

Report on Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado (2022)

Pursuant to CRS 24-31-903

January 2024

Prepared by

Jack Reed, Research Director
Courtney Leapley, Research Analyst
Katherine Hernandez, Statistical Analyst

Office of Research and Statistics

Colorado Department of Public Safety
Division of Criminal Justice
Office of Research and Statistics

700 Kipling St., Denver, Colorado 80215
<https://dcj.colorado.gov/dcj-offices/ors>



COLORADO
Division of Criminal Justice
Department of Public Safety

Report on Contacts and Use of Force in Colorado (2022)

Pursuant to CRS 24-31-903

January 2024

Stan Hilkey, Executive Director, Department of Public Safety
Matthew M. Lunn, Director, Division of Criminal Justice
Jack Reed, Research Director, Office of Research and Statistics

The Division of Criminal Justice is committed to the full inclusion of all individuals, and we are continually making changes to improve accessibility and usability of our services. As part of this commitment, the Division of Criminal Justice is prepared to offer reasonable accommodations for those who have difficulty engaging with our content. As an example, documents can be produced in an alternative file format upon request. To request this and other accommodations, or to discuss your needs further, please contact the Office of Research and Statistics <https://dcj.colorado.gov/dcj-offices/ors/req> or 303-239-4442 (Press 7).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..... 2

Introduction 3

 Summary of Statute 3

 Description of Process 3

 Data Collection & Limitations 4

Citizen Contacts 6

 Demographics of Citizens Contacted 6

 Reason for Citizen Contact..... 7

 Search and seizure Information 15

Showup Identifications 18

Use of Force 19

 Officer Weapon Use..... 20

 Ambulance Call 21

 Citizen weapon possession 22

 Complaints and Investigations after Use of Force 23

Citizen Deaths 25

Agency-level reporting..... 26

Conclusion..... 35

Appendix A. Statutory Language of CRS 24-31-901 & 24-31-903..... 36

 24-31-901. Definitions. 36

 24-31-903. Division of criminal justice report. 36

Executive Summary

The first report from data collected by *Colorado's Law Enforcement Integrity, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System* is the beginning of a move to gather information on officer-citizen contacts and use of force. 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 with time.

Reports were provided from August to December 2022 by 146 agencies, comprising 57% of all agencies in Colorado. The variable number of months reporting, the variation in the completeness of data reported by agencies, and the uncertainty regarding uniform definitions of some terms makes the fundamental usefulness of these data less than ideal. Future reports will be able to provide a clearer picture.

There were 208,352 contacts reported involving 233,806 citizens. The term "citizen" will be used to designate the individual persons contacted during an event. In the context of this report "citizen" does not indicate whether a person may be born in the United States, a lawful permanent resident, an undocumented immigrant, or a refugee. Approximately two-thirds (68%) of these contacts were the result of pro-active officer-initiated activity and 32% were from a call for service/dispatch. Black/African-American NH citizens were contacted due to officer-initiated activity 60% of the time, which compares to 68% of White NH citizen contacts, and 69% of Hispanic/Latino citizen contacts. Juveniles were contacted due to officer-initiated activity 43% of the time compared to 69% of adult contacts coming from officer-initiated activity.

Traffic offenses were the most common reason for a contact, which is more reflective of the fact that the Colorado State Patrol accounted for approximately one-third of all contacts reported.

The most common outcomes from a contact were a citation (37%) or a warning (36%).

An exception to the requirement for a search warrant was the most common basis for a search (51%), with an inventory (36%), or consent (10%) following behind.

There is uncertainty regarding the completeness of use of force reporting, particularly around the broad "use of force" definition adopted in CRS 24-31-901 which is different than the definitions previously utilized by agencies or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Law enforcement reported use of force in 767 contacts, accounting for 0.3% of all citizens contacted. There was no apparent injury in 78% of the cases reported, with 8 deaths reported in the abbreviated time period and with limited agency reporting. Firearms, electric shock weapons, and projectile weapons were most commonly reported but the data are limited. The discharge of a firearm was reported in 2% of cases where a firearm was used, which includes brandishing/displaying the weapon to the citizen.

It was reported that citizens possessed a firearm in 71 cases where force was used.

Complaints of officer misconduct were most commonly closed (79%) or unfounded (10%). Investigations resulted in 36% of cases being closed with 29% (N=95) concluding with charges being filed.

Introduction

The first report from data collected by Colorado's *Law Enforcement Integrity, Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System* is the beginning of a move to gather information on officer-citizen contacts and use of force. The data collection is unique in Colorado's history and will eventually allow for a deeper look into this important topic as the robustness of these data improve with time. 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 undertook the effort to accomplish this task in conjunction with the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, law enforcement agencies, vendors that supply the software to collect these data, and our vendor Beyond 20/20. This could not have been accomplished without cooperation from all of these entities and our sincere thanks are extended to everyone involved.

Summary of Statute

The initial legislation which created this reporting requirement, 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 bill which attempted to clarify some of the uncertainty in SB20-217, HB21-1250, was signed in July 2021. The bills instructed the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) to create a data reporting system that could be implemented by April 2022. The final statutes, 24-31-901 and 24-31-903, are in Appendix A.

Description of 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 brought to 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 did lead to some agency collection and reporting delays through no fault of their own.

The reporting system was developed using the same platform as the Colorado Bureau of Investigation's (CBI) National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The Crime Insight platform was developed by Beyond 20/20, a company with 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 agencies reporting crime data to the CBI's NIBRS system would have the same logon and the process would be very similar.

Additionally, when considering the most optimal way to design the data collection platform, the DCJ took a stance that an agency could utilize their current records management system (RMS), a third-party vendor's application created for this purpose, or an application developed by Beyond 20/20, which would be available at no cost to the agency. This "all of the above" approach was chosen because the approximately 260 agencies in Colorado already have their own methods for collecting information for

purposes of record-keeping and data reporting. If an agency's current data system was able to meet the specification requirements put forth by DCJ, then the method of that collection could be flexible. However, it also required agencies to work with their own RMS vendors or third-party vendors to create the application and a process that would allow them to efficiently capture these data.

The ability of a current RMS vendor to make substantial changes to their products is challenging. Consequently, agencies and RMS vendors were required to construct a data capture system with very specific state requirements in a short timeframe.

The data collection began August 2022, with the expectation that there would be monthly files uploaded to the system. The DCJ staff, CBI, and Beyond 20/20 worked with agencies to make sure they could logon and get the files uploaded properly. Again, this process was not without challenges due to the large number of agencies in Colorado that were now having to engage in an entirely new method of data collection and reporting.

