizens contacted due to unlawful activity were issued citations and an additional 26% were arrested, making these individuals the group most likely to be arrested. Among citizens involved in contacts due to suspicious activity, over half (57%) had no action from law enforcement reported, which was roughly 3-times higher compared to the overall rate; this group also had the second highest arrest rate at 13% and the highest rate of transportation to a mental health facility (2%). While most citizens who encountered law enforcement via routine patrol either had no action taken (38%) or received a warning (30%), 9% were arrested.

**Table 15: Citizen contacts: contact reason and outcomes, 2023**

Contact Reason	Citizen Count	Percent No action	Percent Warning	Percent Citation	Percent Property seizure	Percent Arrest	Percent MH* Transport Percent
Traffic stop	483,074	2.6%	47.4%	48.6%	0.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Other	130,140	62.3%	5.1%	21.5%	0.9%	10.1%	0.9%
Unlawful activity	73,312	24.5%	25.7%	26.2%	0.7%	25.6%	0.9%
Suspicious activity	40,641	56.8%	22.7%	6.7%	0.5%	12.7%	2.0%
Routine patrol	27,499	37.5%	29.6%	24.7%	0.3%	8.5%	0.6%
Total	754,666	19.2%	36.0%	38.6%	0.4%	6.6%	0.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen.

The outcomes of police contacts are summarized within citizen race/ethnicity categories in Table 16, and there are racial/ethnic disparities in arrest rates. The arrest rates were highest in the following groups: Native American/Alaska Native NH (15%), Black/African-American NH (13%), Multiracial H (10%), and Native American/Alaska Native H (10%), while arrest rates were lowest for these groups: Asian NH (4%), White NH (5%) and Other NH (5%). Certain groups were also more likely to receive a citation compared others; 44% of Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH received citations compared to 26% of Native American NH. Warnings were also not evenly distributed; less than a third of Black/African American citizens received warnings during law enforcement contacts (31%), while 42% of Multiracial H/NH and 36% overall had this outcome.

**Table 16: Citizen contacts: outcomes and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizens count</b>	<b>Percent No action</b>	<b>Percent Warning</b>	<b>Percent Citation</b>	<b>Percent Property seizure</b>	<b>Percent Arrest</b>	<b>Percent MH* Transport</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	16,254	15.7%	37.3%	43.5%	0.3%	4.0%	0.2%
Black/African American NH	48,672	17.1%	31.3%	39.9%	0.6%	12.9%	0.4%
Multiracial H	2,905	18.1%	41.9%	29.9%	0.3%	10.4%	0.8%
Multiracial NH	3,566	16.5%	42.1%	35.4%	0.4%	6.1%	0.5%
Native American H	716	25.8%	34.2%	30.4%	1.0%	9.9%	0.8%
Native American NH	3,903	21.1%	38.3%	25.6%	0.8%	15.0%	1.0%
Other H	5,932	16.9%	39.4%	35.0%	0.5%	9.1%	0.4%
Other NH	3,657	18.2%	41.3%	36.1%	0.2%	4.8%	0.4%
White H	187,951	18.8%	32.9%	41.0%	0.5%	8.2%	0.3%
White NH	481,110	19.7%	37.5%	37.7%	0.3%	5.3%	0.4%
Total All	754,666	19.2%	36.0%	38.6%	0.4%	6.6%	0.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively. Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen. \* Mental Health

In Denver, the most common outcome of a police contact was no action (47%), followed by citation (46%) (see Table 17). Citizen contacts who interacted with DPD and DSD were rarely issued warnings (less than 1%). Among racial/ethnic groups with totals over 500, White H citizens had the highest rates of "no action" taken (65%), as well as arrest rates (10%). Other NH had the highest citation rate (68%). Due to the fact that DPD and DSD used a different reporting mechanism, comparing Denver's data to the state overall is not recommended.

**Table 17: Denver citizen contacts: outcomes and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizens count</b>	<b>Percent No Action</b>	<b>Percent Warning</b>	<b>Percent Citation</b>	<b>Percent Arrest</b>	<b>Percent Arrest &amp; Citation</b>	<b>Percent MH* Transport</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	703	40.4%	0%	55.2%	4.0%	0.4%	0%
Black/African American NH	6,498	60.9%	0.2%	28.8%	9.1%	1.0%	0%
Multiracial H	24	37.5%	0%	50%	8.3%	0%	0%
Multiracial NH	140	69.3%	0.7%	21.4%	7.1%	1.4%	0%
Native American H	7	71.4%	0%	14.3%	0%	14.3%	0%
Native American NH	130	43.1%	0%	40.8%	12.3%	3.8%	0%
Other H	218	71.6%	1.4%	8.3%	18.8%	0%	0%
Other NH	5,687	30.8%	0%	68.3%	0.9%	0%	0%
White H	2,750	64.6%	0.3%	24.4%	9.7%	1.0%	0%
White NH	15,275	44.2%	0.2%	49.3%	5.8%	0.6%	0%
Total All	31,432	47.2%	0.1%	46.0%	6.0%	0.6%	0%

Source: Denver Police Department & Denver Sheriff's Department, Contacts and Use of Force, CY 2023.

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively. The N may be different from other tables in the report due to missing and/or incomplete data for the different categories. There were 7,491 citizen contacts with missing race/ethnicity information. Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen. \* Mental Health

Table 18 presents information on the perceived age of the citizen and the outcome of the contact.

Arrest rates peaked in citizens aged 25-34 (8%) and 35-44 (8%), and then dropped with each age category; accordingly, only 2% of those aged 65 & older were arrested. Roughly one-third of citizens under the age of 18 received no further action taken against them, which was the highest rate among all age groups, while 18–24-year-olds had the second lowest rate at 14%. Citations peaked in adults perceived to be 18-24 (45%), and then also dropped with each age category.

**Table 18: Citizen contacts: outcomes and age, 2023**

Age	Citizens Count	Percent No action	Percent Warning	Percent Citation	Percent Property seizure	Percent Arrest	Percent MH* Transport
Under 18	41,917	32.7%	26.4%	35.3%	0.3%	5.2%	1.0%
18 - 24	129,647	14.0%	35.9%	44.9%	0.5%	5.9%	0.3%
25 - 34	198,692	16.8%	34.9%	40.5%	0.4%	8.4%	0.4%
35 - 44	160,608	19.6%	35.7%	36.9%	0.4%	8.2%	0.4%
45 - 54	105,195	20.4%	37.9%	36.3%	0.3%	5.9%	0.3%
55 - 64	70,235	21.8%	39.2%	34.9%	0.3%	4.4%	0.3%
65 and over	48,372	23.7%	41.2%	33.1%	0.2%	1.9%	0.3%
Total	754,666	19.2%	36.0%	38.6%	0.4%	6.6%	0.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen. \* Mental Health

The contact outcomes rates between male and female citizens were roughly equivalent, as shown in Table 19. However, there were some differences in the outcomes between the perceived cisgender and nonbinary citizens. Nonbinary citizen received citations at a lower rate (27%) than females (39%) or males (39%). Within the arrest category, nonbinary citizens were arrested relatively more frequently (10%) than females (5%) or males (8%); however, it is worth noting again the small number of perceived nonbinary citizen contacts, which makes these comparisons less reliable.

**Table 19: Citizen contacts: outcomes and gender, 2023**

Gender	Citizens count	Percent No action	Percent Warning	Percent Citation	Percent Property seizure	Percent Arrest	Percent MH* Transport
Female	259,824	21.2%	35.5%	38.7%	0.3%	4.9%	0.4%
Male	493,492	18.2%	36.3%	38.6%	0.4%	7.5%	0.4%
Nonbinary	1,350	23.3%	37.7%	27.1%	0.7%	9.6%	2.7%
Total	754,666	19.2%	36.0%	38.6%	0.4%	6.6%	0.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen. \* Mental Health

In Denver, the outcome of contacts involving nonbinary citizens was most commonly a citation (76%) relative to the rate of citations for female (44%) or male (42%) citizens (see Table 20). Relatedly, the no

action outcome was half as prevalent for nonbinary citizens (24%) than for females (51%) or males (50%). Male citizens were arrested more often (8%) than female (4%) or nonbinary (less than 1%) citizens.

**Table 20: Denver citizen contacts: outcomes and gender, 2023**

Gender	Citizens count	Percent No Action	Warning	Percent Citation	Percent	Percent Arrest & Citation	Percent MH* Transport
Female	11,853	50.6%	0.1%	44.2%	4.4%	0.5%	0.0%
Male	24,945	49.7%	0.1%	41.6%	7.7%	0.9%	0.0%
Nonbinary	2,125	23.9%	0.0%	75.9%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	38,923	48.6%	0.1%	44.3%	6.3%	0.7%	0.0%

Source: Denver Police Department & Denver Sheriff's Department, Contacts and Use of Force, CY 2023. Percentage totals across the rows may add up to greater than 100% as law enforcement might have responded in multiple ways during the interaction with the citizen. \* Mental Health

## Search and Seizure Information

Ensuring lawful citizen searches is a core tenant of public safety and is vital to maintaining public trust in law enforcement. The Colorado legislature included citizen searches and seizure information as required data elements in the contacts reporting system (C.R.S. 24-31-903(2)(a)), and the following tables describe the context of the search and whether contraband or other property was seized. Law enforcement agencies reported any searches that occurred on the citizen's person, vehicle, or property, and the following tables report trends in searches overall and in the above search locations. During a contact incident, police may have conducted more than one type of search, and consequently, the totals of all three search locations will be greater than the overall citizen searches.

In 2023, the DCJ obtained information on 22,148 searches conducted during contact incidents (see Table 21). The most common search type was based on a "search warrant exception" in law, accounting for 57% of searches reported. There are six general exceptions where a warrantless search is permissible: exigent circumstances, plain view, search incident to arrest, consent, automobile exceptions, and special needs. Of these six, consent is a specific category in the data while the other five are grouped together. A search to inventory the possessions of a citizen was the next most common (31%), followed by a search where the citizen gave consent (10%). Two percent of searches occurred with a search warrant.

