

Use of Force Reports in Oregon, 2023

Per House Bill 2932 (2021)

May 1, 2024



Oregon Criminal Justice Commission

Paige Frye Holcomb, Research Analyst

Kelly Officer, Research Director

Ken Sanchagrin, Executive Director

The mission of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission is to improve the legitimacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of state and local criminal justice systems.

Table of Contents

Tables and Figures	ii
1: House Bill 2932 (2021) Requirements	1
2: History of FBI Use-of-Force Reporting.....	1
3: Limitations	2
4: 2023 Oregon Use-of-Force Reporting Compliance	3
5: 2023 Oregon Use-of-Force Incident Data.....	4
5.1. Demographic Information.....	4
5.2. Circumstances of Contact	6
5.3. Incident Description.....	7
5.4. Incident Outcomes	8
6: Conclusion	10
Appendix.....	11

Tables and Figures

4. 2023 Oregon Use-of-Force Reporting Compliance	
Table 4. 1. Three-Tiered Reporting Approach.....	3
Table 4. 2. 2023 UoF Reporting Compliance	4
5.1. Demographic Information	
Table 5.1. 1. Officer Years of Service	4
Table 5.1. 2. Officer Demographics.....	5
Table 5.1. 3. Subject Demographics	5
5.2. Circumstances of Contact	
Table 5.2. 1. Circumstances of Contact	6
Table 5.2. 2. Event Location Type by Reason for Initial Contact.....	6
Table 5.2. 3. Most Serious Offense Type	7
5.3. Incident Description	
Table 5.3. 1. Perceived Subject Impairment	7
Table 5.3. 2. Subject Resistance	8
Table 5.3. 3. Officer-Applied Force.....	8
5.4. Incident Outcomes Tables	
Table 5.4. 1. Subject Injury.....	9
Table 5.4. 2. Subject Injury by Officer-Applied Force	9
Appendix	
Table A. 1. Most Serious Offenses Reported When Responding to Unlawful Conduct	11
Table A. 2. 2023 Use-of-Force Reports and Incident Outcomes	12

1: House Bill 2932 (2021) Requirements

In the 2021 Legislative Session, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2932¹. Section 1 of this bill directs all law enforcement units² across the state to participate in the National Use-of-Force Data Collection operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Section 2 of HB 2932 requires the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to analyze this data and provide annual reports to the legislature in the manner specified in ORS 192.245³. This is the second report required by HB 2932 and provides descriptive statistics on the use-of-force incidents submitted by reporting agencies in Oregon during the calendar year of 2023. The collection and reporting of this data is not intended to evaluate or report whether officers followed their department's policy or acted lawfully.

2: History of FBI Use-of-Force Reporting

In 2015, the FBI established the National Use-of-Force Data Collection based on recommendations from the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board and representatives from major law enforcement organizations⁴. The purpose of the use-of-force data collection is to provide national statistics on officer-involved use-of-force incidents. A successful pilot study was conducted in 2017 and national data collection commenced on January 1, 2019. The FBI released the first year of participation data in 2020. The Use-of-Force reporting is now a component of uniform crime reporting used by law enforcement agencies to report qualifying officer use-of-force incidents. Unless otherwise mandated—as is the case in Oregon following HB 2932—participation in the FBI Use-of-Force Data Collection is encouraged but optional. The collection and publication of this data by the FBI does not evaluate or report whether officers followed their department's policy or acted lawfully.

Data reports contain incident information, officer information and subject information, as well as “zero reports.” Terms used to describe the data in this report are based on those found in the FBI Use-of-Force Data Collection Program⁵. Commonly used terms are defined as follows:

- *Qualifying use-of-force incidents*: incidents that result in a fatality, serious bodily injury to a person, or the discharge of a firearm at or in the direction of a person.
- *Serious bodily injury*: injuries that involve a substantial risk of death, unconsciousness, protracted and obvious disfigurement, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty. Injuries that are not categorized as serious include minor lacerations, contusions, or abrasions that do not require medical action exceeding traditional first-aid treatment.
- *Officer*: this term is used in reference to members of law enforcement units who apply force during the event.
- *Subject*: the individual on which force is used during the event are referred to as “subject.”
- *Zero report*: a zero report is submitted when no qualifying use-of-force incidents occurred during a reporting period (month). Affirmative zero reports denote that agencies are complying with reporting requirements while confirming the absence of qualifying reportable incidents.

