THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

& THE NATIONAL TACTICAL OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

National Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Study:

A National Assessment of Critical Trends and Issues from 2009 to 2013

The International Association of Chiefs of Police & the
National Tactical Officers Association

National Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Study:

A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF CRITICAL TRENDS AND ISSUES FROM 2009 TO 2013

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....v
INTRODUCTION.....1
SURVEY METHODOLOGY.....3
- Research Design.....3
- Sampling.....3
- Data Collection.....4
- Weighting.....4

FINDINGS.....7
- Organization and Volume.....7
- SWAT Access and Composition.....8
- Policy and Training.....11
- Command.....15
- Community Relations.....17
- SWAT Activity.....18
- Conclusion.....20

APPENDIX A: ADVISORY BOARD MEETING I OVERVIEW NOVEMBER 20, 2013.....21
APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP MEETING OVERVIEW AUGUST 22, 2014.....25
APPENDIX C: ADVISORY BOARD MEETING II OVERVIEW NOVEMBER 6, 2014.....27
APPENDIX D: SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....29

Table of Tables

Table 1a: NTOA Region in Frame....4
Table 1b: NTOA Region for Complete Cases Unweighted....4
Table 1c: NTOA Region for Complete Cases Weighted....4
Table 2: Number of Officers and Overall Demand for Service....7
Table 3: Access to SWAT and Participation in SWAT....8
Table 4: How Agencies Refer to their SWAT Team?....8
Table 5: Status and Duties of the SWAT Team Members....9
Table 6: SWAT Agreement....9
Table 7: Selection Criteria for Agency SWAT Team Members....10
Table 8: SWAT Personnel Authorized in Agencies....10
Table 9: Sources of Agency Team Policies and Procedures....11
Table 10: How Often Agencies Review Current Training, Operations, and Policy Related to SWAT?....12
Table 11: Emergency Medical Procedures Agencies Instituted for SWAT Training and/or Operations....13
Table 12: After-Action Reporting Following Deployment....13
Table 13: Source(s) for Team's Training and Performance Standards....14
Table 14: Total Number of Hours All SWAT Personnel Spent Training....14
Table 15: Level of Impact the Following Factors had on Agency's SWAT Activities over the Last 5 Years....14
Table 16: Authority and Command....15
Table 17: Elements an Agency's SWAT Team has Access to....16
Table 18: Who has the Decision-Making Authority?....16
Table 19: SWAT Teams and Community Relations....17
Table 20: Types of Complaints Agencies have Received Concerning SWAT Operations, from 2009 through 2013...18
Table 21: SWAT Activity 2009-2013....19

***Survey respondents provided detailed information to support their answers. This report includes some of the descriptive information collected.*

Executive Summary

Prior research tells us Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) approaches vary across all of the state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies in the United States (U.S.), of which there are more than 17,000. In particular, SWAT staffing levels, composition, policies, training, and deployment can fluctuate noticeably when looking at major, midsize, and smaller agencies. Looking at SWAT operations from a policy perspective (refer to the NTOA Tactical Response and Operations Standard at http://ntoa.org/swat-standard/ or the IACP Model Policy on SWAT or Use of Force at http://www.iacp.org/model-policy) we also know there are substantial variations in the components that go into a SWAT or special operations unit, including, but not limited to, tactical, canine, conflict resolution, and medical response. The compositions of SWAT units vary as well, from functions staffed exclusively by full-time personnel, to those operated by part-time personnel, and those which use both full- and part-time personnel. SWAT is often included in a broader special operations division (SOD) in many major county and city departments. There is also variation in the jurisdictional reach of SWAT, with some designed as city- or county-specific, while others may serve multiple cities within a specified region. Lastly, local SWAT teams often work in partnership with federal SWAT or special operations units, further complicating how SWAT activity statistics are collected, analyzed, and reported.

Over the past several decades, the National Tactical Officers Association (NTOA) has worked diligently to create and support the implementation of best practice policies into SWAT operations across the U.S. Performance standards have been developed, as well as guidelines for minimum training, model policies, and learning validation, measuring officer comprehension and retention of policy details. Due to the complexity of the issue and a need from the law enforcement field, the NTOA contracted the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) to conduct a national research study assessing critical trends and issues related to SWAT in the United States from 2009 through 2013. To avoid any unintended bias, the IACP engaged the services of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to provide data analysis.

Through the development and implementation of the national survey, the NTOA has collected information from 254 law enforcement agencies regarding teams composed of specially selected, trained, and equipped personnel who are activated and, if necessary, deployed to resolve high-risk incidents.

Many individuals have a reasonable interest in understanding SWAT practices more fully, particularly citizens, the media, community organizations, and governing bodies. Generally, these individuals rarely get a chance to hear firsthand from either SWAT members or those involved in a SWAT action, which could help them better understand the complexities of SWAT deployments. This report reveals the results of the research studies and looks into the composition of SWAT teams, protocols, practices, training procedures, community relations, deployment decisions, outcomes, and incident reporting.

Based on the analysis of the data, several important conclusions emerged:

- The sample included agencies of all sizes serving both large and smaller populations. In terms of the number of calls for service each year, the mean and median both indicated a sizable volume of calls requiring a response by an officer.
- Over 60 percent of the 254 respondents had their own SWAT team in 2013, which was the year of the survey.
- Almost all of the respondents had teams comprised of part-time officers who have other responsibilities outside of SWAT. A very small percentage had full-time SWAT officers with no collateral duties.
- Officers being considered for SWAT teams are screened on the basis of an oral interview, minimum years of service, firearms proficiency test results, and physical proficiency test results.
- The most common source of agency team policies and procedures came from their own agency, NTOA, state or regional tactical association, municipal or county law enforcement agency, and the IACP.
- The majority of reporting agencies conducted a review of their training, operations, and policies related to SWAT annually.
- Across the nation, more than half of the responding agencies reported their SWAT team included paramedics.
- Almost all of the agencies reported an after-action report is completed after every SWAT deployment.
- Responding agencies refered to NTOA; state or regional tactical officers associations; federal, municipal or county law enforcement agencies; and recommendations from the IACP for training and performance standards.
- Almost all of the responding agencies reported their curriculum included training in high-risk operations, negotiations, specialty munitions, SWAT management, tactical firearms, and tactics.
- The factor that seemed to have the greatest positive impact was technology. The factor reported as having the least postive impact was mass media.
- Respondents reported that once a SWAT team was deployed, it typically had access to emergency medical support, a hostage or crisis negotiator, a precision long rifle team, and canine support.
- In almost all situations, most respondents reported the decision-making authority at the scene rests with the incident commander.
- Most agency respondents reported their SWAT team had a positive impact on local community relations.
- On a national level, the types of complaints received most often during the survey period with regard to SWAT operations included grievances regarding property damage and unspecified types of complaints.
- The most common incident involving activation of a SWAT team from 2009 through 2013 was a high-risk warrant service incident.
- Agencies that activated their SWAT team indicated they were eight times more likely to use less-lethal solutions than lethal force.
- In terms of incidents that occurred during deployment of SWAT teams or resources by year, the incident type that occurred most often was one in which a suspect was armed or firearms were found.

The 254 responses collected from the IACP NTOA National SWAT Study has significant value to the law enforcement field and beyond, and will contribute to a better understanding of the purpose, structure, and operations of SWAT practices across the country.

Introduction

In 2001, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) released its study on ***Police Use of Force in America***, which represented three years of research in partnership with the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and was intended to provide reliable and current data on police use of force practices in response to intense media scrutiny in the post-Rodney King era. While it is often assumed the police use of force rates are significantly higher, the report confirmed the rate of any type of force, from hands-on injury to firearm deaths, for every 10,000 responses to calls for service in which an officer was dispatched and made contact with a citizen was four incidents.[1]

Law enforcement, specifically Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) operations, still finds itself under scrutiny by the public. A review of recent national press coverage reveals selected incidents in which SWAT team actions were called into question included insufficient intelligence prior to the action, excessive force during the deployment, and mistakes in location (i.e., entering the wrong house). Regardless of whether these incidents are found to be in error or justifiable, the media coverage opens the door to conjecture that American policing may be moving toward 'militarization' and the overly-aggressive use of SWAT activation for situations that could be handled alternatively with less destruction of property and injury to suspects.

With this in mind, the National Tactical Officers Association (NTOA) turned to the IACP, to conduct a national study, which would assess critical trends and issues related to SWAT activities in the United States (U.S.) from 2009 through 2013. The goal of the initiative was to provide an accurate view of SWAT actions from a statistically-defined perspective over time, as opposed to relying on anecdotal incidents of alleged misconduct in order to inform the field, public, and media about the true nature of SWAT practices.

