

Use of Force

300.1 SANCTITY OF LIFE

The Berkeley Police Department's highest priority is safeguarding the life, dignity, and liberty of all persons. Officers shall demonstrate this principle in their daily interactions with the community they are sworn to protect and serve. The Department is committed to accomplishing this mission with respect and minimal reliance on the use of force by using rapport-building communication, crisis intervention, and de-escalation tactics before resorting to force. Officers must respect the sanctity of all human life, act in all possible respects to preserve human life, do everything possible to avoid unnecessary uses of force, and minimize the force that is used, while still protecting themselves and the public.

Commented [LK1]: Subcommittee 6-11-2020

Commented [KL2]: 1st 3 sentences from Perezvelez.

Commented [KL3]: Last sentence from Camden "Purpose" section.

300.1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Best Practice

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

This policy sets forth criteria governing the use of force. All officers are responsible for knowing and complying with this policy and conducting themselves in a manner that reflects the Berkeley Police Department's Use of Force Core Principles. Violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action, including and up to termination, and may subject the officer to criminal prosecution. Supervisors shall ensure that all personnel in their command know the content of this policy and operate in compliance with it.

Commented [LK4]: Subcommittee 6-15-2020. From Camden; Campaign Zero

300.1.2 USE OF FORCE STANDARD

In dealing with suspects, officers shall strive to use alternatives to physical force whenever reasonably possible. In all cases where physical force is used, officers shall use the minimum amount of force that is objectively reasonable, objectively necessary, and proportional to effectively and safely resolve a conflict.

Commented [KL5]: Ramsey proposal with F. Brown edits; Subcomm. agreed 6-24-2020.

The United States Supreme Court in *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989), held that, in order to comply with the U.S. Constitution, an officer's use of force must be objectively reasonable under the totality of circumstances known to the officer at the time. Additionally, Penal Code section 835(a) imposes further restrictions on an officer's use of force. But these standards merely set the minimum standard for police conduct, below which an officer's conduct would be regarded as unlawful.

In fulfilling this Department's mission to safeguard the life, dignity, and liberty of officers themselves and all members of the community they are sworn to protect and serve, this policy

requires more of our officers than simply not violating the law. As a result, this policy is more restrictive than the minimum constitutional standard and state law in two important respects.

First, it imposes a higher duty upon officers to use the minimal amount of force objectively necessary to safely achieve their legitimate law enforcement objective. And, second, this policy imposes a stricter obligation on officers to exert only such force that is objectively proportionate to the circumstances, requiring a consideration of the seriousness of the suspected offense, the availability of de-escalation and other less aggressive techniques, and the risks of harm presented to members of the public and to the officers involved.

Additionally, Penal Code section 835(a) imposes further restrictions on an officer's use of force

300.1.32 CORE PRINCIPLES

A. DE-ESCALATION AND FORCE MINIMIZATION. Every officer's goal, throughout an encounter with a member of the public, ~~should~~ shall be to de-escalate wherever possible and resolve the encounter without resorting to the use of force. Whenever possible, officers shall employ de-escalation techniques to increase the likelihood of voluntary compliance with law enforcement requests or directives and, thereby, decrease the likelihood that a use of force will become necessary during an incident. Further, in any encounters that do call for applying force, officers must always strive to use the minimal amount of force that is objectively reasonable and objectively necessary to safely achieve their legitimate law enforcement objective.

B. PROPORTIONALITY. When determining the appropriate level of force, at all times officers shall balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time. It is particularly important that officers apply proportionality and critical decision making when encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm.

C. MINIMIZING THE USE OF DEADLY FORCE. Deadly force may only be used when the officer reasonably believes that such action is immediately necessary to protect the officer or another person from imminent danger of death or serious bodily harm. Officers shall not use deadly force if the officer reasonably believes that alternative techniques will eliminate the imminent danger and ultimately achieve the law enforcement purpose with less risk of harm to the officer or to other persons

D. DUTY TO INTERVENE. Whenever possible, officers shall intervene when they know or have reason to know that another officer is about to use, or is using, unnecessary force. Officers shall promptly report any use of unnecessary force and the efforts made to intervene to a supervisor.

E. VULNERABLE POPULATIONS. Officers should be particularly sensitive when considering the use of force against vulnerable populations, including children, elderly persons, pregnant women, people with physical and mental disabilities, and people with limited English proficiency.

Commented [LK6]: Subcommittee 6-17-2020

Commented [LK7]: From Ramsey 6-19, a.m.

Commented [KL8]: "Should" to "shall" by Perezvelez 6-27. Not discussed by Subcomm.

Commented [KL9]:

Commented [KL10R9]: Subcomm. added 6-19 per Ramsey.

Commented [KL11]: Leftwich. Subcomm agreed 6-24.

F. FOSTER STRONG COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS. The Berkeley Police Department understands that uses of force, even if lawful and proper, can have a damaging effect on the public's perception of the Department and the Department's relationship with the community. The Department is committed to fostering strong community relations by building on its historic tradition of progressive policing, ensuring accountability and transparency, and striving to increase trust with our community. Officers therefore must carry out their duties, including use of force, in a manner that is fair and unbiased.

Commented [KL12]: Subcomm. 6-19-2020 per Leftwich. From Seattle, Boston PD UOF policies; BPD Mission-Vision-Values.

G. FAIR AND UNBIASED POLICING. Members shall carry out their duties, including the use of force, in a manner that is fair and unbiased, in accordance with Policy 401, Fair and Impartial Policing.

Commented [SH13]: SB 230 requires "An explicitly stated requirement that officers carry out duties, including use of force, in a manner that is fair and unbiased." This seemed an appropriate place to put this language. However, it should be placed wherever the Commission sees fit.

300.1.43 DEFINITIONS

Federal

Definitions related to this policy include:

Minimal amount necessary – [The] least amount of force that is objectively reasonable and objectively necessary to safely effect an arrest or achieve some other legitimate law enforcement purpose.