Data Collection & Limitations

The report is based on data reported from August through December of 2022. The data comes from 146 agencies, which is approximately 57% of the agencies required to report. Our current data does not allow us to easily estimate the percentage of Colorado's population covered by these 146 agencies, in particular because some large agencies did not report. While there is a fair amount of geographic diversity, as can be seen in Table 28's agency-level data, the number of agencies reporting is still lower than is needed to have more confidence in the results. Additionally, the limited five-month period of data collection makes it impossible to use this as a baseline year. It is expected that the 2023 data collection will have more robust reporting and will better reflect the information the legislature desires to have for evidence-based decision-making concerning law enforcement.

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

Additional details will be provided in a [data dashboard](#), which will be updated annually as new reports are prepared.

There were uncertainties regarding several important definitional issues in CRS 24-31-903, even with the subsequent bill revisions. This includes the definition of a contact, where there was still uncertainty regarding whether 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 concluded that *all contacts* should be reported. However, the uncertainty introduced by the phrase *initiated by a peace officer* in statute led some agencies to the conclusion that they were only required to report self-initiated contacts.

"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 nonconsensual, for the purpose of enforcing the law or investigating possible violations of the law. (CRS 24-31-901(1))

There were a number of additional definitional issues that the DCJ, agency and vendor representatives, and the Attorney General's Office (AG) worked to clarify during the specification creation and reporting process. An already-established data collection system, such as NIBRS, has decades of experience answering many of the same questions that came up in the process of implementing the Law Enforcement Integrity (LEI) Contacts and Use of Force Reporting System. These discussions between agencies, vendors, DCJ, the AG's Office, and Beyond 20/20 led to inconsistent practices during the first periods of reporting. This reduces the decision-making value of this first report but the process will inform future iterations of reporting.

Citizen Contacts

The requirement to report on specific elements of all citizen contacts is detailed in 24-31-903(2)(b). The complete statute is available in Appendix A but generally includes: perceived demographics of citizen, whether stop was a traffic stop, time/date/location of contact, duration of contact, reason for contact, suspected crime, result of contact, actions taken by peace officer, and if the contact was a showup.

Demographics of Citizens Contacted

Law enforcement agencies reported 208,352 contacts with 233,806 citizens for the period August-December 2022. The racial/ethnic distribution of the state is presented in Table 1 and the distribution of citizen contacts is reported in Table 2. While race and ethnicity are separate concepts this report will combine them into a single race/ethnicity variable for purposes of presentation and ease of interpretation. The race/ethnicity categories used in this report are derived from those reported by State Office of Demography. This will make future data collection and matching with State Demography's data easier to accomplish moving forward.

The collection of race, ethnicity, gender, and age is based on "the perceived demographic information of the person contacted" and other available data collected by the officer. Consequently, the demographics perceived by law enforcement may differ from how the citizen self-identifies. Officers may be legally prohibited from requesting this race/ethnicity information directly from citizens, which makes the reliability of the identification subject to a variety of outside factors. The use of NH in the tables denotes that the officer perceives the citizen as not being of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity.

The overall distribution of the contacts by race/ethnicity is similar to distribution in the state population overall (Tables 1 & 2). Since we do not have race/ethnicity population data for only agencies reporting these data we are reliant on a comparison with the statewide distribution at this point. The 62% of citizens identified as White NH were somewhat lower than the population (67%), while 28% of Hispanic/Latino citizens contacted were higher than the 23% statewide population. The 7% of Black/African-American NH citizen contacts were somewhat higher than the 4% proportion in the population. The average age of Hispanic/Latino citizens (33.8 years) and Black/African American NH citizens (33.4 years) was five years lower than White NH citizen contacts (38.7 years).

Table 1. Race/ethnicity distribution of Colorado population, 2022

Race/ethnicity	Population	Percent population
All	5,838,738	100%
Asian NH	207,191	4%
Black/African American NH	240,813	4%
Hispanic, any race	1,315,147	23%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	36,678	1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	9,107	0.2%
White NH	3,881,346	67%
Multi-racial/Other NH	149,085	3%

Source: Colorado State Office of Demography, <https://demography.dola.colorado.gov/>

Table 2. Race/ethnicity of citizens contacted, August-December 2022

Race/ethnicity	N citizens	Percent citizens	Average age (years)
All	233,806	100%	36.9
Asian NH	4,098	2%	37.4
Black/African American NH	15,475	7%	33.4
Hispanic, any race	65,011	28%	33.8
Native American/Alaska Native NH	1,377	1%	35.9
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	492	0%	34.6
White NH	145,181	62%	38.7
Multi-racial/Other NH	2,172	1%	31.5

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

The gender distribution of contacts, where 65% were male and 35% were female (Table 3), is very different from the 50/50 gender split reported by the State Office of Demography. This is not surprising as males are consistently more likely to come into contact with law enforcement.

Table 3. Gender of citizens contacted, August-December 2022

Gender	N citizens	Percent citizens	Average age (years)
Total	233,806	100%	36.9
Female	81,449	35%	36.7
Male	151,781	65%	37.0
Non-binary	576	0%	34.1

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

Reason for Citizen Contact

Law enforcement officers may pro-actively 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. An officer may also contact a citizen after they receive a call for service (CFS) directing them to a particular place to investigate activity. Overall, about two-thirds of contacts were pro-active and one-third stemmed from a CFS, as seen in Table 4. There were variations by race/ethnicity, where 60% of Black/African-American NH contacts began with a pro-active activity, compared to 68% of White NH contacts, and 69% of Hispanic/Latino contacts.

Table 4. Initiation of contact, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total citizens	Call for service/Dispatch	Pro-active contact	Percent Calls for Service	Percent Proactive
All	233,806	75,218	158,588	32%	68%
Asian NH	4,098	1,163	2,935	28%	72%
Black/African American NH	15,475	6,176	9,299	40%	60%
Hispanic, any race	65,011	20,376	44,635	31%	69%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	1,377	559	818	41%	59%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	492	171	321	35%	65%
White NH	145,181	46,055	99,126	32%	68%
Multi-racial/Other NH	2,172	718	1,454	33%	67%

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

The distribution of CFS/dispatch and pro-active contact showed variation across different suspected offenses (Table 5). Overall, 74% of contacts were pro-active compared to 26% CFS/dispatch. The largest drivers of pro-active stops were speeding (97%), defective vehicle (96%), and other moving violations (69%). Interestingly, approximately half (51%) of DUI stops were from a CFS/dispatch, which was likely due to a significant percentage of DUI stops coming from vehicle crashes and other road users reporting risky driving activity. The suspected offenses most likely to come from a CFS/dispatch were assault offenses (92%), family offenses-nonviolent (92%), destruction/damage/vandalism of property (90%), and disorderly conduct (89%).