¹ 2021 Regular Legislative Session HB 2932 <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2021R1/Measures/Overview/HB2932>

² A law enforcement unit, as defined by ORS 181A.355, https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors_181A.355

³ ORS 192.245 - Form of report to legislature (public.law)

⁴ National Use-of-Force Data Collection <https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/more-fbi-services-and-information/ucr/use-of-force>

⁵ See Crime Data Explorer/About the Data: [CDE \(cjis.gov\)](https://cde.cjis.gov)

- *Unknown*: if any of the data points are unknown and are unlikely to ever be known, they are marked as “unknown.”
- *Pending*: if the incident is entered while still being investigated, or there is potential for data points to be updated later, a field may be marked as “pending.” Law enforcement agencies may update records as new information becomes available.

Incident information collected includes the following: incident date and time, total number of officers who applied force, number of officers from reporting agency who applied force, incident location, incident location type (street, home, business, etc.), whether the incident was an ambush, whether a supervisor or senior officer was consulted during the incident, reason for initial contact, most serious offense of which the individual was suspected, National Incident-Based Reporting System record number or local incident report number, and case numbers for any additionally involved agencies, if applicable.

Subject information collected includes the following: age, sex, race, ethnicity, height, and weight of subject, injury/death of subject, type of force used, whether the subject directed a threat to the officer or another person, whether the subject resisted, types of resistance or weapon involvement, whether the subject has a known or apparent impairment and type of impairment, and whether the subject was believed to have a weapon.

Officer information collected includes the following: age, sex, race, ethnicity, height, and weight of the officer, years of service in law enforcement, whether the officer was a full-time employee, whether the officer was on duty, whether the officer discharged a firearm, whether the officer was injured, and type of injury.

3: Limitations

The purpose of this report is to fulfill the requirements in Section 2 of HB 2932 (2021). Therefore, data in this report are limited to information recounted exclusively by law enforcement agencies, as modeled by the FBI’s Use-of-Force Data Collection. Data submitted by law enforcement may include information collected following the use-of-force incident and information collected during an investigation conducted by an outside entity, such as a local prosecutor’s office. Many of the initial data points are products of officer discernment, such as subject impairment and subject race/ethnicity. The data points can and should be updated as more information becomes available during an investigation. However, there are no supplemental data submitted to the CJC describing self-identified subject demographics or medical documentation of the presence or absence of subject impairment or psychological conditions. Additionally, law enforcement units are responsible for reporting accurate, complete data. While the CJC may assist with troubleshooting and agency outreach, this report reflects the data submitted by law enforcement agencies with no modifications by the CJC. This data collection effort and report is not intended to investigate or audit specific use-of-force instances and may not include all use-of-force incidents that have occurred.

Section 1 of HB 2932 (2021) requires law enforcement units to participate in the FBI’s Use-of-Force Data Collection. This is one of many data collection efforts concerning law enforcement use of force. However, each data collection program may have different purposes, highlight different information, and use various methods of collecting and reporting data. This report should be interpreted within the context of the FBI’s Use-of-Force Data Collection Program and not compared with reports from other programs or entities. Furthermore, there are many factors, such as population, agency capacity, or patrolling practices, that may contribute to the uniqueness of each jurisdiction. Because of this variation, care should

be taken not to compare or rank individual law enforcement agencies or jurisdictions based solely on the data in this report.

4: 2023 Oregon Use-of-Force Reporting Compliance

The second year of mandated data reporting includes incidents from the calendar year of 2023. The Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) began receiving reported data in January of 2024. The final submissions were received on March 1, 2024. Law enforcement agencies across the state of Oregon submitted their use-of-force incident data through a secure web-based platform called the Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal (LEEP). The data was then extracted and transferred to the CJC by Oregon State Police. The Oregon Department of Corrections (ODOC) submitted their data to the CJC independently, as they are not permitted to participate in the FBI data collection via the LEEP platform. The Oregon Department of Corrections reported three qualifying use-of-force events for the calendar year of 2023.