Commented [KL14]: Appeared in a prior draft but deleted as redundant of Policy 401. Per City Attorney comment above re SB 230 requirement, can either reinstate OR add language to end of prior section.

Commented [KL15]: 6-19 Subcomm. observed definitions appear to be grouped, so subheadings would be useful.

Commented [LK16]: Perezvelez

Commented [LK17]: From Ramsey 6-19. Subcomm. agreed; BPD to opine.

Deadly force - Any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury, including, but not limited to, the discharge of a firearm (Penal Code § 835a).

Commented [KL18]: Subcomm. 6-19-2020.

Commented [KL19]: Subcomm. pinned for further discussion but did not return.

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

Commented [OJ20]: Changes based on Lexipol update related to the new use of force law

Commented [GA21]: New

Commented [GA22]: Combines existing U-2 language

Less-Than-Lethal Force – Any use of force which, due to possible physiological effects of application, presents less potential for causing death or serious injury than conventional lethal force options. Less-than-lethal force options include, but are not limited to, a specialized launcher, or other authorized device that can discharge, fire, launch or otherwise propel single or multiple flexible or non-flexible projectiles designed to cause physiological effects consistent with blunt force impact.

Non-Lethal Force – Any use of force other than lethal force or less-than lethal force.

Commented [GA23]: U-2

Compliant Suspect – Cooperative and/or responsive to lawful commands.

Commented [GA24]: New

Commented [KL25]: Subcomm. 6-19-2020

Passive Resistance – Noncompliance to lawful authority without physical resistance or mechanical enhancement.

Commented [GA26]: New

Active Resistance – Use of physical effort or mechanical resistance in achieving and/or maintaining noncompliance.

Commented [GA27]: New

Passive Resistance: When an individual does not follow the lawful verbal commands of a police officer, but does not physically resist in any way.

Commented [KL28]: Subcomm agreed on three definitions submitted by BPD 6-22.

Examples: A person who goes completely limp, sits down and refuses to stand or walk, or who may stand with arms at their sides without attempting to strike at or physically resist officers.

Active Resistance: An individual who is uncooperative and fails to comply with the lawful verbal commands of a police officer, and attempts to avoid physical control and/or arrest by physically struggling to free oneself from being restrained. The individual may also use verbal non-compliance (refusing a lawful order or direction).

Examples: A person who attempts to avoid physical control and/or arrest by pulling or pushing away from the officer, tensing arm or muscles, hiding from the officer, and/or fleeing.

Combative Resistance: An individual not only resists the officer, but poses a threat of harm to the officer or others, in an aggressive manner that may cause physical injury.

Examples: A person who violently attempts to or attacks an officer. This action is sometimes preceded by "pre-assault" cues such as taking a threatening stance (clenching fists, facial expressions, threats, etc.) and non-verbal non-compliance.

Commented [KL29]: BPD corrected 6-23.

Control Hold: Any Department approved hold, designed to allow an officer to control the movement of a subject (e.g., twist lock, rear wrist lock, finger lock, etc.). A control hold can be applied without implementing pain.

Commented [KL30]: Added 6-26. From Policy 428.

Pain Compliance Technique: Involves either the manipulation of a person's joints (control holds) or activating certain pressure points intended to create sufficient pain for the purpose of motivating a person to comply with verbal commands (e.g. examples of pressure points include buccal nerve, gum nerve, sternum rub).

Commented [KL31]: Added 6-26. From Policy 428.

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.06", Pattern: Clear (White), Tab stops: 0", Left

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Underline

Control Techniques – Control holds, Personal Impact Weapons, and Take Downs.

Commented [GA32]: New

Personal Body Weapons - An officer's use of his/her body part, including but not limited to hand, foot, knee, elbow, shoulder, hip, arm, leg or head by means of kinetic energy transfer (impact) to gain control of a subject.

Commented [KL33]: Subcomm. 6-26: delete definition if not used elsewhere?

Commented [GA34]: New

Blue Team (BT) – Computer software that allows officers to enter use of force and other incidents from a Department computer.

Commented [GA35]: New

Concealment - Anything which conceals a person from view.

Commented [GA36]: New

Cover - Anything which provides protection from bullets or other projectiles fired or thrown. Cover is subjective and its effectiveness depends upon the threat's ballistic capability (handgun, rifle, etc.).

Commented [GA37]: New

Blocking - The positioning of a police vehicle in the path of an occupied subject vehicle where contact between the vehicles is not anticipated or is anticipated to be minimal.

Commented [GA38]: New

Ramming - The use of a vehicle to intentionally hit another vehicle

Commented [GA39]: New

Serious Bodily Injury - A bodily injury that creates a substantial risk of death, causes serious, permanent disfigurement or results in a prolonged loss or impairment of the functioning of any bodily member or organ.

Commented [GA40]: New

Commented [KL41]: 6-22 Subcomm. agrees to this definition, though Ramsey wants to avoid confusion with definition of Serious Bodily Injury in PC 835a.

Officer (or) Police Officer - Any sworn peace officer.

Commented [GA42]: Existing language

Authorized Employee - Any non-sworn employee who has received defensive tactics training and has been authorized by the Chief of Police to use non-lethal force.

Commented [GA43]: Existing language

Employee - Any non-sworn employee of the Berkeley Police Department, including those deemed "authorized employees."