Table 5. Suspected offense, by contact initiation type, August-December 2022

Suspected Offense	Total contacts	Percent CFS/Dispatch	Percent Pro-active contact
All	208,352	26%	74%
Arson	137	70%	30%
Assault offenses	4,030	92%	8%
Burglary/breaking & entering	775	82%	18%
Curfew/runaway	247	51%	49%
Destruction/damage/vandalism of property	1,013	90%	10%
Disorderly conduct	2,177	89%	11%
Drug/narcotics offenses	1,968	48%	52%
Family offenses, nonviolent	925	92%	8%

Suspected Offense	Total contacts	Percent CFS/Dispatch	Percent Pro-active contact
Fraud/forgery/counterfeiting/extortion/blackmail/bribery/bad checks/embezzlement	271	66%	34%
Gambling/pornography/obscene material/peeping tom	29	90%	10%
Homicide/vehicular homicide	153	65%	35%
Kidnapping	98	69%	31%
Larceny/theft/stolen property	2,789	81%	19%
Liquor law violations/drunkenness	695	62%	38%
Loitering/trespassing	7,027	65%	35%
Motor vehicle theft	1,295	43%	57%
Obstruction/resisting arrest	222	73%	27%
Other Crime (not traffic)	14,149	49%	51%
Prostitution	41	22%	78%
Robbery	238	70%	30%
Sex offenses	511	65%	35%
Traffic: Defective vehicle	18,565	4%	96%
Traffic: DUI	1,882	51%	49%
Traffic: Improper/reckless/careless driving	7,315	45%	55%
Traffic: Lane usage	8,298	8%	92%
Traffic: Other Moving Violation	39,318	31%	69%
Traffic: Parking Violation	574	32%	68%
Traffic: Pedestrian Violation	344	18%	82%
Traffic: Right of way	1,635	36%	64%
Traffic: Speed	77,391	3%	97%
Traffic: Traffic control device	7,148	6%	94%
Weapons	1,023	83%	17%

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

Table 6 indicates that juveniles under 18 years old were contacted due to a CFS/dispatch at a higher rate (57%) than those over 18 years old (31%). Much of this disparity was due to the lower proportion of traffic stops involving juveniles. The primary driver for the higher percentage of CFS/dispatch were assault (93%), disorderly conduct (92%), and other non-traffic crimes (67%). The distribution of adult stops was similar to the overall rates, with a little over two-thirds (69%) being contacted through officer-initiated proactive enforcement.

Table 6. Suspected offense, by age group and contact initiation type, August-December 2022

Suspected Offense	Total contacted under 18 years old	Percent CFS/dispatch under 18 years old	Percent Pro-active under 18	Total contacted 18 years or older	Percent CFS/dispatch 18 years or older	Percent Pro-active 18 years or older
All	14526	57%	43%	219280	31%	69%
Arson	20	85%	15%	141	70%	30%
Assault offenses	675	93%	7%	4293	92%	8%
Burglary/breaking & entering	59	81%	19%	838	83%	17%
Curfew/runaway	243	60%	40%	128	35%	65%
Destruction/damage/vandalism of property	199	93%	7%	978	90%	10%
Disorderly conduct	515	92%	8%	2395	89%	11%
Drug/narcotics offenses	377	78%	22%	2057	42%	58%
Family offenses, nonviolent	131	92%	8%	1150	94%	6%
Fraud/forgery/counterfeiting/extortion/blackmail/bribery/bad checks/embezzlement	14	86%	14%	294	68%	32%
Gambling/pornography/obscene material/peeping tom	12	100%	0%	29	90%	10%
Homicide/vehicular homicide	20	75%	25%	209	57%	43%
Kidnapping	15	87%	13%	103	72%	28%
Larceny/theft/stolen property	302	84%	16%	2932	80%	20%
Liquor law violations/drunkenness	139	78%	22%	720	59%	41%
Loitering/trespassing	443	60%	40%	8252	62%	38%
Motor vehicle theft	175	47%	53%	1345	43%	57%
Obstruction/resisting arrest	19	47%	53%	216	75%	25%
Other Crime (not traffic)	1244	67%	33%	14530	50%	50%
Prostitution	10	30%	70%	42	17%	83%
Robbery	61	66%	34%	197	73%	27%
Sex offenses	123	85%	15%	473	61%	39%
Traffic: Defective vehicle	721	6%	94%	18206	4%	96%
Traffic: DUI	57	53%	47%	1894	53%	47%
Traffic: Improper/reckless/careless driving	666	63%	37%	7961	51%	49%
Traffic: Lane usage	233	23%	77%	8302	9%	91%
Traffic: Other Moving Violation	3482	76%	24%	46829	43%	57%
Traffic: Parking Violation	16	50%	50%	604	33%	67%
Traffic: Pedestrian Violation	12	8%	92%	345	18%	82%
Traffic: Right of way	117	62%	38%	1686	40%	60%
Traffic: Speed	2934	7%	93%	74780	3%	97%

Suspected Offense	Total contacted under 18 years old	Percent CFS/dispatch under 18 years old	Percent Pro-active under 18	Total contacted 18 years or older	Percent CFS/dispatch 18 years or older	Percent Pro-active 18 years or older
Traffic: Traffic control device	316	11%	89%	6942	7%	93%
Weapons	223	83%	17%	990	83%	17%

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

The most common reason for a citizen contact was a traffic stop (52%), followed by other (16%), routine patrol other than traffic stop (14%), and response to unlawful activity (9%) (Table 7). The significant proportion of traffic stop contacts was partly a result of the fact that the Colorado State Patrol (CSP) accounted for approximately 32% of reported citizen contacts (N=74,764), making the CSP the single largest reporter. There were differences based on the race/ethnicity of the citizen. In particular, the response to unlawful activity comprised 17% of contacts for Black/African Americans NH compared to 9% overall and 8% for White NH citizens contacted. Additionally, traffic stops amounted to 52% of contacts overall, but in Asian NH and Multiracial/Other NH, they totaled 59% of contacts whereas Black/African Americans NH and Native American/Alaska Native NH had lower rates.

Table 7. Reason for contact, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	All	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multiracial/Other NH
Total citizens	233,806	4,098	15,475	65,011	1,377	492	145,181	2,172
Court order	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Curfew	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Follow-up investigation	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%
Mass demonstration	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Response to suspicious activity	5%	3%	7%	6%	7%	6%	5%	7%
Response to unlawful activity	9%	7%	17%	10%	16%	10%	8%	14%
Routine patrol other than traffic stop	14%	13%	12%	13%	12%	10%	15%	3%
Traffic stop	52%	59%	46%	54%	43%	52%	53%	59%
Warrant service	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Other	16%	17%	14%	15%	19%	18%	17%	12%

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

Citation (37%) and warning (36%) were the most common outcomes for citizen contacts (Table 8). Arrest was the most common outcome of the contact for warrant service (79%) and court order (51%). The

outcome for response to unlawful activity was nearly equally spread among arrest (26%), citation (24%), warning (24%), and no action/other (26%). The outcome of a traffic stop was almost as likely to be a warning (47%) as a citation (50%).

