In partnership with the people of Juneau, our mission is to make our city a place where people can live safely and without fear.
A Message from Police Chief Bryce Johnson

The past year of 2015 was an unprecedented challenging year for the Juneau Police Department and the Juneau community. With multiple murder cases occurring in a short period of time along with other high profile cases and the explosion of opioid overdoses, the resources and abilities of what was always a small town police department were stretched. While in the middle of these challenges I watched the detectives, patrol officers and every member of the JPD team working so hard and oftentimes in very creative ways to solve cases and bring justice to victims and the community. I was left thinking that this would become JPD’s finest hour. We rose to the unprecedented challenge and helped the community return to a sense of normality and stability.

Part of that unprecedented challenge was a 39% increase in part I crimes from the previous year. This was fueled by large increases in almost every crime category. Crime rates change for a variety of reasons. The rates have been tied to the age of the population, economic factors, substance abuse rates, and communities engaging in crime prevention tactics like improving lighting and taking pride in the appearance of our communities. There was also an increase in part II crimes which include simple assaults and vandalism cases. With more crime came additional arrests. Arrests were up 16% over the previous year. At the same time, police officers’ use of force saw a 33% reduction. JPD officers made 1,641 arrests but only had to use force in 26 of those instances for a 1.58% use of force rate. Also, JPD clearance rates continue to be well above the national average.

The people here at the Juneau Police Department are talented, motivated, and caring professionals who have put their sweat and tears into making this community safer. It is my honor to associate with them and to wear the uniform of the Juneau Police Department. I thank each of them for their dedicated service. I would like to thank City Manager Kim Kiefer, the Assembly, and all the citizens of Juneau for your continued support to the Juneau Police Department through this very difficult year.

Sincerely,

Chief Bryce Johnson
Core Values

**Integrity:** is a concept of consistency of ethical actions, values, methods, measures, principles, expectations, and outcomes. In ethics, integrity is regarded as the honesty and truthfulness or accuracy of one’s actions. Integrity can be regarded as the opposite of hypocrisy, in that integrity regards internal consistency as a virtue. Integrity means doing the ethical, moral, or correct thing even when no one else will know what you have done. Decisions and actions should be made under the “bright light of day” test which assumes that all of our actions and decision making process will one day be under public scrutiny. Everything we say and do should stand on its own when opened up to public scrutiny.

**Courage:** is the mental and moral strength to protect others and to promote truth and justice in the face of danger, difficulty, uncertainty, or pain without being overcome by fear. Physical courage is courage in the face of physical pain, hardship, death, or threat of death. Moral courage is the ability to act rightly in the face of popular opposition, shame, scandal, or discouragement.

**Respect:** is a willingness to show consideration, care and appreciation toward others with dedication to building relationships based on truth and authenticity. It is an action that denotes a positive regard or feeling of esteem for a person or other entity. Respect is both given and received. Respect cannot be imposed by suppression or flaunting of power. Respect is a deliberate action that must be earned and built over time, but that can be lost with one thoughtless or inconsiderate act. One can ask or beg for respect, but it will only be given based on others’ perceived treatment by us. People who possess high moral values and show compassion and solidarity toward others are respected. To respect someone is to accept their individuality and preserve their dignity by engaging in actions and behavior that values them.

**Service:** is the useful, beneficial, or helpful work performed by a public servant that contributes to the welfare of others. It must be recognized that police departments are public service organizations. Whenever we interact with the public in any way we should always strive to provide the quality and level of service we would expect for ourselves or for any member of our family.

Mission Statement

In partnership with the people of Juneau, our mission is to make our city a place where people can live safely and without fear.

Vision Statement

The Juneau Police Department is united in a spirit of teamwork to be an open, courteous, and community-minded organization devoted to quality public service. We are dedicated to live by values reflecting a genuine desire to care for the safety and well-being of the public we serve as well as the professionals who provide that service.
When fully staffed, the Juneau Police Department is comprised of 90 employees: 55 officers and 35 civilian staff. JPD is the second largest municipal police department in the State of Alaska. JPD is organized into functional work sections and work units as depicted in the organizational chart. The JPD org chart is also available online at http://jpd/Orgchart.pdf.

**Chief of Police** – The Chief is responsible for the overall direction and operation of JPD.

**Deputy Chief of Police** – Reporting to the Chief, the Deputy Chief is responsible for oversight of the Operations Division, which includes Patrol, Special Operations, and Community Support. The Deputy Chief also oversees the Administrative Officer whose responsibilities include fiscal activities and the department’s fleet of vehicles. The Deputy Chief is responsible for the overall direction and operation of JPD when the Chief is away.

