

# Electronic Control Weapons in Massachusetts, 2023



Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security  
June 2026

Maura T. Healey, Governor  
Kimberley Driscoll, Lieutenant  
Gina K. Kwon, Secretary of Public Safety and Security

Office of Grants and Research  
Kevin Stanton, Executive Director  
Lisa Lundquist, Division Director

Report Prepared by:  
Kelly Goggin, Senior Research Analyst  
Research and Policy Analysis Division  
35 Braintree Hill Office Park, Suite 302  
Braintree, Massachusetts 02184

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u><b>About the Office of Grants and Research</b></u> .....	5
<u><b>Legislative Language</b></u> .....	5
<u><b>2023 Report Highlights</b></u> .....	6
<u><b>Introduction</b></u> .....	8
<u><b>ECW Incidents and Law Enforcement Agencies</b></u> .....	8
Figure 1. Massachusetts Municipal Law Enforcement Agency ECW Growth, 2005 - 2023 .....	9
Figure 2. Number of ECW Incidents by Agency, 2023 .....	10
Figure 3. Massachusetts Municipal Law Enforcement ECW Incidents, 2023 .....	10
<u><b>Current Trends</b></u> .....	11
Figure 4. ECW Incidents and Percent Change, Calendar Years 2020 - 2023 .....	11
Table 1. Characteristics of ECW Reporting Agencies, 2020 - 2023 .....	12
<u><b>ECW Contacts</b></u> .....	12
<u><b>ECW Warnings and Submissions</b></u> .....	13
Table 2. ECW Warning Types by Submissions, 2023 .....	15
<u><b>Contact Characteristics</b></u> .....	15
<u><b>ECW Deployments</b></u> .....	16
Figure 6. ECW Incidents and Deployments Density Chart, 2023 .....	17
Table 3. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Gender, 2023 .....	18
Table 4. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Race, 2023 .....	18
Table 5. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Ethnicity, 2023 .....	18
Table 6. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Age, 2023 .....	19
Figure 5. Massachusetts Municipal Law Enforcement ECW Deployments, 2023 .....	19
Table 7. Distribution of ECW Submissions by Deployment Type, 2023 .....	20

<b><u>Appendix</u></b> .....	A1
Appendix Table 1. Municipal and Non-municipal ECW Incidents, 2020 - 2023.....	A1
Appendix Table 2. Non-Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023 .....	A1
Appendix Table 3. Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023 .....	A2
Appendix Table 4. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Subject Gender, 2023.....	A12
Appendix Table 5. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Subject Age, 2023 .....	A12
Appendix Table 6. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Subject Race/Ethnicity, 2023 .....	A13
Appendix Table 7. Number of Municipal and Non-Municipal ECW Deployments, 2023 .....	A14
Appendix Table 8. Non-Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023 .....	A14
Appendix Table 9. Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023 .....	A15
<b><u>Terms and Definitions</u></b> .....	A24
<b><u>About the Research and Policy Analysis Division</u></b> .....	A26
<b><u>Acknowledgements</u></b> .....	A26

## **ABOUT THE OFFICE OF GRANTS AND RESEARCH**

The Office of Grants and Research (OGR) is a state agency that is part of the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS). The agency promotes public safety and security in Massachusetts communities through the management of grant funds and research programs focused on crime prevention and intervention, traffic safety, law enforcement, and homeland security initiatives. OGR manages more than \$279 million in state and federal grants that are distributed to state, municipal, education, and nonprofit agencies across the Commonwealth. It is also home to the Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Center.

## **LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE**

Section 131J of Chapter 140 of Massachusetts General Laws (as amended by St. 2004, c. 170, §1 and St. 2018, c. 123, §13) requires the Secretary of Public Safety and Security to establish minimum safety and quality standards, safe storage requirements, education and safety training requirements, and law enforcement training on the appropriate use of electronic control weapons (ECWs), which shall require that any ECW purchased or used by a law enforcement or public safety official include a mechanism for tracking the number of times the ECW has been fired. In October 2004, in response to Chapter 170 of the Acts of 2004, EOPSS promulgated 501 CMR 8.00 et seq., regulations governing the sale of ECWs in the Commonwealth and the training of law enforcement personnel on the appropriate use of such weapons. The regulation was updated on January 6, 2023 to reflect changes to Section 131J of Chapter 140 of the General Laws and Chapter 253 of the Acts of 2020, *An Act Relative to Criminal Justice, Equity, and Accountability in Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth*.

Section 2 of Chapter 170 of the Acts of 2004 further requires the Secretary of Public Safety and Security to develop a uniform protocol directing state and municipal law enforcement officers to collect data pursuant to the number of times the device or weapon has been fired and the identifying characteristics, including the race and gender, of the individuals who have been fired upon. The data are reported to OGR to be analyzed and included in an annual report.

## **2023 REPORT HIGHLIGHTS**

- At the end of 2023, there were 286 municipal and 14 non-municipal law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts with ECWs, totaling 300 ECW agencies. This represents a 0.7% increase in the total number of ECW agencies from 2022.
- Two agencies, one non-municipal and one municipal, acquired ECWs during 2023: Bunker Hill Community College Police Department and Goshen Police Department.
- There was a total of 1,257 reported ECW incidents in 2023, a 13.1% increase from 2022. Municipal ECW departments reported 1,147 ECW incidents and non-municipal ECW departments reported 110 ECW incidents. An ECW incident is defined as any instance in which an officer or group of officers issued an ECW warning and/or deployed ECWs.
- In 2023, the number of incidents reported by each department ranged from zero (103 agencies) to 83 incidents (one agency). 197 agencies (65.7%) reported at least one ECW incident.
- From 2022 to 2023, the number of sworn officers employed by ECW agencies, officers carrying ECWs, and agency-owned ECW devices decreased by 0.5%, 2.1%, and 9.5%, respectively.