Commented [GA44]: Existing language

300.2 POLICY

Best Practice

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

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

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

300.2.1 DUTY TO INTERCEDE

Federal

~~Any officer present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall, when in a position to do so, intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force. An officer who observes another employee or member of another department use force that exceeds the degree of force permitted by law shall promptly report these observations to a supervisor.~~

Commented [GA45]: Added from existing BPD U-2

300.2.1 DUTY TO INTERCEDE/ INTERVENE AND DUTY TO REPORT

Any officer who observes another officer or member of the Berkeley Police Department using force that is clearly in violation of this policy shall immediately take reasonable action to attempt to mitigate such use of force. This may include verbal intervention or, when in a position to do so, physical intervention. Further, any officer who learns of a potentially unauthorized use of force which the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of

Commented [KL46]: Ramsey/Leftwich language. Subcomm. approved 6-22.

information actually known to the officer, to be a violation of this policy, even if the officer did not witness it personally, shall promptly report this information to an on-duty sergeant or a command officer at the first opportunity.

Commented [SH47]: Recommended language to more closely mirror SB 230: " A requirement that officers report potential excessive force to a superior officer when present and observing another officer using force that the officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer."

Any officer who observes an employee or member of a different law enforcement agency use force that exceeds the degree of force permitted by law shall promptly report these observations to an on-duty sergeant or a command officer at the first opportunity.

Commented [KL48R47]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

300.3 USE OF FORCE

Federal

~~Officers shall use only that amount of force that is objectively reasonable given the facts and totality of the circumstances known or perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose. Officers shall use only the force that is objectively reasonable to effectively bring an incident under control, while protecting the safety of the officer and others. (Penal Code § 835a)~~

Commented [GA49]: Changes based on Lexipol/new use of force law

~~The reasonableness of force will be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene at the time of the incident, rather than with the 20 / 20 vision of hindsight. Any evaluation of reasonableness must allow for the fact that officers are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force that reasonably appears necessary in a particular situation, with limited information and in circumstances that are tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving. This policy takes into consideration that there are a range of reasonable responses to each situation. (Graham) v. Connor 490 U.S. 386 (1989))~~

Commented [GA50]: Added citation

~~The decision to use force "requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officer or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight." (Graham) v. Connor 490 U.S. 386 (1989))~~

Commented [GA51]: Added citation

~~In deciding what type of reasonable force to use, officers and employees must use sound judgment and their training to assess the degree of threat in a given situation, and to determine what departmentally authorized force technique or weapons will bring the situation under control in a reasonable manner.~~

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

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

300.3.1 USE OF FORCE TO EFFECT AN ARREST

State

Any peace officer may use objectively reasonable, objectively necessary, and proportional force to effect an arrest, to prevent escape or to overcome resistance. A peace officer who makes or attempts to make an arrest need not retreat or desist from his/her efforts by reason of resistance or threatened resistance on the part of the person being arrested; nor shall an officer be deemed the aggressor or lose his/her right to self-defense by the use of reasonable force to effect the arrest, prevent escape or to overcome resistance ~~(Penal Code § 835a)~~.

Commented [KL52]: Perezvelez revised 6-27 per Subcomm's general directive 6-26. PRC should discuss substance of this section on 6-29.

300.3.2 USE OF FORCE TO SEIZE EVIDENCE

In general, officers may use objectively reasonable, objectively necessary, and proportional force to lawfully seize evidence and to prevent the destruction of evidence. In the instance when force is used an officer shall not ~~intentionally~~ use any technique that restricts blood flow to the head, restricts respiration or which creates a reasonable likelihood that blood flow to the head or respiration would be restricted. Officers are encouraged to use techniques and methods taught by the department for the specific purpose of collecting evidence.

Commented [KL53]: Perezvelez revised 6-27 per Subcomm's general directive 6-26. PRC. should discuss substance of this section on 6-29.

Commented [KL54]: Perezvelez revised 6-27. Subcomm. hasn't discussed change, but it is consistent with chokehold language.

300.3.3 FACTORS USED TO DETERMINE THE REASONABLENESS, NECESSITY, AND

Federal

PROPORTIONALITY OF FORCE

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

Commented [KL55]: Subcomm. 6-26.

Commented [GA56]: Items in below listed with the PC 835a citation are new to the law.

- (a) The apparent immediacy and severity of the threat to officers or others (Penal Code § 835a).
- (b) The conduct of the individual being confronted, as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time.
- (c) Officer/subject factors (age, size, relative strength, skill level, injuries sustained, level of exhaustion or fatigue, the number of officers available vs. subjects).
- (d) The conduct of the involved officer (Penal Code § 835a).
- (e) The effects of drugs or alcohol.
- (f) The individual's apparent mental state or capacity (Penal Code § 835a).
- (g) The individual's apparent ability to understand and comply with officer commands (Penal Code § 835a).
- (h) Proximity of weapons or dangerous improvised devices.
- (i) The degree to which the subject has been effectively restrained and his/her ability to resist despite being restrained.
- (j) The availability of other reasonable and feasible options and their possible effectiveness (Penal Code § 835a).
- (k) Seriousness of the suspected offense or reason for contact with the individual.

- (l) Training and experience of the officer.
- (m) Potential for injury to officers, suspects, and others.
- (n) Whether the person appears to be resisting, attempting to evade arrest by flight, or is attacking the officer.
- (o) The risk and reasonably foreseeable consequences of escape.
- (p) The apparent need for immediate control of the subject or a prompt resolution of the situation.
- (q) Whether the conduct of the individual being confronted no longer reasonably appears to pose an imminent threat to the officer or others.
- (r) Prior contacts with the subject or awareness of any propensity for violence.
- (s) Any other exigent circumstances.

The level of resistance that an officer encounters is a key factor in determining the proportionate amount of force. It is not possible to determine ahead of time what the proportionate level of force is for every possible situation that officers may face. Nevertheless, one of the key factors in determining what level of force is **objectively reasonable, objectively** necessary, and proportionate in a given situation is the level of resistance that an officer encounters. In general, the less resistance an officer faces, the less force the officer should use. The types of resistance officers may encounter fall along a continuum, from a cooperative person to an active assailant. Consistent with training, the following general rules apply when officers are exercising judgment in determining what level of force is necessary and proportionate:

- Compliant – In general, when dealing with a compliant person, officers may rely on police presence and/or verbal control techniques, but should not use greater force.
- Passive resistance – In general, when dealing with a suspect involved in passive resistance, officers may rely on police presence, verbal control techniques, or control holds, but should not use greater force.
- Active resistance – In general, in dealing with a suspect involved in active resistance, in addition to the options available for passive resistance, officers may rely on pain compliance techniques or takedowns, but should not use greater force.
- Combative resistance – In general, in dealing with a suspect involved in combative resistance, officers have all use-of-force options available to them, but deadly force shall only be used in compliance with this policy as described in Section 300.4.