**Table 21: Citizen searches: basis for search, 2023**

Basis for search	Search Count	Percent Citizens
Consent	2,257	10.2%
Inventory	6,869	31.0%
Search warrant	518	2.3%
Search warrant exception	12,504	56.5%
Total All	22,148	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Table 22 highlights differences in the basis for the search and the citizen's racial/ethnic category; however, racial/ethnic comparisons were difficult to perform for all but Black/African American NH, White H and NH due to small cell counts. White H & NH citizen groups had similar rates of consent (11% vs. 10%), inventory (29% vs. 31%), warrant (2% vs. 3%) and warrant exception (58% vs. 57%) searches. Black/African American NH were subject to higher rates of inventory searches (38%) compared to White H & NH and lower rates of search warrant exception searches (50%).

**Table 22: Citizen searches: basis for search and race/ethnicity, 2023**

Race/Ethnicity	Citizens Searched Count	Percent Consent	Percent Inventory	Percent Search warrant	Percent Search warrant exception
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	332	9.3%	44.6%	1.8%	44.3%
Black/African American NH	2,791	9.7%	38.0%	2.1%	50.2%
Multiracial H	105	13.3%	22.9%	4.8%	59.0%
Multiracial NH	86	22.1%	34.9%	0%	43.0%
Native American H	26	7.7%	15.4%	3.8%	73.1%
Native American NH	206	8.7%	18.9%	1.0%	71.4%
Other H	161	12.4%	28.6%	1.9%	57.1%
Other NH	68	16.2%	42.6%	2.9%	38.2%
White H	7,090	10.9%	28.5%	2.2%	58.4%
White NH	11,283	9.7%	30.7%	2.5%	57.0%
Total All	22,148	10.2%	31.0%	2.3%	56.5%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.



Table 23 provides details on the basis for search and the age of the citizen. The basis for searches involving citizens aged 18 to 64 were similar in proportion to all searches; however, there was some variation in the search basis rates for citizens under 18 and aged 65 and over. Seventeen percent of searches in citizens under 18 were performed based on citizen consent, which was higher than the 10% rate overall. Citizens over the age of 65 had a higher rate of inventory searches (49%) and a lower rate of search warrant exception searches (38%).

**Table 23: Citizen searches: basis for search and age, 2023**

Age	Citizens Searched Counts	Percent Consent	Percent Inventory	Percent Search warrant	Percent Search warrant exception
Under 18	937	16.8%	32.4%	3.0%	47.8%
18 - 24	3,797	10.0%	32.3%	2.0%	55.6%
25 - 34	7,233	9.7%	31.2%	2.1%	57.0%
35 - 44	5,562	9.9%	28.2%	2.4%	59.5%
45 - 54	2,694	9.9%	30.1%	2.5%	57.5%
55 - 64	1,379	10.5%	31.8%	2.8%	55.0%
65 and over	546	9.5%	48.9%	3.8%	37.7%
Total	22,148	10.2%	31.0%	2.3%	56.5%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Table 24 highlights some of the gender differences in the basis for searches. Compared to searches performed on males, ones on females were more likely to be inventory searches (30% vs. 34%). The small cell counts of searches performed on nonbinary citizens makes comparisons between them and searches on cisgender citizens less reliable.

**Table 24: Citizen searches: basis for search and gender, 2023**

Gender	Citizens Searched Counts	Percent Consent	Percent Inventory	Percent Search warrant	Percent Search warrant exception
Female	5,571	8.8%	34.1%	2.2%	54.8%
Male	16,543	10.6%	30.0%	2.4%	57.0%
Nonbinary	34	17.6%	11.8%	0%	70.6%
Total	22,148	10.2%	31.0%	2.3%	56.5%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

In 2024, law enforcement reported 15,436 contact incidents involving 16,146 citizens who had their person searched, 6,274 whose vehicle was searched, and 1,726 whose property was searched (Table 25). Citizens may have more than one type of search performed on them.

**Table 25: Citizen searches: search type, 2023**

Search Type	Citizen Search Count	Percent Citizen Search
Person Search	16,146	66.9%
Vehicle Search	6,274	26.0%
Property Search	1,726	7.1%
Total	24,146	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

As shown in Table 26, law enforcement reported finding contraband in 18% of citizen searches overall. Success in searches varied by the type of search performed, by the perceived racial/ethnic group or age of the citizen as shown in Table 27 and Table 28 below.

**Table 26: All citizen searches: search outcomes, 2023**

Search outcome	Citizen Search Count	Percent Citizen Search
Contraband found	4,018	18.1%
No contraband found	18,213	81.9%
Total	22,231	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

In Table 27 we see that Black/African American NH citizens were nearly three times more likely to be subject to a person search (4.7%), and White H citizens almost twice as likely (2.8%), than White NH citizens (1.6%). Table 27 shows that in 14% of all person searches, 22% of vehicle searches, and 35% of property searches did law enforcement uncover contraband. Person searches performed on Black/African American NH citizens had a lower contraband found rate (10%) compared to White NH where 16% of searches returned contraband.

Law enforcement reported 6,274 citizen vehicle searches as shown in Table 27. Twenty-two percent of these searches uncovered contraband, and the three racial/ethnic groups that had the highest number of searches - Black/African Americans NH and White H/NH – had nearly identical success rates.

Law enforcement reported 1,726 property searches on citizens in 2023, and the over one-third of these searches resulted in contraband being found (35%), as seen in Table 27. Property searches performed on White H had a lower contraband yield (32%) compared to property searches of White NH citizens (37%). The DCJ urges caution in interpreting the wide range of contraband found in the other racial/ethnic groups due to small cell counts.

**Table 27: Citizen Contacts resulting in searches with contraband found, and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizen count</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Person Search</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Vehicle Search</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Property Search</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Person Search Contraband found</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Vehicle Search Contraband found</b>	<b>Percent Citizens Property Search Contraband found</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	16,254	1.3%	0.7%	0.1%	10.4%	13.2%	52.6%
Black/African American NH	48,672	4.7%	0.9%	0.4%	10.4%	21.5%	35.9%
Multiracial H	2,905	2.8%	0.7%	0.6%	20.0%	35.0%	41.2%
Multiracial NH	3,566	2.0%	0.2%	0.3%	2.8%	37.5%	10.0%
Native American H	716	3.1%	1.0%	0.3%	18.2%	0%	0%
Native American NH	3,903	4.2%	1.2%	0.6%	9.3%	21.3%	27.3%
Other H	5,932	2.0%	0.8%	0.3%	14.5%	31.1%	33.3%
Other NH	3,657	1.6%	0.1%	0.1%	11.7%	0%	20.0%
White H	187,951	2.8%	1.1%	0.3%	13.9%	21.6%	32.0%
White NH	481,110	1.6%	0.7%	0.2%	16.3%	21.9%	36.9%
Total All	754,666	2.1%	0.8%	0.2%	14.4%	21.7%	35.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

As seen in Table 28, citizens aged 25 to 54 had the highest rates of contraband found (15%) during a person search, which is slightly higher than the overall rate of 14%. Vehicle searches on citizens aged 35-44 yielded the highest rate of contraband at 27%, 5 percentage points higher than the overall rate. In 40% of property searches conducted on citizens aged 25 to 34 was contraband found, similar to those under 18 years old where 39% of searches resulted in contraband being found.

**Table 28: Contacts resulting in searches with contraband found, and age, 2023**

Age	Citizens count	Percent Citizens Person Search	Percent Citizens Vehicle Search	Percent Citizens Property Search	Percent Citizens Person Search Contraband found	Percent Citizens Vehicle Search Contraband found	Percent Citizens Property Search Contraband found
Under 18	41,917	1.5%	0.4%	0.3%	14.2%	20.1%	38.9%
18 - 24	129,647	2.0%	0.9%	0.2%	12.6%	20.6%	36.0%
25 - 34	198,692	2.7%	1.0%	0.3%	15.1%	22.6%	39.8%
35 - 44	160,608	2.6%	0.9%	0.3%	15.4%	26.7%	35.8%
45 - 54	105,195	1.9%	0.7%	0.2%	15.4%	20.6%	30.8%
55 - 64	70,235	1.4%	0.6%	0.1%	11.3%	17.9%	13.7%
65 and over	48,372	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	8.5%	3.7%	33.3%
Total	754,666	2.1%	0.8%	0.2%	14.4%	21.7%	35.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

## Police Entry

The contacts reporting system also collects information regarding the manner that law enforcement entered private property. Overall, most citizen contacts (93%; count = 702,649) did not experience law enforcement entry of their property. Of the 52,017 citizens who experienced law enforcement entering their private property, 0.2% citizens (count = 100) did not receive an announced entry (Table 29).

**Table 29: Citizen contacts whose property was entered: police entry type, 2023**

<b>Entry Type</b>	<b>Citizen with Property Entry Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Announced entry	51,917	99.8%
Unannounced entry	100	0.2%
Total	52,017	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Table 30 presents entry type rates alongside race/ethnicity of the citizen. Other H (2%), Native American NH (1%) and Black/African American NH (1%) citizens had the highest rates of unannounced entry into their residences among citizens whose property was entered.

**Table 30: Citizen contacts whose property was entered: police entry type and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizen with Property Entry Count</b>	<b>Percent Announced</b>	<b>Percent Unannounced</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	1,307	100.0%	0.0%
Black/African American NH	3,058	99.3%	0.7%
Multiracial H	114	100.0%	0.0%
Multiracial NH	267	99.6%	0.4%
Native American H	13	100.0%	0.0%
Native American NH	123	99.2%	0.8%
Other H	150	98.0%	2.0%
Other NH	46	100.0%	0.0%
White H	13,411	99.7%	0.3%
White NH	33,528	99.9%	0.1%
Total All	52,017	99.8%	0.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

The unannounced entry rates for the different gender categories are presented in Table 31, and there was little variation in the rates in these groupings. There were 32,987 males, 18,990 females and 40

nonbinary citizens whose property was entered. Both male and female citizens had unannounced entry rates of 0.2%, and there no reported unannounced entries into the residences of nonbinary citizens.