In order to achieve this goal, the IACP: 1) developed advisory and focus groups to assist in the development of the survey instrument and guide the research project; 2) developed and conducted a national survey for law enforcement to provide information on deployment, utilization, and organization of tactical teams; and 3) produced this final report, which includes a thorough analysis of current practices, trends, and issues to reflect a national representation of all U.S. state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. In order to avoid any unintended bias, the IACP engaged the services of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to provide thorough data analysis and compile survey results. The results covered in this document tie together what was learned from the survey results to the outcomes from focus group and advisory board meetings conducted over two years. Much like the IACP's earlier study on law enforcement use of force, the historical and anecdotal information on SWAT mobilizations indicates there was reduced injury to suspects and officers based on the skills of SWAT officers, and the array of less lethal options they have access to.

1 "Police Use of Force in America, 2001" p. 9. International Association of Chiefs of Police. 2001, http://www.theiacp.org/Portals/0/pdfs/Publications/2001useofforce.pdf.

Survey Methodology

RESEARCH DESIGN

Advisory Board

The IACP and NTOA carefully selected 15 subject matter experts to provide outset, ongoing, and end-product advice over the course of the study. Advisory board members included a mayor, member of the research field, medical professional, and prosecutor, as well as law enforcement leaders, SWAT commanders, and legal officers. Advisory board members met twice over the project period to discuss the survey's design, content, and end-product format as well as improvement to protocols and the current needs of the field. (See Appendices A and C for Advisory Board Meetings Minutes).

Development of the National Survey

Drawing from feedback gathered during the advisory group meeting, the IACP staff worked with the NORC to develop the IACP NTOA National SWAT Survey instrument. The group worked to ensure the instrument was without bias, user-friendly in its presentation to reduce responder frustration, and the content would yield answers to all critical questions regarding SWAT operations. The IACP NTOA National SWAT Survey was developed and pretested by NTOA and IACP members. The survey format included both fixed-response and open-ended questions focused on seven areas of interest: SWAT team composition, policies, training, command, protocols, community relations, and incidents. The response period was October through December of 2014, and a total of 254 responses were received during this timeframe.

Focus Group

The IACP, in collaboration with the NTOA, held a focus group in August 2014 with 10 selected law enforcement experts, varying in rank, department size, and region of the country, to offer substantive information, highlight successes, and address critical issues related to SWAT activities. The focus group discussed the overall survey research approach, militarization of police, future of SWAT, and needs of the field. The information gained during the one-day event helped inform this final report. (See Appendix B for Focus Group Minutes).

SAMPLING

The IACP project team worked to determine the universe of SWAT operations to be studied and the best sources to obtain a representative sample of these operations. In preparing to conduct this study, the sampling approach focused on 3,643 cases of NTOA membership data. After cleaning and deduplication, a set of 999 cases emerged. This data set was assessed for consistency with characteristics of region and size distributions observed in the 2008 Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA) and was found to be comparable.[2] The data was further reduced to 865 cases determined to be eligible based on the desired makeup and SWAT presence. A power analysis was conducted to determine an adequate sample size to conduct the type of assessment intended for the use of the data being collected using a stratification by the

2 United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA), 2008 (ICPSR 27681) http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2216

NTOA regions (West, Central, and East) and by agency size. It was determined a sample of 828 would be adequate to produce an 80-85 percent power to detect moderate effects (i.e., differences between subgroups) at alpha=.05.

However, since the data on agency size was only available for agencies in existence at the time of the 2008 CSLLEA and the size of the available frame was not unduly larger than the target sample size from the power analysis, it was decided to field the survey using the entire list of 865 eligible respondents. This gave the possibility of reaching agencies not in place before the last CSLLEA and in light of typically lower response rates present in online surveys, it also increased the possibility to obtain a larger number of completions, which would be the case with a smaller sample.

DATA COLLECTION

The IACP project team proposed a mixed-method approach to data collection. Agencies identified in the sample were invited by mail to participate in the electronic survey. Agencies were provided with a website link to the online survey and an identification code. Each agency was given a five digit code in order to maintain anonymity. By request, agencies could fill out a hard copy version. Agency contacts were primarily executive level personnel; however, there were no restrictions on who from the agency completed the survey. Additional follow-up calls and emails were conducted to help improve the response rate.

WEIGHTING

In the frame used to field the survey, cases were distributed across regions as seen in **Table 1a**.

The 254 completions were found to distribute across the regions in proportions not significantly different from those of the frame (see **Table 1b**).

Since there was no reason to suspect a systematic influence on nonresponse, post-stratification weights were used to adjust for nonresponse in order to distribute responding cases across the regions in the original proportions. The weighted sample of completions distributes across the regions as follows in **Table 1c**.

These weights reflect the original stratification by region and do not distort results of analyses conducted by region. However, caution should be used if another stratification is necessary for the analysis, unless the results are checked against unweighted computations in case the second variable distributes unevenly across the regions.

Table 1a: NTOA Region in frame

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Central	329	38.0
	East	364	42.1
	West	171	19.8
	Total	865	100.0

Table 1b: NTOA Region for complete cases unweighted

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Central	92	36.2
	East	107	42.1
	West	55	21.7
	Total	254	100.0

Table 1c: NTOA Region for complete cases weighted

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Central	329	38.1
	East	364	42.1
	West	171	19.8
	Total	865	100.0

For example, if the data are further broken down by size of agency, it is unknown whether the size variable distributes proportionately across regions; thus, weighted analysis could exaggerate the results in this case. It would be better to assess this as an unweighted analysis unless or until it became possible to check the distribution of size for the sample of completions against the frame and build the variable in question into the post-stratification.

A second instance in which unweighted analysis would be a more conservative approach is if the assessments are completed based on estimates made retrospectively over the course of multiple years, in which it cannot be determined if other characteristics of the sample have changed over those years and the data are actually based on questionnaire responses collected at a single point in time. In this case, inflating the numbers to the frame sizes could also overestimate the differences observed from a small sample of completed cases, which may not represent the frame proportionately for the variables in question. Results of these analyses should be treated descriptively and only interpreted for the obtained sample rather than as inferring to the population.

Definitions

Mean: The average of all the numbers in the distribution.

Mode: The most frequently appearing number in the distribution.

Median: The number in the middle of the distribution.

Findings

The IACP NTOA National SWAT Survey was designed to be representative of the broadest range of SWAT programs and address important questions regarding the use of SWAT by law enforcement agencies across the nation. The results of the survey should serve as a primary research policy platform for agencies seeking to deliver SWAT services that improve and enhance capacities. From this survey, a number of important observations were learned. The following are the survey's findings.

ORGANIZATION AND VOLUME

The initial questions in the survey were intended to gather information about the range of sizes and types of organization in the reporting agencies, and whether or not there was any observable change over the years. For all respondents, **Table 2** shows from 2009 through 2013 the average number of sworn officers in the department, the total number of people served, and the number of calls for service they received requiring an officer response.

Table 2 shows little variance in the mean or average number of sworn officers in responding agencies, with 210 in 2009 and 200 in 2013. The median was 72 officers every year besides 2009, when it was 75. This means for half of the agencies surveyed, the number of officers in every year except 2009 was greater than 72, and for the other half it was less. These numbers suggest the sample includes smaller, midsize, and large agencies. The mean number of people served decreased from 501,690 in 2009 to 495,198 in 2013. In contrast, the mode increased from 50,000 in 2009 to 50,725 in 2013, but with some disparity across time. These changes were not significant over time, and similarly, the number of calls for service requiring an officer response was relatively steady. In summary, the sample includes smaller, midsize, and large agencies that serve paralleling populations.

Table 2: Number of Officers and Overall Demand for Service

	Total number of sworn officer		Total number of people served		The number of calls for service requiring an officer response*	
Year	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
2009	210	75	501690	50000	81005	33000
2010	191	72	430247	52000	82228	32274
2011	183	72	451812	51000	79619	32000
2012	182	72	449004	53000	78702	32667
2013	200	72	495198	50725	80735	33000

N = 245 observations used for this (some had missing values or weights)
**Response could be actual or estimated*

In terms of the number of calls for service each year, the mean and median both indicate a sizable volume of calls requiring a response by an officer.

SWAT ACCESS AND COMPOSITION

Given some variation in agency size, number of people served, and service required, the next set of questions asked respondents whether or not they had their own SWAT team, access to a SWAT team, and if they participated in a multi-agency SWAT team. **Table 3** shows more than 60 percent of the respondents said they had their own SWAT team in 2013, the year of the survey. More than 30 percent said they participated in a multi-agency SWAT team, and less than nine percent said they had no access to SWAT services.

Of the agencies participating in multi-agency teams, a little more than half said they loaned officers and resources to other agencies, and slightly less than half borrowed officers and resources. This indicates a majority of responding agencies leverage available resources by participating in the exchange of SWAT expertise.

As it relates to this study, 'deployment' means a team has taken SWAT-related tactical police action, whereas 'activated' means to put a team on notice of potential activation. Respondents with SWAT teams were asked how they referred to their SWAT team. **Table 4** shows that almost half said the team was called a Special Weapons and Tactics Team, and less than two percent said it was called a Special Operations Division.

