

	CS Gas (Tear Gas)			OC Spray (Pepper Spray)			Blast Balls			40mm Launcher			Noise Flash Diversionary Devices (NFDD)			Executive Approval
	Use During First Amendment Protected Activity/Crowd Control	Use on Patrol - Non Crowd Control	SWAT Use - Non Crowd Control	Use During First Amendment Protected Activity/Crowd Control	Use on Patrol - Non Crowd Control	SWAT Use - Non Crowd Control	Use During First Amendment Protected Activity/Crowd Control	Use on Patrol - Non Crowd Control	SWAT Use - Non Crowd Control	Use During First Amendment Protected Activity/Crowd Control	Use on Patrol - Non Crowd Control	SWAT Use - Non Crowd Control	Use During First Amendment Protected Activity/Crowd Control	Use on Patrol - Non Crowd Control	SWAT Use - Non Crowd Control	
CPC	No	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas...regardless of their use."	Not specifically addressed but presume no. CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas...regardless of their use."	No	Not specifically addressed. CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas and blast balls regardless of their use," but OC used in targeted circumstances with strong policies and accountability mechanisms may be acceptable.	Not specifically addressed. CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas and blast balls regardless of their use," but OC used in targeted circumstances with strong policies and accountability mechanisms may be acceptable.	No	No. CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as...blast balls regardless of their use."	Not specifically addressed but presume no. CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as...blast balls regardless of their use."	Not specifically addressed but presume no. CPC supports the ICW ordinance which bans "lethal impact projectiles" which likely covers 40mm launcher)	Not specifically addressed. May support use if these are seen as more targeted and less "indiscriminate" than CS/blast balls.	Not specifically addressed. May support use if these are seen as more targeted and less "indiscriminate" than CS/blast balls.	Not specifically addressed. Presume yes, but with changes in policy and training to reduce risk of indiscriminate or inappropriate use of force: update policies to distinguish levels/types of force; improve communication with protesters and warnings before use of force including use of sound truck/visual display boards, devise better methods of handling large stationary crowds, provide more practice opportunities with less lethal tools, and review how senior level command is held accountable.	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas and blast balls regardless of their use." NFDDs seem more similar to blast balls/other indiscriminate weapons.	Not specifically addressed but CPC supports "elimination of indiscriminate, crowd control weapons such as tear gas and blast balls regardless of their use." NFDDs seem more similar to blast balls/other indiscriminate weapons.	Recognizes that ICs determine criteria for dispersal orders/not declarations. Does not take a position on executive input, but raises concern about individual officers declaring riots. Recommends collaborative work between City, CPC, OPA, OIG, and community stakeholders to set "clear, strong, and high standards for when police and city officials are able to declare unlawful assemblies..." and also recommends requiring ICs to document reasons for dispersal orders/riot declarations, with outside agency later to review actions taken/outcomes.
OIG	No for general use in protest settings. Notes that "SPD and Council may wish to consider limiting use of this weapon to full-scale riot situations involving violence. SPD and Council may also wish to consider prohibiting the use of weapons such as CS solely in defense of property." As a general matter, less-lethal weapons should only be used for crowd control in clearly delineated circumstances involving violence or life safety. Recommends that if it is determined that non-SWAT officers will be authorized to deploy CS in future demonstrations, ensure officers receive training regarding the proper use of CS and related first aid and	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes but with changes in policy and training to reduce risk of indiscriminate or inappropriate use of force: update policies to distinguish levels/types of force, improve communication with protesters and warnings before use of force including use of sound truck/visual display boards, devise better methods of handling large stationary crowds, provide more practice opportunities with less lethal tools, and review how senior level command is held accountable.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes, but notes "[b]last balls have the potential to inflict serious injury or even death if detonated too close to a person, underscoring the importance of policy, training, and the ability to practice before use in a live setting. Providing warnings to the public before use of these weapons would help mitigate risk." Recommends the Council address previous recommendations issued by CPC, OPA, and external experts on blast balls. Also subject to general OIG recommendations for changes in policy and training to reduce risk of indiscriminate or inappropriate use of force: update policies to distinguish levels/types of force, improve communication with protesters and warnings before use of force including use of sound truck/visual display boards, devise better methods of handling large stationary crowds, provide more practice opportunities with less lethal tools, and review how senior level command is held accountable. As a general matter, less-lethal weapons should only be used for crowd control in clearly delineated circumstances involving violence or life	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes, but notes "less lethal launchers, such as the 40mm, can cause lethal harm if rounds hit the head, neck, or chest, or at too close range. Policy and training should continue to emphasize safe targeting practices for these weapons." Also subject to general OIG recommendations for changes in policy and training to reduce risk of indiscriminate or inappropriate use of force: update policies to distinguish levels/types of force, improve communication with protesters and warnings before use of force including use of sound truck/visual display boards, devise better methods of handling large stationary crowds, provide more practice opportunities with less lethal tools, and review how senior level command is held accountable. As a general matter, less-lethal weapons should only be used for crowd control in clearly delineated circumstances involving violence or life safety.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Not specifically addressed. Presume yes, but with changes in policy and training to reduce risk of indiscriminate or inappropriate use of force: update policies to distinguish levels/types of force, improve communication with protesters and warnings before use of force including use of sound truck/visual display boards, devise better methods of handling large stationary crowds, provide more practice opportunities with less lethal tools, and review how senior level command is held accountable.	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OIG generally supports reauthorizing use of less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	No. Sufficient time to seek executive approval may not exist, executive lacks tactical expertise and access to sufficient on the ground information, and also lacks independent source of information.
OPA	No. Believes use of CS should be banned during demonstrations.	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes but with restrictions: individual officers can make independent decision to use only to protect themselves or others and not in defense of property; require ICs to create detailed contingency plans; require ICs to plan responses to protests to avoid escalation; require public address system/dispersal orders be broadcast to crowd before use of less lethal tools; explore targeted arrest tactics	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes but with restrictions: individual officers can make independent decision to use only to protect themselves or others and not in defense of property; require ICs to create detailed contingency plans; require ICs to plan responses to protests to avoid escalation; require public address system/dispersal orders be broadcast to crowd before use of less lethal tools; explore targeted arrest tactics	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes but with restrictions: individual officers can make independent decision to use only to protect themselves or others and not in defense of property; require ICs to create detailed contingency plans; require ICs to plan responses to protests to avoid escalation; require public address system/dispersal orders be broadcast to crowd before use of less lethal tools; explore targeted arrest tactics	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes but with restrictions: individual officers can make independent decision to use only to protect themselves or others and not in defense of property; require ICs to create detailed contingency plans; require ICs to plan responses to protests to avoid escalation; require public address system/dispersal orders be broadcast to crowd before use of less lethal tools; explore targeted arrest tactics	N/A - only SWAT authorized to use. Regardless, OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	Yes. OPA recommends reauthorizing use of all less-lethal tools for non-crowd control situations.	No. Requiring executive approval of crowd dispersal orders would be impractical and contrary to City Charter which places management and supervision responsibility with Chief of Police.