**Public Safety Manager** – Reporting to the Chief, the Public Safety Manager is responsible for oversight of the operations and management of the Communications Center, statistical data processing, the CBJ E911 system, the Records Unit, the Property and Evidence Unit, and the Information Technology & Radio Unit.
Uniform Crime Reporting Overview

The Uniform Crime Reporting program was conceived in 1929 by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The purpose was to give law enforcement officials reliable information concerning crime statistics. In 1930, the FBI was tasked with putting the program in place. By 2014, crime reporting data was “received from over 18,000 city, university/college, county, state, tribal, and federal law enforcement agencies voluntarily participating in the FBI’s UCR Program.” (http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr)

UCR reporting divides offenses into Part I and Part II crimes. Part I crimes include eight offenses, which are generally considered the more severe crimes. Part I crimes include Homicide, Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Burglary, Theft/Larceny, Motor Vehicle Theft, and Arson. Data collected on Part I crimes include clearance rates, demographic information, and arrests. Part II crimes consist of 21 offenses, which will be addressed later in this report. (http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/offense-definitions)

It is important to recognize some of the limits of the UCR program. First, data collected is based on reported crimes. Under-reporting of crimes is inevitable, which means the actual number of offenses will most likely be higher than the number listed. The extent of under-reporting is usually not known.

Second, the Part I and Part II crimes are based on a 1930s framework. If the program was established today, the crimes listed in each category might be different. For example, technological and social changes would invariably be included in a more modern framework. Crimes related to computer/technology usage, hate crimes, identity theft, and terrorism just to name a few, were not considered major social issues in the 1930s.

Third, crime definitions were also established in 1930. Updating a definition is problematic, because it limits the ability to compare statistics from year to year. A significant update occurred in 2011 when the UCR Rape definition was updated to include situations that would apply to male victims and further expanded situations that could apply to females. Prior to 2011, the UCR definition for Rape only applied to female victims. Agencies began collecting and reporting data using these new definitions in 2013. (http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/recent-program-updates/reporting-rape-in-2013-revised)

Finally, the FBI cautions against using UCR data to draw comparisons between cities that could “lead to simplistic and/or incomplete analysis that can often create misleading perceptions adversely affecting communities and their residents.” (http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/preliminary-semiannual-uniform-crime-report-january-june-2013) Therefore, the 2016 JPD Annual Report does not include any comparisons to other communities.
CBJ Trends for UCR Part I Crimes

The trend for Part I Crimes from 2014 to 2015 saw an overall increase of 428 reported crimes, or an increase of 39.59%. 2015 marked the highest number of Part I Crimes over the past 5 years. The yearly average (mean) of Part I Crimes over the past 5 years is 1,285.8 crimes, with a standard deviation of 151.42. 2015’s Part I Crimes total of 1,509 crimes is 223 higher than the average of 1,285.8, and is more than one standard deviation away from the mean.

Of the eight Part I categories, all saw an increase with the exception of Arson. The largest increases by percentage were in Criminal Homicide, Rape, Burglary, and Vehicle Theft. The 300% increase in Criminal Homicide was due to an increase from 1 homicide in 2014 to 4 in 2015. Theft/Larceny saw the largest increase in the number of crimes reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 Crimes</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300.00%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>195.65%</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>21.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>127.20</td>
<td>31.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>64.08%</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Larceny</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>33.56%</td>
<td>942.80</td>
<td>111.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90.32%</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-43.75%</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>1402</strong></td>
<td><strong>1231</strong></td>
<td><strong>1206</strong></td>
<td><strong>1081</strong></td>
<td><strong>1509</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1285.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>151.42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-12.20%</td>
<td>-2.03%</td>
<td>-10.36%</td>
<td><strong>39.59%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criminal Homicide Statistics

UCR definition of Criminal Homicide – “Murder and non-negligent manslaughter: the willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another.”

Criminal Homicide Statistics Observations: The number of Criminal Homicides increased from one in 2014 to four in 2015. The Criminal Homicide category has the lowest number of incidents of all Part I Crimes reported; therefore any change will produce a large percentage increase or decrease. The 4 Criminal Homicides in 2015 occurred in three incidents, with one case being a double murder. Two of the cases were cleared with an arrest, and the double murder is still under investigation.

Rape Statistics

UCR definition of Rape – “Penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim.”