**Table 31: Citizen contacts: police entry type and gender of citizen, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Citizen with Property Entry Count</b>	<b>Percent Announced</b>	<b>Percent Unannounced</b>
Female	18,990	99.8%	0.2%
Male	32,987	99.8%	0.2%
Nonbinary	40	100.0%	0.0%
Total	52,017	99.8%	0.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Similar to the gender breakdowns in Table 31, the rates of unannounced entry were similar between the citizens in different age categories, as shown in Table 32.

**Table 32: Citizen contacts: police entry type and age of citizen, 2023**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Citizen with Property Entry Count</b>	<b>Percent Announced</b>	<b>Percent Unannounced</b>
Under 18	4,133	99.8%	0.2%
18 – 24	9,043	99.8%	0.2%
25 – 34	13,059	99.8%	0.2%
35 – 44	10,587	99.8%	0.2%
45 – 54	7,242	99.8%	0.2%
55 – 64	4,775	99.9%	0.1%
65 and over	3,178	99.8%	0.2%
Total	52,017	99.8%	0.2%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

## Showup Identifications

The statutory requirement to report on the details of a “showup” (24-31-903(2)(c) (II.5), C.R.S.) was added in HB21-1142, a bill relating to eyewitness identification. A showup occurs when a law

enforcement officer locates a witness on scene whom they believe may be able to identify a citizen suspected of illegal activity. The data below on showups provide some additional context into these events.

Table 33 gives a summary of the law enforcement officer's confidence of the identification outcome based on whether the citizen and the witness were the same race/ethnicity (intra-racial) or a different race/ethnicity (cross-racial). There were 358 showups reported over the 12-month period, and of those, 56% comprised intra-racial showups (count = 202) and 30% involved cross-racial ones (count = 108). Thirteen percent of showups were missing race/ethnicity data for witness and were unable to be classified, which is a limitation of these analyses along with the small cell counts. In assessing the credibility of intra-racial showups, 77% of officers involved in intra-racial showups were confident or somewhat confident in the identification compared to 74% of officers who were witness to a cross-racial showup. Eighteen percent of officers involved in cross-racial showups reported that no identification was made compared to 12% of officers with intra-racial showups.

**Table 33: Witness showups: racial concurrence of witness and suspect and witness identification outcome, 2023**

Identification outcome	Showups	Percent Overall	Percent Intra-racial	Percent Cross-racial	Percent Missing
Yes: Confident or somewhat confident	274	76.5%	77.2%	74.1%	79.2%
Yes: Not confident	17	4.7%	3.5%	6.5%	6.3%
No identification	48	13.4%	12.4%	17.6%	8.3%
Unknown	19	5.3%	6.9%	1.9%	6.3%
Total	358	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

## Use of Force

As outlined in C.R.S. 24-31-903(2)(a), the state definition of “use of force” includes: “actions taken by peace officers that result in death or serious bodily injury or that involve the use of a weapon.” The above statute also outlines required reporting elements for use of force. Agencies must specify the date/time/location of the incident; the perceived demographics of the citizen contact; the type of force, severity and nature of injury; the use or brandishing of a weapon; whether the weapon was discharged; the names of officers who used force and the POST numbers of officers on the scene; whether force

resulted in a complaint or investigation, outcome of that complaint or investigation, whether an ambulance was called and whether the citizen was transported, and whether the citizen exhibited a weapon prior to the use of force.

As shown in Table 34, 4,111 contact incidents involved the use of force in 2023, which translates to a rate of 607 incidents per 100,000 contact incidents. Multiple citizens could have had force used on them during these incidents or could have been witness to the force. The DCJ calculated a rate for these involved citizens, and in 2023, there were 663 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts, as well as a rate for citizens subject to the force, which amounted to 594 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts. Denver reported the use of force on 3,000 citizens, or 398 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts. Given that there is no comparable national rate, it is difficult to contextualize these figures. The national reporting from the FBI is based on a definition that requires either: 1) “serious bodily injury or death” or 2) “discharge of a weapon at or in the direction of a person” for it to be considered force, which is a more limited definition than is used by Colorado (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.).

**Table 34: Use of force incidents and citizen contacts involved, 2023**

Unit	Measure
All contact incidents, count	676,970
Contact incidents involving UoF* count	4,111
Rate of contact incidents involving UoF, per 100,000 contacts	607.3
All citizens count	754,666
Citizens involved in UoF count	5,002
Citizens involved in UoF, per 100,000 citizen contacts	662.8
Force used on citizens count	4,481
Force used on citizen per 100,000 citizen contacts	593.8

Note: \* UoF refers to use of force.

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

In the following use of force demographic tables (Table 35 - Table 37), the DCJ compares force used as rates per 100,000 citizens contacted. Table 35 illustrates some of the disparities. Law enforcement officials reported using force most frequently on Black/African American NH at a rate of 1,822 use of force incidents per 100,000 citizen contacts. This rate was over five times higher than the rate of force used against White NH citizen contacts (349 per 100,000 citizen contacts), which was the lowest rate



among the race/ethnicity categories. The second and third highest rates were in Multiracial H (1,102 per 100,000 citizen contacts) and White H (902 per 100,000 citizen contacts).

**Table 35: Citizen contacts and use of force counts and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023**

Race/Ethnicity	Citizen Count	Force Used on Citizen Count	Force Used on Citizen Rate
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	16,254	61	375.3
Black/African American NH	48,672	887	1,822.4
Multiracial H	2,905	32	1,101.5
Multiracial NH	3,566	27	757.2
Native American H	716	5	698.3
Native American NH	3,903	29	743.0
Other H	5,932	46	775.5
Other NH	3,657	20	546.9
White H	187,951	1,695	901.8
White NH	481,110	1,679	349.0
Total All	754,666	4,481	593.8

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

Table 36 shows use of force rates and gender. Law enforcement used force on male citizens at over double the rate of female citizens (725 vs. 344 per 100,000 citizen contacts). Nonbinary citizens had force used against them at a similar rate (741 per 100,000 citizen contacts) as cisgender males.

**Table 36: Citizen contacts and use of force counts and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: gender, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
<b>Female</b>	259,824	893	343.7
<b>Male</b>	493,492	3,578	725.0
<b>Nonbinary</b>	1,350	10	740.7
<b>Total All</b>	754,666	4,481	593.8

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Trends in use of force based on the perceived age of the citizen are shown in Table 37. Citizens perceived to be under the age of 18 were subject to the most force (1,062 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts). While rates lessened in ages 18-24 (580 per 100,000 citizen contacts), the second highest rates were in those aged 25-34 (790 per 100,000 citizen contacts). Rates in the following age groups declined markedly, and law enforcement were least likely to use force against those aged 65 and over (112 incidents per 100,000 citizen contacts).

**Table 37: Citizen contacts and use of force counts rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: age, 2023**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Under 18	41,917	445	1,061.6
18 – 24	129,647	752	580.0
25 – 34	198,692	1,569	789.7
35 – 44	160,608	1,071	666.8
45 – 54	105,195	435	444.6
55 – 64	70,235	155	220.7
65 and over	48,372	54	111.6
<b>Total All</b>	754,666	4,481	593.8

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

## Citizen weapon possession

In cases where force was used against the citizen, agencies were also able to report whether the citizen exhibited a weapon. As displayed in Table 38, law enforcement reported 1,006 citizens who exhibited a weapon, or 22% of all citizens who had force used against them. Firearms were the most frequently exhibited citizen weapons (40%), followed by personal weapons (31%), which included hands, fists and feet. Overall, law enforcement reported that 31% exhibited the weapons before the use of force and 47% exhibited the weapon afterwards. However, 22% of law enforcement did not know whether the weapon was exhibited before or after, which makes comparing when the weapon was exhibited with the weapon type difficult. Law enforcement recalled that dangerous weapons (i.e., knives, blunt objects or projectiles) and motor vehicle or vessels were most frequently displayed before the use of force.

**Table 38: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: before or after force was used, 2023**

<b>Citizen Weapon</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Before</b>	<b>Percent After</b>	<b>Percent Unknown</b>
Firearm	403	23.6%	43.2%	33.3%
Dangerous Weapons (knives, blunt objects, projectiles)	150	62.0%	35.3%	2.7%
Motor Vehicle/Vessel	42	61.9%	33.3%	4.8%
Personal Weapons (hands, fist, feet)	316	27.5%	60.1%	12.3%
All others	95	8.4%	46.3%	45.3%
Total	1,006	30.7%	47.2%	22.1%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Table 39 displays the percent of citizens who possessed a weapon compared to all citizens who had force used against them by weapon type and race/ethnicity. Compared to the overall rate of 9% among all citizens who had force used against them, Multiracial NH (15%), Other H (13%) and White H (11%) had the highest rates of firearm exhibition. Multiracial H had the highest rate (16%) of displaying personal weapons, and other than Native American H and Other H, Black/African American NH had the lowest rate (3%). However, small cell counts in this table limits the ability of DCJ to draw conclusions about these differences.