There were 158 law enforcement units enrolled as reporting agencies. The overall rate of participation for the reporting year of 2023 was 100%. Of the agencies enrolled, all participated in reporting. This is an 8.2% increase in participation rate from 2022, which had an overall participation rate of 92.4%. Reasons cited for partial to no participation in 2022 were inability to access the reporting portal, staffing shortages, and capacity challenges.⁶

As shown in Table 4.1, the CJC used a three-tiered approach⁷ to categorize agencies by size and staffing capacity when analyzing reporting compliance. Agencies within all tiers had a 100% participation rate, meaning there were no reporting periods in which an agency did not report either an

Table 4. 1. Three-Tiered Reporting Approach

Tier	Officers Per Agency	Agencies Within Tier	Participation	Reported Incidents
Tier 1	100+	14	100%	44
Tier 2	25-99	46	100%	18
Tier 3	1-24	98	100%	3
Totals for Tiers 1-3		158	100%	65

affirmative zero or qualifying incident(s). Tier 1 consists of agencies with more than 100 employed officers. This group also includes the Oregon Department of Corrections. Agencies within this tier reported 44 qualifying use-of-force incidents from January to December 2023. Tier 2 consists of agencies with 25-99 employed officers. This group reported 18 qualifying use-of-force incidents. Tier 3 consists of agencies with 24 or fewer officers employed. This group reported three qualifying use-of-force incidents.

On some occasions, more than one law enforcement agency may be present during a use-of-force incident. Each agency whose officer(s) used force during the incident must submit their own individual incident report. For this reason, there may be multiple accounts of the same reportable incident. The CJC takes this reporting requirement into consideration when analyzing use-of-force incident, officer, and subject data. For example, there were 65 agency reports of use-of-force incidents but four of those incidents were identified as occurrences in which officers from more than one agency were present. There were two incidents in which officers from two agencies applied force and submitted individual reports, resulting in four reports for two distinct incidents. Similarly, another two incidents involved officers from three agencies who applied force, all submitting an individual report. This resulted in six reports for two

⁶ Refer to appendix for breakdown of reports by agency.

⁷ The categorization of reporting agencies in this report is based on the three-tiered reporting approach and inclusion criteria used in the Statistical Transparency of Policing Report per HB 2255 (2017).

distinct incidents. Therefore, of the 65 agency reports, 59 events were identified as distinct use-of-force incidents.

Table 4.2. displays the number of zero reports, agency reports, and distinct incidents. The highest number of distinct use-of-force events for the reporting year of 2023 occurred in April. March had the fewest distinct incidents. The average number of agency reports per month was five, with a maximum of nine and a minimum of two.

Table 4. 2. 2023 UoF Reporting Compliance

Month	Zero	Agency	Distinct
January	154	4	4
February	153	7	7
March	156	2	2
April	152	9	8
May	151	7	7
June	155	3	3
July	154	6	6
August	156	4	3
September	153	5	5
October	155	4	4
November	154	5	3
December	150	9	7
Total	1843	65	59

5: 2023 Oregon Use-of-Force Incident Data

For the calendar year of 2023, there were 65 agency reports for 59 distinct qualifying use-of-force incidents in the state of Oregon. Of the 59 incidents, 113 officers and 63 subjects were involved in the 59 incidents. Qualifying use-of-force incidents were examined by incident circumstances, as well as officer and subject information, which are described in detail below⁸. Incidents reported by ODOC occurred in correctional facilities, while all other agencies reports are in a community setting. As such, the circumstances of contact, incident descriptions, and demographic information will vary given the more restricted environment.

5.1. Demographic Information

Demographic information was collected for officers and subjects involved in qualifying use-of-force incidents. Officer demographics include age, race/ethnicity, sex, and employment information. Subject demographics displayed in this report include subject age, race/ethnicity, and sex.