Rape Statistics Observations: Rape statistics increased from 23 cases in 2014 to 68 cases in 2015, for a 195% increase. While there is a real increase in this crime category, most of the increase is due to changes in reporting standards. With a mean of 26.4 and a standard deviation of 21.3, the 68 cases in 2015 were just shy of two standard deviations from the mean. The 2015 Rape statistics also saw an increase in the clearance rate to 61.7%, the second highest clearance rate in the past five years.
Robbery Statistics

UCR definition of Robbery – “The taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear.”

Robbery Statistics Observations: The number of Robbery cases increased from 24 in 2014 to 29 in 2015, or a 20.8% increase. 2015 also had the highest number of Robbery cases in the past five years. With a mean of 21.8 and standard deviation of 5.4, the 29 Robbery cases are less than two standard deviations from the average. The clearance rate of 31.03% was the lowest clearance rate of the past five years.

Aggravated Assault Statistics

UCR definition of Aggravated Assault – “An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Simple assaults are excluded.”

Aggravated Assault Statistics Observations: The number of Aggravated Assault cases increased from 141 in 2014 to 180 in 2015, or a 27.7% increase. This was the third year in a row that saw an increase in Aggravated Assaults, and 2015 was the highest year over the past 5 years. The clearance rate increased to 77.8%, from the 5-year low in 2014.
Burglary Statistics

UCR definition of Burglary – “The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. Attempted forcible entry is included.”

Burglary Statistics Observations: Burglary reports increased for the third year in a row. The number of Burglary reports increased from 103 in 2014 to 169 in 2015, or a 64% increase. 2015 saw the highest number of Burglary cases in the past five years. With a mean of 115.6 and standard deviation of 27.2, the 169 cases in 2015 were very close to being two standard deviations from the average. The clearance rate in 2015 did increase to 27.8%, up from 20.4% in 2014.

Theft/Larceny Statistics

UCR definition of Theft/Larceny – “The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another.”

Theft/Larceny Statistics Observations: The number of Theft/Larceny reports increased for the first time in four years. The rate increased from a 5-year low in 2014 of 742 to 991 in 2015, or a 33.6% increase. With a mean of 942.8 and a standard deviation of 111, the number of Theft/Larceny reports of 991 in 2015 is less than half a standard deviation from the mean. The clearance rate rose slightly in 2015 to 23.9%.
Vehicle Theft Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-23.08%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>-13.89%</td>
<td>90.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | St Dev | 39.00 | 10.53 |

UCR definition of Vehicle Theft – “The theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle. A motor vehicle is self-propelled and runs on land surface and not on rails.”

Vehicle Theft Statistics Observations: The number of Vehicle Theft cases increased from 31 cases in 2014 to 59 cases in 2015, or a 90.3% increase. 2015 had more Vehicle Thefts than any other year in the past five years. With a mean of 39 and a standard deviation of 10.5, the 59 cases were just under two standard deviations from the mean. The clearance rate fell to 33.9%, which was the second lowest clearance rate over the past five years.

Arson Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-55.56%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>-43.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | St Dev | 12.00 | 4.15 |

UCR definition of Arson – “Any willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc.”

Arson Statistics Observations: Of all the Part I Crimes, Arson is the only one that decreased in 2015. The number of Arson cases fell from 16 in 2014 to 9 in 2015, or a 43.8% decrease. Given the low number of cases, it is not unusual to see a large percentage change. The clearance rate fell to the lowest rate over the past five years.
UCR Part I Crimes Clearance Rate Comparisons

The UCR program allows law enforcement agencies to close or clear a reported crime in one of two ways. The first method of clearing a case is through an arrest. In essence, clearance by arrest includes arrests, charging or citing a person with the commission of the offense, or turning a case over to the court for prosecution. It is important to note that clearance data is based on the number of offenses and not number of people arrested. This is due to the fact that arrested suspects can be charged with multiple offenses. https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement/clearances/main

The second method to clear a report is closure through exceptional means. Clearance by exception is normally applied when circumstances are beyond the control of the reporting agency. “Examples of exceptional clearances include, but are not limited to, the death of the offender; the victim’s refusal to cooperate with the prosecution after the offender has been identified; or the denial of extradition because the offender committed a crime in another jurisdiction and is being prosecuted for that offense.” https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement/clearances/main

As of the writing of this report, the most current data available on-line for national clearance rates was for 2014. (https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2014/crime-in-the-u.s.-2014/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement/clearances/main) The chart below illustrates the most current data, which are the 2014 national clearance rates and the 2015 CBJ clearance rates. The chart does not address Arson, because the FBI web page did not list the 2014 clearance rate for Arson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National 2014</th>
<th>CBJ 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Homicide</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Larceny</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the 2015 Part I Crimes listed, the JPD clearance rates have exceeded the 2014 national averages in every single category except Criminal Homicide. As of the writing of this Annual Report, there is one open Criminal Homicide case that is actively being investigated.