Reporting agencies with SWAT teams were asked about the status and duties of team members. Almost 90 percent of the respondents said their teams were comprised of part-time officers who have other responsibilities outside of SWAT, demonstrated by **Table 5**.

Table 3: Access to SWAT and Participation in SWAT

	All Agencies		
Access to SWAT	Number	Percent	
My agency has its own SWAT Team	517	60.3	N=857
My agency participates in a multi-agency SWAT Team	265	30.9	
My agency has no access to SWAT services	75	8.79	
If Agency Participates in a Multi-Agency SWAT Team	Number	Percent	
Lends officers and resources to other agencies	212	52.4	N=265
Borrows officers and resouces from other agencies	192	47.6	

Table 4: How Agencies Refer to their SWAT Team

	Number	Percent
Special Weapons and Tactics Team	401	51.1
Special Response Team	113	14.3
Special Emergency Response Team	41	5.2
Emergency Response Team	87	11.1
Special Operations Team	13	1.7
Other	130	16.6

N = 785

Less than two percent said they have full-time SWAT officers with no collateral duties.

Respondents were then asked about the formal authority under which the SWAT team was organized and the areas of responsibility covered by the agreement. **Table 6** shows almost 85% reported having an agency policy related to SWAT activity. Similarly, most reporting agencies have standard operating procedures (77.4%), an external Memoranda of Understanding (66.4%), and a Threat Assessment Matrix (57.8%). These percentages were comparable across all regions.

Of the areas addressed in established agreements, **Table 6** shows that across the country and in all regions about half of all agencies reported having an agreement with other SWAT teams or agencies which included geographical boundaries and legal authority of mutual aid participants. In terms

Table 5: Status and Duties of the SWAT Team Members

	All Agencies	
	Number	Percent
Part-time (members have primary duties and responsibilities outside of the SWAT unit)	705	89.8
Full-time with collateral duties (members assigned full time to the SWAT unit)	20	2.6
Full-time (members have no collateral duties)	13	1.7
Both full- and part-time members	47	6

N = 785

Table 6: SWAT Agreement

	All Agencies		East Region		Central Region		West Region	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
SWAT-Related Agency Agreements								
An agency policy	731	84.6	302	83	279	84.8	149	873.
Standard written operating procedures	669	77.4	268	73.6	254	77.2	146	85.4
External memoranda of understanding (MOU)	574	66.4	248	68.1	211	64.1	115	67.3
Threat assessment matrix	499	57.8	194	53.3	193	58.7	112	65.4
Areas Addressed in the Established Agreements with other SWAT Teams or Agencies								
Geographical boundaries	431	49.9	184	50.5	154	46.7	93	54.5
Joint communications methodologies	358	41.4	167	45.8	129	39.1	62	36.4
Responsibilities regading concurrent jurisdiction	311	36.0	122	33.6	111	33.7	78	45.4
Procedures for activating the mutual aid agreement	558	64.6	228	62.6	222	67.4	109	63.6
Legal authority of mutual aid participants	456	52.8	191	52.3	175	53.3	90	52.7
Other	71	8.2	34	9.3	21	6.5	16	9.1

Total N=864 (East=364 Central=329 West=171)
Note: Column percentages equal more than 100 percent since respondents were asked to respond yes to all that applied.

Table 7: Selection Criteria for Agency SWAT Team Member

	All Agencies		East Region		Central Region		West Region	
Criteria	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Application	697	80.7	286	78.5	263	80.0	143	83.6
Minimum years of service	700	81.0	282	77.6	272	82.6	146	85.5
Physical proficiency test	712	82.4	299	82.2	257	78.3	155	90.9
Tactical proficiency test	472	54.6	225	61.7	157	47.8	90	52.7
Confidence test (water)	37	4.3	27	7.5	4	1.1	6	3.6
Oral interview	675	78.1	279	76.6	347	100.0	149	87.1
Written test	102	11.8	44	12.1	36	10.9	22	12.7
Background investigation of job performance	543	62.8	225	61.7	200	60.9	118	69.1
Firearms proficiency test	70.	81.4	299	82.2	261	79.3	143	83.6
Psychological assessment	151	17.5	78	21.5	36	10.9	37	21.8
Stress management assessment	152	17.6	88	24.3	36	10.9	28	16.4
Other	98	11.4	41	11.2	36	10.9	22	12.7

N=864

Based on actual or estimate. Note: Column percentages equal more than 100% since respondents were asked to respond yes to all that applied.

Table 8: SWAT Personnel Authorized in Agencies

Mean and Median by Year*

Rank	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
All Agencies	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Officers	14.8	12.0	14.9	12.0	14.7	12.0	14.9	12.0	15.3	12.0
Sergeants	2.8	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.7	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.8	2.0
Lieutenants	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
Captains or above	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0
East Region	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Officers	14.2	11.0	14.3	11.0	14.3	11.0	14.9	11.0	15.5	12.0
Sergeants	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0
Lieutenants	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
Captains or above	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0
Central Region	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Officers	13.7	11.0	13.8	11.0	13.5	11.0	13.1	11.0	13.5	12.0
Sergeants	3.3	2.0	3.2	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.1	2.5
Lieutenants	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
Captains or above	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
West Region	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Officers	18.1	16.0	18.1	15.5	17.7	16.0	17.7	17.0	18.3	17.0
Sergeants	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.0	2.7	2.0	2.8	2.0
Lieutenants	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0
Captains or above	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.0

N=864

of responsibilities regarding concurrent jurisdiction, only 36 percent had an agreement with other SWAT teams or agencies compared to slightly lesser percentages in the East and Central regions and more (45.4%) in the West region.

All reporting agencies identified the criteria used for the selection of SWAT team members. **Table 7** shows four out of every five agencies reported they used the application submitted by the person being considered, their oral interview, their minimum years of service, the result of their firearms proficiency test, and the results of their physical proficiency test. A water confidence test was the criterion considered by the fewest number of agencies responding to the survey (nationwide 4.3%; East 7.5%; Central 1.1%; and West 3.6%). Other criteria used by a small number of agencies included a written test (nationwide 11.8%; East 12.1%; Central 10.9%; and West 12.7%), a psychological assessment (nationwide 17.5%; East 21.5%; Central 10.9%; and West 21.8%), and a stress management assessment (nationwide 17.6%; East 24.3%: Central 10.9%; and West 16.4%).

Respondents to the survey were asked about the ranks of personnel within SWAT units. **Table 8** shows the mean and median numbers of SWAT-authorized personnel in the agency. In all regions, the greatest number in the unit in each agency included officers, followed by sergeants, then lieutenants, and then captains or higher ranks.

Interestingly, the mean or average number of each was fairly consistent across the years in all regions with few variations. In the East region, the mean number of SWAT officers in reporting departments ranged from 14.2 in 2009 to 15.5 in 2013. In the Central region, the mean number of SWAT officers ranged from a low of 13.1 in 2012 to a high of 13.8 in 2010. In the West region, where across time the mean and median number of officers was highest, the range was from a low mean of 17.7 officers in 2011 and 2012 to a high of 18.3 officers in 2013.

POLICY AND TRAINING

Respondents representing agencies with SWAT units were asked about the source of their SWAT team policies and procedures. **Table 9** shows agencies responding to the survey most often reported the source of SWAT team policies and procedures came from their own agency (85.4%). The next most common response was that policies and procedures came from NTOA (67.4%). More than a third of agencies responding reported a source of policy and procedure for their SWAT team came from a state or regional tactical association (41.6%) or from a municipal or county law enforcement agency (35.5%). One of every five (20.1%) reported a source was the IACP.

Table 9: Sources of Agency Team Policies and Procedures

Source	Number	Percent
Own agency	738	85.4
State/regional tactical officers association	359	41.6
Municipal or county law enforcement agency	307	35.5
Private Vendor	63	7.3
State law enforcement agency	92	10.6
U.S. military	61	7.1
Federal law enforcement agency	44	5.1
Foreign military	0	0.0
National Tactical Officers Association	582	67.4
International Association of Chiefs of Police	174	20.1
Other	41	4.7

N=864

Table 10: How Often Agencies Reviews Current Training, Operations, and Policy Related to SWAT

Time	Number	Percent
Following a SWAT team deployment	127	16.2
Monthly	166	21.2
Quarterly	34	4.4
Semi-Annually	34	4.4
Annually	317	40.5
Never	10	1.3
Other	94	12.1
If Reviewed, Level of Review	% Yes	
Agency legal counsel	9.6	
Agency leadership	30.7	
SWAT team personnel	54.1	
Local government	0.0	
Other	5.7	

N=782

In terms of policies for SWAT units and training of team personnel, respondents were asked how often their agency conducted a review of their current training, operations, and policy related to SWAT (see **Table 10**). Of all the agencies reporting, the greatest number of them (40.5%) responded a review was conducted annually. About one of every five (21.2%) reported they conduct a review monthly, while roughly one in every six (16.2%) reported that they conduct a review following a deployment. Of the agencies reporting that do conduct reviews, more than half reported the review is conducted at the level of SWAT team personnel.