Table 8. Outcome of contact, by contact reason August-December 2022

Contact Reason	All	Arrest	Citation	Warning	No action/ other
All	233,806	7%	37%	36%	20%
Court order	612	51%	10%	5%	34%
Curfew	234	5%	12%	65%	18%
Follow-up investigation	2,996	15%	24%	6%	54%
Mass demonstration	18	22%	22%	28%	28%
Response to suspicious activity	12,188	13%	5%	23%	58%
Response to unlawful activity	21,961	26%	24%	24%	26%
Routine patrol other than traffic stop	32,576	5%	29%	51%	15%
Traffic stop	122,713	2%	50%	47%	2%
Warrant service	2,047	79%	6%	3%	12%
Other	38,461	6%	23%	5%	66%

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

The outcome of the contact by citizen race/ethnicity is summarized in Table 9. African-American/Black NH citizens were arrested in 15% of contacts, Native American/Alaska Native NH citizens were arrested 14% of the time, and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders NH 12% of the time. This contrasts with 6% of White NH citizens and 8% of the Hispanic/Latino citizens being arrested.

Table 9. Outcome of contact, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	All	Arrest	Citation	Warning	No action/other
All race/ethnicity	236199	7%	37%	36%	20%
Asian NH	4128	4%	42%	38%	17%
Black/African American NH	15669	15%	37%	29%	18%
Hispanic, any race	66264	8%	39%	33%	19%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	1386	14%	26%	39%	21%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	495	12%	31%	36%	21%
White NH	146083	6%	37%	37%	21%
Multi-racial/Other NH	2174	7%	33%	39%	21%

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

Table 10 presents information on the offense suspected across the 208,352 total contacts. There can be more than one citizen involved in a contact, but these are the offenses suspected at the initiation of the contact itself. The prevalence of traffic enforcement contacts in the data were associated with the offense citizens were suspected of committing upon contact initiation. Speeding (37%), other moving violation (19%), and defective vehicle (9%) were the top three suspected offenses reported.

Table 10. Suspected offenses in contacts, August-December 2022

Offense type	Total Suspected Offense	Percent Suspected Offense
All	208,352	100%
Arson	137	0%
Assault offenses	4,030	2%
Burglary/breaking & entering	775	0%
Curfew/runaway	247	0%
Destruction/damage/vandalism of property	1,013	0%
Disorderly conduct	2,177	1%
Drug/narcotics offenses	1,968	1%
Family offenses, nonviolent	925	0%
Fraud/forgery/counterfeiting/extortion/ blackmail/bribery/bad checks/embezzlement	271	0%
Gambling/pornography/obscene material/peeping tom	29	0%
Homicide/vehicular homicide	153	0%
Kidnapping	98	0%
Larceny/theft/stolen property	2,789	1%
Liquor law violations/drunkenness	695	0%
Loitering/trespassing	7,027	3%
Motor vehicle theft	1,295	1%
Obstruction/resisting arrest	222	0%
Other Crime (not traffic)	14,149	7%
Prostitution	41	0%
Robbery	238	0%
Sex offenses	511	0%
Traffic: Defective vehicle	18,565	9%
Traffic: Driver's License Violation	0	0%
Traffic: DUI	1,882	1%
Traffic: Improper/reckless/careless driving	7,315	4%
Traffic: Lane usage	8,298	4%
Traffic: Other Moving Violation	39,318	19%
Traffic: Parking Violation	574	0%
Traffic: Pedestrian Violation	344	0%
Traffic: Right of way	1,635	1%
Traffic: Speed	77,391	37%
Traffic: Traffic control device	7,148	3%
Traffic: Vehicle Insurance Violation	0	0%
Weapons	1,023	0%

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

There was some variation of suspected offense based on race/ethnicity compared to the overall distribution (Table 11). For Black/African-American NH citizens they were more likely to be suspected of some other non-traffic crime (+5%) and less likely to be stopped for a suspected speeding offense (-9%) or some other moving violation (-7%) compared to the overall distribution. Hispanic/Latino citizens were somewhat less likely to be stopped for a speeding offense (-4%). Native American/Alaska Native NH citizens were more likely to be suspected of loitering/trespassing (+4%) and less likely to be suspected of some other moving violation (-5%). There was a lower likelihood of a multi-racial/other race citizen being stopped for some other moving violation (-10%) or speeding (-5%) and somewhat more likely to be stopped for some other non-traffic offense (+4%).

Table 11. Suspected offense, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

Suspected Offense	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/Other NH
Total number of offenses	223,434	4,026	15,421	62,234	1,263	476	137,988	2,026
Arson	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Assault offenses	2%	2%	6%	3%	4%	6%	2%	4%
Burglary/breaking & entering	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Curfew/runaway	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Destruction/damage/ vandalism of property	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Disorderly conduct	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%
Drug/narcotics offenses	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Family offenses, nonviolent	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Fraud/forgery/counterfeiting/ extortion/ blackmail/bribery/bad checks/embezzlement	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Gambling/pornography/obscene material/ peeping tom	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Homicide/vehicular homicide	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kidnapping	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Larceny/theft/stolen property	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Liquor law violations/drunkenness	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Loitering/trespassing	4%	2%	7%	3%	8%	3%	4%	6%
Motor vehicle theft	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Obstruction/resisting arrest	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Crime (not traffic)	7%	5%	13%	8%	8%	10%	6%	11%
Prostitution	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Robbery	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Suspected Offense	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/Other NH
Sex offenses	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Traffic: Defective vehicle	8%	6%	7%	10%	6%	8%	8%	10%
Traffic: DUI	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Traffic: Improper/reckless/careless driving	4%	4%	4%	4%	2%	3%	4%	4%
Traffic: Lane usage	4%	7%	3%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%
Traffic: Other Moving Violation	23%	22%	15%	23%	18%	21%	24%	13%
Traffic: Parking Violation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Traffic: Pedestrian Violation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Traffic: Right of way	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Traffic: Speed	35%	40%	25%	31%	35%	28%	37%	29%
Traffic: Traffic control device	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%
Weapons	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%

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

Search and seizure Information

A person search was the most common type of search conducted, with 2.1% of citizen contacts having their person searched, compared to 0.3% of property, and 0.8% of vehicles (Table 12). Black/African-American NH citizens had their person searched in 5.9% of contacts, compared to 1.6% of White NH citizens, and 2.4% of Hispanic/Latino citizens.