- Of the 1,356 human contacts, 1,228 were male (90.6%), 125 were female (9.2%), and three had gender reported as Unknown (0.2%). An ECW contact is defined as each individual officer's deployment, warning, or display of an ECW towards a single subject.
- Regarding race of the human contacts, 964 were White (71.1%), 298 were Black (22%), 40 were Other Race (2.9%), and 54 had race reported as Unknown, Not Reported, or Refused to Answer (4%).
- For Hispanic ethnicity of the human contacts, 899 were Non-Hispanic (66.3%), 269 were Hispanic (19.8%), and 188 had ethnicity reported as Unknown or Not Reported (13.9%).
- The average age of human contacts was 35.5 years, with nearly three-quarters of contacts involving subjects between 20 and 44 years of age (71.2%). Subjects in the two oldest age groups (60 – 64 years and 65+ years) represented the smallest proportion of ECW contacts (1.7% and 1.6%, respectively).
- Officer(s) issued at least one ECW warning in 91.2% of the 1,356 human contacts. Of these contacts with warnings (1,237), 41.1% of contacts (508) submitted to the warning and no deployment was made.
- 34.3% of agencies reported no ECW incidents (103 agencies), and 56.7% (170 agencies) reported no ECW deployments.
- An ECW was deployed in under half (36%) of the 1,356 human contacts.
- When examining the data by incidents, subjects submitted to deployments 67% of the time (327 submissions to 488 deployments).

## **INTRODUCTION**

As required by the Legislature, this report summarizes data provided by Massachusetts law enforcement agencies with ECWs<sup>1</sup> for calendar year 2023. Agencies with ECWs are required to complete annual reports on information related to: 1) the number of sworn officers serving the agency; 2) the number of ECW-trained officers serving the agency; 3) the number of ECWs owned by the agency; 4) the number of officers carrying ECWs; 5) the number of total ECW-related incidents that occurred during the reporting period; 6) general details about each incident (e.g., warnings, deployments, submissions, etc.); and 7) demographic information of the subject involved in the incident. Terms and definitions referenced in this report are provided in the appendix on page A24.

## **ECW INCIDENTS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

During 2023, two new law enforcement agencies began reporting use of ECWs, raising the cumulative total to 300 ECW agencies in Massachusetts. [Figure 1 \(pg. 9\)](#) illustrates the growth in municipal ECW reporting agencies from 2005 to 2023. The greatest concentration of cities and towns that did not have ECWs in 2023 are in the western region of the state, particularly Berkshire and Franklin counties.

In Massachusetts, there was a total of 1,257 **ECW incidents**<sup>2</sup> reported in 2023. 197 agencies (65.7%) reported at least one ECW incident. The number of incidents reported by each department ranged from zero (103 agencies) to 83 incidents (one

---

<sup>1</sup> a stun gun or any portable device or weapon that is designed to incapacitate temporarily by causing neuromuscular incapacitation or pain so that an officer can regain and maintain control of the subject.

<sup>2</sup> an event in which an officer (or group of officers) issues a warning and/or deploys an ECW towards a single subject.

agency). ([Appendix Tables 1-3, pgs. A1 - A11](#)). As shown in [Figure 2 \(pg. 10\)](#), over three-quarters (79.7%) of agencies reported five or fewer incidents. 20.3% of agencies reported more than five incidents, including nine agencies reporting 25 or more incidents. Those nine agencies accounted for 32.5% (409) of all ECW incidents in 2023.

**Figure 1. MA Municipal Law Enforcement Agency ECW Growth, 2005 - 2023**




Figure 2. Number of ECW Incidents by Agency, 2023





Figure 3. Massachusetts Municipal Law Enforcement ECW Incidents, 2023




## CURRENT TRENDS

[Figure 4](#) below and [Table 1](#) on the following page illustrate the annual percentage change in reported ECW incidents from 2020 to 2023. Overall, the number of ECW incidents has increased by 0.2% since 2020. ECW incidents increased by 13.1% from 2022 to 2023, marking a two-year trend of rising ECW incidents<sup>3</sup>.

As shown in [Table 1 \(pg. 12\)](#), the growth in the number of ECW agencies and ECW trained officers has slowed over the four-year period. The number of sworn officers from ECW agencies declined for the fourth year in a row. The number of agency-owned ECW devices rose sharply in 2022 after minimal increase in 2021. In 2023, growth in the number of ECW agencies was 0.7%. The number of sworn officers, ECW trained officers, and agency-owned devices decreased by 0.4%, 2.1%, and 9.5%, respectively.

**Figure 4. ECW Incidents and Percent Change, Calendar Years 2020 – 2023**



<sup>3</sup> Earlier Electronic Control Weapon Reports are archived on <https://archives.lib.state.ma.us/entities/aggregation/e92914bc-d01f-4923-803b-23669e5f8e82>

During the four-year period from 2020 to 2023, the growth of agency-owned ECW devices (17.2%) far surpassed that seen in ECW incidents (0.2%), ECW agencies (3.8%), sworn officers (-1.9%), and ECW trained officers (1.5%). The ratio of ECW incidents to ECW trained officers was 0.11 in the year 2020, 0.09 in both 2021 and 2022, and 0.11 in 2023.

**Table 1. Characteristics of ECW Reporting Agencies and Annual Percentage Change, 2020 – 2023**

Year	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020 - 2021	2021 - 2022	2022 - 2023
ECW Incidents	1,255	1,090	1,111	1,257	-13.1%	1.9%	13.1%
ECW Agencies	289	296	298	300	2.4%	0.7%	0.7%
Sworn Officers <sup>a</sup>	16,034	15,909	15,797	15,735	-0.8%	-0.7%	-0.4%
ECW Trained Officers	11,319	11,525	11,730	11,486	1.8%	1.7%	-2.1%
ECW Agency-Owned Devices	9,247	9,543	11,973	10,837	3.2%	20.3%	-9.5%

<sup>a</sup> Sworn officers include all part-time, full-time, reserve, and other officers serving in ECW agencies. ECW agencies report the number of officers as of the end of the calendar year.