About one-third (30.7%) reported the review is conducted at the level of agency leadership, and about one-tenth (9.6%) reported it is conducted at the level of agency counsel. Agencies responding to the survey were also asked about what emergency medical procedures they had instituted for their SWAT training teams and operations. **Table 11** shows that across the nation and in each region, about two-thirds (67%) of the agencies responding reported their procedure was to have an ambulance routinely on standby at or near the SWAT command post. Across the nation, more than half of the responding agencies nationwide (54.8%) reported that their SWAT team includes paramedics with some variation by region (East 59.8%; Central 53.3%; and West 47.3%). Nationally, one-third (34.6%) of the respondents reported there were medical personnel who routinely responded to the scene.

Agencies that reported having deployed a SWAT team were asked about after-action reporting by the agency. **Table 12** shows approximately 95 percent of all agencies responding to the survey reported an after-action report is completed after every SWAT deployment. Of those that do prepare a report, about one-third (30%) indicated that the report was made accessible to the agency head or other executive-level law enforcement; similarly, almost one-third (29.7%) reported the members of the SWAT team had access to the report. Approximately 10 percent responded the District or State's Attorney had access to the report.

Agencies responding to the survey regarding policy and training also reported on the source of training and performance standards followed by their SWAT unit and on the areas covered in their training curriculum. **Table 13** shows most agencies responding to the survey (85.4%) state the source of standards for their SWAT team training and performance came from their own agency. About

Table 11: Emergency Medical Procedures Agencies Instituted for SWAT Training and/or Operations

	All Regions		East Region		Central Region		West Region	
Procedure	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
SWAT Team includes paramedics	474	54.8	218	59.8	175	53.3	81	47.3
Medical personnel routinely respond to scene	299	34.6	109	29.9	122	36.9	68	40.0
Ambulance routinely on standby at or near command post	579	67.0	235	64.5	229	69.5	115	67.3
No EMS procedures	10	1.2	0	0.0	7	2.2	3	1.8
Other	183	21.1	78.	21.5	61	18.5	44	25.4

N=864
Note: Column percentages equal more than 100 percent since respondents were asked to respond yes to all that applied.

Table 12: After-Action Reporting Following Deployment

Time	Yes (Number)	Percent
After-Action Report is Completed After Every SWAT Deployment	734	94.7
Who Has Access to Review Agency's After-Action Report?	% Yes	
Magistrate/Judge	4.6	
District/State attorney	9.5	
Chief of Police/Executive Level Law Enforcement	30.0	
SWAT Team	29.7	
Law Enforcement Personnel	10.3	
County/Town Executive	4.7	
City Council	2.9	
Public Record	6.2	
Other	2.1	

N=864

three-fourths (74.6%) reported they used standards of the NTOA, and approximately half (49.7%) responded they used standards from a state or regional tactical officers association. Roughly 40 percent said they used standards from a municipal or county law enforcement agency. About 20 percent said they came from the IACP; similarly, about 23 percent said the standards came from those of a federal law enforcement agency. More than one-fourth (27.2%) of the agencies reported they used standards from a private vendor. In terms of areas of curriculum, **Table 13** shows for almost all agencies the curriculum for SWAT training was extensive. Between 84 and almost 90 percent of all responding agencies reported their curriculum includes training in high-risk operations, negotiations, specialty munitions, SWAT management, tactical firearms, and tactics.

Agencies responding to the survey were asked about the number of hours SWAT personnel spent in training. **Table 14** shows the mean and mode number of hours for agencies in the various regions across all years from 2009 to 2013. Across the U.S., SWAT teams received on average more than 1,400 hours of training. However, the mode was closer to 240 hours. By region, the table shows some variation. The mean across the years were similar for the U.S. as a whole and for the East region, but they were lower in the Central region, ranging from 1,061 hours in 2013 to 1,122 in 2011, and higher in

Table 13: Source(s) for Team's Training and Performance Standards

Source	Yes (Number)	Percent
Own agency	738	85.4
State/regional tactical officers association	430	49.7
Municipal or county law enforcement agency	349	49.7
Private vendor	235	27.2
State law enforcement agency	164	19.0
U.S. Military	139	16.1
Federal law enforcement agency	199	23.0
Other	51	5.9
Training Curriculum Areas	**Yes (Number)**	**Percent**
High Risk Patrol Operations	774	89.6
Negotiations	726	84.0
Specialty Munitions	774	89.6
SWAT Management	723	83.7
Tactical Firearms	771	89.2
Tactics	771	89.2

N=864

Table 14: Total Number of Hours All SWAT Personnel Spent Training

2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
All Regions: Mean and Mode by Year*									
Mean	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**
1,406.6	232.0	1,418.5	240.0	1.416.0	240.0	1,440.8	240.0	1,455.1	240.0
East Region: Mean and Mode by Year*									
Mean	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**
1,407.1	232.0	1,442.5	236.0	1,398.5	232.0	1,487.9	232.0	1,528.2	232.0
Central Region: Mean and Mode by Year*									
Mean	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**
1,098.9	208.0	1,111.6	208.0	1,122.2	218.0	1,076.9	240.0	1,061.0	240.0
West Region: Mean and Mode by Year*									
Mean	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**	**Mean**	**Mode**
2,020.3	243.0	1,965.0	256.0	2,021.7	248.0	2,038.4	240.0	2,031.7	245.0

*N=864 *Actual or estimate*

Table 15: Level of Impact the Following Factors had on Agency's SWAT Activities over the Last 5 Years

Percent Indicating an Impact at One Level or Another

	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative Nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
Technology	0.0	4.4	15.4	48.2	32.0
Budget	12.0	30.7	25.1	21.8	10.5
Social Media	1.4	20.5	58.4	15.8	4.0
Local Media (newspaper, television)	0.5	13.8	55.7	24.3	5.8
Mass Media (television, films, video games)	5.8	25.5	59.8	5.8	3.1

N=864

the West region, ranging from 1,965 hours in 2010 to 2,038 in 2012.

One question covered the impact of different factors on the agency's SWAT activities. Respondents to the survey were asked if the impact of a set of factors over the last 5 years. According to the responses of the survey, **Table 15** shows the factor that seemed to have the greatest positive impact was technology, with 32 percent saying it had a highly positive impact, and an additional 48 percent saying it had a somewhat positive impact. The budget had the most negative impact, with 12 percent of the agency respondents reporting it had an very negative impact and an additional 31 percent saying it had a somewhat negative impact. Almost 60% of respondents reported the mass media had neither a negative or positive impact on SWAT activities over the last five years. However, one out of four respondents found mass media had a somewhat negative impact on SWAT activities over the last five years.

COMMAND

Another set of questions in the survey asked agency respondents about the command of SWAT units; specifically, who in the agency had authority to deploy a SWAT team for their agency. **Table 16** shows the greatest number of respondents reported the authority rests with a SWAT commander or chief executive of the agency. Of all respondents, 33.3 percent said the authority came from the SWAT commander or supervisor, 29.5 percent replied it came from the chief executive, 16.2 percent stated it came from the watch commander, and 12.3 percent responded it came from the field supervisor. Only 2.1 percent said the first officer on the scene could deploy a SWAT unit, and less than one percent said it could be deployed by either the mayor or a county executive.

Respondents were asked what elements or department resources a SWAT team had access to once the SWAT unit has been deployed. **Table 17** shows 80 percent or more of the respondents reported once they deploy a SWAT team, it has access to emergency medical support, a hostage or crisis negotiator, a precision long rifle team, and canine support. More than half, but fewer than 80 percent, of the responding agencies reported their SWAT team has access to animal control, social services, bomb technology, an armored vehicle, a robot, explosives, and video or audio taping equipment. Over one-third of respondents reported their SWAT team would have access to aviation (38.1%), marine support (34.5%), and body-worn cameras (27.1%).

Once a SWAT unit is deployed, a vast number of decisions need to be made and actions taken in a short amount of time under extremely stressful conditions.

Table 16: Authority and Command

	All Agencies	
Who has the Authority to Deploy the SWAT Team	Number	Percent
First officer on the scene	41	2.1
Field supervisor	238	12.3
Watch commander	314	16.2
SWAT commander/supervisor	647	33.3
Chief executive	573	29.5
Mayor	14	0.7
County Executive	17	0.9
Other	98	5.1

N=864

Table 17: Elements an Agency's SWAT Team has Access to

	All Agencies	
	Number	Percent
Hostage/Crisis Negotiator	758	87.7
Emergency Medical Support	758	87.8
Social Services	545	63.1
Animal Control	635	73.5
Precision Long Rifle Team (Sniper)	750	86.8
Bomb Tech	516	59.8
K-9	693	80.2
Armored Vehicle	672	77.8
Robot	582	67.4
Explosives	4.8	50.8
Video and/or Audio Taping	525	60.7
Body-Worn Cameras	234	27.1
Aviation	329	38.1
Marine	298	34.5

N=864

Table 18: Who has the Decision-Making Authority?