Officer Demographics

All law enforcement officers involved in qualifying use-of-force incidents were on duty at the time of the event. All 113 officers involved were employed at 35 or more hours per week. Of the 113 officers, 106 were reported to be readily identifiable as law enforcement officers by clothing or insignia at the time of the incident. This information was not specified for seven of the 113 officers. Table 5.1.1. displays total years of service as a law enforcement officer for individual officers involved in qualifying use of force incidents. The minimum was one year of service and the maximum was 29 years. The average total years of service for officers involved in use-of-force incidents was 10 years. One involved officer's years of service was not specified.

Table 5.1. 1. Officer Years of Service

Years of Service	
Average	10
Minimum	1
Maximum	29

As presented in table 5.1.2., officer demographic information from distinct incidents showed that most officers involved in use-of-force incidents were White and male, with 92% reported as White and 97% reported as male. Most officers involved were between the ages of 31-40 years.

⁸ See [CJIS Document Number – UoF-DOC-37001-4.7](#) for details on information included in the export files from the National Use-of-Force Data Collection system. [the Use-of-Force Data Dictionary can be provided by the CJC upon request.](#)

Table 5.1. 2. Officer Demographics

Officer Demographics	Count	% of Officers
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic	4	4%
Indigenous	0	0%
Asian	1	1%
Black/African American	4	8%
Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	104	92%
Sex		
Male	110	97%
Female	3	3%
Age Group		
20-30	29	26%
31-40	40	35%
41-50	35	31%
50+	9	8%
Total Officers	113	100%

Subject Demographics

Subject information may be based on officer perception or information obtained during follow-up investigations. Analysis of demographic data from distinct incidents showed that 73% of subjects were White and 87% of subjects were male. The majority of subjects were between 31-40 years old. One subject was under the age of 18, at 17 years old.

Table 5.1. 3. Subject Demographics

Subject Demographics	Count	% of Subjects
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic	10	16%
Indigenous	1	2%
Asian	1	2%
Black/African American	4	6%
Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	45	73%
Unknown	2	3%
Sex		
Male	55	87%
Female	8	13%
Age Group		
Under 18	1	2%
18-20	5	8%
21-30	16	25%
31-40	24	38%
41-50	10	16%
50+	6	10%
Not Specified	1	2%
Total Subjects	63	100.00%

5.2. Circumstances of Contact

Data points relative to the circumstances of contact can provide insight into the use-of-force event setting and what prompted the encounter. Tables 5.2.1. and 5.2.2. displays initial contact and location types for all qualifying use-of-force incidents. Event information for distinct incidents showed that the most common initial contact type (63%) was in response to unlawful or suspicious activity. Traffic stops were the second most common initial contact point although it should be noted that the gap between the first and second most common contact reason is large.

Most distinct use-of-force events occurred on a highway, road, alley, street, or sidewalk, with a total of 44% of the incident location types. Twenty-nine percent of events occurred in a residential or lodging environment, such as a home or hotel. Five events occurred in a place of business, such as a convenience store, restaurant, specialty store, gas/service station, or a commercial/office building. Three events took place in a parking lot or structure. Three events took place in a correctional setting. Two events took place in a park or playground. Two events occurred in other locations, such as outdoors, wooded areas, beaches or waterways, rest areas, or otherwise unspecified locations. One event was recorded as taking place in a medical setting.

Table 5.2. 1. Circumstances of Contact

Initial Contact Reason	Incident Count	% of Contact
Unlawful/Suspicious Activity	37	63%
Traffic Stop	10	17%
Welfare Assistance	3	5%
Routine Patrol	3	5%
Correctional Setting	3	5%
Other*	3	5%
Total	59	100%
Location Type		
Place of Business	5	8%
Residence/Home/Lodging	17	29%
Roadway/Sidewalk	26	44%
Parking Lot/Structure	3	5%
Medical Setting	1	2%
Correctional Facility	3	5%
Park/Playground/Community	2	3%
Other	2	3%
Total	59	100%

*Includes one instance of warrant service, one follow-up contact, and one true "other". These categories were consolidated because of low counts.

