

Disclaimer for this data

The data herewith was compiled from APD use of force incident reports, the full metadata sheet is available at the Athens County Cop Watch website. For the analysis of this data, the focus is on active APD officers. This is so that rates of use of force can be determined, as active officers have a clear employment date. Rates were used to compare data between officers. To calculate the rates, the use of force/arrest values per officer were normalized to the years employed at APD as an active officer, through the span of the data time frame (1.1.15 - 7.5.20). Specifically, the date of hire and date of termination (if applicable) was used to determine the exact amount of time (measured in years) in which each officer was active duty during the time frame of the data. To further categorize the types of responses displayed in the use of force reports, the ACSO use of force action response system was utilized (no equivalent for APD). A copy of the description of this system can be found in the ACSO use of force policy, however a snippet of the descriptions of each level will be included at the end of this document. A caveat about this data is that there are several incidents in the narrative is withheld from the public, as it is still under investigation. Therefore, all officers involved in these sealed cases are recorded as displaying all action response types in the report. These cases are highlighted in orange on the metadata spreadsheet.

Officers	Years Employed During Data Time Frame	Handcuffs		Joint Manipulation	Pressure Point Control	Balance Displacement	TASER Brandished	Take Down	Floor Control	Baton Techniques	Striking Motor Points	TASER Deployed	Service Weapon Brandish	Service Weapon Discharge
		Handcuffs	Leg Restraint											
Doerr, Ethan	2.41	5.81	0.00	2.49	0.00	3.74	0.42	3.32	4.57	0.00	0.83	2.49	0.00	0.00
Withers, Thomas	0.81	1.23	0.00	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.23	0.00	0.00
Reece, Andrew	4.85	2.89	0.41	1.03	0.00	0.62	0.00	1.65	1.65	0.21	0.62	0.82	0.00	0.00
Foster, Andrew	5.51	3.99	0.18	0.54	0.18	1.81	0.54	2.18	2.36	0.00	0.18	0.73	0.18	0.18
Warren, Matt	5.51	2.18	0.00	0.36	0.18	0.91	0.18	1.09	1.09	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.18
Holter, Ross	5.51	3.81	0.00	1.63	0.18	1.63	0.00	2.18	2.00	0.18	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.00
Boggs, Justin	4.47	5.37	0.90	2.46	0.22	0.90	0.45	3.13	4.70	0.00	0.67	0.45	0.00	0.00
Emerick, Jeremy	5.51	3.08	0.18	1.45	0.00	0.91	0.36	1.27	3.08	0.00	0.18	0.36	0.00	0.00
Spear, Andrew	5.51	3.45	0.54	1.63	0.18	1.81	0.36	2.18	2.72	0.00	0.54	0.36	0.18	0.00
Brooks, Ron	3.67	0.55	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00
Jenne, Annie	4.47	2.24	0.45	0.45	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.90	1.34	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.00
Flick, Destry	5.51	1.63	0.00	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.18	0.54	0.73	0.18	0.36	0.18	0.18	0.00
Magruder, Nick	5.51	3.08	0.54	1.09	0.36	0.91	0.18	1.45	2.18	0.00	0.36	0.18	0.00	0.18
Brandau, Romar	5.51	1.81	0.18	0.73	0.18	0.73	0.00	0.91	1.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00
Brown, Cassand	4.03	1.99	0.25	1.24	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.50	1.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clair, Adam	5.51	3.08	0.18	1.81	0.18	0.36	0.00	1.63	1.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dicken, Neal	5.51	1.45	0.00	0.54	0.18	0.54	0.00	0.73	1.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fish, Andrew	5.05	0.79	0.00	0.40	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.79	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Filar, Robert	5.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hahn, Zachary	0.62	6.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.60	0.00	4.81	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Johnson, Derek	3.49	4.86	0.29	2.86	0.00	0.86	0.00	3.43	4.01	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.00
McGrew, Joe	4.85	1.65	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.82	0.21	1.03	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
McCall, Jeff	5.51	0.36	0.18	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
McPherson, Sco	2.42	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Olexa, David	0.36	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Shaver, Travis	3.49	0.29	0.00	0.29	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Simpson, Thom	5.51	1.63	0.00	1.63	0.36	0.91	0.00	0.54	0.36	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wesselhoeft, Du	2.14	4.20	0.47	2.80	0.00	1.87	0.00	2.34	3.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Withers, John	2.09	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Department Ave	2.23	1.81	0.14	0.78	0.12	0.61	0.10	0.94	1.23	0.03	0.11	0.20	0.03	0.02