	SWAT Officers	Incident Commander	Chief Executive	Other
Who can make the decision on the scene?	% Yes	% Yes	% Yes	% Yes
Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in hostage/barricade situations?	7.8	62.1	17.3	12.8
Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in the use of chemical agents?	6.9	67.4	12.0	13.7
Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in explosive breach situations	4.8	55.3	16.8	23.1
Who can authorize a no knock warrant?	% Yes			
Magistrate/Judge	76.6			
District/State Attorney	7.4			
Chief Executive	3.1			
Incident Commander	6.7			
County/Town Executive	0.0			
Other	6.2			

N=864

Respondents to the survey were asked who has decision-making authority on the scene, excluding exigent circumstance. **Table 18** shows for almost all situations, most respondents reported the authority to make decisions at the scene rests with the incident commander. In the case of a hostage or barricade situation, 62.1 percent of respondents said the decision-making authority rests with the incident commander.

Table 19: SWAT Teams and Community Relations

How Agencies See the Impact of its SWAT Team on Community Relations	Number	Percent
Very Negative	0	0.0
Somewhat Negative	13	1.7
Neither Negative nor Positive	242	31.3
Somewhat Positive	307	39.5
Very Positive	213	27.5

How Agencies See the Level of Impact on the Public's Perception of Agency SWAT Activities, 2009 and 2013					
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative Nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
Social Media	0.5	13.5	54.5	23.2	8.3
Local Media (newspaper, television)	0.0	9.1	44.3	36.6	9.9
Mass Media (television, films, video games)	4.0	18.7	61.6	10.9	4.8

N=776

Similarly, in situations involving chemical agents, 67.4 percent of respondents said the decision-making authority rests with the incident commander, as did 55.3 percent of the respondents when asked about situations involving an explosive breach. According to respondents, the decision-making authority at the scene rarely rests with SWAT officers. **Table 18** also shows what respondents said about who can authorize a no-knock warrant. Of all respondents, 76.6 percent said it was a magistrate or judge. Some respondents said it could be a district or state's attorney or even an incident commander or chief executive; however, none of the respondents said it could be a county or town executive.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Agency respondents to the survey were asked questions regarding the relationship between SWAT units of law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve. **Table 19** shows of all respondents, two-thirds said their impact on community relations was either very positive (27.5%) or somewhat positive (39.5%). None reported it was very negative, and only 1.7 percent reported it was somewhat negative. In terms of the impact of media on the public perception of SWAT activities, most respondents reported that for social media and mass media, such as television, films, video games, the impact was neither positive nor negative. For local media, including newspapers and television, 44.3% of the respondents found the impact as neither positive nor negative.

In terms of community relations, respondents were asked about the types of complaints agencies have received concerning SWAT activities. **Table 20** shows the types of complaints received by agencies with regard to SWAT operations for the period from 2009 through 2013 in the U.S. and by region. On a national level, the types of complaints received most often during this period with regard to SWAT operations included complaints about property damage (37.8%) and unspecified types of complaints (other = 30.2%). This pattern essentially repeated itself across the country with complaints about property damage being the most frequently

Table 20: Types of Complaints Agencies have Received Concerning SWAT Operations, from 2009 through 2013

	All Regions		East Region		Central Region		West Region	
Complaint	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Excessive use of force	119	13.8	78	21.5	29	8.7	12	7.3
Unlawful tactics	14	1.6	7	1.9	7	2.2	0	0.0
Unlawful search and seizure	41	4.7	24	6.5	11	3.3	6	3.6
Unlawful entry	42	4.8	27	7.5	14	4.3	0	0.0
Property damage	327	37.8	119	32.7	139	42.4	68	40.0
Wrongful death	41	4.7	20	5.6	14	4.3	6	3.6
Decision to deploy/activate SWAT	88	10.2	24	6.5	39	11.9	25	14.5
Other	261	30.2	102	28.0	97	29.3	62	36.3

N=864

reported by agency respondents in the East (32.7%), Central (42.4%), and West (40.0%).

Table 20 also shows the least-often reported type of complaint received concerning SWAT operations according to agency respondents included unlawful tactics (national 1.6%; East 1.9%; Central 2.2%; and West 0.0%). Similarly, agency respondents reported low numbers of complaints about unlawful search and seizure (national 4.7%; East 6.5%; Central 3.3%; and West 3.6%), unlawful entry (national 4.8%; East 7.5%; Central 4.3%; and West 0.0%), and wrongful death (national 4.7%; East 5.6%; Central 4.3%; and West 3.6%). Reports of having received complaints about excessive use of force by SWAT teams during operations ranged from a low of 7.3 percent in the West to a high of 21.5 percent in the East.

SWAT ACTIVITY

One of the most important questions asked of respondents was about the number of different types of SWAT incidents their agency experienced during the years 2009 through 2013. The numbers in **Table 21** are not necessarily taken from official department records, but they are numbers provided by a representative reporting on behalf of the department. The way the question was asked, these could be actual numbers or estimates. For purposes of this report, the two are treated equally, meaning the numbers in the table represent the best possible estimate without having each agency go through years of records of the extent and range of different types of incidents for SWAT team deployments or resources were necessary.

The activity section of the survey lists a variety of activities for which SWAT resources might be used. The list is broken down by categories by year including: (1) activations by incident type; (2) incidents that occurred during a given deployment; and (3) supports used in response to incidents. Activations by incident type could include warrant service, suicidal individuals, barricaded suspects, crowd control, hostage situations or rescue, vehicle assaults, building or area searches, active shooters, or downed officers. Incidents occurring during deployment could include chemical agents found, suspects fired shots, SWAT officer injured or killed, suspect injured or killed, animals engaged, hostages killed or injured, and lethal or less-lethal solutions used. Supports could include canine support, use of anarmored vehicle or robot, explosive entry, tear gas, pepper or ball spray, or bean bag rounds.

Table 21 shows the mean or average number of positive responses to each of these questions by year for 2009 through 2013. It also shows the change in the mean number between the years 2009 and 2013, though without reporting the change from year to year. In terms of SWAT team activations by type, **Table 21** shows the most common incident involving activation for all years was a high risk

Table 21: SWAT Activity 2009-2013

Activity	Mean of Numbers Reported by Respondents Who Responded (Includes Actual or Estimate Without)					Percent Change
	2009	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2009-13**
ACTIVATIONS by Incident Type by Year (Combined Actual and Estimates)						
Warrant Service (Unknown Risk)	4.07	4.03	3.46	3.82	4.15	2.0
Warrant Service (High Risk)	17.04	16.35	15.44	14.86	14.13	-17.1
Suicidal Individuals	1.54	1.69	1.43	1.48	1.56	1.3
Barricaded Suspects	3.42	3.33	3.4	3.68	3.47	1.5
Civil Unrest/Crowd Control	0.26	0.31	0.41	0.31	0.34	30.8
Hostage Situations	0.61	0.51	0.48	0.41	0.51	-16.4
Hostage Rescue	0.22	0.2	0.19	0.1	0.16	-27.3
Automobile/Van/Truck Assault	0.67	0.59	0.62	0.75	0.77	14.9
Water-borne Assault	0	0	0	0	0.02	
Bus Assault	0.018	0.011	0.035	0.034	0.028	55.6
Train Assault	0	0	0	0	0	
Building Searchs	5.11	4.92	4.73	5.14	5.03	-1.6
Area Searchs	1.24	1.42	1.24	1.51	1.42	14.5
Woodland Searchs	0.67	0.68	0.72	0.81	0.79	17.9
Active Shooter	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.11	-15.4
Downed Officer	0.043	0.03	0.024	0.029	0.017	-60.5
Aircraft Assault	0	0	0	0	0	
INCIDENTS that Occurred During Deployment by Year (Combined Actual and Estimates)						
Improvised Explosive Device Encounters	0.28	0.38	0.32	0.4	0.33	17.9
Chemical Agent(s) Encountered	0.055	0.11	0.1	0.097	0.083	50.9
Suspects Armed or Guns Found	7.6	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.4	-2.6
Suspects Fired Shots and SWAT Did Not	0.23	0.299	0.27	0.22	0.213	-7.4
SWAT Officers Injured	0.177	0.201	0.16	0.18	0.19	7.3
SWAT Officers Killed	0.006	0.006	0	0	0.005	-16.7
Suspects Injured	0.48	0.41	0.44	0.37	0.45	-6.2
Suspects Killed	0.07	0.12	0.1	0.09	0.08	14.3
Animals Engaged with Less Lethal	0.76	0.65	0.66	0.67	0.68	-10.5
Animals Engaged with Deadly Force	0.19	0.2	0.16	0.14	0.19	0.0
Hostages Injured	0	0.01	0.005	0.04	0.005	
Hostages Killed	0.006	0.006	0	0	0	-100.0
Lethal Force Used	0.17	0.1	0.11	0.1	0.15	-11.8
Less Lethal Solutions Used	1.3	1.09	1.07	1.17	1.19	-8.5
SUPPORTS Used in Response to Incidents by Year (Combined Actual and Estimates)						
K-9 Support	6.5	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.7	-12.3
Armored Vehicle	9.5	10	9.7	9.3	9.2	-3.2
Robot	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.8	3.1	40.9
Explosive Entry	0.32	0.33	0.31	0.3	0.43	34.4
Tear Gas	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.25	-16.7
Pepper/Ball Spray	0.27	0.3	0.25	0.28	0.31	14.8
Bean Bag Rounds	0.33	0.26	0.24	0.31	0.34	3.0