The five-year clearance rate trend for each offense is listed individually in its specific section.
CBJ Trends for UCR Part II Crimes

UCR Part II Crimes are comprised of 21 lower level offenses, which are Simple Assault, Forgery, Fraud, Embezzlement, Stolen Property, Vandalism, Weapons Misconduct, Prostitution, Sex Offenses except Rape, Drug Offenses, Gambling, Offenses Against Family and Children, Driving Under the Influence, Liquor Laws, Drunkenness, Disorderly Conduct, Vagrancy, All Other Offenses Except Traffic, Suspicion, Curfew/Loitering Laws, and Runaways.


The data collected on Part II Crimes is not as comprehensive as the data collected on Part I Crimes. Part I Crime statistics track reported crime. The FBI only requires that arrests are tracked on Part II Crime, but JPD has elected to track reported Part II Crimes. Also, once a Part I Crime is cleared, the agency reports information concerning the age, sex, and race of each person arrested. Part II Crimes do not include this demographic information.

Part II Crimes are more subject to changes in reporting. For example, in 2010 and 2011 runaways were treated as arrests. Starting in 2012, JPD no longer “arrested” runaways, and the reports were no longer tracked in the same manner in the Records Management System. Therefore, it appears as though the runaway problem has been solved, while in reality the CBJ still has runaways.

For the sake of brevity, this report will only provide an in-depth review of the Part II crimes of Simple Assaults and Vandalism.
Simple Assault Statistics

UCR definition of Simple Assault – “Assaults and attempted assaults where no weapon was used or no serious or aggravated injury resulted to the victim.”

Simple Assault Statistics Observations: The number of Simple Assaults increased from 528 in 2014 to 589 in 2015, or a 11.5% increase. With a mean of 576 and standard deviation of 75.4, the 589 cases from 2015 are close to the statistical 5-year average. The clearance rate of 77.4% was the second lowest of the past five years, but it was an increase from the 2014 clearance rate of 72.7%.

Vandalism Statistics

UCR definition of Vandalism – “To willfully or maliciously destroy, injure, disfigure, or deface any public or private property, real or personal, without the consent of the owner or person having custody or control by cutting, breaking, marking, painting, drawing, covering with filth, or any other such means as may be specified by local law.”

Vandalism Statistics Observations: Vandalism cases increased for the first time in the previous 5-year period. The number of Vandalism cases increased from 177 in 2014 to 245 in 2015, or a 38.4% increase. With a mean of 298.8 and standard deviation of 105.1, the 245 cases, although an increase from 2014, are approximately half a standard deviation below the 5-year average. The clearance rate for Vandalism fell to 26.5%.
Arrest Statistics

Alaska Statute 12.25.160 defines an arrest as, “Arrest is the taking of a person into custody in order that the person may be held to answer for the commission of a crime.”

From 2014 to 2015, overall arrests increased by 16.05%. With a mean of 1,500 arrests and a standard deviation of 90.61, the 1,641 arrests in 2015 were approximately one and a half standard deviations above the 5-year average. 2015 had the highest number of arrests in the 5-year period, while 2014 had the lowest number of arrests. Both adult and juvenile arrests increased in 2015.

The subcategory of DV arrests in 2015 saw a decrease from 2014. The number of DV arrests decreased from 267 in 2014 to 223 in 2015, or a 16.5% decrease. 2015 tied for the second highest number of DV arrests in the 5-year period, but a decrease was observed because 2014 had the highest number of DV arrests.

Calls for Service Statistics

A Call for Service occurs any time a citizen asks for, or needs, assistance from the Department. Requests can come via the telephone or in person, or can be officer-initiated. Calls for Service are documented in either a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report, or Records Management System (RMS) case.

From 2014 to 2015, Calls for Service decreased by 1.88%, with 49,673 calls in 2014 and 48,741 calls in 2015. While Officer-Initiated calls increased, both Caller-Initiated and In Progress calls saw a decrease.
Use of Force Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-42.86%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Spray</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-33.33%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-23.81%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shots fired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-33.33%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
<td>1500.2</td>
<td>90.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Force</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Baton</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hands</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pepper Spray</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Taser</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a 33.3% decrease in the number of Use of Force reports from 2014 to 2015. There were 39 applications of force in 2014 and 26 applications in 2015. Given the low numbers involved, it is not unusual to see a large percentage change. 2015 had the lowest rate of use of force during the past five years.