300.3.4 USE OF FORCE CONTINUUM

The Department uses a "use of force continuum" that refers to the concept that there are

Commented [OJ57]: Lexipol updated this list based on changes in the law. The main changes are d) and g). Added "apparent" to sections a) and f) and included language referencing Penal Code section 835a, to certain sections.

Commented [KL58]: Added 6-26 with BPD agreement, except for language noted below.

Commented [KL59]: Bold language added by Leftwich 6-28.

Commented [KL60]: Perezvelez language. Subcomm. agreed 6-26.

reasonable responses for every threat an officer faces in a hostile situation. The force utilized need not be sequential (e.g., gradual or preceded by attempts at lower levels of force) if those lower levels are not appropriate. All Uses of Force must be objectively reasonable, objectively necessary, and proportional, based on a totality of the circumstances. All progressions must rest on the premise that officers shall escalate and de-escalate their level of force in response to the subject's actions.

Five levels of Continuum

- **Officer Presence — No force is used. Considered the best way to resolve a situation.**
 - The mere presence of a law enforcement officer works to deter crime or diffuse a situation.
 - Officers' attitudes are professional and nonthreatening.
- **Verbalization — Force is not physical.**
 - Officers issue calm, nonthreatening commands, such as "Let me see your identification and registration."
 - Officers may increase their volume and shorten commands in an attempt to gain compliance. Short commands might include "Stop," or "Don't move."
- **Weaponless defense — Officers use bodily force to gain control of a situation.**
 - Pain compliance and control holds. Officers use grabs, holds and joint locks to restrain an individual.
 - Personal body weapons. Officers may use punches and kicks to restrain an individual.
- **Less-Lethal Force Methods — Officers use less-lethal technologies to gain control of a situation.**
 - Blunt impact. Officers may use a baton or projectile to immobilize a combative person.
 - Chemical. Officers may use chemical sprays or projectiles embedded with chemicals to restrain an individual (e.g., pepper spray).
- **Lethal Force — Officers may use lethal weapons only in compliance with Section 300.4.**

300.3.4300.3.5 DE-ESCALATION (TACTICS)

De-escalation tactics and techniques are actions ~~which may be~~ used by officers which seek to minimize the need to use force during an incident. Such tactics and techniques may increase the likelihood of voluntary compliance when employed and ~~should shall~~ be used when it is safe to do so, without compromising law enforcement objectives and priorities. De-escalation tactics emphasize slowing an incident down to allow time, distance and flexibility for the situation to resolve. ~~Officers shall, when feasible, continually assess the dynamics of a situation, and modulate their response and actions appropriately. Officers may be justified in using force at one moment, but not justified in using force the next moment due to a change in dynamics.~~ The application of these tactics is intended to increase the potential for resolution with a minimal reliance on the use of force, or without using force at all.

Commented [GA61]: New language-BPD Unique

Commented [KL62]: Perezvelez revisions discussed 6-24; Subcomm. agreed.

Commented [MC63]: I think when feasible should be removed here. As a matter of practice, officers should at all times process proportionality and de-escalation

Commented [KL64R63]: Unsure if this was resolved.

If immediate action is not necessary, an officer(s) ~~should~~shall attempt to use verbal de-escalation techniques. When available and when practicable, a Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officer, crisis negotiator, or Berkeley Mental Health Mobile Crisis Team member ~~should~~shall be called upon as a resource.

~~When reasonable under the totality of circumstances, o~~Officers ~~should~~shall gather information about the incident, assess the risks, assemble resources, attempt to slow momentum and communicate and coordinate a response. In their interaction with subjects, officers should use advisements, warnings, verbal persuasion and other tactics and alternatives to ~~higher~~any levels of force. Officers ~~may~~shall move to a position that is tactically more secure or allows them greater distance to consider or deploy a greater variety of force options.

- ~~a) De-escalation techniques may include verbal persuasion, warnings and tactical de-escalation techniques, such as: slowing down the pace of an incident; "waiting out" subjects; creating distance (and thus the reactionary gap) between the officer and the threat; and requesting additional resources (e.g., specialized units, mental health care providers, negotiators, etc.) to resolve the incident.~~
- ~~b) Officers should recognize that they may withdraw to a position that is tactically advantageous or allows them greater distance to de-escalate a situation.~~
~~—Officers should consider a variety of options, including lesser force or no force options. 3- Officers should perform their work in a manner that avoids unduly jeopardizing their own safety or the safety of others. D~~
- ~~c) Officers shall not intentionally and unnecessarily escalate and/or create a need to use force.~~
- ~~d) Officers should attempt to understand and consider possible reasons why a subject may be noncompliant or resisting arrest.~~
- ~~e) A subject may not be capable of understanding the situation because of a medical condition; mental, physical, or hearing impairment; language barrier; drug interaction; or emotional crisis, and have no criminal intent. These situations may not make the subject any less dangerous, but understanding a subject's situation may enable officers to calm the subject and allow officers to use de-escalation techniques while maintaining public and officer safety.~~
- ~~f) Officers should continue de-escalation techniques, when feasible and appropriate, and take as much time as reasonably necessary to resolve the incident, in effort to avoid and/or minimize the use of force.~~
- ~~g) When an officer recognizes that mental illness, post-traumatic stress disorder, alcohol and/or drug addictions, or other health issues are causing an individual to behave erratically, the officer shall, when feasible and appropriate, try to de-escalate the situation using de-escalation and/or crisis Intervention techniques.~~
- ~~h) Establishing Ccommunication with non-compliant subjects is often most effective when officers establish rapport, use the proper voice intonation, ask questions and provide advice to defuse conflict and achieve voluntary compliance before resorting to force options.~~

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

i) The officer's physical actions may also de-escalate a potentially volatile/violent situation; e.g., exhibiting relaxed body language.