## **ECW CONTACTS**

From January 1 through December 31, 2023, ECW agencies recorded 1,368 ECW contacts.<sup>4</sup> Of those contacts, 12 involved animals or fowl, such as dogs or turkeys. The remaining 1,356 ECW contacts involved people. The vast majority (90.6%) of the 1,356 human contacts involved male subjects (see [Appendix Tables 4 – 6, pgs. A12 – A13](#)). Over two-thirds of contacts were with White subjects: Non-Hispanic (47.9%),

<sup>4</sup> ‘ECW Contact’ refers to an individual officer’s deployment, warning, or display of an ECW towards a single subject. Multiple ECW contacts can occur during a single ECW incident, (e.g., an incident in which two officers each issue a warning and/or deploy an ECW at a subject is considered two contacts and one incident). This section details ECW contacts between officers and subjects.

Hispanic Ethnicity (14.9%), Unknown Ethnicity (8.3%). Black subjects accounted for 22% of total human contacts: Non-Hispanic (16.7%), Hispanic Ethnicity (1.9%), Unknown Ethnicity (3.4%). Subjects with unknown race and ethnicity accounted for 2.1% of contacts and subjects of Other Races<sup>5</sup> made up 3% of contacts. Of all human contacts, 19.8% involved subjects of Hispanic Ethnicity.

The average age of contacts was 34.3 years, with nearly three-quarters of contacts involving subjects between 20 and 44 years of age (71.2%). Subjects in the two oldest age groups (60 - 64 years and 65+ years) represented the smallest proportion of ECW contacts (1.7% and 1.6%, respectively).

## **ECW WARNINGS AND SUBMISSIONS**

Of the 1,356 ECW contacts with human subjects, 1,237 or 91.2% involved the officer(s) issuing at least one **ECW warning (verbal warning, laser warning, and/or spark warning)**<sup>6</sup> in an attempt to gain the subject's compliance. In contacts that involved an ECW warning, officers issued a single type of warning in 35.7% of contacts, with a verbal warning being the most common (407 of 442, 92.1%) ([Table 2, pg. 15](#)). The rate

---

<sup>5</sup> 'Other' comprises the race categories of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, and Other (specified).

<sup>6</sup> ECW Warnings:

**Laser Warning:** A visual warning whereby an officer employs the laser function of the ECW device to indicate that an ECW will be deployed.

**Spark Warning:** A visual warning whereby an officer employs a spark on a handheld stun device in order to demonstrate its effectiveness.

**Verbal Warning:** Any spoken words or display of the ECW that would indicate to a subject that an ECW may be used. This warning could include: 1) Any direct wording to a subject indicating or implying that an ECW will be used. *Example: Displaying ECW and shouting "Stop!"* 2) Any indirect wording that a subject may overhear indicating or implying that an ECW is about to be deployed. *Example: A warning to other officers that an ECW is about to be deployed by saying "Taser!"*

of compliance for contacts with one warning, however, was the lowest for verbal warnings (31.9%), excluding spark warnings (n = 1). Laser warnings had the highest rate of compliance (55.9%), though the use of laser warnings only was rare (n = 34).

Over half of ECW contacts involved multiple warnings (64.3%). Of these, the verbal and laser warning comprised the vast majority (725 of 795, 91.2%) and resulted in a compliance rate of 47%. A combination of verbal and spark warnings had a compliance rate of 20%. A combination of all three ECW warnings had a 30.2% compliance rate.

In a smaller number of contacts (119 or 8.8%), the officer did not issue a warning prior to ECW deployment. Incidents involving two or more officers may result in one warning but more than one deployment. Thus, both contacts would indicate a deployment, but only one would show a warning was given. In 68 contacts (5.0%), the subject received no warning prior to ECW deployment. Agencies indicated that sudden actions by the subject (i.e., subjects becoming combative during handcuffing) required immediate ECW deployment (probe deployment, 5-second cycle, and/or stun deployment)<sup>7</sup> and precluded an opportunity for the officer to issue a warning.

---

<sup>7</sup> ECW Deployments:

**Probe Deployment:** the act of firing two small dart-like probes from the ECW, which attach to the subject. The device then delivers a 5-second electrical cycle, which can be repeated as needed in order to incapacitate the subject to the point of submission.

**5-Second Cycle:** a five second electrical charge resulting from a probe deployment, which can be repeated as needed.

**Stun Deployment:** the act of bringing the ECW device into direct contact with the subject's skin or clothing in order to induce pain to the point of submission. Stuns can be repeated as needed if the subject does not initially submit.

**Table 2. ECW Warning Types by Submissions, 2023**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Warnings Number (%)</b>	<b>Submissions Number (%)</b>	<b>Percent that Submit</b>
One Warning	442 (35.7%)	149 (29.3%)	33.7%
Verbal	407 (32.9%)	130 (25.6%)	31.9%
Laser	34 (2.7%)	19 (3.7%)	55.9%
Spark	1 (--)	-- (--)	--
Multiple Warnings	795 (64.3%)	359 (70.7%)	45.2%
Verbal/Laser	725 (58.6%)	341 (67.1%)	47.0%
Verbal/Spark	25 (2.0%)	5 (1.0%)	20.0%
Laser/Spark	2 (--)	-- (--)	--
Verbal/Laser/Spark	43 (3.5%)	13 (2.6%)	30.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,237 (100%)</b>	<b>508 (100%)</b>	<b>41.1%</b>

-- Percentages with such a small denominator are not statistically reliable.

## **CONTACT CHARACTERISTICS**

[Tables 3 - 6 \(pgs. 18 - 19\)](#) presents some demographic data on the contacts with subjects for whom these characteristics are known. The data show officers' use of warnings and/or ECW deployments by subject gender, race, ethnicity, and age. A consistent pattern is revealed across all of the subject groups: a) in more than half of contacts (62.6%), the officer(s) issues an ECW warning with no subsequent ECW deployment; b) in about 32% of contacts, the officer(s) issued an ECW warning and an ECW deployment; and c) in about 5% of contacts the officer(s) deployed an ECW with no prior ECW warning.