Table 5.2. 2. Event Location Type by Reason for Initial Contact

Location Type	Initial Contact Reason						Total
	Suspicious Activity	Welfare Respons	Correctional Setting	Routine Patrol	Traffic Stop	Other	
Place of Business	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Residence/Lodging	14	1	0	0	0	2	17
Roadway/Sidewalk	13	1	0	3	8	1	26
Parking Lot/	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Correctional Facility	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Medical Setting	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Park/Playground	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Other	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
Total	37	3	3	3	10	3	59

As shown in Table 5.2.1., 63% of distinct encounters were initiated as a response to unlawful or suspicious activity. Of those encounters, officers entered the most serious offense and up to two more offenses⁹. Table 5.2.3. displays the most serious offenses listed for all incidents initiated by a response to unlawful or suspicious activity. Forty-three percent of the most serious offenses listed were person crimes, such as assault related crimes, homicide offenses, and kidnapping or abduction. Thirty-eight percent were property crimes, such as arson, burglary, destruction of property or vandalism, motor vehicle theft, robbery, stolen property offenses, and trespassing. Eight percent were societal crimes, such as disorderly conduct, driving under the influence of intoxicants (DUII), and weapon law violations. Eleven percent were listed as “other,” and did not include additional detail.

Table 5.2. 3. Most Serious Offense Type

Most Serious Offense Type	Count	% of Offense Type
Person Crimes	16	43%
Property Crimes	14	38%
Societal Crimes	3	8%
Other	4	11%
Total	37	100%

5.3. Incident Description

Incident descriptions include information about the types of subject resistance reported, any suspected or known subject impairment, and the type of officer-applied force used during distinct events. Subject impairment is determined by the involved officer based on professional judgment as to whether the subject exhibited an apparent or known impairment in their mental or physical condition during the qualifying event. If additional information is provided from an investigation, subject impairment can be updated in the LEEP portal at a later date.

Twenty-seven individuals, or 43% of subjects, were reported to have been impaired during the incident.

Thirty-eight percent reportedly showed no signs of perceived or known impairment. The most common type of reported impairment was alcohol impairment. There were nine instances where the subject reportedly displayed multiple types of perceived impairment. Cases where multiple impairments were perceived or known included three instances where the subject was presumed to have mental health and drug impairments, three with mental health and alcohol impairments, two with alcohol and drug impairment, and one with mental health, alcohol, and drug impairment. Table 5.3.1. displays perceived subject impairment and type of impairment reported during all qualifying events.

Table 5.3. 1. Perceived Subject Impairment

Impaired	Count	% of All Subjects
Yes	27	43%
No	24	38%
Unknown	6	10%
Pending	6	10%
Total	63	100%
Impairment Type	Count	% of Impaired Subjects
Mental	5	19%
Alcohol	8	30%
Drugs	4	15%
Multiple	9	33%
Unknown	1	4%
Total	27	100%

Ninety percent of subjects were reported to have displayed resistance during distinct incidents. Table 5.3.2. displays all reported forms of subject resistance. Subjects may have displayed more than one type

⁹ See Table A.1. in appendix for breakdown of most serious offenses listed for encounters initiated by a law enforcement response to unlawful or suspicious activity.

of resistance. For example, a subject may have resisted detainment, escaped, and displayed a weapon. Thirty-one agency reports indicated more than one type of resistance.

Of the 63 subjects involved in qualifying use-of-force incidents, 67% were reportedly in possession of a weapon at the time of the event, regardless of whether the weapon was used in a threatening or assaultive manner. However, not all armed subjects displayed resistance involving a weapon. Twenty-two percent of subjects were reported to have displayed a weapon at or in the direction of an officer or another person. The most common form of all reported resistance was the use of a firearm against an officer or another person, with this type of resistance displayed by 33% of subjects. Three percent of subjects used another weapon, such as a blunt object, electronic control weapon, edged weapon, or chemical agent, against an officer or another person during the event.