The data above shows the rate at which each officer uses each action response (rate= # of each force / years)

I	J	K	L	M	N
Officers	Level 1: Coopera	Level 2: Contact	Level 3: Complia	Level 4: Defense	Level 5: Deadly F
Antle, Ernie	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
Boggs, Justin	82.76	41.38	75.86	17.24	0.00
Bolen, Ron	100.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	0.00
Brandau, Roman	78.92	46.15	61.54	0.00	7.69
Brown, Cassand	66.67	66.67	66.67	0.00	0.00
Brooks, Ron	100.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
Claar, Adam	87.50	75.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
Doerr, Ethan	77.78	72.22	66.67	44.44	0.00
Dicken, Neal	72.73	54.55	54.55	0.00	0.00
Emerick, Jeremy	77.27	45.45	81.82	13.64	0.00
Foster, Andrew	91.67	50.00	66.67	20.83	8.33
Fish, Andrew	100.00	75.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
Filar, Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Flick, Destry	75.00	58.33	41.67	33.33	8.33
Gray, Randy (RP	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Hahn, Zachary	100.00	25.00	75.00	0.00	0.00
Hixson, Duane	50.00	50.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
Holter, Ross	78.92	50.00	65.38	15.38	0.00
Jenne, Annie	90.91	45.45	63.64	9.09	0.00
Johnson, Derek	94.44	61.11	88.89	5.56	0.00
Magruder, Nick	89.47	57.89	73.68	15.79	5.26
McGrew, Joe	80.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
McCall, Jeff	66.67	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
McPherson, Scot	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mingus, Tracy	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Olexa, David	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
Reece, Andrew	82.35	41.18	52.94	47.06	0.00
Shaver, Travis	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Simpson, Thoma	90.00	100.00	40.00	10.00	0.00
Spear, Andrew	76.00	68.00	68.00	20.00	4.00
Warren, Matt	75.00	37.50	56.25	25.00	6.25
Wesselhoeft, D	90.00	70.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
Withers, John	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
Withers, Thomas	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
Total	80.34	53.65	65.45	15.45	1.97

The data above shows the percentage in which every officer employs each action response level as a percentage of the total number of use of force incidents per officer. For this analysis the sum total of each action response level was used (% = sum total per action response level per officer / sum total of incidents per officer). This data can be used to determine how often does each officer resort to each respective response level, when force is used in an arrest.

Officers	Level 1: Cooper	Level 2: Contact	Level 3: Compliance	Level 4: Defense	Level 5: Deadly Force
Boggs, Justin	6.27	4.03	7.83	1.12	0.00
Brandau, Roman	2.00	1.63	2.36	0.00	0.18
Brown, Cassand	2.23	2.23	2.48	0.00	0.00
Brooks, Ron	0.55	0.55	0.27	0.27	0.00
Claar, Adam	3.27	2.36	3.27	0.00	0.00
Doerr, Ethan	5.81	6.64	7.89	2.91	0.00
Dicken, Neal	1.45	1.27	1.81	0.00	0.00
Emerick, Jeremy	3.27	2.72	4.35	0.54	0.00
Foster, Andrew	4.17	3.08	4.54	0.91	0.36
Fish, Andrew	0.79	0.79	0.99	0.00	0.00
Filar, Robert	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Flick, Destry	1.63	1.81	1.27	0.73	0.18
Hahn, Zachary	6.42	1.60	6.42	0.00	0.00
Holter, Ross	3.81	3.45	4.17	0.73	0.00
Jenne, Annie	2.69	1.12	2.24	0.22	0.00
Johnson, Derek	5.15	3.72	7.44	0.29	0.00
Magruder, Nick	3.63	2.54	3.63	0.54	0.18
McGrew, Joe	1.65	1.44	1.85	0.00	0.00
McCall, Jeff	0.54	0.36	0.18	0.00	0.00
McPherson, Sco	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.00
Olexa, David	2.77	0.00	2.77	0.00	0.00
Reece, Andrew	3.30	1.65	3.30	1.65	0.00
Shaver, Travis	0.29	0.57	0.57	0.00	0.00
Simpson, Thoma	1.63	2.90	0.91	0.18	0.00
Spear, Andrew	3.99	3.99	4.90	0.91	0.18
Warren, Matt	2.18	1.63	2.18	0.73	0.18
Wesselhoeft, D	4.67	4.67	6.07	0.00	0.00
Withers, John	0.48	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.00
Withers, Thomas	1.23	1.23	0.00	1.23	0.00
Department Ave	1.95	1.61	2.17	0.34	0.04

The data above shows the rate in which every officer uses each action response level. For this analysis, the sum total of each action response level was normalized to each respective officers years on active duty during the time frame of the data (rate = sum total of each action response level per officer / years). This analysis can be used to compare how often each officer will use force and if so what level. This is distinct from the previous data which shows when force is used , what percentage of the time is each action level response employed.