When time and circumstances allow, officers ~~should~~shall consider the following tactical principles:

- (a) Make a tactical approach to the scene.
- (b) Maintain a safe distance.
- (c) Use available cover or concealment and identify escape routes.
- (d) Stage Berkeley Fire Department.
- (e) Control vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- (f) Establish communication, preferably with one officer.
- (g) Create an emergency plan and a deliberate plan with contingencies.
- (h) The officer's physical actions may also de-escalate a potentially volatile/violent situation; e.g., exhibiting relaxed body language.

~~When time and circumstances reasonably permit, officers should consider whether a subject's lack of compliance is a deliberate attempt to resist or is the result of an inability to comply based on factors such as:~~

- ~~(a) Medical conditions~~
- ~~(b) Mental impairment~~
- ~~(c) Developmental disability~~
- ~~(d) Physical Disability~~
- ~~(e) Physical limitation~~
- ~~(f) Language barrier~~
- ~~(g) Drug interaction~~
- ~~(h) Behavioral crisis~~

~~300.3.5~~300.3.6 PAIN COMPLIANCE TECHNIQUES

Best Practice

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

- (a) The degree to which the application of the technique may be controlled given the level of resistance and threat posed by the person.
- (b) Whether the person can comply with the direction or orders of the officer.

Commented [KL65]: Revisions suggested by BPD and Subcomm. accepted 6-24. See insertion of PCT and control hold definitions in that section; 6-26.

- (c) Whether the person has been given sufficient opportunity to comply.

The purpose of pain compliance is to direct a person's actions. The application of any pain compliance technique shall be discontinued once the officer determines that compliance has been achieved.

300.3.6300.3.7 USE OF NON-LETHAL FORCE

When lethal force and less-than-lethal force are not authorized, officers and authorized employees may use objectively reasonable, objectively necessary, and proportional approved non-lethal force techniques and weapons in the following circumstances:

- a) To protect themselves or another person from physical injury;
- b) To restrain or subdue a resistant individual; or
- c) To bring an unlawful situation safely and effectively under control.

300.3.7300.3.8 CAROTID CONTROLCHOKEHOLD PROHIBITION

The use of a Carotid Restraint Hold is prohibited. Carotid Restraint Hold: Council Resolution No. 52,605 - N.S., February 14, 1985, "Prohibiting use of 'chokehold' for law enforcement purposes in the City of Berkeley" states: "Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Berkeley as follows: That the chokehold, including but not limited to the carotid restraint and the bar-arm hold, is hereby banned from use for law enforcement purposes in the City of Berkeley."

The term bar-arm refers to a variety of techniques. The use of any chokehold is strictly prohibited. A chokehold is any hold or contact with the neck – including a carotid restraint -- that may inhibit breathing by compression of the airway in the neck, may inhibit blood flow by compression of the blood vessels in the neck, or that applies pressure to the front, side, or back of the neck. As defined in the City Council Resolution, "bar-arm hold" refers to *any* use of the forearm to exert pressure against the front of the neck. However, other types of arm hold techniques (e.g., those that involve control of the arm, wrist or elbow) remain authorized.

Commented [SH66]: SB 230 requires that the policy include "Comprehensive and specific guidelines regarding approved methods and devices available for the application of force."

The draft could benefit from greater discussion of "devices." It currently does not appear to contain much in terms of "specific guidelines regarding approved devices" such as less-than-lethal weapons, chemical agents (e.g., pepper spray), batons, handcuffs, body wrap restraints, spit hoods etc. Discussion could be done in a discrete section on devices, or placed throughout the document where relevant.

Commented [KL67R66]: Devices are covered in Policies 302 & 303. Will a reference to them be sufficient to fulfill requirements of SB 230?

Commented [GA68]: Longstanding Berkeley City Council Resolution

Commented [KL69]: Based on Perezvelez language. + Subcomm. revised w/ BPD agreement 6-19-2020.

300.4 DEADLY FORCE APPLICATIONS

Federal

~~If an objectively reasonable officer would consider it safe and feasible to do so under the totality of the circumstances, officers should evaluate the use of other reasonably available resources and techniques when determining whether to use deadly force. The use of deadly force is only justified in the following circumstances (Penal Code § 835a):~~

- ~~(a) An officer may use deadly force to protect him/herself or others from what he/she reasonably believes is an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person.~~
- ~~(b) An officer may use deadly force to apprehend a fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, if the officer reasonably~~

~~believes that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended.~~

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

~~Officers shall not use deadly force against a person based on the danger that person poses to him/herself, if an objectively reasonable officer would believe the person does not pose an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or to another person (Penal Code § 835a).~~

~~An "imminent" threat of death or serious bodily injury exists when, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable officer in the same situation would believe that a person has the present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person. An officer's subjective fear of future harm alone is insufficient as an imminent threat. An imminent threat is one that from appearances is reasonably believed to require instant attention (Penal Code § 835a).~~

300.4 USE OF DEADLY FORCE

Commented [KL70]: Leftwich language. Subcomm. agreed 6-26

~~An officer's use of **deadly force** may only be used is justified only when the officer reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, that such force is necessary to-, as a last resort- 1) defend against **when an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another is imminent**, or 2) apprehend a suspected fleeing person for any felony that threatened or resulted in death or serious bodily injury, provided the officer has a reasonably objective belief that the person will cause imminent death or serious bodily injury to another unless immediately apprehended.~~

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

~~An officer shall not use deadly force against another person unless the officer objectively and reasonably believes that using deadly force would not unnecessarily endanger innocent people.~~

~~all of the following conditions are met:~~

~~The officer has an objectively reasonable belief that deadly force is necessary to protect the officer or another person from a subject who is posing a current, active and immediate threat of death:~~

~~— The officer has exhausted all reasonable alternatives to the use of force, including de-escalation, other reasonable means of apprehending the subject, self-defense or defense of others; and~~

~~The officer objectively and reasonably believes that using deadly force would not unnecessarily endanger innocent people.~~

Lethal force is prohibited when its sole purpose is to effect an arrest, overcome resistance or prevent a subject from escaping when the subject does not present an immediate danger of death or serious bodily injury. Lethal force is also prohibited solely to prevent property damage or prevent the destruction of evidence.; disable a moving vehicle or against a person who only poses a threat to him/herself and not to others.