warrant service incident. The mean number of such incidents reported by the agencies responding to the survey was 17 in 2009. In 2013, the mean was only 14, meaning there were 17.1 percent fewer incidents. The table notably shows a decline in the number of such incidents involving activation of a SWAT team or resources declined each year from 2009 through 2013. The mean number of such incidents for warrant services with unknown risk was fairly even across the years, ranging from 3.5 to 4.2. Incidents involving building searches accounted for a mean of roughly five activations per year, ranging from a high of 5.1 in 2009 to a low of 4.7 in 2011. Incidents involving barricaded suspects accounted for a mean of about three or four activations per year, ranging from a high of 3.7 in 2012 and a low of 3.3 in 2010. In terms of incidents that occurred during the deployment of SWAT teams or resources, **Table 21** shows encountering an armed suspect or finding guns were the most prevalent. On average, agencies found an armed suspect or guns at the scene of a SWAT deployment between seven and eight times yearly.

It is important to note reporting agencies indicated they were eight times more likely to use less-lethal solutions than lethal force. In terms of particular supports used by agencies in response to incidents involving the deployment of SWAT resources, the most commonly reported support was an armored vehicle. **Table 21** shows that between 2009 and 2013, agencies reported having deployed a SWAT team or resources for an incident used an armored vehicle on average between nine and 10 times, ranging from 9.2 in 2013 to 10 in 2010. The second-most commonly used support in response during a SWAT deployment was canine support, ranging on average from 5.7 times in 2012 and 2013 to 6.5 times in 2009. Other supports used on average one or more times each year from 2009 through 2013 included tear gas and robots.

CONCLUSION

The results of the IACP NTOA National SWAT Study are compelling. The study offers law enforcement leaders a thorough analysis of current practices, trends, and issues that reflect a national representation of U.S. state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. The results clearly reveal the composition of agency SWAT teams, protocols, practices, training procedures, and community relations and demonstrate police leaders have a powerful resource in SWAT teams. Throughout the survey, law enforcement agencies articulated clear protocols and practices that promote public safety. Overall, this survey reveals SWAT operations are in demand based on incidents within communities, and the teams are professional with extensive training, policies, and procedures in place; additionally, the teams are more likely to utilize less-lethal solutions and are necessary to keep communities safer.

Appendix A: Advisory Board Meeting I Overview November 20, 2013

The advisory board meeting was held at the IACP headquarters in Alexandria, VA, and convened on behalf of the NTOA on November 20th, 2013. Collectively, the IACP and the NTOA selected 21 law enforcement subject matter experts of active and retired law enforcement professionals from agencies ranging in size, population served, and rank, and status to provide valuable input regarding the national SWAT study.

The moderated group conversation covered project concepts such as goals and objectives, survey development and methodology, survey content development, survey sample, and marketing to ensure success. The group agreed SWAT's number one priority is to save lives through training, equipment, and selection of staff. Major concerns addressed were policy, the impact of legislation, budgets (especially for smaller law enforcement agencies), incident data collection, training, public perception, technology, resources, and tactical paramedics.

Following the advisory board meeting, the IACP and the NTOA walked away with five key focus areas of the national survey: SWAT composition, policy and training, command, community relations, and SWAT activity.

PARTICIPANTS

Toney Armstrong
Director
Memphis Police Department (TN)

Marcus L. Brown
Colonel/ Superintendent
Maryland State Police

Cheye M. Calvo
Mayor
Town of Berwyn Heights (MD)

Robert Chabali
Assistant Chief of Police
Dayton Police Department (OH)

Edward Davis
Commissioner (retired)
Boston Police Department (MA)

Tim Dickinson
Captain (retired)
Alexandria Police Department (VA)
Northern Virginia Community College

Pete Eliadis
Major
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Kevin Gerold
Doctor of Obstetrics, Juris Doctor
Maryland State Police

Don Harrison
Captain
Maryland State Police

Steve Jansen
Vice-President
Association of Prosecuting Attorneys

Lisa A. Judge
Police Legal Advisor
Tucson Police Department (AZ)

Joseph Kistle
Chief of Police (retired)
Franklin Borough Police Department (NJ)

Clete Knight
Deputy Chief of Police
Memphis Police Department (TN)

David LaBahn
President/Chief Executive Officer
Association of Prosecuting Attorneys

Kenneth McLaughlin
Chief of Police
Ocean View Police Department (DE)

Tomas Mijares, PhD
Texas State University

Brock Simon
Lieutenant (retired)
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (CA)

Jay S. Tabb, Jr.
Section Chief/ HRT Commander
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Scott Wayne
Major
Maryland State Police

David Williams
Colonel (retired)
Illinois State Police

NTOA STAFF

Mark Lomax
NTOA Board Member
Executive Director

Laura Gerhart
Training Supervisor

NORC STAFF

David Herda
Senior Survey Director

Henry H. Brownstein, PhD
Senior Fellow

IACP STAFF

Bart R. Johnson
Executive Director

James W. McMahon
Deputy Executive Director

John Firman
Director of Research

Phil Lynn
Senior Program Manager

Courtney E. Mariette
Project Manager

Ross Arends
IACP Visiting Fellow
Supervisory Special Agent
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

Chrystal Tibbs
IACP Visiting Fellow
Lieutenant
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Jennifer Styles
Project Specialist

Edwina Barber
Project Assistant

Kaylin Miller
Research Center Division Intern

Darcy Nardotti
Research Center Division Intern

Appendix B: Focus Group Meeting Overview August 22, 2014

The focus group meeting was held at the IACP headquarters in Alexandria, VA, and convened on behalf of the NTOA. Jointly, the IACP and the NTOA selected 12 active and retired law enforcement professionals from agencies ranging in size, population served, rank, and status to provide valuable input regarding the national SWAT study. The focus group is a component of a larger effort, the cornerstone of which is a national study to assess critical trends and issues related to SWAT teams in the U.S. from 2009 through 2013. Through the national survey, the IACP will gather information about law enforcement teams and specially selected, trained, and equipped personnel deployed to resolve high-risk incidents. The survey will reveal the composition of SWAT teams, protocols, practices, training procedures, and community relations.

The moderated group conversation covered project concepts such as goals and objectives, the definition of militarization, perceptions of the public, depictions of the media, issues faced by agencies with SWAT teams, needs of the field, and the future of SWAT. Participants explored whether or not selected incidents where SWAT team actions were questioned are ultimately found to be justifiable or in error; discussed media coverage that has led to the perception that American policing may be moving toward 'militarization'; and addressed the overly-aggressive use of SWAT response for situations that could be handled alternatively with less destruction of property and injury to officers, suspects, and the public. Taken together, information gained from the survey, and focus group will inform the public and the media about the true nature of SWAT practices, debunk myths, and provide a more accurate, data-driven account of SWAT activities.

PARTICIPANTS

Jason K. Bryk
Lieutenant
Arlington County Police Department (VA)

Wade Carpenter
Chief of Police
Park City Police Department (UT)

Heath Clark
Lieutenant
Tuscaloosa Police Department (AL)

Robert Evans
Captain (retired)
Margolis Healy

Fred Farris
Sergeant
Lenexa Police Department (KS)

Patrick Fiorilli
Officer
Lakewood Police Department (OH)

Steve Ijames
Major (retired)
Springfield Police Department (MO)

Shawn Reynolds
Deputy Chief of Police
Olathe Police Department (KS)

Keith Stone
Major
Pennsylvania State Police

Dennis Valone
Lieutenant
Alpharetta Police Department (GA)

Louis R. Williams, II
Corporal
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Brandon Zuidema
Chief of Police
Garner Police Department (NC)

NTOA STAFF

Mark Lomax
Executive Director

IACP STAFF

Vincent Talucci
Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer

John Firman
Research and Programs Director

Nancy Kolb
Senior Program Manager

Courtney E. Mariette
Project Manager

Rosemary DeMenno
Program Manager

Jennifer Foley
Project Manager

Appendix C: Advisory Board Meeting II Overview November 6, 2014

This advisory board meeting, held at the IACP headquarters in Alexandria, VA, on November 6th, 2014, was convened on behalf of the NTOA. It served as the second and final meeting of this group of experts selected and convened to provide valuable input regarding the national SWAT research survey. The moderated group conversation covered an update on the status of the survey, information collected from the focus group meeting, reactions to recent events depicted in the media, recommendations on building trust with community, improvements to SWAT processes and protocols, and identifying needs of the field. Participants explored the impact of quick decision-making, discussed media coverage and the ever present cameras, addressed the importance of educating the public to sustain valuable relationships, and reviewed past events that could serve to develop best practices. Combined with the information gained from the survey, the advisory group meetings and the focus group, the study will provide a more accurate, data-driven account of SWAT activities.