**Table 39: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: weapon type and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Force used on citizen count</b>	<b>Firearm</b>	<b>Dangerous Weapons</b>	<b>Motor Vehicle/ Vessel</b>	<b>Personal Weapons</b>	<b>All Others</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	61	6.6%	1.6%	0.0%	9.8%	4.9%
Black/African American NH	887	8.7%	1.6%	4.5%	2.7%	0.8%
Multiracial H	32	9.4%	6.3%	3.1%	15.6%	0.0%
Multiracial NH	27	14.8%	7.4%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
Native American H	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Native American NH	29	6.9%	10.3%	3.4%	10.3%	0.0%
Other H	46	13.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other NH	20	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
White H	1,695	10.8%	3.0%	1.2%	7.7%	2.5%
White NH	1,679	7.3%	4.3%	1.0%	8.6%	2.6%
Total all	4,481	9.0%	3.3%	0.9%	7.1%	2.1%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

Perceived age and weapon type possession among citizens who had forced used against them comparisons are shown in Table 40. Citizens under the age of 18 tended to have the lowest rates of weapon exhibition, particularly of firearms. Only 0.2% of those juvenile citizens who had force used against them exhibited firearms, compared to 13% of citizens aged 18-24. Those aged 65 and older had elevated rates of dangerous weapons used, but the small overall number of older adults who had force used against them suggests that caution should be used in drawing conclusions about this finding.

**Table 40: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incident and who exhibited a weapon: age, 2023**

Age	Force used on citizen count	Firearm	Dangerous Weapons	Motor Vehicle/Vessel	Personal Weapons	All Others
Under 18	445	0.2%	2.5%	0.0%	1.8%	1.3%
18 – 24	752	12.9%	2.1%	1.1%	7.7%	0.1%
25 – 34	1,569	9.2%	2.8%	1.2%	7.6%	2.4%
35 – 44	1,071	6.3%	4.4%	0.8%	7.9%	2.4%
45 – 54	435	9.0%	4.4%	1.1%	7.6%	2.8%
55 – 64	155	9.6%	5.8%	0.0%	7.7%	0.6%
65 and Over	54	7.4%	7.4%	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%
Total all	4,481	9.0%	3.3%	0.9%	7.1%	2.1%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

## Officer Weapon and Force Use

As described earlier, use of force incidents may or may not involve the use of a weapon. Weapons in statute were defined as a “firearm, long gun, taser, baton, nun chucks or projectiles” (C.R.S. 24-31-901). Law enforcement also reported on other use of force incidents, which involved the “application of physical techniques or tactics, chemical agents or weapons to another person” that resulted in serious bodily injury or death (C.R.S. 24-31-901). These non-weapon displays of force were defined in the contacts reporting system as physical force involving hands, feet or fists; blunt objects; chemicals or explosives; flashbang devices, canines and other. This section provides context on the type of weapon used and the discharge status during use of force incident, and other use of force mechanisms. These tables also include citizen demographic information.

Table 41 presents data on statute-defined weapons used during contact incidents and weapons included: firearms, long guns, tasers or other electric shock devices, or projectile weapons. Officers might have reported using more than one weapon during a contact incident. One limitation of officer weapon reporting is the lack of clarity for the definition of projectile weapons, which are not explicitly defined in C.R.S. 24-31-901. The DCJ came to define these as weapons that propel or throw a solid object at a target with substantial force (e.g. stun grenade, pepper ball gun, bean bag shotgun, tear gas). This definition does overlap with a few of the non-weapon categories of force such as chemical agents

and flashbang devices, and it is also unclear how law enforcement reconciled these categories in the 2023 data. In 2023, law enforcement reported using 1,034 firearms, 347 tasers, 173 long guns, and 102 projectile weapons. Although the data is not shown in the tables, law enforcement reported using 5 batons and 2 nun chucks. Because these weapons are not discharged in the conventional sense, the contacts reporting system did not collect information on their discharge. The discharge rates shown in Table 41 underscore that one-third (34%) of law enforcement officers who reported using a taser discharged them during the use of force event, which was the highest discharge rate. Firearm and long guns had the lowest discharge rates with 1% of firearm and 3% of long gun users firing them.

**Table 41: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon type and discharge status, 2023**

<b>Weapon type</b>	<b>Weapon used Count</b>	<b>Percent Discharged</b>	<b>Percent Brandished</b>
Firearm	1,034	1.1%	98.9%
Taser/electric shock weapon	347	33.7%	66.3%
Long gun	173	2.9%	97.1%
Projectile weapon	102	18.6%	81.4%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

The following tables (Table 42 - Table 47) assess citizen demographics, type of force rates, and discharge rates. In Table 42, Table 44 and Table 46, these force type categories were more expansive compared to the officer weapons listed in Table 41 and included data on baton or blunt object, physical weapons, canines, chemicals or explosives, and other uses of force. DCJ calculated these types of force rates per 100,000 citizen contacts in Table 42, Table 44 and Table 46. Out of 100,000 citizen contacts, 279 had a firearm or long gun, 176 had physical force, 72 had tasers, 23 had projectile or flashbang devices, 2 had a baton or blunt object, 3 had chemical or explosives, 3 had canines, and 50 had another form of force used against them in 2023. Citizens could have had multiple uses of force used against them, so the total of force type categories rates is greater than the force used on citizens rate of 594, as shown in Table 34.

Table 42 underscores disparities in the force use rates by race/ethnicity of the citizen. In 2023, law enforcement reported using firearms or long guns against Black/African American NH (754 citizens per 100,000 citizens) five times more often compared to White NH (150 per 100,000.) Other racial/ethnic groups had over double the rates of being subject to firearms and long guns compared to White NH: White H (490 per 100,000 citizens), Other H (421 per 100,000 citizens) and Multiracial NH (393 per 100,000 citizens). Black/African American NH were also subject to the most use of physical force by law

enforcement (621 per 100,000 citizens) and had rates that were nearly eight-fold higher than the rates for Asian/Pacific Islander NH (80 per 100,000 citizens), which were the lowest of the racial/ethnic groups. Other racial/ethnic groups with more prevalent rates of physical force were Native American H (559 per 100,000 citizens) and Multiracial H (551 per 100,000 citizens). Law enforcement also used tasers/electric shock weapon, the third largest force category, most frequently against Black/African American NH at a rate of 214 citizens per 100,000. Other than Native American H and Other NH, which all had no reported tasers employed on them, Other H (17 citizens per 100,000) and White NH (45 citizens per 100,000) had the lowest rates of tasers being used against them.

Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado: CY 2023 Report

**Table 42: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/ Ethnicity</b>	<b>Citizens count</b>	<b>Firearm or Long Gun</b>	<b>Physical (hands, fists, feet)</b>	<b>Taser/ electric shock weapon</b>	<b>Projectile or Flashbang Device</b>	<b>Baton or Blunt Object</b>	<b>Chemical or Explosive</b>	<b>Canine</b>	<b>Other</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	16,254	178.4	80.0	49.2	12.3	0	6.2	0	49.2
Black/African American NH	48,672	754.0	620.5	213.7	78.1	2.1	4.1	8.2	178.7
Multiracial H	2,905	413.1	550.8	103.3	34.4	0	0	0	34.4
Multiracial NH	3,566	392.6	224.3	56.1	0	0	0	0	56.1
Native American H	716	139.7	558.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native American NH	3,903	179.3	409.9	153.7	0	0	0	0	25.6
Other H	5,932	421.4	219.2	16.9	16.9	0	0	0	84.3
Other NH	3,657	218.8	218.8	0	0	0	0	0	82.0
White H	187,951	490.0	219.7	106.4	38.8	3.2	3.7	4.8	69.2
White NH	481,110	150.1	111.2	44.9	12.3	1.0	3.1	1.7	29.3
Total All	754,666	279.1	176.0	71.6	23.1	1.6	3.4	2.8	50.1

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.



Table 43 presents data on officer weapon discharge status and race/ethnicity of the citizen, and discharge rates ranged from 0%, as seen in Multiracial NH, Native American H, and Other H & NH, to 25%, as seen in Native American NH. Among groups with over 100 officer weapon counts – Black/African Americans NH, White H and White NH, rates of discharge were similar and ranged between 8 to 10%.

**Table 43: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and race/ethnicity of citizen, 2023**

Race/Ethnicity	Weapon Count	Percent Discharged	Percent Brandished
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	20	10.0%	90.0%
Black/African American NH	171	9.9%	90.1%
Multiracial H	10	10.0%	90.0%
Multiracial NH	9	0.0%	100%
Native American H	1	0.0%	100.0%
Native American NH	8	25.0%	75.0%
Other H	16	0.0%	100.0%
Other NH	5	0.0%	100.0%
White H	704	7.5%	92.5%
White NH	645	9.0%	91.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: “H” and “NH” in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

As seen in Table 44, law enforcement reported using firearms or long gun, tasers, and projectiles most frequently against citizen contacts perceived to be under the age of 18. In particular, the use of firearm or long gun deployment was more than double the overall rate for all citizen contacts (594 vs. 279 citizens per 100,000). Additionally, the rate of physical force and tasers used in under-18-year-olds was respectively 36% and 56% higher compared to overall rates. Rates of firearm or long gun usage (341 citizens per 100,000 citizens), and tasers (107 per 100,000 citizens) were the second highest in ages 25-34. After these second peaks, the force type rates declined by age.

Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado: CY 2023 Report

**Table 44: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizen contacts: age, 2023**

Age	Citizens Count	Firearm or Long Gun	Physical (hands, fists, feet)	Taser/ electric shock weapon	Projectile or Flashbang Device	Baton or Blunt Object	Chemical or Explosive	Canine	Other
Under 18	41,917	594.0	238.6	112.1	47.7	0	0	0	66.8
18 – 24	129,647	296.2	157.4	53.2	17.0	0.8	1.5	2.3	61.7
25 – 34	198,692	341.2	251.6	106.7	30.2	3.0	2.5	5.5	69.5
35 – 44	160,608	307.0	199.2	92.8	26.2	1.9	5.6	3.1	52.3
45 – 54	105,195	193.9	127.4	45.6	17.1	1.9	6.7	0	31.4
55 – 64	70,235	102.5	76.9	19.9	10.0	0	2.8	2.8	14.2
65 and over	48,372	53.8	33.1	2.1	10.3	0	2.1	0	10.3
Total All	754,666	279.1	176.0	71.6	23.1	1.6	3.4	2.8	50.1

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Although youth under 18 had the highest rates of force used against them and in being subject to specific force types (shown in Table 37 and Table 44) Table 45 documents that officer weapons were discharged least frequently on this age group (4%). Officer weapons were discharged most frequently against citizens aged 45-54 (11%), followed by citizens aged 35-44 (9%).