An "imminent" threat of death or serious bodily injury exists when, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable officer in the same situation would believe that a person has the present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or serious bodily injury to the officer or another person. An officer's subjective fear of future harm alone is insufficient as an imminent threat. An imminent threat is one that from appearances is reasonably believed to require instant attention.

300.4. 1. DRAWING AND POINTING FIREARMS

Commented [SH71]: SB 230 requires the UOF policy include "Clear and specific guidelines regarding situations in which officers may or may not draw a firearm or point a firearm at a person."

Commented [KL72R71]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

Commented [GA73]: BPD Language

300.4.1 DIRECTED FIRE

Officers may use controlled gunfire that is directed at the suspect, reducing the suspect's ability to return fire while a group or individual movement is conducted.

Officers may employ this tactic when dealing with a suspect who poses an immediate and ongoing lethal threat and only under circumstances where the use of deadly force is legally justified. Target acquisition and communication are key elements in the successful use of this tactic. Officers remain accountable for every round fired under these circumstances. Officers must consider their surroundings and potential risks to bystanders, to the extent reasonable under the circumstances, before discharging a firearm.

Commented [SH74]: SB 230 requires that the policy include: "A requirement that officers consider their surroundings and potential risks to bystanders, to the extent reasonable under the circumstances, before discharging a firearm."

Commented [KL75R74]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

Commented [KL76]: Subcomm. and BPD agreed to revisions 6-26.

300.4.2 SHOOTING AT OR FROM MOVING VEHICLES

Best Practice

Absent exigent circumstances, officers shall not discharge firearms from a moving vehicle.

Firearms should-shall not be discharged at a stationary or moving vehicle, the occupants of a vehicle, or the tires of a vehicle unless a person in the vehicle is imminently threatening an officer or another person present with deadly force. The moving vehicle alone does not presumptively constitute a threat that justifies the use of deadly force.

Officers shall not move into, remain, or otherwise position themselves in the path of a vehicle in an effort to detain or apprehend the occupants. Any officer in the path of a moving vehicle shall immediately attempt to move to a position of safety rather than discharging a firearm at the vehicle or any of the occupants.

Because this policy may not cover every situation that may arise, a deviation from this policy may be objectively reasonable and; objectively necessary depending on the totality of the circumstances. A deviation from this policy would, for instance, be justified if the officer used a firearm in an attempt to stop an imminent vehicle attack on a crowd or a mass casualty terrorist event.

Factors that may be used to evaluate the reasonableness of the use of a firearm against a vehicle include:

- (a) The availability and use of cover, distance and / or tactical relocation
- (b) Incident command and personnel placement
- (c) Tactical approach
- (d) Regard for viable target acquisition and background including location, other traffic, the presence of innocent persons, and police officers

300.5 USE OF VEHICLES

Officers shall not use police vehicles to ram or block other vehicles, persons, or moving objects in a manner that reasonably appears to constitute the use of lethal force, except under circumstances outlined in section 300.4 and in Policy V-6 that covers vehicle operations.

Commented [GA77]: BPD Language

The Vehicle Containment Technique (VCT) is the positioning of a police vehicle in the path of a suspect vehicle where contact between the vehicles is not anticipated or is anticipated to be minimal. VCT shall only be used on vehicles that are either stationary or moving at a slow speed. This technique is designed to contain a suspect vehicle to a single stationary location, thereby preventing a pursuit from initiating, or a potentially violent situation (e.g. a hostage situation or person barricaded inside a vehicle) from becoming mobile.

When properly utilized, the VCT can give officers time, distance, and cover in order to safely and effectively resolve a situation.

300.6 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Best Practice

~~Any use of force described in 300.6.2 shall be documented promptly, completely and accurately in an appropriate report, depending on the nature of the incident. The officer should articulate the factors perceived and why he/she believed the use of force was reasonable under the circumstances. Whenever an officer or employee uses Oleoresin Capsicum (pepper spray) he or she must also complete a "Use of Pepper Spray Report."~~

Commented [KL78]: BPD submitted revisions to its original language 6-24.

~~Any incident involving deadly force will be investigated under the protocols outlined in Policy P-12.~~

~~A use of force report is not required when a person is handcuffed, searched, or subject to a control hold and there is no injury or complaint of injury.~~

~~Absent any factors outlined in Section 306.2 officers shall document the following actions in a police report, citation, Field Interview, and / or CAD entry. Supervisors will review police report narratives for approval:~~

- ~~— Control Hold / Pressure point application~~
- ~~— Grab~~
- ~~— Application of bodyweight~~
- ~~— Lowering a subject to a seated position or to the ground while partially or complete supporting the person's body weight.~~

300.6 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

All uses of force shall be documented promptly, completely and accurately in an appropriate report, depending on the nature of the incident and the level of force used. The officer should articulate the factors perceived and why he/she believed the use of force was objectively reasonable and objectively necessary under the circumstances. ~~Whenever an officer or employee uses Oleoresin Capsicum (pepper spray) he or she must also complete a "Use of Pepper Spray Report."~~

Upon receiving notification of a use of force, an uninvolved supervisor, when feasible, will determine the level of force reporting level, investigation, documentation and review requirements.