PARTICIPANTS

Cheye M. Calvo
Mayor
Town of Berwyn Heights (MD)

Robert Chabali
Assistant Chief of Police Dayton
Police Department (OH)

Pete Eliadis
Major
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Don Harrison
Training and Operational Support Specialist
U.S. Marshals Service

Joseph Kistle
Chief of Police (retired)
Franklin Borough Police Department (NJ)

David LaBahn
President/Chief Executive Officer
Association of Prosecuting Attorneys

Kenneth McLaughlin
Chief of Police
Ocean View Police Department (DE)

Tomas Mijares, PhD
Texas State University

Jay S. Tabb, Jr.
Section Chief/HRT Commander
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Scott Wayne
Major
Maryland State Police

NTOA STAFF

Mark Lomax
NTOA Board Member
Executive Director

IACP STAFF

Vincent Talucci
Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer

Gwen Boniface
Deputy Executive Director

John Firman
Director of Research

Gene Voegtlin
Director Division of Partner Engagement and Outreach

Rosemary DeMenno
Program Manager

Phil Lynn
Program Manager

Courtney E. Mariette
Project Manager

Jennifer Foley
Project Manager

Sarah Guy
Legislative Affairs Manager

Ross Arends
IACP Visiting Fellow
Supervisory Special Agent
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives

Joey D. Benford
IACP Visiting Fellow
Lieutenant
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Joe Ghattas
IACP Visiting Fellow
Lieutenant
Prince George's County Police Department (MD)

Appendix D:
Survey Instrument

INTRODUCTION

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), in coordination with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago (NORC), and with support from the National Tactical Officers Association (NTOA), is conducting a survey to assess critical trends and issues related to SWAT activities in the United States from 2009 through 2013.

This important effort will provide comprehensive information regarding the composition of SWAT teams, protocols, practices, training procedures, community relations, deployment decisions, outcomes, and incidents. The survey results will have significant value to the field and provide a more accurate, data-driven understanding of SWAT activities. Further, it will contribute to the development of resources for law enforcement agencies across the country.

Your response to this survey is completely voluntary and will be stored confidentially. Agency and individual identifiers will be removed during the analysis phase by NORC and data will be aggregated to protect respondent confidentiality. The estimated time to complete the survey is 60 minutes.

To view a full version of the IACP/NTOA National SWAT Survey, visit http://www.theiacp.org/portals/0/documents/pdfs/IACP_NTOA_SWAT_Survey_Final_Paper_Version.pdf . Here you can download, complete, and mail in a paper version or simply preview before completing the online survey.

Although this survey is voluntary, we urgently need and appreciate your cooperation to make the results comprehensive, accurate, and timely. We thank you in advance for your participation and ask that you respond to the survey as soon as possible, **but not later than December 31, 2014**. If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact Courtney Mariette at 1-800-843-4227, ext. 816 or mariette@theiacp.org.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. **Please insert identification code.**
   _____

Please enter the total number of full-time sworn personnel at your agency for the following years.

2. Total number of full-time sworn personnel

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please indicate the total population served by your agency for the following years.

3. **Total number of people**

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please enter the number of calls for service requiring an officer response your agency received in the following years. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

4. Calls for Service

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

CONFIRMATION OF SWAT SERVICES

The purpose of this survey is to learn about the availability and use of SWAT services by law enforcement agencies across the country. Many departments have SWAT services, but many others do not. Among those that do not, some have access to services from other agencies and some have no access.

1. **Please check the statement below that best describes your department's access to SWAT services:**
   - ○ My agency has its own SWAT Team (IF YOU CHOOSE THIS ANSWER, PROCEED TO QUESTION #1 UNDER SWAT COMPOSITION)
   - ○ My agency participates in a multi-agency SWAT team (IF YOU CHOOSE THIS ANSWER, PROCEED TO QUESTION #2)
   - ○ My agency has no access to SWAT services (IF YOU CHOOSE THIS ANSWER, PROCEED TO OPTIONAL CONTACT INFORMATION)

2. **If your agency participates in a multi-agency SWAT team, check all that apply below.**
   - ☐ Lends officers and resources to other agencies
   - ☐ Borrows officers and resources from other agencies

SWAT COMPOSITION

1. **As it relates to this study, the term "deployment" means that a team has taken SWAT-related tactical police action where as "activated" means to put a team on notice of potential deployment. What types of calls have led to deployment in your jurisdiction between 2009 and 2013? For example; barricaded armed persons, hostage incidents, warrants services, armed suicide, etc. (Please list all types that occurred between 2009 and 2013.)**

   _____

2. **What year was the SWAT team established (yyyy)?**

   Year
   _____

3. **Which of the following best represents how you refer to your SWAT team? Mark one answer.**
   - o Special Weapons and Tactics Team
   - o Special Response Team
   - o Special Emergency Response Team
   - o Emergency Response Team
   - o Special Operations Division
   - o Other_____

4. **Which of the following best describes the status and duties of the SWAT team members? Mark one answer.**
   - o Part-time (members have primary duties and responsibilities outside of the SWAT unit)
   - o Full-time with collateral duties (members assigned full time to the SWAT unit)
   - o Full-time (members have no collateral duties)
   - o Both full and part-time members

5. **As it relates to SWAT, does your agency have:**

An agency policy	**Standard Written Operating Procedures (SOPs)**	**External Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)**	**Threat Assessment Matrix**
o Yes	o Yes	o Yes	o Yes
o No	o No	o No	o No

6. **Which of the following areas are addressed in the established agreements with other SWAT teams or agencies? Mark all that apply.**

- ☐ Geographical boundaries
- ☐ Joint communications methodologies
- ☐ Responsibilities regarding concurrent jurisdiction
- ☐ Procedures for activating the mutual aid agreement
- ☐ Legal authority of mutual aid participants
- ☐ Other_____

7. **What are the selection criteria for your SWAT team members? Mark all that apply.**

- ☐ Application
- ☐ Minimum years of service
- ☐ Physical proficiency test
- ☐ Tactical proficiency test
- ☐ Confidence test (water)
- ☐ Oral interview
- ☐ Written test
- ☐ Background investigation of job performance
- ☐ Firearms proficiency test
- ☐ Psychological assessment
- ☐ Stress management assessment
- ☐ Other_____

Please enter the number of SWAT personnel authorized in your agency at each rank for the following years. If your agency includes the corporal (or similar) rank, count all team members of this rank as officers. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

8 **Officers**

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

Sergeants

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

Lieutenants

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

Captains or above

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

POLICY AND TRAINING

1. **Which of the following are sources of your team policies and procedures? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ Own agency
   - ☐ State/regional tactical officers association
   - ☐ Municipal or county law enforcement agency
   - ☐ Private vendor
   - ☐ State law enforcement agency
   - ☐ U.S. military
   - ☐ Federal law enforcement agency
   - ☐ Foreign military
   - ☐ National Tactical Officers Association
   - ☐ International Association of Chiefs of Police
   - ☐ Other_____

2. **How often does your agency review current training, operations, and policy related to SWAT? Mark one answer.**
   - o Following a SWAT team deployment(PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a.)
   - o Monthly (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a.)
   - o Quarterly (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a.)
   - o Semi-Annually (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a.)
   - o Annually (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2a.)
   - o Never
   - o Other_____

2a. At what level is this review conducted? Mark all that apply.
   - ☐ Agency legal counsel
   - ☐ Agency leadership
   - ☐ SWAT team personnel
   - ☐ Local government
   - ☐ Other_____

3. **Which of the following emergency medical procedures has your agency instituted for SWAT training and/or operations? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ SWAT team includes paramedics
   - ☐ Medical personnel routinely respond to scene
   - ☐ Ambulance routinely on standby at or near command post
   - ☐ No EMS procedures
   - ☐ Other_____

4. **As it relates to this study, the term "deployment" means that a team has taken SWAT-related tactical police action where as "activated" means to put a team on notice of potential deployment. Are after-action reports completed after every SWAT deployment?**
   - o Yes (IF YOU CHOOSE THIS ANSWER, PROCEED TO QUESTIONS #4a. AND 4b.)
   - o No (IF YOU CHOOSE THIS ANSWER, PROCEED TO QUESTION #5)