Table 5.3. 2. Subject Resistance

Type of Resistance	Count	% of All Subjects
Escape/Flee	19	30%
Resist Detainment	17	27%
Barricade	4	6%
Firearm	21	33%
Other Weapon	2	3%
Physical	8	13%
Display Weapon	14	22%
Vehicle	3	5%
Body Fluids	2	3%
Throwing	2	3%
Verbal Threats	5	8%
Noncompliance	17	27%

*Subjects may have displayed more than one type of resistance

A reported 58% of the 113 officers involved in distinct use-of-force incidents discharged their firearm. Of the 63 subjects, 36 sustained forces applied with a firearm. The second most common method of force used was physical force applied with officer hands, fist, and/or feet, with 25% of subjects impacted by this type of force. Table 5.3.3. shows counts for all reported forms of officer-applied force with the percentage of all subjects that were impacted by this force. More than one type of force may have been applied per incident. There are no reported counts of explosive force, baton force, or blunt object force. This does not mean that there were no instances of officer-applied force involving electronics, batons, or blunt objects in 2023, rather there were no instances that qualified as reportable incidents within the framework of the FBI's Use-of-Force Data Collection.

Table 5.3. 3. Officer-Applied Force

Type of Force	Count	% of All Subjects
Firearm	36	57%
Electronic	5	8%
Explosive	0	0%
Chemical	2	3%
Baton	0	0%
Projectile	5	8%
Blunt Object	0	0%
Physical	16	25%
Canine	10	16%
Other	1	2%

*More than one type of force may have been applied per incident.

5.4. Incident Outcomes

Data are collected regarding incident outcomes for both subjects and officers. Officer injuries are reported when they were sustained during the event and precipitated the use of force. Ten of the 113 officers involved in use-of-force incidents were injured during the event, precipitating the use of force. Five officers were reported to have sustained minor injuries. Four suffered a gunshot wound, two of which also suffered other serious injuries requiring medical intervention or hospitalization. Information regarding the nature of the injury of one officer was listed as unknown.

Subject injury categories consisted of a gunshot wound, unconsciousness, other serious injury, death, and no injury. Serious bodily injury includes apparent broken bones, loss of teeth, chipped teeth, canine bites that require medical attention, severe lacerations, stitches, sutures, and possible internal injuries.

Table 5.4.1. displays subject injury categories by total reported injury count and percentage of all subjects impacted by the corresponding injury.

There was one instance where the subject was reported to have suffered injuries from multiple categories. Sixteen percent of subjects suffered a gunshot wound, including minor or grazing wounds. Six percent of subjects suffered a loss of consciousness, regardless of duration. Thirty-eight percent of subjects suffered other serious injuries that required medical intervention or hospitalization¹⁰. Thirteen percent of subjects were reported to have suffered no injuries during the use-of-force incident.

Table 5.4. 1 Subject Injury

Subject Injury	Count	% of Subjects
Gunshot	10	16%
Unconsciousness	4	6%
Other Serious Injury	24	38%
Death	18	29%
None	8	13%

*Subjects may have sustained more than one type of injury causing percentages to total more than 100 percent.

Table 5.4.2. displays forms of officer-applied force with the resulting injury(s) to the 63 impacted subjects. The counts displayed represent the number of subjects impacted by the corresponding injury and officer-applied force. The categories of *multiple force* and *multiple injuries* were generated to reflect the incidents in which multiple types of officer-applied force are used on an individual subject and/or the subject has sustained multiple injuries from one or more forms of officer-applied force. Forty-four percent of the events where multiple types of force were used involved one or more of the following: force by firearm, electronic force, and physical force. Additionally, 56% involved the use of projectile force and 22% involved canine force and/or chemical force. There was one instance where the subject sustained multiple types of injuries, suffering both a gunshot wound and other serious injury. Based on agency reports, 29% of qualifying incidents resulted in death. All events resulting in the death of a subject involved officer-applied force by firearm; four of which involved the use of multiple types of force. Of the eight events with no reported injuries, the type of force recorded was use of firearm. Discharging a firearm at or in the direction of a subject automatically qualifies the event as a reportable use-of-force incident, with or without resulting in serious injury or death.