[Appendix Tables 4 - 6 \(pg. A12 - A13\)](#) break down the data slightly differently, looking at contacts with a warning or contacts with an ECW deployment by subject gender, race/ethnicity, and age. The percentages are similar by gender and differ slightly by race/ethnicity and age. Those in the Black, Hispanic Ethnicity category (n =

26), the Other Race, Unknown Hispanic Ethnicity category (n = 1), and the Unknown Race, Non-Hispanic Ethnicity category (n = 3) had the highest proportion of contacts with warnings (100%), though the number of contacts was low. The next highest proportion of contacts with warnings was the Black, Non-Hispanic Ethnicity category (98.8%), followed by the White, Non-Hispanic Ethnicity category (92.8%). Those in the Unknown Race, Unknown Hispanic Ethnicity category had the highest percentage of contacts with an ECW deployment (48.3%) followed by the Other Race, Hispanic Ethnicity category (47.4%).

[Appendix Table 5 \(pg. A12\)](#) shows that subjects in the age categories 65 years and older and 40 – 44 years received the highest percent of contacts with a warning (100% and 96.5%, respectively). Subjects 65 years and older had the smallest percentage of contacts with an ECW deployment (27.3%). Subjects 40 – 44 years had the largest percentage of contacts with an ECW deployment (41.3%).

## **ECW DEPLOYMENTS**


Of the 300 Massachusetts agencies with ECWs in 2023, 56.7% (170 agencies) reported zero ECW deployments. The remaining 43.3% (130 agencies) reported between one and 50 deployments, totaling 768 weapon (probe and/or stun) deployments. Of the agencies with a deployment, over half (82 agencies, 63.1%) reported between one and three ECW deployments. [Figure 5 \(pg. 19\)](#) displays the number of ECW deployments by agency, excluding non-municipal agencies.

[Appendix Tables 7 – 9 \(pgs. A14 - A23\)](#) provide information on the type of deployment by department, revealing a slightly higher overall usage of probe

deployments (394, 51.3%) compared to stun deployments, also known as a “drive stun” (374, 48.7%). The range of stun deployments per department was more widely dispersed (1 to 30) than probe deployments (1 to 27).

[Figure 6](#) is a density chart illustrating the number of reported ECW incidents and deployments by agency. The majority of agencies are concentrated around low numbers of ECW incidents and deployments (shown in red). In fact, 34.3% of agencies reported no ECW incidents (103 agencies) and 56.7% reported no ECW deployments (170 agencies).

**Figure 6. ECW Incidents and Deployments Density Chart, 2023**



**Table 3. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Gender, 2023**

	<b>Contacts with Warning(s), No ECW Deployment</b>	<b>Contacts with Warning(s) and ECW Deployment(s)</b>	<b>Contacts with ECW Deployment(s), No Warning</b>	
<b>Gender</b>	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	<b>Total</b>
Male	744 (62.9%)	377 (31.9%)	62 (5.2%)	1,183
Female	70 (58.8%)	43 (36.1%)	6 (5.0%)	119
Unknown	3 (100%)	0 (--)	0 (--)	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>817 (62.6%)</b>	<b>420 (32.3%)</b>	<b>68 (5.2%)</b>	<b>1,305</b>

-- Percentages with such a small denominator are not statistically reliable.

**Table 4. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Race, 2023**

	<b>Contacts with Warning(s), No ECW Deployment</b>	<b>Contacts with Warning(s) and ECW Deployment(s)</b>	<b>Contacts with ECW Deployment(s), No Warning</b>	
<b>Race</b>	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	<b>Total</b>
White	584 (62.8%)	307 (33.0%)	39 (4.2%)	930
Black	183 (63.8%)	85 (29.6%)	19 (6.6%)	287
Other	21 (56.8%)	11 (29.7%)	5 (13.5%)	37
Unknown	29 (56.9%)	17 (33.3%)	5 (9.8%)	51
<b>Total</b>	<b>817 (62.6%)</b>	<b>420 (32.3%)</b>	<b>68 (5.2%)</b>	<b>1,305</b>


**Table 5. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Ethnicity, 2023**

	<b>Contacts with Warning(s), No ECW Deployment</b>	<b>Contacts with Warning(s) and ECW Deployment(s)</b>	<b>Contacts with ECW Deployment(s), No Warning</b>	
<b>Ethnicity</b>	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	<b>Total</b>
Non-Hispanic	563 (65.1%)	264 (30.5%)	38 (4.4%)	865
Hispanic	146 (55.9%)	98 (37.5%)	17 (6.5%)	261
Unknown	108 (60.3%)	58 (32.4)	13 (7.3)	179
<b>Total</b>	<b>817 (62.6%)</b>	<b>420 (32.3%)</b>	<b>68 (5.2%)</b>	<b>1,305</b>

**Table 6. Percent of Contacts with a Warning and/or ECW Deployment by Subject Age, 2023**

Age	Contacts with Warning(s), No ECW Deployment	Contacts with Warning(s) and ECW Deployment(s)	Contacts with ECW Deployment(s), No Warning	Total
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)	
Less than 20 Years	64 (66.7%)	27 (27.9%)	5 (5.4%)	111
20 – 24 Years	107 (66.0%)	44 (27.2%)	11 (6.8%)	162
25 – 29 Years	109 (63.0%)	57 (32.9%)	7 (4.0%)	173
30 – 34 Years	141 (59.7%)	79 (33.5%)	16 (6.8%)	236
35 – 44 Years	209 (58.9%)	127 (35.8%)	19 (5.4%)	355
45 – 54 Years	122 (64.2%)	62 (32.6%)	6 (3.2%)	190
55+ Years	65 (70.5%)	24 (25.6%)	4 (3.8%)	78
<b>Total</b>	<b>817 (62.6%)</b>	<b>420 (32.3%)</b>	<b>68 (5.2%)</b>	<b>1,305</b>

**Figure 5. MA Municipal Law Enforcement ECW Deployments, 2023**



Officers deployed ECWs in under half (36.0%) of the 1,356 human contacts. [Table 7](#) shows that, of the 488 incidents where an ECW was deployed, 48.6% involved the use of only probe deployments (the firing of two small dart-like probes from the ECW, which attach to the subject and can emit an electrical charge), 40.8% involved the use of only stun deployments (bringing the ECW device into direct contact with the subject’s skin or clothing), and 10.7% of the incidents involved a combination of probe and stun deployments. Overall, subjects submitted to the deployments of an ECW 67% of the time. Subjects submitted to individual stun deployments more often than individual probe deployments (73.9% and 61.6%, respectively). Combined probe and stun deployments had a submission rate of 65.4%.