Overall, 12.2% of person searches resulted in contraband being found. There were differences by race/ethnicity, with 5.2% of Black/African-American NH person searches resulting in contraband being found, compared to 15.3% of White NH person searches, and 12.5% of Hispanic/Latino citizens. The likelihood of finding contraband after a property search (42.9%) or vehicle searches (23.7%) was higher than person searches (12.2%). In this case, Hispanic/Latino citizens were less likely to have contraband found during a property search (37.4%) compared to Black/African-American NH citizens (42.5%) or White NH citizens (46.9%).

Table 12. Percent of contacts resulting in searches and percent resulting in contraband found, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	% citizens person search	% citizens property search	% citizens vehicle search	% citizens person search contraband found	% citizens property search contraband found	% citizens vehicle search contraband found
All	2.1%	0.3%	0.8%	12.2%	42.9%	23.7%
Asian NH	1.9%	0.0%	0.5%	6.4%	0.0%	5.3%
Black/African American NH	5.9%	0.5%	0.9%	5.2%	42.5%	20.0%
Hispanic, any race	2.4%	0.3%	0.9%	12.5%	37.4%	25.1%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	3.5%	0.4%	0.7%	12.5%	0.0%	11.1%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	3.3%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
White NH	1.6%	0.2%	0.7%	15.3%	46.9%	23.7%
Multi-racial/other NH	2.4%	0.2%	0.1%	3.8%	80.0%	66.7%

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

There were 6,760 searches reported. There could have been more than one search type, and consequently, this figure does not represent the number of contacts or citizens (Table 13). The most common search type was based on one of the “search warrant exceptions” in law, accounting for 51% of searches reported. A search to inventory the possessions of a citizen was the next most common (36%), followed by a search where the citizen gave consent (10%).

Table 13. Justification of search, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total searches reported	Consent %	Inventory %	Search warrant %	Search warrant exception %
All	6,760	10%	36%	2%	51%
Asian NH	93	6%	46%	3%	44%
Black/African American NH	1,076	9%	49%	1%	40%
Hispanic, any race	2,137	11%	33%	2%	54%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	59	15%	24%	0%	61%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	20	10%	60%	5%	25%
White NH	3,314	11%	33%	2%	54%
Multi-racial/other NH	61	13%	56%	0%	31%

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

Law enforcement report that nearly all entries into residences occurred after an announcement of their intent, with only 0.3% of entries occurring unannounced (Table 14). The amount of time between the announcement and entry into the residence is unknown.

Table 14. Announcement status prior to entry into the residence, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Any entry reported N	Announced entry N	Unannounced entry N	Announced entry %	Unannounced entry %
All race/ethnicity	5,979	5,960	19	99.7%	0.3%
Asian NH	104	104	0	100.0%	0.0%
Black/African American NH	368	368	0	100.0%	0.0%
Hispanic, any race	2,215	2,210	5	99.8%	0.2%
Native American/Alaska Native NH	19	18	1	94.7%	5.3%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	8	8	0	100.0%	0.0%
White NH	3,325	3,315	10	99.7%	0.3%
Multi-racial/other NH	23	23	0	100.0%	0.0%

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

Showup Identifications

The statutory requirement to report on the details of a showup (24-31-903(2)(c)(II.5)) were added by HB21-1142, a bill relating to eyewitness identification. A showup occurs when a law enforcement officer has a witness on scene that they believe may be able to identify a citizen suspected of illegal activity. At a showup, a witness or victim is normally confronted with only one person rather than a group of people as in a lineup. There are questions regarding the accuracy of identification when the witness and the citizen are of different racial/ethnic categories. Table 15 gives a summary of the confidence of the identification outcome by whether the witness and citizen were the same race/ethnicity (intra-racial) or a different race/ethnicity (cross-racial). There were 121 showups reported over the five-month period which limits the validity of any determination about the differential belief in witness accuracy across racial/ethnic categories. There were 68 intra-racial showups (56%) and 53 cross-racial showups (44%). Intra-racial showups resulted in *no identification* 19% of the time and cross-racial showups 11%. The biggest difference was in the *yes: somewhat confident* category, which accounted for 3% of intra-racial showups and 17% of cross-racial ones.

Table 15. Showup outcome confidence indicator, by witness-to-citizen race/ethnicity identification, August-December 2022

Identification outcome	Total N	Intra-racial N	Cross-racial N	Total %	Intra-racial %	Cross-racial %
Total	121	68	53	100%	100%	100%
No identification	19	13	6	16%	19%	11%
Yes: Confident	78	43	35	64%	63%	66%
Yes: Somewhat confident	11	2	9	9%	3%	17%
Yes: Not confident	7	6	1	6%	9%	2%
Unknown	6	4	2	5%	6%	4%

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

Use of Force

The requirements for reporting on use of force are detailed in 24-31-903(2)(a). The requirements are generally for date/time/location of force, perceived demographics of the citizen contact, type of force, severity and nature of injury, use or brandishing of a weapon, whether weapon was discharged, names of officers who used force and 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 citizen was transported, and whether the citizen contact exhibited a weapon prior to the use of force.

Law enforcement reporting of force being used is relatively small at around 0.3% (Table 16). Given that this is the first time these data have been reported, and there is no true national rate, it is unknown if this would be comparable to other jurisdictions. 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 Colorado's.

Table 16. Use of Force reported, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total contacts	Contact Involved the Use of Force	Force Used on Citizen	Force Not Used on Citizen	Force Not Used in Contact	% reported force
All race/ethnicity	233,806	767	609	158	233,039	0.3%
Asian NH	4,098	4	3	1	4,094	0.1%
Black/African American NH	15,475	81	64	17	15,394	0.4%
Hispanic, any race	65,011	303	254	49	64,708	0.4%
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	1,377	5	4	1	1,372	0.3%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	492	0	0	0	492	0.0%
White NH	145,181	370	282	88	144,811	0.2%
Multi-racial/ Other NH	2,172	4	2	2	2,168	0.1%

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

Law enforcement also reported the perceived injury of the citizen with the results (see Table 17) indicating *no apparent injury* was the most common outcome. The definition of force includes use of weapon of brandishing/display of a weapon by the officer, which would logically decrease the likelihood that injury would be reported after a force event. The act of brandishing or displaying a weapon will not cause injury to a citizen, which would reduce the percentage of cases resulting in injury.



Table 17. Reported citizen injury, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total N	Death %	Suspected Serious Injury %	Suspected Minor Injury %	Possible Injury %	No Apparent Injury %	Unknown Injury Severity %
All	609	1%	1%	13%	4%	78%	2%
Asian NH	3	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%
Black/African American NH	64	0%	3%	9%	5%	75%	8%
Hispanic, any race	254	1%	1%	10%	2%	83%	2%
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	4	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
White NH	282	1%	1%	16%	6%	75%	1%
Multi-racial/Other NH	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

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

Officer Weapon Use

The type of weapon reported by the officer is presented in Table 18. Since more than one weapon may be used or brandished during a contact the total number of 708 represented the number of weapons reported as used or brandished, not the number of citizens it was used on. Overall, 44% of weapons reported as used/brandished were against White NH, 41% were against Hispanic/Latino citizens, and 14% were used/brandished against Black/African-American NH citizens.