Officers	Rate of Use of Force	Level 1: Cooper	Level 2: Contact	Level 3: Compliance	Level 4: Defense	Level 5: Deadly
Boggs, Justin	6.49	5.37	2.69	5.15	1.12	0.00
Brandau, Romar	2.36	1.81	1.09	1.45	0.00	0.18
Brown, Cassand	2.98	1.99	1.99	1.99	0.00	0.00
Brooks, Ron	0.55	0.55	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.00
Claar, Adam	2.90	2.54	2.18	2.18	0.00	0.00
Doerr, Ethan	7.06	5.40	4.98	4.57	2.91	0.00
Dicken, Neal	2.00	1.45	1.09	1.09	0.00	0.00
Emerick, Jeremy	3.99	3.08	1.81	3.27	0.54	0.00
Foster, Andrew	4.35	3.99	2.18	2.90	0.91	0.36
Fish, Andrew	0.79	0.79	0.59	0.79	0.00	0.00
Filar, Robert	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Flick, Destry	2.18	1.63	1.27	0.91	0.73	0.18
Hahn, Zachary	6.42	6.42	1.60	4.81	0.00	0.00
Holter, Ross	4.72	3.81	2.36	3.08	0.73	0.00
Jenne, Annie	2.46	2.24	1.12	1.57	0.22	0.00
Johnson, Derek	5.15	4.86	3.15	4.58	0.29	0.00
Magruder, Nick	3.45	3.08	2.00	2.54	0.54	0.18
McGrew, Joe	2.06	1.65	1.03	1.03	0.00	0.00
McCall, Jeff	0.54	0.36	0.36	0.18	0.00	0.00
McPherson, Sco	0.41	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00
Olexa, David	2.77	2.77	0.00	2.77	0.00	0.00
Reece, Andrew	3.50	2.89	1.44	1.86	1.65	0.00
Shaver, Travis	0.57	0.29	0.29	0.57	0.00	0.00
Simpson, Thoma	1.81	1.63	1.81	0.73	0.18	0.00
Spear, Andrew	4.54	3.45	3.08	3.08	0.91	0.18
Warren, Matt	2.90	2.18	1.09	1.63	0.73	0.18
Wesselhoeft, D	4.67	4.67	3.27	3.74	0.00	0.00
Withers, John	0.48	0.48	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.00
Withers, Thomas	1.23	1.23	1.23	0.00	1.23	0.00
Department Averi	2.12	1.75	1.18	1.42	0.34	0.04

This data is similar to the previous data, however, distinct in the fact it measured simply the presence of each action response level per incident, rather than the sum total of action responses per level. That's to say if an officer used take down and ground control, in the previous data set, this would be recorded as 2, level three response levels, whereas, it would be recorded as 1, in this data set. Essentially these two data sets measure the same thing, rate of each action response level per officer, by two different means.

Arresting Officer	Total Arrests	Years Employed During Data Range	Normalized Rate of Arrest
Unkown	64.00	N/A	N/A
DOERR, ETHAN	292.00	2.41	121.18
REECE, ANDRE	579.00	4.85	119.37
JENNE, AMELIA	496.00	4.47	111.03
MAGRUDER, NI	513.00	5.51	93.09
FOSTER, ANDR	504.00	5.51	91.45
WESSELHOEFT	180.00	2.14	84.07
JOHNSON, DER	291.00	3.49	83.27
FLICK, DESTRY	418.00	5.51	75.85
WARREN, MAT	409.00	5.51	74.22
BOGGS, JUSTIN	269.00	4.47	60.22
HAHN, ZACH	36.00	0.62	57.76
OLEXA, DAVID	20.00	0.36	55.30
CLAAR, ADAM	302.00	5.51	54.80
MCGREW, JOSE	265.00	4.85	54.61
SPEAR, ANDRE	294.00	5.51	53.35
BROWN, CASSA	210.00	4.03	52.14
WITHERS, JOH	100.00	2.09	47.77
EMERICK, JERI	263.00	5.51	47.72
MCPHERSON, :	109.00	2.42	45.06
BRANDAU, FRA	221.00	5.51	40.10
DICKEN, NEAL	207.00	5.51	37.56
HOLTER, ROSS	189.00	5.51	34.30
SIMPSON, TOM	182.00	5.51	33.02
BROOKS, RON	83.00	3.67	22.63
WITHERS, THO	15.00	0.81	18.50
SHAVER, TRAVI	34.00	3.49	9.73
FISH, ANTHON	48.00	5.05	9.51
FILAR, ROBERT	36.00	5.51	6.53
MCCALL, JEFF	29.00	5.51	5.26
CROSSEN, RIC	2.00	0.45	4.40
PYLE II, THOMA	10.00	5.51	1.81
HAEGELE, CHA	3.00	5.51	0.54
HARVEY, RALP	3.00	5.51	0.54
Total	6730.00		
This is actual total, including arrests by reserve officers			