**Table 7. Distribution of ECW Submissions by Deployment Type, 2023<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>ECW Deployments Number (%)</b>	<b>ECW Submission Number (%)</b>	<b>Percent that Submit</b>
Probe	237 (48.6%)	146 (44.6%)	61.6%
Stun	199 (40.8%)	147 (45.0%)	73.9%
Combined Probe and Stun	52 (10.7%)	34 (10.4%)	65.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>488 (100%)</b>	<b>327 (100%)</b>	<b>67.0%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Excludes cases where subject was not a person

**Appendix Table 1. Municipal and Non-municipal ECW Incidents, 2020 – 2023**

<b>Agency Type</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Non-municipal	90	56	112	110
Municipal	1,165	1,034	999	1,147
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,255</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>1,111</b>	<b>1,257</b>

**Appendix Table 2. Non-municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Amtrak Police	0	0	0	0
Bridgewater State University	0	0	0	1
Bristol County Sheriff's Office	--	--	0	0
Bunker Hill Community College <sup>a</sup>	--	--	--	0
Central Massachusetts Law Enforcement Council	1	1	0	1
Clark University	0	1	0	2
Holyoke Community College	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts State Police	82	43	83	73
Massasoit Community College	0	0	0	0
Martha's Vineyard Police Tactical Response Team	0	0	0	0
University of Massachusetts, Lowell	0	0	0	0
University of Massachusetts, Memorial Medical Center	1	9	2	1
University of Massachusetts, Worcester	6	2	27	31
Westfield State College	--	--	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>110</b>

<sup>a</sup> Agency began using Electronic Control Weapons in 2023.

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 – 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Abington	0	0	0	0
Acushnet	5	6	3	1
Adams	4	2	7	7
Agawam	6	7	7	10
Amesbury	0	0	1	1
Andover	2	3	2	5
Aquinnah	0	0	0	0
Ashburnham	2	2	2	0
Ashfield	0	0	0	0
Ashland	9	6	1	3
Athol	0	6	4	7
Attleborough	5	0	5	4
Auburn	4	5	1	1
Avon	0	0	0	0
Ayer	0	5	5	2
Barnstable	15	10	19	23
Barre	0	0	2	3
Becket	0	0	0	0
Bedford	4	2	3	3
Belchertown	0	0	0	0
Belmont	2	4	2	5
Berkley	0	0	1	2
Bernardston	0	0	0	0
Beverly	6	4	2	7
Billerica	1	4	6	1
Blackstone	4	1	2	1
Blandford	0	0	0	0
Bolton	1	0	0	0
Boston	3	1	1	1
Bourne	7	6	5	5
Boxborough	1	1	0	0
Boxford	0	1	0	0

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Boylston	1	4	2	0
Braintree	1	3	3	5
Brewster	0	1	0	0
Bridgewater	2	0	1	3
Brockton	23	19	17	42
Brookfield	0	0	0	2
Burlington	1	0	0	0
Canton	8	3	5	2
Carlisle	2	0	0	0
Carver	2	2	1	1
Charlton	1	5	5	6
Chatham	1	1	1	1
Chelmsford	8	11	5	2
Chelsea	9	8	7	7
Cheshire	0	0	0	0
Chesterfield	--	0	0	0
Chicopee	44	33	23	56
Chilmark	0	0	0	1
Clinton	4	2	2	4
Cohasset	0	0	1	0
Colrain	0	0	0	0
Concord	1	1	1	2
Dalton	1	0	1	5
Danvers	11	8	10	6
Dartmouth	4	9	11	5
Dedham	4	4	7	3
Deerfield	0	2	0	0
Dennis	10	16	1	7
Dighton	2	2	3	1

---

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Douglas	4	1	1	0
Dover	0	0	0	0
Dracut	3	3	1	6
Dudley	0	2	6	6
Dunstable	0	1	0	0
Duxbury	2	0	4	4
East Bridgewater	2	1	8	6
East Brookfield	2	2	1	0
Eastham	4	2	1	1
Easthampton	0	6	5	2
Easton	2	1	1	6
Edgarton	0	3	4	1
Egremont	0	1	0	0
Erving	0	1	0	0
Essex	1	1	0	0
Everett	12	7	5	9
Fairhaven	1	3	2	6
Fall River	16	19	22	24
Falmouth	8	9	4	4
Fitchburg	16	21	14	21
Foxborough	4	5	5	2
Framingham	14	10	6	11
Franklin	0	4	4	8
Freetown	7	4	9	11
Gardner	1	2	2	5
Georgetown	0	0	1	1
Gill	0	0	0	2
Gloucester	--	--	1	5

---

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Goshen <sup>a</sup>	--	--	--	0
Grafton	3	3	1	6
Granby	0	0	0	1
Granville	0	0	0	0
Great Barrington	1	1	7	3
Greenfield	5	14	10	17
Groton	2	1	1	0
Groveland	0	2	0	0
Hadley	2	2	3	2
Hamilton	0	0	0	0
Hampden	0	1	0	0
Hanson	0	0	0	0
Hardwick	0	2	1	1
Harvard	--	0	1	0
Harwich	6	2	1	0
Hatfield	0	0	0	0
Haverhill	2	1	1	7
Hingham	5	6	3	2
Hinsdale	0	0	0	0
Holbrook	0	0	1	1
Holden	3	2	1	1
Holland	0	0	0	0
Holliston	1	2	0	1
Holyoke	11	7	14	14
Hopedale	0	0	0	1
Hopkinton	2	0	1	1
Hubbardston	0	0	0	0
Hudson	3	0	1	1

<sup>a</sup> Agency began using Electronic Control Weapons in 2023.