4a. **Describe the after action report review process (i.e., at what level(s) does this occur and what is the focus sign off, policy compliance, training, remediation)?**

_____

_____

4b. **Who has access to review your agency's after-action report? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ Magistrate/Judge
   - ☐ District/State attorney
   - ☐ Chief of Police/Executive Level Law Enforcement
   - ☐ SWAT team
   - ☐ Law Enforcement personnel
   - ☐ County/Town Executive
   - ☐ City Council
   - ☐ Public record
   - ☐ Other_____

5. **Which of the following are source(s) for your team's training and performance standards? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ Own agency
   - ☐ State/regional tactical officers association
   - ☐ Municipal or county law enforcement agency
   - ☐ Private vendor
   - ☐ State law enforcement agency
   - ☐ U.S. military
   - ☐ Federal law enforcement agency
   - ☐ Foreign military
   - ☐ National Tactical Officers Association
   - ☐ International Association of Chiefs of Police
   - ☐ Other_____

5a. **Which of the following areas does your agency's training curriculum cover? Mark all that apply.**

High Risk Patrol Operations
- ☐ Multi-Assault Counter-Terrorism
- ☐ Patrol Counter Ambush Tactics and Techniques
- ☐ Response to Active Shooter
- ☐ School and Workplace Violence: Planning and Response
- ☐ Supervising Patrol Critical Incidents
- ☐ Other_____

Negotiations
- ☐ 911 Dispatcher Crisis Communications
- ☐ Basic Crisis Negotiations
- ☐ Negotiations for First Responders
- ☐ Other_____

Specialty Munitions
- ☐ Chemical Agents Instruction
- ☐ Flash / Sound Diversionary Device
- ☐ Less Lethal Projectiles
- ☐ Other

SWAT Management
- ☐ Incident and Tactical Command Post Operations
- ☐ SWAT Command Decision-Making and Leadership
- ☐ Training Management and Risk Mitigation for SWAT
- ☐ Other_____

Tactical Firearms
- ☐ Tactical Pistol/Handgun
- ☐ Tactical Long Range Rifle
- ☐ Other_____

Tactics
- ☐ Ballistic Shield
- ☐ High Risk Warrant Service
- ☐ Hostage Rescue
- ☐ Resolution of Barricaded Suspect
- ☐ Resolution of Barricaded Suspect and Hostage Rescue
- ☐ Entries/Movement Techniques
- ☐ Other_____

Please indicate the total number of hours that ALL of your SWAT personnel spent training in the following years. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

6. **SWAT Training**

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

7. **Does your agency provide tactical response training to patrol officers?**
   - o Yes
   - o No

8. Please indicate the level of impact the following factors have had on your agency's SWAT activities over the last 5 years.

Technology
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Budget
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Social Media
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Local Media (newspaper, television)
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Mass Media (television, films, video games)
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

9. **Have significant changes been made to your SWAT program structure, personnel, policy, or training between 2009 and 2013?**
   - o Yes
   - o No

10. **Please explain why those changes were made (for example: a lawsuit, training, media scrutiny, or changes in leadership).**

_____
_____

COMMAND

1. **Who has the authority to deploy the SWAT team? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ First officer on the scene
   - ☐ Field supervisor
   - ☐ Watch commander
   - ☐ SWAT commander/supervisor
   - ☐ Chief executive
   - ☐ Mayor
   - ☐ County executive
   - ☐ Other_____

2. **Which of the following elements does your agency's SWAT team have access to? Mark all that apply.**
   - ☐ Hostage/Crisis Negotiator
   - ☐ Emergency Medical Support
   - ☐ Social Services
   - ☐ Animal control
   - ☐ Precision Long Rifle Team (Sniper)
   - ☐ Bomb Tech
   - ☐ K-9
   - ☐ Armored vehicle
   - ☐ Robot
   - ☐ Explosives
   - ☐ Video and/or audio taping
   - ☐ Body-worn cameras
   - ☐ Aviation
   - ☐ Marine

3. **Who plays the role of the incident commander? Mark one answer.**
   - o The SWAT supervisor/commander
   - o A non-SWAT supervisor/command staff member
   - o The officer who was in charge of the incident that prompted the SWAT mobilization retains overall command of the incident
   - o Other

4. **Is the commander provided with specific training pre-event to make decisions related to tactical operations?**
   - o Yes
   - o No

5. **Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in hostage/barricade situations? Mark one answer.**
   - o SWAT officers
   - o Incident commander
   - o Chief executive
   - o Other_____

6. **Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in the use of chemical agents? Mark one answer.**
   - o SWAT officers
   - o Incident commander
   - o Chief executive
   - o Other_____

7. **Excluding exigent circumstance, who has the decision-making authority in explosive breach situations? Mark one answer**.
   - o SWAT officers
   - o Incident commander
   - o Chief executive
   - o Other_____

8. **Who can authorize a no knock warrant? Mark one answer.**
   - o Magistrate/Judge
   - o District/State attorney
   - o Chief executive
   - o Incident commander
   - o County/Town executive
   - o Other_____

9. **Who conducts your agency's pre-raid investigation? Mark one answer.**
   - o Investigators
   - o SWAT team members
   - o Patrol officers
   - o Other_____

10. **Does the SWAT team vet or verify the information provided in the pre-raid investigation?**
- o Yes
- o No

10a. **Please describe the review and approval process as it relates to both pre-event and operational planning and decision making.**

_____
_____

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

1. Please indicate the level of impact your agency's SWAT team has had on community relations.
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

1a. Please describe the impact.

_____
_____

2. Please indicate the level of impact the following factors have had on the public's perception of your agency's SWAT activities between 2009 and 2013.

Social Media
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Local Media (newspaper, television)
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

Mass Media (television, films, video games)
- o Very negative
- o Somewhat negative
- o Neither positive or negative
- o Somewhat positive
- o Very positive

3. **What types of complaint(s) has your agency received concerning SWAT operations in your jurisdiction between 2009 and 2013? Mark all that apply.**

- ☐ Excessive use of force
- ☐ Unlawful tactics
- ☐ Unlawful search and seizure
- ☐ Unlawful entry
- ☐ Property damage
- ☐ Wrongful death
- ☐ Decision to deploy/activate SWAT
- ☐ Other_____

Please enter the number of citizen complaints that occurred for the following years. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

3a. **Citizen Complaint**

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate	_____	o Actual o Estimate

4. **Do you feel the public's perception of your agency's SWAT activities is accurate?**

- o Yes
- o No

5. Please indicate the number of occurrences for each of the following items your agency received relative to SWAT activities over the following years.

How many citizen complaints did your agency receive relative to your agency's SWAT activities?

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

How many legal challenges were filed against your agency related to your agency's SWAT activities?

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

How many of the legal challenges resulted in a finding or settlement against your agency?

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

SWAT ACTIVITY

The purpose of this section is to collect historical data from 2009-2013 about your SWAT team activities in the field. If you do not have this information and are able to provide estimates, please do so. In the case where the information is not available, please indicate that you don't know by leaving the space blank.

Please enter the number of SWAT activations that occurred for the following incident types by year. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

Warrant service (unknown risk)

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Warrant service (high risk)

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Suicidal Individuals

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Barricaded suspects

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Civil unrest/crowd control

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Please enter the number of SWAT activations that occurred for the following incident types by year. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

Hostage situations

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Hostage rescue

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Automobile/van/truck assault

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Water-borne assault

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Bus assault

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Train assault

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Please enter the number of SWAT activations that occurred for the following incident types by year. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

Building searches

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Area searches

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Woodland searches

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Active shooter

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Downed officer

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Aircraft assault

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Please enter the number of incidents that occurred during SWAT deployments for each of the following years. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

Improvised explosive device encounters

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Chemical agent(s) encountered

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Suspects armed or guns found

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Suspects fired shots and SWAT did not

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

SWAT officers injured

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

SWAT officers killed

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Suspects injured

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Please enter the number of incidents that occurred during SWAT deployments for each of the following years. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

Suspects killed

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Animals engaged with less lethal

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Animal engaged with deadly force

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Hostages injured

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Hostages killed

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Lethal force used

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Less lethal solution used

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate	_____	○ Actual ○ Estimate

Please enter the number of SWAT responses where you used the following supports by year. If actual numbers are not available, please provide an estimate. For each year next to each category, please select Actual or Estimate. If the number is not known, please leave blank.

K-9 support

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Armored vehicle

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Robot

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Explosive entry

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Tear gas

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Pepper/ball spray

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

Bean bag rounds

2009	2009 A or E	2010	2010 A or E	2011	2011 A or E	2012	2012 A or E	2013	2013 A or E
	○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate		○ Actual ○ Estimate

OPTIONAL CONTACT INFORMATION

If you would like to provide your contact information, please submit your information below.

Name

Title/Rank

City/Town

State

Email address