**Table 45: Weapon used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and age of citizen, 2023**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Weapon Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Discharged</b>	<b>Percent Brandished</b>
Under 18	117	4.3%	95.7%
18 – 24	285	7.4%	92.6%
25 – 34	514	8.6%	91.4%
35 – 44	408	9.1%	90.9%
45 – 54	181	11.0%	89.0%
55 – 64	64	7.8%	92.2%
65 and over	20	5.0%	95.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Gender disparities were observed in the types of force used against citizens, as seen in Table 46. Male citizens had double the rates compared female citizens of being subject to officer firearms or long guns (338 vs. 168 per 100,000 citizens) and to physical force (212 vs. 107 per 100,000 citizens) and had a four-fold higher rate of being tasered (97 vs. 23 per 100,000 citizens).

Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado: CY 2023 Report

**Table 46: Type of force used and rate per 100,00 citizens: gender, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Firearm or Long Gun</b>	<b>Physical (hands, fists, feet)</b>	<b>Taser/ electric shock weapon</b>	<b>Projectile or Flashbang Device</b>	<b>Baton or Blunt Object</b>	<b>Chemical or Explosive</b>	<b>Canine</b>	<b>Other</b>
Female	259,824	168.2	107.4	23.1	15.0	0.4	0.8	1.5	28.9
Male	493,492	337.6	212.2	97.1	27.4	2.2	4.9	3.4	61.2
Nonbinary	1,350	222.2	148.1	74.1	0	0	0	0	74.1
Total	754,666	279.1	176.0	71.6	23.1	1.6	3.4	2.8	50.1

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Rates of officer weapon discharge against male citizens (9%) were over double the rate compared to females (4%), as seen in Table 47.

**Table 47: Force used on citizen contacts: officer weapon discharge status and gender of citizen, 2023**

Gender	Weapon Used on Citizen Count	Percent Discharged	Percent Brandished
Female	304	4.3%	95.7%
Male	1,283	9.4%	90.6%
Nonbinary	2	0.0%	100.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

## Injury Severity

The contacts reporting system provides additional details about the severity of the injury incurred during use of force incidents. Injured citizens might have had been subject to multiple uses of force. Table 48 shows that in about half of cases of force used on a citizen, it was reported that there were no apparent injuries, unknown injury severity was reported 38% of the time, 10% of citizens with force used against them had a reported minor or possible injury. Serious injuries accounted for less than one percent of citizens with force used on them. There were 16 deaths reported, which equates to 0.3% of citizens who were subject to force.

**Table 48: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity, 2023**

Injury Severity	Force Used on Citizen Count	Percent Force Used on Citizen
Death	16	0.4%
Serious Injury	22	0.5%
Minor or Possible Injury	451	10.1%
No Apparent Injury	2,309	51.5%
Unknown Injury Severity	1,683	37.6%
Total	4,481	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

As seen in Table 49, trends involving race/ethnicity of the citizen force was used on and injury severity are difficult to interpret due to small cell counts and the high proportion of citizens with an unknown injury severity (38% overall). These limitations hinder DCJ's ability to interpret these data confidently.

Other NH (10%) had the highest amounts of use of force cases that resulted in the death of a citizen(s) (Table 49). Those aged 65 and older had the highest rate of use of force resulting in the death of a citizen(s) at 2%, while citizens aged 35 to 44 had the lowest (0%) (Table 50). When breaking down by the gender of citizen(s), 20% of use of force cases involving nonbinary citizens resulted in death (Table 51), however, it is worth noting again the small number of perceived nonbinary citizen contacts, which makes these comparisons less reliable. The number of reported deaths is fewer than those reported using the Deaths in Custody Reporting Act data portal, with results reported separately.

**Table 49: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/ Ethnicity</b>	<b>Forced Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent Death</b>	<b>Percent Serious Injury</b>	<b>Percent Minor or Possible Injury</b>	<b>Percent No apparent injury</b>	<b>Percent Unknown injury severity</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	61	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	39.3%	55.7%
Black/African American NH	887	0.5%	0.1%	4.3%	27.1%	68.1%
Multiracial H	32	3.1%	0%	21.9%	53.1%	21.9%
Multiracial NH	27	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	44.4%	37.0%
Native American H	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Native American NH	29	0.0%	0.0%	20.7%	48.3%	31.0%
Other H	46	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	50.0%	45.7%
Other NH	20	10.0%	0.0%	5.0%	40.0%	45.0%
White H	1,695	0.4%	0.6%	8.4%	54.7%	35.9%
White NH	1,679	0.2%	0.7%	14.7%	62.0%	22.5%
Total All	4,481	0.4%	0.5%	10.1%	51.5%	37.6%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Note: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively.

**Table 50: Force used on citizen contacts: injury severity and age, 2023**

Age	Forced Used on Citizen Count	Percent Death	Percent Serious Injury	Percent Minor or Possible Injury	Percent No apparent injury	Percent Unknown injury severity
Under 18	445	0.4%	0.7%	2.7%	46.5%	49.7%
18 – 24	752	0.8%	0.5%	8.9%	48.9%	40.8%
25 – 34	1,569	0.2%	0.4%	10.6%	49.3%	39.5%
35 – 44	1,071	0%	0.5%	11.8%	54.9%	32.9%
45 – 54	435	0.7%	0.5%	14.0%	56.8%	28.0%
55 – 64	155	0.6%	1.3%	7.7%	60.0%	30.0%
65 and over	54	1.9%	0%	13.0%	59.3%	25.9%
Total All	4,481	0.4%	0.5%	10.1%	51.5%	37.6%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

**Table 51: Injured citizen contacts involved in use of force incident: injury severity and gender, 2023**

Gender	Force Used on Citizen Count	Percent Death	Percent Serious Injury	Percent Minor or Possible Injury	Percent No apparent injury	Percent Unknown Severity
Female	893	0.1%	0.2%	6.3%	57.2%	36.2%
Male	3,578	0.4%	0.6%	11.0%	50.1%	37.9%
Nonbinary	10	20.0%	0.0%	10.0%	40.0%	30.0%
Total All	4,481	0.4%	0.5%	10.1%	51.5%	37.6%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

## Ambulance Call

This section provides details on ambulance calls associated with use of force incidents. Roughly one out of four (26%), or 1,172 citizens who had force used against them, required law-enforcement to call an ambulance, as shown in Table 52. Twenty-two percent of those who had force used against them were



transported for further medical care. Table 52 also provides data on these ambulance-call and transport rates for the race/ethnicity groups of the citizen. Approximately 41% of Multiracial H citizens, 38% of Native American NH citizens, and 37% of Multiracial NH citizens necessitated an ambulance call after force was used. Conversely, only 20% of Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander citizens had ambulances called to the scene of the use of force. The racial/ethnic groups with the highest prevalence of being transported were Native American H (35%), Multiracial H (31%) and White NH (28%). Black/African American citizens were least likely to be transported after an ambulance call (17%) of groups

**Table 52: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status, transportation status and race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Percent AMB* called</b>	<b>Percent AMB not called</b>	<b>Percent Unknown AMB Called</b>	<b>Percent TRAN~</b>	<b>Percent Not TRAN</b>	<b>Percent Unknown TRAN</b>
Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	61	19.7%	80.3%	0%	18.0%	82.0%	0.0%
Black/African American NH	887	24.5%	74.4%	1.1%	17.0%	83.0%	0.0%
Multiracial H	32	40.6%	56.3%	3.1%	31.3%	65.6%	3.1%
Multiracial NH	27	37.0%	63.0%	0.0%	25.9%	70.5%	0.0%
Native American H	5	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	0.0%
Native American NH	29	37.9%	62.1%	0%	34.5%	65.5%	0.0%
Other H	46	23.9%	69.6%	6.5%	26.1%	73.9%	0.0%
Other NH	20	25.0%	75.0%	0%	20.0%	80%	0.0%
White H	1,695	22.6%	74.6%	2.8%	17.9%	81.8%	0.3%
White NH	1,679	30.3%	65.7%	4.0%	27.8%	71.8%	0.4%
Total All	4,481	26.2%	71.0%	2.9%	21.6%	78.1%	0.3%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Notes: "H" and "NH" in the Race/ethnicity column refer to Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, respectively. AMB\* refers to "ambulance"; TRAN~ refers to "transportation." In addition, the ambulance rates sum by row to equal 100%, and the transportation rates do as well.

The DCJ also included ambulance and transport rates for citizens who had force used against them by perceived age, as shown in Table 53. In 2023, ambulances were called least frequently to assist youth under the age of 18 (20%) and most commonly in adults aged 25-34 (29%); similarly, these age groups had the lowest (14% for youth under 18) and highest (24% for adults aged 25-34) rates of medical transportation.

**Table 53: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status, transportation status and age, 2023**

Age	Force Used on Citizen Count	Percent AMB* called	Percent AMB not called	Percent Unknown AMB Called	Percent TRAN~	Percent Not TRAN	Percent Unknown TRAN
Under 18	445	19.8%	80.2%	0.0%	13.7%	85.9%	0.4%
18 – 24	752	21.7%	73.7%	4.7%	17.7%	82.2%	0.1%
25 – 34	1,569	29.1%	68.7%	2.2%	24.2%	75.5%	0.3%
35 – 44	1,071	27.8%	68.3%	3.8%	23.0%	76.6%	0.4%
45 – 54	435	25.7%	72.0%	2.3%	23.4%	76.4%	0.2%
55 – 64	155	25.2%	70.3%	4.5%	23.9%	75.5%	0.6%
65 and over	54	27.8%	68.5%	3.7%	18.5%	81.5%	0.0%
Total All	4,481	26.2%	71.0%	2.9%	21.6%	78.1%	0.3%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

AMB\* refers to “ambulance”; TRAN~ refers to “transportation.” In addition, the ambulance rates sum by row to equal 100%, and the transportation rates do as well.