This data shows the rate of arrest per officer. The rate is derived by dividing the # of arrest per officers / their respective years on active duty during the data time frame.

Arresting Officer	Black/African American Arrests	White Arrests	Total Arrests	Black/African American Percentage of Arrests	White Percentage of Arrests	Black/African American rate of Arrest	White Rate of Arrest	Rate of Black/African American vs White Rate of Arrest
unknown	9	42	64	14.06	65.63	2.65	0.78	3.38
EMERICK , JER	35	181	263	13.31	68.82	2.51	0.82	3.05
OFFICER, SPE	4	25	35	11.43	71.43	2.16	0.85	2.52
FILAR , ROBER	4	29	36	11.11	80.56	2.10	0.96	2.18
BROWN, CASS	24	183	212	11.32	86.32	2.14	1.03	2.07
JOHNSON, DEF	31	241	295	10.51	81.69	1.98	0.98	2.03
HAHN, ZACH	4	32	36	11.11	88.89	2.10	1.06	1.97
CLAAR , ADAM	30	249	302	9.93	82.45	1.87	0.99	1.90
FLICK , DESTRE	41	344	416	9.86	82.69	1.86	0.99	1.88
REECE, ANDRE	51	480	579	8.81	82.90	1.66	0.99	1.68
HOLTER , ROS	15	144	189	7.94	76.19	1.50	0.91	1.64
SIMPSON , TOM	16	156	182	8.79	85.71	1.66	1.03	1.62
DOERR, ETHAN	23	227	293	7.85	77.47	1.48	0.93	1.60
WARREN , MAT	27	297	406	6.65	73.15	1.25	0.88	1.43
BROOKS , RON	6	69	83	7.23	83.13	1.36	0.99	1.37
MCGREW, JOSI	19	226	263	7.22	85.93	1.36	1.03	1.33
WESSELHOEFT	12	146	180	6.67	81.11	1.26	0.97	1.30
DICKEN , NEAL	14	176	209	6.70	84.21	1.26	1.01	1.25
OLEXA , DAVID	1	13	20	5.00	65.00	0.94	0.78	1.21
WITHERS , THO	1	13	15	6.67	86.67	1.26	1.04	1.21
JENNE, AMELIA	31	436	496	6.25	87.90	1.18	1.05	1.12
BOGGS, JUSTIN	17	241	269	6.32	89.59	1.19	1.07	1.11
FOSTER , ANDR	30	450	502	5.98	89.64	1.13	1.07	1.05
MAGRUDER, NI	30	454	513	5.85	88.50	1.10	1.06	1.04
SPEAR , ANDRI	17	267	294	5.78	90.82	1.09	1.09	1.00
BRANDAU , FRA	12	189	219	5.43	86.43	1.02	1.03	0.99
SHAVER, TRAV	2	32	34	5.88	94.12	1.11	1.13	0.99
WITHERS , JOH	4	86	100	4.00	86.00	0.75	1.03	0.73
MCPHERSON ,	4	98	109	3.67	89.91	0.69	1.08	0.64
MCCALL , JEFF	1	25	29	3.45	86.21	0.65	1.03	0.63
FISH , ANTHON	1	36	48	2.08	75.00	0.39	0.90	0.44
CROSSEN , RICHARD			2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HAEGELE , CHARLES		3	3	0.00	100.00	0.00	1.20	0.00
HARVEY , RALPH		3	3	0.00	100.00	0.00	1.20	0.00
PYLE II , THOMAS D		8	10	0.00	80.00	0.00	0.96	0.00
Grand Total	519	5618	6730	7.71	83.48	1.46	1.00	1.46

This data compares the rate of arrest between black/African Americans and whites for each officer. The rates of arrest per race were determined by normalizing the percentage of arrest per race by their respective city population percentage. Then the rate of black/African American arrests was divided by the rate of white arrests ($[\text{Black/African American \% of arrests} / \text{Black/African American \% population}] / [\text{White \% of arrests} / \text{white \% of population}]$). It should be noted that the most recent comprehensive demographic population data available is from the 2010 census. Black only and white only (including hispanics) population data were used in this analysis, which were 5.3 and 83.6% respectively. When making conclusions from all the data presented, please keep in mind the limitations of this data and the effect of sample sizes.