The percentage of firearms being used or brandished against a Black/African-American NH citizen was 10% of the total, with 54% against Hispanic/Latino citizens, and 35% against White NH citizens.

Table 18. Type of weapon used by officer, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total N	Asian NH %	Black/African-American NH %	Hispanic, any race %	Native American/ Alaska Native NH %	White, NH %	Multi-racial/ Other NH %
Total	708	1%	14%	41%	0%	44%	0%
Baton	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Firearm	288	0%	10%	54%	0%	35%	0%
Long gun	40	3%	3%	28%	0%	68%	0%
Unknown	269	0%	20%	34%	0%	45%	0%
Nunchucks	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Projectile weapon	25	4%	0%	28%	0%	68%	0%
Taser/electric shock weapon	81	4%	16%	30%	2%	48%	0%

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

Law enforcement report that the likelihood of discharging a firearm was 2% with no reported discharges of long guns (Table 19). There was a greater likelihood of reporting the discharge of a projectile weapon

(68%) or an electric shock weapon (35%). The number of uses of a weapon was still very low and caution should be used when interpreting these results.

Table 19. Weapon discharge status, by type of weapon, August-December 2022

	Total N	Percent Discharged	Percent Not Discharged	Percent Unknown
Total	708	7%	55%	38%
Baton	4	0%	100%	0%
Firearm	288	2%	98%	0%
Long gun	40	0%	100%	0%
Unknown	269	0%	0%	100%
Nunchucks	1	0%	100%	0%
Projectile weapon	25	68%	32%	0%
Taser/electric shock weapon	81	35%	65%	0%

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

The distribution of citizen injury by the type of weapon or force type is presented in Table 20. If any type of force results in serious bodily injury or death, regardless of whether a weapon is used, it is considered reportable force. The most common injury type was *no apparent injury*, with 79% of the 700 citizen reports of force. Suspected minor injury (10%), possible injury (4%), and suspected serious injury (3%) were the other common outcomes. Death was reported in 1% of cases.

Table 20. Reported citizen injury, by weapon/use of force type, August-December 2022

	Total N	Death %	Suspected Serious Injury %	Suspected Minor Injury %	Possible Injury %	No Apparent Injury %	Unknown Injury Severity %
Baton	4	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Canine	8	0%	13%	0%	0%	88%	0%
Chemical	14	0%	0%	7%	0%	93%	0%
Electronic/taser	92	0%	4%	15%	1%	77%	2%
Firearm	295	2%	2%	4%	1%	92%	0%
Long gun	41	0%	0%	0%	0%	98%	2%
Other	79	0%	11%	4%	19%	59%	6%
Physical (hands, fist, feet)	150	1%	0%	24%	7%	65%	3%
Projectile	17	12%	0%	47%	6%	29%	6%
Grand Total	700	1%	3%	10%	4%	79%	2%

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

Ambulance Call

Law enforcement reported calling an ambulance to the scene of a contact for 184 citizens (Table 21). In 71% of cases the citizen was transported from the scene. There was some variation by race/ethnicity, with 78% of Black/African-American NH citizens transported, 72% of Hispanic/Latino citizens transported, and 67% of White NH citizens transported when an ambulance was called.

Table 21. Ambulance called to scene and citizen transport status, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

Race/ethnicity	Total ambulance calls	Percent Citizen transported from scene	Percent Citizen not transported from scene	Percent Unknown if citizen transported
All race/ethnicity	184	71%	29%	1%
Asian NH	0	0%	0%	0%
Black/African American NH	23	78%	22%	0%
Hispanic, any race	58	72%	26%	2%
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	1	100%	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	0	0%	0%	0%
White NH	101	67%	33%	1%
Multi-racial/Other NH	1	100%	0%	0%

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

Citizen weapon possession

In cases where use of force is reported against the citizen it is also possible to report whether the citizen possessed a weapon. The numbers were very small and it is recommended that these data not be utilized until a more accurate and reliable picture of citizen firearm possession can be ascertained (Table 23).

Table 22. Citizen weapon possession, by citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

	Total	Dangerous Weapons (knives, blunt objects, projectiles)	Firearm	Motor Vehicle/Vessel	Other	Person
All	242	31	71	3	47	90
Asian NH	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black/African American NH	29	3	6	1	8	11
Hispanic, any race	80	7	31	1	12	29
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	3	0	0	0	0	3
Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0
White NH	130	21	34	1	27	47
Multi-racial/Other NH	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Table 24 presents the number of times a citizen possessed a weapon and whether it was seen by the officer before or after the use of force. In 38% of cases the officer perceived a weapon prior to using

force, in 42% no weapon was perceived, and in 20% of cases it was unknown. Again, the small number of cases makes additional interpretation of these data problematic.

Table 23. Citizen exhibited weapon prior to use of force by officer, by citizen race/ethnicity August-December 2022

	Total	Yes	No	Unknown
All	242	38%	42%	20%
Asian NH	0	0%	0%	0%
Black/African American NH	29	52%	28%	21%
Hispanic, any race	80	35%	51%	14%
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	3	100%	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	0	0%	0%	0%
White NH	130	36%	40%	24%
Multi-racial/Other NH	0	0%	0%	0%

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

In Table 25, we see that no apparent injury against the officer was reported in 80% of the 1,015 officers involved in use of force incidents and an additional 17% reported unknown injury severity.

Table 24. Officer injury reported in use of force incident, August-December 2022

	Number	Percent
Suspected Serious Injury	1	0.1%
Suspected Minor Injury	24	2%
Possible Injury	3	0.3%
No Apparent Injury	816	80%
Unknown Injury Severity	171	17%
Total	1,015	100%

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

Complaints and Investigations after Use of Force

Tables 26 and 27 provide details on complaints and investigations reported by law enforcement agencies following a use of force. Of the 324 complaints reported, 79% of cases were closed, 10% were unfounded, 6% were under investigation, and 4% were sustained (Table 26). Of the 331 investigations reported, 36% were closed, 29% resulted in charges filed, 21% were under investigation, and 11% were unfounded (Table 27).