Table 54 contrasts ambulance and transportation call rates and gender. Male citizens compared to female citizens involved in use of force had both higher rates of needing an ambulance (27% vs. 23%) and in being transported for medical care (22% vs. 19%).

**Table 54: Citizen contacts involved in use of force incidents: ambulance call status and gender, 2023**

Gender	Force Used on Citizen Count	Percent AMB* called	Percent AMB not called	Percent Unknown AMB Called	Percent TRAN~	Percent Not TRAN	Percent Unknown TRAN
Female	893	23.3%	75.3%	1.5%	18.9%	80.8%	0.3%
Male	3,578	26.9%	69.9%	3.2%	22.3%	77.4%	0.3%
Nonbinary	10	20.0%	80.0%	0%	20%	80%	0%
Total All	4,481	26.2%	71.0%	2.9%	21.6%	78.1%	0.3%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

Notes: AMB\* refers to “ambulance”; TRAN~ refers to “transportation.” In addition, the ambulance rates sum by row to equal 100%, and the transportation rates do as well.

## Complaints and Investigations after Use of Force

Table 55 and Table 56 provide details on complaints and investigations following a use of force incident.

Law enforcement officers might have received multiple complaints, and the totals in Table 55 refer to complaints. Of the 68 complaints reported, the majority (69%) were listed in the contacts reporting system as under investigation. Of the complaints that had a recorded disposition, 11 were determined to be unfounded (i.e. not based in fact); 8 were closed, and 2 were sustained (Table 55).

**Table 55: Complaints and outcomes, 2023**

Complaint Outcome	Complaint Count	Percent Complaints
Under investigation	47	69.1%
Sustained	2	2.9%
Unfounded	11	16.2%
Closed	8	11.8%
Total	68	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023

The count of investigations law enforcement agencies undertook of officers involved in use of force are displayed in Table 56. Of the 156 investigations reported, the majority were not under investigation or had some known outcome (72%). In 56 investigations, law enforcement agencies stated that they had

filed charges as a result of the investigation (36%). The remaining investigations had the following outcomes: 21% were sustained, 8% were found to be not sustained, unfounded or exonerated, and 8% were closed (Table 55).

**Table 56: Investigation and outcomes, 2023**

<b>Investigation Outcome</b>	<b>Investigation Count</b>	<b>Percent Investigations</b>
Charges Filed	56	35.9%
Under Investigation	33	21.2%
Sustained	33	21.2%
Not Sustained/ Unfounded/ Exonerated	12	7.7%
Closed	11	7.1%
Outcome Unknown	11	7.1%
Total	156	100%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

## Civilian Deaths

The reporting of the number of officer-involved civilian deaths is an element in the statute (24-31-903(2)(e), C.R.S.) that is separate from either the contacts or use of force sections. There is a different data collection managed by the DCJ, which stems from the Deaths in Custody Reporting Act (DCRA), a reporting requirement mandated by the United States Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance. Since the requirements for reporting in 24-31-903(2)(e), C.R.S., overlap with the more detailed requirements of the DCRA, it was decided to combine these two collections to ease the burden of duplicative data submissions. Agencies report deaths in custody to the DCJ on a quarterly basis, and this data reporting system includes details on race/ethnicity, gender, agency, location of death, and cause of death. However, the distribution of the population by race/ethnicity in any particular agency’s jurisdictional catchment area was both not readily available and not necessarily representative of the racial/ethnic distribution of the citizens that pass through that jurisdiction.

Table 57 and Table 58 present DCRA data from January-December 2023. There were 29 law-enforcement-related deaths reported from January-December 2023 with 48% recorded as White NH, 35% as Hispanic/Latino, and 14% as Black/African-American NH. The majority of these deaths occurred

in males (90%), as shown in Table 58.

**Table 57: Officer-involved civilian deaths: race/ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	<b>Deaths Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Asian NH	0	0.0%
Black/African-American NH	4	13.8%
Hispanic or Latino, Any Race	10	34.5%
American Indian/Alaskan Native NH	0	0.0%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander NH	0	0.0%
White NH	14	48.3%
Unknown	1	3.4%
Total	29	100.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Deaths in Custody Report.

**Table 58: Officer-involved civilian deaths, gender, 2023**

<b>Gender of citizen</b>	<b>Deaths Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	26	89.7%
Female	3	10.3%
Total	29	100.0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Deaths in Custody Report.

## Agency-level reporting

Table 59 shows monthly agency submissions to the statewide contacts reporting system via the Crime Insight portal. We have highlighted earlier the 182 agencies who reported any data to the contacts reporting system, which does show the improvement in reporting from the partial 2022 report to the 2023 report. However, of the 254 reporting agencies, only 106 (42%) submitted all twelve months of data. As mentioned earlier, the Denver Police Department began reporting in December 2023, and these contact incident and citizen counts reflected their reporting for that month. Separately, the Denver Police Department and Denver Sheriff's Department both submitted data for all 12 months. Table 58 also presents the total number of citizens contacted by each agency for the statewide contacts reporting system. The Colorado State Patrol reported 30% of all contact incidents (count = 201,507), making this

agency the greatest contributor to the contacts reporting system. The second and third largest reporters were Aurora Police Department (count = 32,254 contacts) and Colorado Springs Police Department (count = 29,967 contacts).

The DCJ also included agency totals for contact incidents involving use of force, force used on citizens and force used on citizen rates per 100,000 citizen contacts in Table 59. Aurora Police Department (count = 1,546) had the highest number of contacts involving the use of force, followed by Lakewood Police Department (count = 407) and Westminster Police Department (count = 337). Among agencies that reported any use of force use, rates ranged from 19 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts (Windsor Police Department) up to 10,638 citizens per 100,000 citizen contacts (Saguache County Sheriff's Office, note the small number of contacts however). It is more difficult to draw conclusions about these elevated rates of force used on citizens in rural areas due to the small cell counts. Among urban jurisdictions, Aurora Police Department and Westminster Police Department also had the highest force used against citizens rates (5,069 and 4,205 citizens per 100,000 contacts, respectively). Furthermore, agencies with higher counts and rates of use of force might reflect more accurate reporting of use of force incidents as opposed to higher prevalence of force used in these agencies.

**Table 59: Jurisdiction reporting: months of data submitted, contact incident count, citizens count, use of force count, force used on citizen count and force used on citizen rate per 100,000 citizen contacts, 2023**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Colorado	NA	676,970	754,666	4,111	4,481	593.8
Adams County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Adams State University Police Department	3	7	7	0	0	0.0
Aims Community College Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Alamosa County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Alamosa Police Department	1	5	5	0	0	0.0
Alma Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Arapahoe Community College Campus Police Department	12	71	73	2	2	2,739.7
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office	12	3,541	3,541	0	0	0.0
Archuleta County Sheriff's Office	12	2,354	2,458	7	7	284.8
Arvada Police Department	12	12,392	12,390	67	67	540.8
Aspen Police Department	8	2,374	2,442	4	5	204.8
Ault Police Department	3	524	529	0	0	0.0
Auraria Campus Police Department	8	806	931	9	9	966.7
Aurora Police Department	12	32,254	33,872	1,546	1,717	5,069.1
Avon Police Department	12	2,031	2,031	10	10	492.4
Baca County Sheriff's Office	10	139	150	2	2	1,333.3
Basalt Police Department	12	2,239	2,570	8	7	272.4
Bayfield Marshal's Office	12	857	922	1	0	0.0



<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Bent County Sheriff's Office	8	30	31	0	0	0.0
Black Hawk Police Department	12	1,359	1,510	11	12	794.7
Blanca Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Blue River Police Department	11	769	784	0	0	0.0
Boulder County Sheriff's Office	11	5,907	6,362	14	14	220.1
Boulder Police Department	11	9,851	10,708	63	57	532.3
Bow Mar Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Breckenridge Police Department	12	1,561	1,580	0	0	0.0
Brighton Police Department	10	5,189	5,574	21	20	358.8
Broomfield Police Department	12	11,051	12,080	24	25	207.0
Brush Police Department	12	519	626	1	1	159.7
Buena Vista Police Department	12	859	892	2	2	224.2
Burlington Police Department	12	1,114	1,402	3	3	214.0
Calhan Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Campo Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Canon City Police Department	12	5,237	6,896	11	10	145.0
Carbondale Police Department	12	1,856	1,948	6	6	308.0
Castle Rock Police Department	12	2,928	3,142	2	2	63.7
Cedaredge Police Department	6	560	794	3	3	377.8
Centennial Police Department	12	6,850	6,850	0	0	0.0
Center Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Central City Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Chaffee County Sheriff's Office	4	125	142	1	1	704.2
Cherry Hills Village Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Cheyenne County Sheriff's Office	3	707	735	0	0	0.0
Clear Creek County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Collbran Marshal's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Colorado School of Mines Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Colorado Springs Police Department	12	29,967	31,951	101	104	325.5
Colorado State Patrol	12	201,507	235,024	139	142	60.4
Colorado State University Police Department - Fort Collins	12	1,790	1,964	4	3	152.7
Colorado State University-Pueblo	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Columbine Valley Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Commerce City Police Department	12	8,787	8,786	162	162	1,843.8
Conejos County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Cortez Police Department	12	1,517	1,597	0	0	0.0
Costilla County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Craig Police Department	12	2,585	2,774	40	40	1,442.0
Crested Butte Police Department	12	290	300	1	1	333.3
Cripple Creek Police Department	11	499	679	3	3	441.8
Crowley County Sheriff's Office	12	658	885	0	0	0.0
Custer County Sheriff's Office	12	520	547	4	4	731.3
Dacono Police Department	12	716	883	11	9	1,019.3