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Hull	0	3	4	4
Ipswich	0	0	1	2
Kingston	2	2	1	2
Lakeville	4	7	7	5
Lanesborough	1	0	0	0
Lawrence	21	18	14	34
Lee	0	1	0	0
Leicester	2	2	2	1
Lenox	1	1	0	0
Leominster	25	16	20	14
Leverett	0	0	1	1
Lincoln	0	0	0	0
Littleton	0	1	2	4
Longmeadow	2	0	0	0
Lowell	29	24	38	21
Ludlow	2	3	10	7
Lunenburg	0	1	3	3
Lynn	27	20	13	31
Lynnfield	1	0	0	0
Manchester-by-the-Sea	0	1	3	3
Mansfield	12	1	7	9
Marblehead	2	1	3	0
Marion	2	1	2	1
Marlborough	15	9	6	4
Marshfield	4	1	5	3
Mashpee	1	6	3	3
Maynard	0	0	1	0
Medfield	0	0	0	0
Medway	1	0	0	1
Mendon	0	1	2	0
Merrimac	0	0	3	1
Methuen	17	11	9	9

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Middleborough	5	10	9	8
Middleton	1	1	1	1
Milford	6	7	6	11
Millbury	6	3	4	7
Millis	0	3	0	0
Millville	0	0	0	0
Milton	--	0	1	2
Monson	9	6	5	4
Montague	2	4	2	3
Nantucket	0	0	0	1
Natick	6	3	7	12
Needham	0	2	4	3
New Bedford	12	15	11	15
New Braintree	0	0	0	1
New Marlborough	0	0	0	0
New Salem	0	0	0	0
Newbury	0	0	1	1
Newburyport	6	2	1	0
Norfolk	0	2	1	3
North Adams	3	1	4	2
North Andover	1	0	2	0
North Attleborough	0	2	1	6
North Brookfield	0	1	1	1
North Reading	0	1	3	3
Northborough	1	4	2	1
Northbridge	2	3	1	1
Northfield	0	0	0	0
Norton	9	5	5	3
Norwell	0	0	0	0

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Norwood	4	5	3	3
Oak Bluffs	5	4	4	0
Oakham	0	0	1	0
Orange	1	1	3	1
Orleans	3	0	1	2
Oxford	5	5	3	5
Palmer	12	5	6	4
Paxton	5	0	2	0
Peabody	12	13	11	17
Pembroke	4	2	3	2
Pepperell	6	1	1	1
Petersham	0	1	0	0
Phillipston	0	0	0	0
Pittsfield	7	8	4	3
Plainville	1	2	2	2
Plymouth	14	12	12	7
Plympton	1	2	0	1
Princeton	0	2	2	2
Provincetown	2	5	4	9
Quincy	2	1	2	4
Randolph	12	11	9	15
Raynham	7	11	5	4
Reading	--	0	1	1
Rehoboth	1	4	3	4
Revere	4	0	5	4
Rockland	3	7	5	9
Rowley	0	1	1	1
Royalston	0	0	0	0
Rutland	2	9	8	3

---

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Salem	10	7	1	0
Salisbury	1	1	3	3
Sandwich	12	13	4	3
Scituate	3	1	1	0
Seekonk	3	6	1	3
Sharon	1	1	1	1
Sheffield	7	0	0	0
Sherborn	0	0	0	0
Shirley	3	0	0	0
Shrewsbury	6	8	9	17
Shutesbury	0	0	0	0
Somerset	1	2	3	2
South Hadley	3	6	1	3
Southborough	1	1	1	0
Southbridge	7	11	7	16
Southwick	0	0	2	1
Spencer	7	3	8	5
Springfield	81	53	39	27
Sterling	0	4	0	0
Stockbridge	0	1	0	1
Stoneham	3	2	4	3
Stoughton	19	15	16	10
Stow	1	0	0	0
Sturbridge	1	4	3	1
Sudbury	3	1	2	0
Sunderland	2	1	1	1
Sutton	0	1	0	1
Swampscott	1	0	2	0
Swansea	2	5	0	3
Taunton	10	4	9	6
Templeton	0	0	0	0
Tewksbury	9	7	10	7

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Tisbury	4	0	0	0
Tolland	0	0	0	0
Topsfield	0	0	0	0
Townsend	0	3	3	0
Truro	0	3	1	1
Tyngsborough	3	4	3	4
Upton	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	5	7	4	5
Wakefield	2	3	6	2
Wales	1	0	0	0
Walpole	6	7	6	9
Ware	22	9	2	1
Wareham	26	18	11	4
Warren	1	0	1	1
Warwick	0	0	0	0
Watertown	5	4	4	4
Webster	13	10	23	16
Wellesley	2	1	0	1
Wellfleet	2	1	2	0
Wenham	0	0	0	0
West Boylston	0	0	0	0
West Bridgewater	5	3	1	1
West Brookfield	0	0	0	0
West Newbury	0	0	0	0
West Springfield	15	10	12	30
West Stockbridge	0	0	0	0
West Tisbury	0	2	1	1
Westborough	10	2	8	10
Westfield	13	18	12	15
Westford	4	1	1	2

**Appendix Table 3. (continued) Municipal ECW Incidents by Agency, 2020 - 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Westhampton	--	0	0	0
Westminster	1	0	1	1
Westport	3	2	2	2
Westwood	3	0	1	0
Weymouth	27	1	7	10
Whately	0	9	0	0
Whitman	0	0	1	3
Williamsburg	--	0	0	0
Williamstown	0	0	0	1
Wilmington	3	4	4	4
Winchendon	2	1	1	6
Winchester	1	0	0	0
Woburn	3	1	2	1
Worcester	54	55	72	83
Worthington	--	0	0	0
Wrentham	4	4	2	1
Yarmouth	9	10	2	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,165</b>	<b>1,034</b>	<b>999</b>	<b>1,147</b>

---

-- cells denoted by "--" indicate the agency had not yet implemented use of ECWs.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 4. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Subject Gender, 2023**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Contacts</b>	<b>Warnings</b>	<b>Deployments</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Warning</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Weapon Deployment</b>
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)		
Male	1,228 (90.6%)	1,121 (90.6%)	439 (90.0%)	91.3%	35.7%
Female	125 (9.2%)	113 (9.1%)	49 (10.0%)	90.4%	39.2%
Unknown	3 (--)	3 (--)	0 (--)	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,356 (100%)</b>	<b>1,237 (100%)</b>	<b>488 (100%)</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>36.0%</b>

-- Percentages with such a small denominator are not statistically reliable.