Commented [KL79]: Leftwich/Perezvelez language 6-26. Subcomm. agreed.

Commented [KL80]: Subcomm. agreed with Chief's suggestion to delete this longstanding, separate reporting requirement, as use of OC spray will now be captured in new UOF reporting mandates.

300.6.1 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY

Best Practice

When a supervisor is able to respond to an incident in which there has been a reported application of force as defined in 300.6.2 and the scene is secure, the supervisor is ~~expected to~~ should:

- (a) Obtain the basic facts from the involved officers. Absent an allegation of misconduct or excessive force, this will be considered a routine contact in the normal course of duties.
- (b) Ensure that any injured parties are examined and treated.
- (c) Once any initial medical assessment has been completed or first aid has been rendered, ensure that photographs have been taken of any areas involving visible injury or complaint of pain, as well as overall photographs of uninjured areas. These photographs should be retained until all potential for civil litigation has expired.
- (d) Identify any witnesses not already included in related reports.
- (e) Review and approve all related reports
- (a)(f) Review body worn camera footage related to the incident.

Commented [KL81]: Subcomm. moved from 300.8.

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

Commented [KL82]: Originally in 300.8 but not discussed.

300.6.2 USE OF FORCE REPORTING LEVELS

Level 1

(a) Subject allowed him/herself to be searched, escorted, and/or handcuffed. The officer did not use force to overcome resistance, nor did the officer use force in the absence of resistance.

(b) The officer used any of the following, and the circumstances of the application would lead an objectively reasonable officer to conclude that the subject did not experience more than momentary discomfort:

Commented [KL83]: Leftwich/Perezvelez language. Subcomm. agreed 6-26.

1. Control holds/ pain compliance techniques
2. Leverage
3. Grab
4. Bodyweight
5. The officer lowered the subject to a seated position or to the ground while partially or completely supporting the person's bodyweight.
6. Takedown

Officers shall document Level 1 actions in a police report, citation, Field Interview, and / or CAD entry. Supervisors will review police report narratives for approval.

Level 2

(a) No suspect injury or complaint of continuing pain due to interaction with officer.

(d) Officer's use of force was limited to the following:

1. Firearm drawn/deployed but not fired, suspect contacted.
2. Control hold, pressure point, leverage, grab, takedown, and/or bodyweight, and the application would lead a reasonably objective officer to conclude that the individual may have experienced more than momentary discomfort.

An uninvolved supervisor, when feasible, will respond to the scene and conduct a Use of Force Investigation, ensuring that statements are taken from the suspect and witnesses, and that photos are taken of all involved parties. If the incident fits the parameters for a Level 2 incident, the supervisor will enter all applicable data into Blue Team and attach a completed Use of Force Investigation Checklist with a brief summary.

Level 3

(a) Would have otherwise been classified as a Level 2, except one or more of the following apply:

1. Suspect injury or complaint of injury or continuing pain due to interaction with the officer.
2. Officer body worn camera was not activated in a timely manner, prior to the enforcement contact, per policy.

(b) The officer used any of the following force options:

1. Chemical Agents/Munitions
- 2.. Impact Weapon Strikes
3. Personal Body Weapons

An uninvolved supervisor, when practical, will respond to the scene and conduct a Use of Force Investigation, ensuring that statements are taken from the suspect and witnesses. If the incident fits the parameters for a Level 3 incident, the supervisor will enter all applicable data into Blue Team and attach a completed Use of Force Investigation Checklist.

The supervisor will also complete a Use of Force Investigation Report narrative for review through the Use of Force Review process. Suspect and witness statements from the crime report will be attached to the use of force investigation.

Level 4

Any incident involving deadly force or any force likely to cause death or serious bodily injury will be investigated under the protocols outlined in Policy P-12.

300.6.2 EMPLOYEE USE OF FORCE

When any Berkeley Police Department employee has a use of force as defined in this policy, the use of force must be reported to a Berkeley Police supervisor and investigated in accordance with this policy.

~~300.6.1 INTENTIONALLY **POINTING** A FIREARM AT AN INDIVIDUAL~~

~~Whenever an officer intentionally points a firearm at an individual they shall document the occurrence on a Blue Team report. Officers shall articulate the facts that lead them to point a firearm at an individual and advise a supervisor prior to the end of shift so they can review the report documenting the incident.~~

~~Officers are not required to document drawing or deploying a firearm if they do not intentionally point it at a subject.~~

Commented [GA84]: BPD Language

Commented [OJ85]: Requires us to be live on Blue Team.

~~300.6.2 NOTIFICATION TO SUPERVISORS~~

~~**Best Practice**~~

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

- ~~(a) The application caused a visible injury.~~
- ~~(b) The application would lead a reasonable officer to conclude that the individual may have experienced more than momentary discomfort.~~
- ~~(c) The individual subjected to the force complained of injury or continuing pain as a result of the use of force.~~
- ~~(d) Any application of less than lethal munitions or pepper spray.~~
- ~~(e) The individual was struck by a baton~~
- ~~(f) The individual subjected to the force was rendered unconscious.~~
- ~~(g) The individual was struck with a personal body weapon or was subjected to a take-down.~~
- ~~(h) An individual alleges any of the above has occurred.~~

300.6.3 REPORTING TO CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

State

Statistical data regarding all officer-involved shootings and incidents involving use of force resulting in serious bodily injury is to be reported to the California Department of Justice as required by Government Code § 12525.2. See the Records Management policy.

300.6.4 PUBLIC RECORDS

300.7 MEDICAL CONSIDERATION

Best Practice

When an officer or employee uses force that results in injury, or when a subject complains that an injury has been inflicted, the officer or employee shall promptly provide, if properly trained, or otherwise promptly procure medical assistance in order to ensure that the subject receives appropriate medical care.