Jurisdiction	Months Count	Contact Count	Citizen Count	UoF* Contacts Count	Force Used on Citizen Count	Force Used on Citizen Rate
De Beque Marshal's Office	8	96	108	0	0	0.0
Del Norte Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Delta County Sheriff's Office	11	1,096	1,136	0	0	0.0
Delta Police Department	12	649	688	8	9	1,308.1
Denver Police Department~	1	3,259	4,039	132	151	3,738.5
Denver Sheriff's Department~	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Dillon Police Department	4	278	286	2	2	699.3
Dinosaur Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Dolores County Sheriff's Office	8	91	113	0	0	0.0
Douglas County Sheriff's Office	12	18,366	18,359	14	14	76.3
Durango Police Department	11	4,564	5,077	6	6	118.2
Eagle County Sheriff's Office	9	2,071	2,071	4	4	193.1
Eagle Police Department	12	1,251	1,318	9	7	531.1
Eaton Police Department	12	4,353	5,645	12	15	265.7
Edgewater Police Department	4	460	526	0	0	0.0
El Paso County Sheriff's Office	12	3,702	3,745	7	4	106.8
Elbert County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Elizabeth Police Department	12	661	753	0	0	0.0
Empire Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Englewood Police Department	9	1,708	1,812	16	16	883.0
Erie Police Department	12	3,747	3,816	9	9	235.8
Estes Park Police Department	12	1,337	1,460	10	10	684.9

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Evans Police Department	12	4,848	5,286	27	32	605.4
Fairplay Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Federal Heights Police Department	12	970	1,027	4	4	389.5
Firestone Police Department	12	2,100	2,253	6	6	266.3
Florence Police Department	8	386	448	3	3	669.6
Fort Collins Police Department	12	15,504	17,433	75	67	384.3
Fort Lewis State College Police Department	12	421	510	0	0	0.0
Fort Lupton Police Department	12	2,760	3,287	5	5	152.1
Fort Morgan Police Department	11	1,352	1,599	3	3	187.6
Fountain Police Department	12	5,252	5,882	12	13	221.0
Fowler Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Fraser/Winter Park Police Department	12	1,174	1,326	7	7	527.9
Frederick Police Department	12	2,423	2,531	7	11	434.6
Fremont County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Frisco Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Fruita Police Department	10	516	581	0	0	0.0
Garden City Police Department	12	1,052	1,153	0	0	0.0
Garfield County Sheriff's Office	12	3,364	3,669	3	3	81.8
Georgetown Police Department	9	466	466	0	0	0.0
Gilcrest Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Gilpin County Sheriff's Office	12	1,681	1,842	8	9	488.6

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Glendale Police Department	10	2,775	3,286	22	16	486.9
Glenwood Springs Police Department	12	2,449	2,657	11	13	489.3
Golden Police Department	12	2,914	2,989	4	4	133.8
Granada Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Granby Police Department	9	709	861	1	1	116.1
Grand County Sheriff's Office	9	1,947	2,160	3	3	138.9
Grand Junction Police Department	12	3,436	3,810	0	0	0.0
Greeley Police Department	12	10,804	11,266	98	121	1,074.0
Green Mountain Falls Marshal's Office	11	111	133	2	2	1,503.8
Greenwood Village Police Department	9	732	732	8	8	1,092.9
Gunnison County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Gunnison Police Department	12	1,619	1,733	18	18	1,038.7
Gypsum Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Haxtun Police Department	9	186	234	1	1	427.4
Hayden Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Hinsdale County Sheriff's Office	12	369	400	0	0	0.0
Holyoke Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Hotchkiss Police Department	12	961	1,015	0	0	0.0
Hudson Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Huerfano County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Hugo Marshal's Office	12	1,717	1,723	2	2	116.1
Idaho Springs Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Ignacio Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Jackson County Sheriff's Office	11	520	579	3	2	345.4
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office	0	4	4	0	0	0.0
Johnstown Police Department	12	2,324	2,551	8	9	352.8
Keenesburg Police Department	12	1,228	1,346	5	5	371.5
Kersey Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Kiowa County Sheriff's Office	7	137	143	0	0	0.0
Kiowa Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Kit Carson County Sheriff's Office	12	471	556	0	0	0.0
Kremmling Police Department	12	199	202	2	2	990.1
La Jara Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
La Junta Police Department	3	21	24	0	0	0.0
La Plata County Sheriff's Office	12	1,599	1,616	0	0	0.0
La Salle Police Department	12	986	1,163	0	0	0.0
La Veta Marshal's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Lafayette Police Department	12	5,968	6,262	11	11	175.7
Lake County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Lakeside Police Department	11	2,386	2,480	1	1	40.3
Lakewood Police Department	12	16,835	18,793	407	447	2,378.5
Lamar Police Department	3	68	84	0	0	0.0
Larimer County Sheriff's Office	11	2	2	0	0	0.0
Las Animas County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Leadville Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Limon Police Department	11	590	642	6	7	1,090.3
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office	4	437	448	9	9	2,008.9
Littleton Police Department	12	2,201	2,201	0	0	0.0
Lochbuie Police Department	12	1,196	1,475	3	3	203.4
Log Lane Village Marshal's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Logan County Sheriff's Office	12	1,255	1,377	3	3	217.9
Lone Tree Police Department	12	6,481	6,804	12	13	191.1
Longmont Department of Public Safety	10	10,511	13,586	165	184	1,354.3
Louisville Police Department	12	2,840	3,884	14	12	309.0
Loveland Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Mancos Marshal's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Manitou Springs Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Manzanola Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Mead Police Department	12	1,435	1,522	7	11	722.7
Meeker Police Department	12	755	1,045	0	0	0.0
Mesa County Sheriff's Office	12	4,748	5,844	17	13	222.5
Milliken Police Department	12	2,139	3,266	6	8	244.9
Mineral County Sheriff's Office	11	158	163	0	0	0.0
Minturn Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Moffat County Sheriff's Office	11	819	835	6	6	718.6
Monte Vista Police Department	12	2,166	3,189	9	7	219.5
Montezuma County Sheriff's Office	10	467	473	1	1	211.4

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Montrose County Sheriff's Office	12	1,352	1,498	2	2	133.5
Montrose Police Department	12	1,822	2,512	8	6	238.9
Monument Police Department	12	1,873	2,077	0	0	0.0
Morgan County Sheriff's Office	12	1,368	1,495	7	9	602.0
Morrison Police Department	0	2,714	2,806	3	3	106.9
Mountain View Police Department	10	1,280	1,296	1	0	0.0
Mountain Village Police Department	12	142	160	0	0	0.0
Mt Crested Butte Police Department	12	399	409	0	0	0.0
Nederland Police Department	12	0	0	0	0	0.0
New Castle Police Department	12	497	504	0	0	0.0
Northern Colorado Drug Task Force	10	11	21	1	1	4,761.9
Northglenn Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Nunn Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Oak Creek Police Department	11	275	368	0	0	0.0
Olathe Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Otero County Sheriff's Office	12	618	657	10	7	1,065.4
Ouray County Sheriff's Office	6	225	232	0	0	0.0
Ouray Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Pagosa Springs Police Department	11	460	472	0	0	0.0
Palisade Police Department	7	861	919	1	1	108.8
Palmer Lake Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Paonia Police Department	9	132	143	4	4	2,797.2



<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Parachute Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Park County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Parker Police Department	12	4,350	4,524	13	12	265.3
Phillips County Sheriff's Office	9	164	202	0	0	0.0
Pikes Peak State College Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Pitkin County Sheriff's Office	6	1,506	1,548	2	3	193.8
Platteville Police Department	3	125	150	0	0	0.0
Prowers County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Pueblo County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Pueblo Police Department	12	6,016	8,218	28	29	352.9
Rangely Police Department	9	900	988	7	6	607.3
Red Rocks Community College Campus Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Regional Transportation District Transit Police Dept	12	1,200	1,292	2	2	154.8
Ridgway Marshal's Office	11	279	280	1	1	357.1
Rifle Police Department	12	1,047	1,079	3	3	278.0
Rio Blanco County Sheriff's Office	12	693	866	0	0	0.0
Rio Grande County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Rocky Ford Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Routt County Sheriff's Office	12	2,322	2,397	8	8	333.8
Saguache County Sheriff's Office	4	29	47	3	5	10,638. 3

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
Salida Police Department	8	791	989	3	3	303.3
San Juan County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
San Miguel County Sheriff's Office	10	1,430	1,612	0	0	0.0
Sanford Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Severance Police Department	12	736	804	1	1	124.4
Sheridan Police Department	12	3,739	4,106	10	13	316.6
Silt Police Department	12	566	631	3	1	158.5
Silverthorne Police Department	11	747	758	0	0	0.0
Simla Police Department	8	159	159	0	0	0.0
Snowmass Village Police Department	12	906	1,009	0	0	0.0
South Fork Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Springfield Police Department	4	41	41	0	0	0.0
Steamboat Springs Police Department	12	2,630	2,722	3	3	110.2
Sterling Police Department	12	3,649	4,460	13	13	291.5
Stratton Marshal's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Summit County Sheriff's Office	11	2,677	2,837	1	1	35.2
Teller County Sheriff's Office	9	1,462	1,681	8	8	475.9
Telluride Marshal's Office	12	222	264	0	0	0.0
Thornton Police Department	12	26,435	27,533	7	7	25.4
Timnath Police Department	12	2,615	2,666	0	0	0.0
Trinidad Police Department`	8	181	211	16	17	8,056.9

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Months Count</b>	<b>Contact Count</b>	<b>Citizen Count</b>	<b>UoF* Contacts Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Count</b>	<b>Force Used on Citizen Rate</b>
University of Colorado - Boulder Police Department	12	1,741	1,798	6	5	278.1
University of Colorado - Colorado Springs Police Department	5	76	112	1	1	892.9
University of Colorado - Denver Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus - Denver Police Department	10	408	425	5	3	705.9
University of Northern Colorado Police Department	12	537	571	0	0	0.0
Vail Police Department	12	2,857	2,858	19	20	699.8
Walsenburg Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Walsh Police Department	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Washington County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Weld County Drug Task Force	4	15	26	2	2	7,692.3
Weld County Sheriff's Office	11	8,074	10,074	21	20	198.5
Westminster Police Department	12	10,189	10,558	337	444	4,205.3
Wheat Ridge Police Department	9	2,707	2,707	7	7	258.6
Wiggins Police Department	12	440	449	1	1	222.7
Windsor Police Department	12	5,311	5,407	1	1	18.5
Woodland Park Police Department	12	3,054	3,433	2	2	58.3
Wray Police Department	12	452	455	1	1	219.8
Yuma County Sheriff's Office	11	254	260	0	0	0.0
Yuma Police Department	11	674	720	2	2	277.8

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System CY 2023.