**Appendix Table 5. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Subject Age, 2023**

<b>Subject Age (in Years)</b>	<b>Contacts</b>	<b>Warnings</b>	<b>Deployments</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Warning</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Weapon Deployment</b>
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)		
Under 18	60 (4.4%)	52 (4.2%)	18 (3.7%)	86.7%	30.0%
18 - 19	41 (3.0%)	39 (3.2%)	14 (2.9%)	95.1%	34.1%
20 - 24	172 (12.7%)	151 (12.2%)	55 (11.3%)	87.8%	32.0%
25 - 29	179 (13.2%)	166 (13.4%)	64 (13.1%)	92.7%	35.8%
30 - 34	246 (18.1%)	220 (17.8%)	95 (19.5%)	89.4%	38.6%
35 - 39	196 (14.5%)	170 (13.7%)	75 (15.4%)	86.7%	38.3%
40 - 44	172 (12.7%)	166 (13.4%)	71 (14.5%)	96.5%	41.3%
45 - 49	119 (8.8%)	114 (9.2%)	42 (8.6%)	95.8%	35.3%
50 - 54	74 (5.5%)	70 (5.7%)	26 (5.3%)	94.6%	35.1%
55 - 59	52 (3.8%)	48 (3.9%)	15 (3.1%)	92.3%	28.8%
60 - 64	23 (1.7%)	21 (1.7%)	7 (1.4%)	91.3%	30.4%
65 or older	22 (1.6%)	20 (1.6%)	6 (1.2%)	91.0%	27.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,356 (100%)</b>	<b>1,237 (100%)</b>	<b>488 (100%)</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>36.0%</b>

**Appendix Table 6. Distribution of ECW Contacts, Warnings, and Deployments by Race/Ethnicity, 2023**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Contacts</b>	<b>Warnings</b>	<b>Deployments</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Warning</b>	<b>Percent of Contacts with a Weapon Deployment</b>
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)		
White, non-Hispanic	650 (47.9%)	603 (48.7%)	218 (44.7%)	92.8%	33.5%
White, Hispanic	202 (14.9%)	185 (15.0%)	90 (18.4%)	91.6%	44.6%
White, Unknown Ethnicity	112 (8.3%)	103 (8.3%)	38 (7.8%)	92.0%	33.9%
Black, non-Hispanic	226 (18.3%)	203 (18.1%)	77 (17.4%)	98.8%	37.5%
Black, Hispanic	26 (1.9%)	26 (2.1%)	8 (1.6%)	100%	30.8%
Black, Unknown Ethnicity	46 (3.4%)	39 (3.2%)	19 (3.9%)	84.8%	41.3%
Other <sup>a</sup> Race, non-Hispanic	20 (1.5%)	18 (1.5%)	7 (1.4%)	90.0%	35.0%
Other <sup>a</sup> Race, Hispanic	19 (1.4%)	13 (1.1%)	9 (1.8%)	68.4%	47.4%
Other <sup>a</sup> Race, Unknown Ethnicity	1 (--)	1 (--)	0 (--)	--	--
Unknown Race, non-Hispanic	3 (--)	3 (--)	0 (--)	--	--
Unknown Race, Hispanic	22 (1.6%)	20 (1.6%)	8 (1.6%)	90.9%	36.4%
Unknown Race, Unknown Ethnicity	29 (2.1%)	23 (1.9%)	14 (2.9%)	79.3%	48.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,356 (100%)</b>	<b>1,237 (100%)</b>	<b>488 (100%)</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>36.0%</b>

-- Percentages with such a small denominator are not statistically reliable.

<sup>a</sup> The race/ethnicity categories of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, and Other (specified) comprise Other.

-- Percentages with such a small denominator are not statistically reliable.

**Appendix Table 7. Number of Municipal and Non-Municipal ECW Deployments, 2023**

Agency Type	Probe Cycles	Stuns	Total Deployments
Non-municipal	35	31	66
Municipal	359	343	702
<b>Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>768</b>

**Appendix Table 8. Non-Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

Agency Name	Probe Cycles	Stuns	Total Deployments
Amtrak Police	0	0	0
Bridgewater State University	0	0	0
Bristol County Sheriff's Office	0	0	0
Bunker Hill Community College <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0
Central Massachusetts Law Enforcement Council	0	0	0
Clark University	1	0	1
Holyoke Community College	0	0	0
Massachusetts State Police	27	23	50
Massasoit Community College	0	0	0
Martha's Vineyard Police Tactical Response Team	0	0	0
University of Massachusetts, Lowell	0	0	0
University of Massachusetts, Memorial Medical Center	0	0	0
University of Massachusetts, Worcester	6	8	14
Westfield State College	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>66</b>

<sup>a</sup> Agency began using Electronic Control Weapons in 2023.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 9. Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Abington	0	0	0
Acushnet	0	1	1
Adams	2	1	3
Agawam	1	1	2
Amesbury	0	0	0
Andover	2	0	2
Aquinnah	0	0	0
Ashburnham	0	0	0
Ashfield	0	0	0
Ashland	0	2	2
Athol	0	5	5
Attleborough	2	2	4
Auburn	0	0	0
Avon	0	0	0
Ayer	0	2	2
Barnstable	9	12	21
Barre	0	0	0
Becket	0	0	0
Bedford	3	0	3
Belchertown	0	0	0
Belmont	0	0	0
Berkley	0	1	1
Bernardston	0	0	0
Beverly	6	8	14
Billerica	0	0	0
Blackstone	0	0	0
Blandford	0	0	0
Bolton	0	0	0
Boston	3	0	3
Bourne	0	3	3
Boxborough	0	0	0
Boxford	0	0	0
Boylston	0	0	0
Braintree	2	0	2
Brewster	0	0	0