Table 5.4. 2. Subject Injury by Officer-Applied Force

Type of Force	Type of Injury						Total
	Gunshot Wound	Loss of consciousness	Other Serious Injuries	Death	Multiple Injuries	None	
Firearm	9	0	0	14	1	8	32
Electronic	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Physical	0	3	9	0	0	0	12
Canine	0	0	8	0	0	0	8
Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Multiple Force	0	0	5	4	0	0	9
Total	9	4	23	18	1	8	63

¹⁰ Routine evaluation for the basis of determining fitness for arrest or detention is not considered medical intervention.

6: Conclusion

In summary, HB 2932 (2021) required all law enforcement units in Oregon to participate in the FBI's National Use-of-Force Collection and the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) to analyze this data and provide annual reports to the legislature. This report provides an overview of the second year of mandated reporting. For the calendar year of 2023, data reported to the CJC showed 158 law enforcement units enrolled in use-of-force reporting and a 100% overall participation rate.

Qualifying use-of-force incidents were examined by incident circumstances, as well as officer and subject information. For the calendar year 2023, there were 59 distinct qualifying use-of-force incidents reported through the use-of-force data collection, involving 113 law enforcement officers and 63 subjects. Analyses showed that most qualifying incidents began as a law enforcement response to unlawful or suspicious behavior. Ninety percent of subjects were reported to have displayed resistance during the incidents and 67% were reportedly in possession of a weapon at the time of the event. Fifty-eight percent of officers discharged their firearm and 29% of incidents resulted in death.

The CJC will continue to work with law enforcement agencies across the state on use-of-force reporting and publish reports on an annual basis.

Appendix

Table A. 1. Most Serious Offenses Reported When Responding to Unlawful Conduct

Most Serious Offense Reported	Offense Category	Count	% of Reported Offenses
Assault Offenses - Aggravated Assault	Persons	5	14%
Assault Offenses - Intimidation	Persons	3	8%
Assault Offenses - Simple Assault	Persons	6	16%
Burglary/Breaking & Entering	Property	2	5%
Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property	Property	1	3%
Disorderly Conduct	Societal	3	8%
Homicide Offenses - Murder & Non-negligent Manslaughter	Persons	1	3%
Kidnapping/Abduction	Persons	1	3%
Larceny/Theft Offenses - Shoplifting	Property	1	3%
Larceny/Theft Offenses - Theft from Building	Property	1	3%
Larceny/Theft Offenses - Theft from Motor Vehicle	Property	1	3%
Motor Vehicle Theft	Property	3	8%
Robbery	Property	3	8%
Trespass of Real Property	Property	2	5%
All Other Offenses	Other	4	11%
Total		37	100%

Table A. 2. 2023 Use-of-Force Reports and Incident Outcomes

Law Enforcement Unit			Types of Force								Subject Outcome		
	Total UoF Incident Reports	Total Number of Subjects	Total types of Force Reported	Firearm	Electronic	Chemical	Projectile	Physical	Canine	Other	Death	Serious Injury	No Injury
Albany Police Department	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Boardman Police Department	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office	4	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Douglas County Sheriff's Office	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Eugene Police Department	6	7	8	3	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	3	3
Grants Pass Department of Public Safety	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hillsboro Police Department	2	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Jackson County Sheriff's Office	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
Josephine County Sheriff's Office	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lane County Sheriff's Office	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Linn County Sheriff's Office	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Marion County Sheriff's Office	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	0
McMinnville Police Department	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Medford Police Department	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multnomah County Sheriff's Department	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Oregon Department of Corrections	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
Oregon State Police	5	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Polk County Sheriff's Office	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Portland Police Bureau	12	12	15	4	3	0	2	4	2	0	4	8	0
Roseburg Police Department	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Salem Police Department	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Springfield Police Department	6	6	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	5	0
Tillamook County Sheriff's Office	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Washington County Sheriff's Office	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Agency Report Totals	65	69	81	41	5	2	5	16	11	1	23	26	8
Distinct Incident Totals	56	63	72	36	5	2	5	16	10	1	18	25	8