Key Findings

Rate of Use of Force

Officer	Rate	Number of Incidents	Rate vs Department Ave
Ethan Doerr	7.06	18	3.33x
Justin Boggs	6.49	29	3.06x
Derek Johnson	5.15	18	2.43x

Zachary Hahn was excluded from this analysis as he only had 4 incidents

The average for active officers is 2.12

Rate of Level 4 Action Response

Officer	Rate	Number of Incidents	Rate vs Department Ave
Ethan Doerr	2.91	7	8.56x
Andrew Reece	1.65	8	4.85
Justin Boggs	1.12	5	3.29

Thomas Withers was excluded from this analysis as he only had 1 incident

The average for active officers is 0.34

The values for the top three officers is the same for both methods of measurement (sum and by incident)

Percentage of level 4 action response

Officer	Percentage	Number of Incidents	Rate vs Department Ave
Andrew Reece	47%	8	3.1x
Ethan Doerr	44%	7	2.9x
Destry Flick	33%	4	2.2x

Thomas Withers and Ron Brooks were both excluded from this analysis due to small sample size

Department average is 15%

TASER Deployment

Officer	Rate	Number of Incidents	Rate vs Department Ave
Ethan Doerr	2.49	6	12.45x
Andrew Reece	0.82	4	4.10x
Andrew Foster	0.73	4	3.65x

Thomas Withers was excluded from this analysis as he only had one incident

The average for active officers is 0.20

Takedowns

Officer	Rate	Number of Incidents	Rate vs Department Ave
Derek Johnson	3.43	12	3.65x
Ethan Doerr	3.32	8	3.53x
Justin Boggs	3.13	14	3.33x

Zachary Hahn was excluded from this analysis as he only had 3 incidents

The average for active officers is 0.94

Action Response Classification from ACSO

- **Level 1 – (Compliant)** The subject actions are perceived by the deputy to be *compliant*. The appropriate level of action-response is *cooperative controls*, including *deputy presence, hand signals, verbal commands and instructions, light touching or patting*, etc. In other words, cooperation at this level is a *two-way street*.
- **Level 2 – (Passively Resistant)** The subject actions are perceived by the deputy to be *passively resistant*. The appropriate level of action-response is *contact controls*, including *soft empty hand techniques, hand and arm holds, pressured physical movement of the suspect, pressure point control tactics, joint manipulation, escort techniques, TASER® display / spark display* etc.
- **Level 3 – (Actively Resistant)** The subject actions are perceived by the deputy to be *actively resistant*. The appropriate action-response is *compliance techniques*. This is the threshold for any reasonable deputy to consider this suspect to be a potential threat to himself, the deputy, or other citizens. Compliance techniques may include *all reasonable* means to cause the *suspect to comply as soon as reasonably possible*. These techniques may include *use of chemical weapons, electronic stun device, TASER®, K-9 Bites, use of restraints, compelled movement, grounding techniques, compel a suspect's limbs behind his back, or using other forms of a rough physical response*, etc. Once suspects are perceived as *actively resistant*, deputies should not relax care until the subject is fully secured.
- **Level 4 – (Assaultive & A Threat to Bodily Harm)** The subject actions are perceived by the deputy to be *assaultive – and a threat to bodily harm*. The appropriate level of action-response is *immediate defensive tactics*. The original assaultive behavior may have been directed at a fellow suspect, apparent victim, or the deputy. *Defensive tactics* may include *impact weapons, hard empty hand techniques, Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint (LVNR)* [if the deputy is trained and has demonstrated proficiency in its use] *or any other reasonable means available* and at hand to stop the aggression, defend against the attack, and bring the suspect into compliance. It is contemplated and understood that reasonable deputies, while employing defensive tactics, may cause injury, serious injury, and in some isolated instances, death without intending such consequences.
- **Level 5 – (Assaultive & Serious Threat of Bodily Harm or Death)** The subject actions are perceived by the deputy to be *assaultive – serious bodily harm or death*. The appropriate level of action-response is a *deadly response*. Deadly response includes firearms, knives, or any other means immediately available that a reasonable deputy, in the same circumstance, would consider as potentially causing death or serious bodily injury.