The on-scene supervisor or, if the on-scene supervisor is not available, the primary handling officer shall ensure that any person providing medical care or receiving custody of a person following any use of force is informed that the person was subjected to force.

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

~~300.8300.6 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY~~

Best Practice

~~When a supervisor is able to respond to an incident in which there has been a reported application of force as defined in 300.6.2 and the scene is secure, the supervisor is expected to:~~

- ~~(b)(a) Obtain the basic facts from the involved officers. Absent an allegation of misconduct or excessive force, this will be considered a routine contact in the normal course of duties.~~
- ~~(c)(a) Ensure that any injured parties are examined and treated.~~
- ~~(d)(a) Once any initial medical assessment has been completed or first aid has been rendered, ensure that photographs have been taken of any areas involving visible injury or complaint of pain, as well as overall photographs of uninjured areas. These photographs should be retained until all potential for civil litigation has expired.~~
- ~~(e)(a) Identify any witnesses not already included in related reports.~~
- ~~(f)(a) Review and approve all related reports~~
- ~~(g)(a) Review body worn camera footage related to the incident.~~

Commented [SH86]: SB 230 requires that the policy include "Procedures for disclosing public records in accordance with [Cal. Gov. Code] Section 832.7."

Section 832.7 deals with the confidentiality of various types of law enforcement records and information.

Commented [KL87R86]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

Commented [SH88]: Language added to more closely follow SB 230: "A requirement that officers promptly provide, if properly trained, or otherwise promptly procure medical assistance for persons injured in a use of force incident, when reasonable and safe to do so."

Commented [KL89R88]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

300.9300.8 WATCH COMMANDER RESPONSIBILITY

Best Practice

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

300.10300.9 USE OF FORCE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

The Division Captain shall review the Use of Force Report (and when applicable, Use of Pepper Spray Report) and route the report to the Chief of Police with a recommendation of findings. The Chief of Police may convene a Review Board as outlined in Policy 301 instead of utilizing Division Captain Review.

The Chief of Police will make a finding that the use of force was either within policy or initiate additional administrative review/investigation as may be appropriate.

Any determination concerning the propriety of force used will be based on the facts and information available to the officer at the time the force was employed, and not upon information gained after the fact.

All Use of Force Reports will be reviewed to determine whether Departmental use of force regulations, policies, or procedures were: 1) violated or followed; 2) clearly understood, effective, and relevant to the situation; 3) require further investigation; and/or, 34) require revision or additional training.

Use of Force Reports will be held in file for at least five (5) years

300.11300.10 TRAINING

Best Practice

Officers will receive periodic training on this policy and demonstrate their knowledge and understanding.

300.12300.11 USE OF FORCE ANALYSIS

Best Practice

The Professional Standards Division Captain or his or her designee shall prepare an analysis report on use of force incidents to be ~~included-incorporated~~ as part of the Police Department's Annual Crime Report to Council. The report shall not contain the names of officers, suspects or case numbers, and should include:

- (a) An analysis of use of force incidents with demographic details of the individual impacted and type of force used
- (b) The identification of any trends in the use of force by members.
- (c) Training needs recommendations.
- (d) Equipment needs recommendations.
- (e) Policy revisions, if any.

On a monthly basis, the department will submit a monthly version of the same report to the

Commented [KL90]: Proposed by Perezvelez 6-27; subcomm. hasn't discussed.

Commented [SH91]: Training section needs elaboration in order to comply with requirements under SB 230 that the policy include:

1. "Training standards and requirements relating to demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the law enforcement agency's use of force policy by officers, investigators, and supervisors."
2. "Training and guidelines regarding vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, children, elderly persons, people who are pregnant, and people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities."
3. "Minimum training and course titles required to meet the objectives in the use of force policy."

Commented [KL92R91]: Subcomm. did not discuss.

Commented [KL93]: Confirmed title correction with Sgt. Ledoux 6-19.

Commented [KL94]: Revisions from Chief after 6-22 meeting.

Commented [OJ95]: Changed language so the information is included as part of the Crime Report.

Police Review Commission, to include the information in (a) – (e) above.

300.11 USE OF FORCE ANALYSIS

Monthly, the department will generate a Use of Force report for review by the Berkeley Police Review Commission. The Department will post on a monthly basis on its website comprehensive use of force statistics and analysis and provide a written use of force report to the Police Commission quarterly.

The report should not contain the names of officers, suspects or case numbers, and should include:

- (a) The identification of any trends in the use of force by members.
- (b) Any statistical data and demographics related to race, gender, age or as requested by the Berkeley Police Review Commission.
- (c) Training needs recommendations.
- (d) Equipment needs recommendations.

Commented [KL96]: Revision proposed by Perezvelez; discussed 6-22 without resolution.

Commented [KL97]: Perezvelez revised his language 6-27 not discussed by Subcomm.

300.12 CITIZEN CIVILIAN COMPLAINTS

Citizen eComplaints by members of the public related to this policy may be filed with the Berkeley Police Department Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) and/or the Police Review Commission (PRC). Complaints will be investigated in compliance with the applicable procedures of the (IAB) and the (PRC) as applicable.

Commented [KL98]: My suggested revisions of City Attorney's language.

Commented [SH99]: SB 230 requires: "Procedures for the filing, investigation, and reporting of citizen complaints regarding use of force incidents."

300.13 POLICY REVIEW AND UPDATES

This policy shall be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect developing practices and procedures.

Commented [SH100]: SB 230 requires the policy include " A requirement for the regular review and updating of the policy to reflect developing practices and procedures."

This section would be improved with more concrete timeline for regular review.

On a bi-annual basis, the Berkeley Police Department and the Police Review Commission shall convene to review and update the Use of Force Policy to reflect developing practices and procedures per SB-230

Commented [KL101]: Perezvelez proposed language 6-27; Subcomm. has not discussed.