The rate of use for Baton, Hands, Pepper Spray, and Taser all decreased. The rate of Firearms usage remained at zero.

While the number of force applications decreased, the number of people arrested increased. 2015 had the highest number of arrests in the past 5 years. Arrests increased to 1,641 in 2015, compared to 1,414 in 2014, or a 16% increase. The 5-year arrest average was 1,500 with a standard deviation of 90.61. The 1,641 arrests in 2015 are 141 arrests higher than the 5-year average and are 1.56 standard deviations from the mean. Therefore, 2015 saw a significant increase in the number of arrests.

Officers are authorized by state law to use force to overcome a person’s resistance to being taken into custody. It is logical to compare use of force rates with the number of people arrested. The increase in the number of people arrested, and the decrease in the number of times force was used resulted in a significant decrease in the overall Use of Force rate in 2015. The Use of Force rate for 2015 was 1.58%. In 2014, the Use of Force rate was 2.76%. Over the last 5 years, 2015 was the only year that had a Use of Force rate below 2%. 
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Traffic Stops and DUI Statistics

The number of traffic stops in 2015 decreased by 12.14%, with 5,576 stops in 2014 and 4,899 stops in 2014. 2015 marked the lowest number of traffic stops during the past five years. With a mean of 5,821 and a standard deviation of 534.9, the 4,899 stops in 2015 were almost two standard deviations away from the 5-year average. 2015 averaged approximately 13.4 traffic stops per day, compared to 2014 which averaged approximately 15.3 traffic stops per day.

The number of Driving Under the Influence arrests decreased from 174 in 2014 to 134 in 2015, for a decrease of approximately 23%. With a mean of 185 and a standard deviation of 31.6, the 134 DUI arrests in 2015 were almost two standard deviations from the 5-year average. 2015 had the lowest number of DUI arrests during the previous five years.

Citations Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABVEH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMV/CPV</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-61.54%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-13.94%</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>-15.84%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICENSING</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>-18.98%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>-21.69%</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-83.33%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>-14.51%</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-24.64%</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRAINT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-60.00%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Controlled Substances Trends

Evaluating controlled substance trends is perhaps one of the most difficult areas for analysis. Drug preferences, availability, and pricing are in constant flux and typically do not remain constant from year to year.

The trend for 2015 showed an overall decrease in seizures of both controlled substances and cash. The values of drug seizures decreased from $5.77M in 2014 to $1.16M in 2015. The value of cash seizure decreased from $109K in 2014 to $47K in 2015.
2015 Employees of the Year

Civilian of the Year – Records Specialist Brian Youll

Dispatcher of the Year – Dispatcher Christy Smith

Leader of the Year – Sergeant Chris Gifford

Officer of the Year – Officer Steve Warnaca

2015 Service Awards

**Outstanding Police Service**
Sergeant Chris Gifford

**Life Saving**
Dispatcher Mackenzie Burnett
Officer Carl Lundquist
Officer Paul Overturf

**Citizen’s Award for Life Saving**
Tom Trego

**Purple Heart**
Sergeant Chris Burke

**Police Medal of Valor**
Sergeant Chris Burke
2015 Years of Service Milestones

30 Years of Service
 Officer Kim Horn

20 Years of Service
 Lt. David Campbell
 Lt. Scott Erickson

15 Years of Service
 Patricia Rumfelt
 Sgt. Chris Gifford
 Deputy Chief Ed Mercer
 Officer Terry Allen

10 Years of Service
 Stacy Eldemar
 Dee Ojard
 Detective Shawn Phelps

5 Years of Service
 Officer Brent Bartlett
 Officer Carl Lundquist
 Jessica Beck
Promotions

Sergeant Jeremy Weske was promoted from police officer to sergeant.

Erann Kalwara was promoted from communications manager to public safety manager.

Retirements

Kim Horn retired after 30 years of service to the City and Borough of Juneau.

Web References

http://jpd/Orgchart.pdf


http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr


\(^1\) In the past, if a person reported being raped multiple times by the same suspect, it was counted as one case. In this year’s report, each occurrence is counted. For example, in past years if a person reported being raped every day for thirty days, it was counted as one case in the totals. This year that would be counted as thirty cases in the totals.