Table 25. Complaints against officers after use of force, by complaint outcome, August-December 2022

Complaint outcome	Number of complaints	Percent of complaints
Total complaints	324	
Exonerated	1	0.3%
Under investigation	21	6%
Not sustained	4	1%
Sustained	12	4%
Unfounded	31	10%
Closed	255	79%

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

Table 26. Investigations of officer conduct, by investigation outcome, August-December 2022

Investigation outcome	Number of investigations	Percent of investigations
Total	331	
Charges filed	95	29%
Under investigation	69	21%
Investigation outcome unknown	6	2%
Not sustained	3	1%
Sustained	3	1%
Unfounded	35	11%
Closed	120	36%

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

Citizen Deaths

The reporting of the number of officer-involved civilian deaths is an element in the statute (CRS 24-31-903(2)(e)) that is separate from either the contacts or use of force sections. There is a different data collection managed by 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 CRS 24-31-903(2)(e) overlap with the more detailed requirements of DCRA it was decided to combine these two collections to avoid law enforcement agencies needing to enter into two collections that are both managed by DCJ. The DCRA data is reported to the DCJ on a quarterly basis and has details on race/ethnicity, gender, agency, location of death, and cause of death.

Table 22 presents DCRA data from January-December 2022. DCRA provides data over a longer time period than the other source in this report. There were 28 law-enforcement involved deaths reported from January-December 2022 (Table 22) with 75% recorded as White NH, 14% as Hispanic/Latino, 7% as Black/African-American NH, and 4% reported as Asian NH.

Table 27. Officer-involved civilian deaths, by citizen race/ethnicity, January-December 2022

Race/ethnicity	Total officer-involved deaths	Percent of officer-involved deaths
All race/ethnicity	28	100%
Asian NH	1	4%
Black/African American NH	2	7%
Hispanic, any race	4	14%
Native American/ Alaska Native NH	0	0%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander NH	0	0%
White NH	21	75%
Multi-racial/Other NH	0	0%

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Deaths in Custody Reporting Act data collection.

Agency-level reporting

Table 28 presents the number of citizens contacted by agency, broken down by race/ethnicity of the citizen. There was wide variation in the number of contacts reported and the number of months agencies reported for due to the relatively short timeframe and the fact that this is a new data collection. Additionally, 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. Further compounding the limitations of racial/ethnic representation within a jurisdiction, are the jurisdictional differences in crime trends, both short and long-term, as well as the nuances of demographic and environmental differences within each jurisdiction. Further analysis and contextualization of these variables in subsequent years may yield useful results for future law enforcement policy

Table 28. Number of citizen contacts reported, by agency and citizen race/ethnicity, August-December 2022

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Arapahoe Community College Campus Police Department	13	0	0	3	0	0	9	1
Arapahoe County Sheriff's Office	942	34	192	235	1	5	475	0
Archuleta County Sheriff's Office	145	0	3	22	6	0	106	8
Arvada Police Department	1621	32	63	381	4	0	1137	4
Aspen Police Department	491	6	14	66	1	0	396	8
Ault Police Department	987	18	30	245	4	2	677	11
Aurora Police Department	13544	346	4139	4214	74	70	4282	419
Avon Police Department	96	2	2	49	0	0	43	0
Basalt Police Department	450	6	3	116	0	0	320	5
Bayfield Marshal's Office	242	0	11	40	12	0	176	3
Black Hawk Police Department	492	36	35	97	2	3	318	1

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Blue River Police Department	100	2	2	14	0	1	78	3
Boulder County Sheriff's Office	2044	94	39	324	3	4	1541	39
Boulder Police Department	1419	42	77	199	10	2	1054	35
Breckenridge Police Department	331	6	4	182	0	0	135	4
Brighton Police Department	827	17	42	390	0	1	370	7
Broomfield Police Department	3917	132	187	915	10	11	2543	119
Brush Police Department	296	1	7	203	1	0	82	2
Buena Vista Police Department	344	6	2	93	1	0	242	0
Burlington Police Department	501	1	17	130	2	3	342	6
Canon City Police Department	814	1	10	532	1	0	258	12
Carbondale Police Department	876	5	10	264	2	0	594	1
Castle Rock Police Department	1568	34	73	261	4	3	1173	20
Centennial Police Department	1459	47	225	287	4	1	895	0
Chaffee County Sheriff's Office	1026	11	8	544	0	1	451	11
Cheyenne County Sheriff's Office	140	0	16	30	0	2	88	4
Colorado Springs Police Department	9741	162	1353	1781	21	41	6306	77
Colorado State Patrol	74764	1480	3420	17837	450	117	51460	0
Colorado State University Police Department - Fort Collins	1020	27	51	120	1	4	793	24

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Commerce City Police Department	154	3	14	69	0	0	68	0
Cortez Police Department	1096	4	7	305	218	10	544	8
Craig Police Department	879	2	22	193	1	0	659	2
Crested Butte Police Department	126	4	4	9	0	0	106	3
Cripple Creek Police Department	103	3	5	21	0	1	70	3
Crowley County Sheriff's Office	341	2	12	201	2	0	123	1
Custer County Sheriff's Office	251	0	2	25	0	0	220	4
Dacono Police Department	616	7	5	346	0	2	246	10
De Beque Marshal's Office	37	0	0	4	0	0	33	0
Delta County Sheriff's Office	465	4	6	50	2	0	395	8
Douglas County Sheriff's Office	194	10	8	18	0	1	155	2
Durango Police Department	750	2	16	75	91	3	556	7
Eagle County Sheriff's Office	112	1	0	55	0	0	56	0
Eagle Police Department	560	4	3	343	0	0	203	7
Eaton Police Department	1925	19	40	501	0	3	1332	30
Edgewater Police Department	608	5	42	229	2	5	312	13
El Paso County Sheriff's Office	2382	34	283	350	1	12	1649	53
Elizabeth Police Department	521	4	18	47	1	0	439	12
Englewood Police Department	740	24	99	176	4	0	424	13

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Erie Police Department	1190	22	18	667	1	1	474	7
Estes Park Police Department	411	14	13	56	0	1	316	11
Evans Police Department	2217	20	87	1111	6	7	972	14
Federal Heights Police Department	333	4	10	161	0	0	153	5
Firestone Police Department	608	17	16	199	1	1	367	7
Florence Police Department	40	0	3	6	0	0	31	0
Fort Collins Police Department	5877	90	387	1055	30	20	4198	97
Fort Lewis State College Police Department	171	4	5	18	58	0	84	2
Fort Lupton Police Department	732	4	26	385	1	0	312	4
Fort Morgan Police Department	1409	3	119	689	0	3	573	22
Fountain Police Department	1909	14	290	400	4	14	1152	35
Fraser/Winter Park Police Department	572	11	20	82	0	2	442	15
Frederick Police Department	687	6	25	206	0	0	442	8
Fruita Police Department	253	2	2	24	0	0	219	6
Garden City Police Department	358	3	31	117	0	1	200	6
Garfield County Sheriff's Office	1099	17	27	383	0	0	655	17
Georgetown Police Department	117	1	6	21	0	0	86	3
Gilpin County Sheriff's Office	926	28	25	468	0	0	398	7