Note: \* refers to “use of force.”

~ Although Denver Police Department and Denver Sheriff’s Department submitted contacts data to the Division of Criminal Justice separately, this table only refers to agency submissions to the Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System. The use of force rate in this table for Denver Police Department will not match the use of force rate reported on page 40 for Denver Police Department.

## Conclusion

This document is the first in which agencies reported a full year's worth of data. This report summarizes data reported by law enforcement agencies pursuant to 24-31-903, C.R.S. It covers the period of January to December of 2023 in which 42% of Colorado agencies were fully compliant in reporting their data all 12 months of 2023. The report does not give a full picture of law enforcement contacts and use of force but is more robust and provides more data across a full year as opposed to a limited number of months as reported in the 2022 Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado Report (Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, 2024). The DCJ observed wide variation in the reporting of force used on citizens across jurisdictions, which could be an indication of differences in reporting practices and interpretations of the use of force statute among agencies. The DCJ is committed to working on both improving the data completeness and standardization of the contacts reporting system to improve future reporting to the public.

However, the nascent reporting on the 676,970 contact incidents highlights a few emerging trends. Law enforcement initiated the majority of contacts with citizens, and traffic stops were overwhelmingly the most common reason for police contact. Law enforcement most frequently issued citations or warnings to contacted citizens. Furthermore, there were over 20,000 searches conducted in 2023, and a large amount were conducted on the citizen's person and based on a search warrant exception. Citizens perceived to be Native American NH, Other NH, Black/African American NH had the least successful person search outcomes. Additionally, the DCJ observed that Black/African Americans NH, Multiracial H and White H were between 1.5 to three times more likely to be subject to force compared to all citizen contacts. The age group with the highest rates of force used against them were youth under the age of 18, and males had higher exposure to force compared to females. Furthermore, a quarter of all citizens subject to force required ambulance attention and 22% were transported for further medical care. The public dashboard will allow viewers to more fully explore these data on their own (Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, 2025).

## References:

Colorado Department of Local Affairs. *Colorado State Demography Office*. (2024.).

<https://demography.dola.colorado.gov/>

Colorado Division of Criminal Justice. *ORS: Crime & Policing-Contacts & Use of Force*. (2025).

<https://dcj.colorado.gov/dcj-offices/ors/dashb-cp-cuf>

Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Law Enforcement Resources*. (nd). <https://le.fbi.gov/informational-tools/ucr/ucr-technical-specifications-user-manuals-and-data-tools#Use-of-Force>

## Appendix A: Statutory Language of 24-31-901 & 24-31-903, C.R.S.

### 24-31-901. Definitions.

As used in this part 9, unless the context otherwise requires:

- (1) “Contact” means an in-person interaction with an individual, whether or not the person is in a motor vehicle, initiated by a peace officer, whether consensual or non-consensual, for the purpose of enforcing the law or investigating possible violations of the law. “Contact” does not include routine interactions with the public at the point of entry or exit from a controlled area; a non-investigatory and consensual interaction with a member of the public, initiated by a member of the public, unless and until the interaction progresses into an investigation of a possible violation of the law; a motorist assists; undercover interactions; or routine interactions with persons detained in a jail or detention facility.
- (2) “Demographic information” means race, ethnicity, gender, and approximate age.
- (2.5) “Exonerated” means dismissal of charges by the court or appropriate prosecutor or a not guilty verdict in a criminal prosecution, a finding of no liability in a civil action, a finding of no culpability or no liability or similar determination in an administrative proceeding, or a finding of not sustained in an internal investigation; except that a finding of no culpability or no liability in an administrative proceeding or a finding of not sustained in an internal investigation does not mean “exonerated” if the officer is found guilty in a subsequent criminal prosecution for the same conduct or found liable for the same conduct in a civil action.
- (3) “Peace officer” means any person employed by a political subdivision of the state required to be certified by the P.O.S.T. board pursuant to section 16-2.5-102, a Colorado state patrol officer as described in section 16-2.5-114, and any non-certified deputy sheriff as described in section 16-2.5-103 (2).
- (4) “Physical force” means the application of physical techniques or tactics, chemical agents, or weapons to another person.
- (4.5) “P.O.S.T. board” means the peace officers standards and training board created in section 24-31-302.
- (5) “Serious bodily injury” has the same meaning as in section 18-1-901 (3)(p).
- (6) “Tamper” means to intentionally damage, disable, dislodge, or obstruct the sight or sound or otherwise impair functionality of the body-worn camera or to intentionally damage, delete, or fail to upload some or all portions of the video and audio.
- (7) “Weapon” means a firearm, long gun, taser, baton, nunchucks, or projectile.

### 24-31-903. Division of criminal justice report.

- (1) Beginning July 1, 2023, the division of criminal justice in the department of public safety shall create an annual report including all of the information that is reported to the division pursuant to subsection

(2) of this section, aggregated and broken down by the law enforcement agency that employs peace officers, along with the underlying data.

(2) Beginning April 1, 2022, the Colorado state patrol and each local law enforcement agency that employs peace officers shall report to the division of criminal justice the following using data-collection methods developed for this purpose by the division of criminal justice in conjunction with the Colorado bureau of investigation and local law enforcement agencies:

(a) All use of force by its peace officers that results in death or serious bodily injury or that involves the use of a weapon, including:

(I) The date, time, and location of the use of force;

(II) The perceived demographic information of the person contacted, provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the contact and other available data;

(III) The names of all peace officers who were at the scene, identified by whether the peace officer was involved in the use of force or not; except that the identity of other peace officers at the scene not directly involved in the use of force shall be identified by the officer's identification number issued by the P.O.S.T. board unless the peace officer is charged criminally or is a defendant to a civil suit as a result arising from the use of force;

(IV) The type of force used, the severity and nature of the injury, whether the peace officer suffered physical injury, and the severity of the peace officer's injury;

(V) Whether the peace officer was on duty at the time of the use of force;

(VI) Whether a peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the incident, and, if so, the type of weapon;

(VII) Whether a peace officer discharged a weapon during the incident;

(VIII) Whether the use of force resulted in a law enforcement agency investigation and the result of the investigation;

(IX) Whether the use of force resulted in a civilian complaint and the resolution of that complaint;

(X) Whether an ambulance was called to the scene and whether a person was transported to a hospital from the scene whether in an ambulance or other transportation; and

(XI) Whether the person contacted exhibited a weapon during the interaction leading up to the injury or death, and, if so, the type of weapon and whether it was discovered before or after the use of force;

(b) All instances when a peace officer resigned while under investigation for violating department policy;

(c) All data relating to contacts and entries into a residence, including a forcible entry, conducted by its peace officers, including:

(I) The perceived demographic information of the person contacted provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the contact and other available data; except that this subsection (2)(c)(I) does not apply to a person contacted who is a witness to a crime or a survivor of a crime;

(II) Whether the contact was a traffic stop;

(II.5) Whether the contact was a show up, as defined in section 16-1-110 (1)(b);



- (III) The time, date, and location of the contact;
  - (IV) The duration of the contact;
  - (V) The reason for the contact;
  - (VI) The suspected crime;
  - (VII) The result of the contact, such as:
    - (A) No action, warning, citation, property seizure, or arrest;
    - (B) If a warning or citation was issued, the warning provided or violation cited;
    - (C) If an arrest was made, the offense charged;
    - (D) If the contact was a traffic stop, the information collected, which is limited to the driver;
    - (E) If the contact was a show up, the information collected pursuant to section 16-1-109 (6) for the eyewitness and the subject.
  - (VIII) The actions taken by the peace officer during the contact, including but not limited to whether:
    - (A) The peace officer asked for consent to search the person, and, if so, whether consent was provided;
    - (B) The peace officer searched the person, a vehicle, or any property, and, if so, the basis for the search and the type of contraband or evidence discovered, if any;
    - (C) The peace officer seized any property and, if so, the type of property that was seized and the basis for seizing the property;
    - (D) A peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the contact, and, if so, the type of weapon; and
    - (E) A peace officer discharged a weapon during the contact;
  - (d) All instances of unannounced entry into a residence, with or without a warrant, including:
    - (I) The date, time, and location of the use of unannounced entry;
    - (II) The perceived demographic information of the subject of the unannounced entry, provided that the identification of these characteristics is based on the observation and perception of the peace officer making the entry and other available data;
    - (III) Whether a peace officer unholstered or brandished a weapon during the unannounced entry, and, if so, the type of weapon; and
    - (IV) Whether a peace officer discharged a weapon during the unannounced entry.
  - (e) The number of officer-involved civilian deaths.
- (3) The Colorado state patrol and local law enforcement agencies shall not report the name, address, social security number, or other unique personal identifying information of the subject of the use of force, victim of the official misconduct, eyewitness or subject in a show up, or persons contacted, searched, or subjected to a property seizure. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the data reported pursuant to this section is available to the public pursuant to subsection (4) of this section.
- (4) The division of criminal justice shall maintain a statewide database with data collected pursuant to this section, in a searchable format, and publish the database on its website.
- (5) The Colorado state patrol and any local law enforcement agency that fails to meet its reporting requirements pursuant to this section is subject to the suspension of its funding by its appropriating authority.