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Glendale Police Department	769	10	177	166	3	0	392	21
Glenwood Springs Police Department	375	4	5	174	0	0	188	4
Golden Police Department	956	33	24	362	2	0	524	11
Grand Junction Police Department	911	9	32	138	8	3	715	6
Greeley Police Department	4138	19	86	2936	5	8	1062	22
Green Mountain Falls Marshal's Office	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Greenwood Village Police Department	28	2	4	7	0	0	15	0
Gunnison Police Department	512	2	19	112	1	2	359	17
Hinsdale County Sheriff's Office	138	0	0	106	0	0	32	0
Hotchkiss Police Department	413	3	0	133	0	0	269	8
Hugo Marshal's Office	242	9	17	55	0	0	141	20
Johnstown Police Department	1046	9	27	230	0	1	776	3
Keenesburg Police Department	117	1	4	38	0	0	74	0
Kit Carson County Sheriff's Office	333	4	15	60	2	0	247	5
Kremmling Police Department	138	4	4	19	1	1	108	1
La Plata County Sheriff's Office	674	2	6	462	18	1	179	6
La Salle Police Department	310	7	13	136	0	0	152	2
Lafayette Police Department	1445	40	40	344	3	0	1002	16

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Lakewood Police Department	5215	91	477	1743	21	6	2841	36
Larimer County Sheriff's Office	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Limon Police Department	486	5	27	63	1	6	375	9
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office	206	2	17	57	0	0	128	2
Littleton Police Department	626	6	32	123	0	2	463	0
Lochbuie Police Department	245	4	12	96	0	0	132	1
Lone Tree Police Department	1682	76	159	312	4	3	1098	30
Longmont Department of Public Safety	1440	25	41	465	5	3	881	20
Louisville Police Department	836	24	52	135	3	2	599	21
Mead Police Department	399	8	8	97	0	0	283	3
Meeker Police Department	428	2	2	51	2	1	362	8
Mesa County Sheriff's Office	2128	9	68	418	4	5	1608	16
Milliken Police Department	400	0	4	123	2	0	270	1
Moffat County Sheriff's Office	265	2	4	47	2	0	207	3
Monte Vista Police Department	1010	1	10	533	3	4	456	3
Montezuma County Sheriff's Office	303	5	3	30	44	1	213	7
Montrose County Sheriff's Office	168	1	2	38	2	0	121	4
Montrose Police Department	1139	6	36	262	1	2	814	18
Monument Police Department	468	7	29	41	0	2	386	3

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Mountain Village Police Department	50	0	0	20	0	0	30	0
Nederland Police Department	18	0	0	1	0	0	12	5
New Castle Police Department	53	1	2	12	0	0	38	0
Nunn Police Department	84	0	5	35	0	0	44	0
Oak Creek Police Department	127	1	3	18	0	1	90	14
Otero County Sheriff's Office	148	0	6	55	0	0	85	2
Ouray County Sheriff's Office	34	0	0	4	0	0	29	1
Pagosa Springs Police Department	338	3	3	57	8	0	265	2
Palisade Police Department	576	2	10	74	2	2	470	16
Parachute Police Department	38	0	0	4	0	0	33	1
Parker Police Department	1136	34	104	180	1	2	772	43
Phillips County Sheriff's Office	14	0	0	5	0	0	9	0
Pitkin County Sheriff's Office	1196	15	21	308	1	3	821	27
Pueblo Police Department	2214	7	101	1080	4	2	1013	7
Rangely Police Department	324	9	8	50	3	0	252	2
Regional Transportation District Police Dept	844	6	272	178	10	2	362	14
Rifle Police Department	320	3	8	143	0	0	163	3
Rio Blanco County Sheriff's Office	296	2	2	42	2	1	243	4

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
Routt County Sheriff's Office	1281	8	25	171	3	1	1065	8
San Miguel County Sheriff's Office	385	1	6	133	4	2	234	5
Severance Police Department	35	0	1	3	0	0	30	1
Sheridan Police Department	1480	38	112	589	8	3	715	15
Silverthorne Police Department	366	5	7	96	0	0	255	3
Snowmass Village Police Department	346	8	8	63	1	1	261	4
Steamboat Springs Police Department	785	15	25	127	1	3	598	16
Sterling Police Department	1396	1	24	800	0	3	564	4
Summit County Sheriff's Office	943	17	28	256	1	4	618	19
Teller County Sheriff's Office	499	9	22	65	2	1	396	4
Telluride Marshal's Office	95	3	0	14	0	0	75	3
Thornton Police Department	8746	189	525	3704	19	14	4120	175
Timnath Police Department	774	18	19	121	3	2	606	5
University of Colorado - Boulder Police Department	565	32	37	56	0	2	436	2
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus - Denver Police Department	205	15	47	43	0	1	99	0

Agency	Total	Asian NH	Black/African American NH	Hispanic, any race	Native American/ Alaska Native NH	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander NH	White NH	Multi-racial/ Other NH
University of Northern Colorado Police Department	327	9	41	119	2	0	152	4
Vail Police Department	247	6	4	50	0	0	186	1
Weld County Sheriff's Office	1860	15	61	701	0	4	1057	22
Westminster Police Department	1816	57	113	628	2	3	1009	4
Wiggins Police Department	202	1	5	93	1	0	102	0
Windsor Police Department	1700	12	27	689	2	2	898	70
Woodland Park Police Department	474	7	15	44	1	5	394	8
Wray Police Department	229	2	1	59	1	1	163	2
Yuma County Sheriff's Office	109	0	2	16	0	0	91	0

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

Conclusion

This document is the first which summarizes data reported by law enforcement agencies pursuant to CRS 24-31-903. It covers the period of August to December of 2022 for 146 agencies, which is about 57% of Colorado agencies. The limited timeframe and the smaller number of agencies reporting means that this report does not give a full picture of law enforcement contacts and use of force. Future reports will paint a more robust picture of contacts and use of force in the state. However, this is still a new data collection and will take some time to reach full compliance from all agencies in the state. The Division of Criminal Justice is working diligently to ensure that we reach full reporting. Agencies are committed to complying with the requirements of the *Law Enforcement Integrity* statute. The public dashboard will allow the public to do a fuller exploration of these data on their own.

Appendix A. Statutory Language of CRS 24-31-901 & 24-31-903

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 nonconsensual, 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 assist; undercover interactions; or routine interactions with persons detained in a jail or detention facility.

(2) “Demographic information” means race, ethnicity, sex, 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 noncertified 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, nun chucks, 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 showup, 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 showup, 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 showup, 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.