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Bridgewater	3	1	4
Brockton	12	16	28
Brookfield	1	2	3
Burlington	0	0	0
Canton	1	0	1
Carlisle	0	0	0
Carver	2	2	4
Charlton	0	0	0
Chatham	0	2	2
Chelmsford	2	0	2
Chelsea	2	5	7
Cheshire	0	0	0
Chesterfield	0	0	0
Chicopee	9	18	27
Chilmark	0	0	0
Clinton	2	1	3
Cohasset	0	0	0
Colrain	0	0	0
Concord	2	2	4
Dalton	0	0	0
Danvers	2	0	2
Dartmouth	0	0	0
Dedham	6	0	6
Deerfield	0	0	0
Dennis	1	0	1
Dighton	0	0	0
Douglas	0	0	0
Dover	0	0	0
Dracut	0	0	0
Dudley	0	0	0
Dunstable	0	0	0
Duxbury	1	0	1
East Bridgewater	1	1	2
East Brookfield	0	0	0

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Eastham	0	0	0
Easthampton	0	0	0
Easton	0	0	0
Edgarton	0	0	0
Egremont	0	0	0
Erving	0	0	0
Essex	0	0	0
Everett	0	16	16
Fairhaven	5	4	9
Fall River	12	3	15
Falmouth	1	0	1
Fitchburg	6	4	10
Foxborough	0	0	0
Framingham	2	6	8
Franklin	2	1	3
Freetown	1	1	2
Gardner	5	2	7
Georgetown	0	0	0
Gill	0	0	0
Gloucester	0	0	0
Goshen <sup>a</sup>	0	0	0
Grafton	2	1	3
Granby	1	0	1
Granville	0	0	0
Great Barrington	0	1	1
Greenfield	2	0	2
Groton	0	0	0
Groveland	0	0	0
Hadley	0	3	3
Hamilton	0	0	0
Hampden	0	0	0

<sup>a</sup> Agency began using Electronic Control Weapons in 2023.

Note: Agencies can acquire ECWs throughout the year, so an agency's first reporting year may not span a full 12 months.

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Hanson	0	0	0
Hardwick	0	1	1
Harvard	0	0	0
Harwich	0	0	0
Hatfield	0	0	0
Haverhill	3	0	3
Hingham	1	0	1
Hinsdale	0	0	0
Holbrook	2	2	4
Holden	0	0	0
Holland	0	0	0
Holliston	0	0	0
Holyoke	6	8	14
Hopedale	0	0	0
Hopkinton	0	0	0
Hubbardston	0	0	0
Hudson	0	0	0
Hull	1	1	2
Ipswich	0	2	2
Kingston	0	0	0
Lakeville	0	0	0
Lanesborough	0	0	0
Lawrence	11	28	39
Lee	0	0	0
Leicester	0	0	0
Lenox	0	0	0
Leominster	9	2	11
Leverett	0	0	0
Lincoln	0	0	0
Littleton	0	0	0
Longmeadow	0	0	0
Lowell	11	3	14
Ludlow	1	2	3
Lunenburg	1	3	4

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Lynn	14	3	17
Lynnfield	0	0	0
Manchester-by-the-Sea	0	0	0
Mansfield	3	1	4
Marblehead	0	0	0
Marion	0	0	0
Marlborough	2	1	3
Marshfield	0	0	0
Mashpee	2	0	2
Maynard	0	0	0
Medfield	0	0	0
Medway	0	0	0
Mendon	0	0	0
Merrimac	0	0	0
Methuen	4	0	4
Middleborough	2	3	5
Middleton	0	0	0
Milford	0	2	2
Millbury	4	0	4
Millis	0	0	0
Millville	0	0	0
Milton	3	0	3
Monson	1	0	1
Montague	0	0	0
Nantucket	0	5	5
Natick	0	1	1
Needham	0	1	1
New Bedford	12	12	24
New Braintree	0	0	0
New Marlborough	0	0	0
New Salem	0	0	0
Newbury	0	0	0
Newburyport	0	0	0
Norfolk	1	0	1
North Adams	2	1	3

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
North Andover	0	0	0
North Attleborough	1	1	2
North Brookfield	0	0	0
North Reading	0	0	0
Northborough	3	0	3
Northbridge	1	0	1
Northfield	0	0	0
Norton	0	0	0
Norwell	0	0	0
Norwood	1	2	3
Oak Bluffs	0	0	0
Oakham	0	0	0
Orange	0	0	0
Orleans	1	0	1
Oxford	4	1	5
Palmer	0	0	0
Paxton	0	0	0
Peabody	1	2	3
Pembroke	1	1	2
Pepperell	1	1	2
Petersham	0	0	0
Phillipston	0	0	0
Pittsfield	3	0	3
Plainville	0	0	0
Plymouth	3	3	6
Plympton	0	0	0
Princeton	1	0	1
Provincetown	2	2	4
Quincy	0	5	5
Randolph	4	0	4
Raynham	0	0	0
Reading	0	0	0
Rehoboth	0	3	3
Revere	1	1	2

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Rockland	1	0	1
Rowley	1	0	1
Royalston	0	0	0
Rutland	2	0	2
Salem	0	0	0
Salisbury	1	0	1
Sandwich	3	0	3
Scituate	0	0	0
Seekonk	0	0	0
Sharon	0	0	0
Sheffield	0	0	0
Sherborn	0	0	0
Shirley	0	0	0
Shrewsbury	2	8	10
Shutesbury	0	0	0
Somerset	1	0	1
South Hadley	0	0	0
Southborough	0	0	0
Southbridge	19	2	21
Southwick	2	0	2
Spencer	3	0	3
Springfield	11	21	32
Sterling	0	0	0
Stockbridge	0	1	1
Stoneham	2	0	2
Stoughton	1	3	4
Stow	0	0	0
Sturbridge	1	0	1
Sudbury	0	0	0
Sunderland	0	0	0
Sutton	1	0	1
Swampscott	0	0	0
Swansea	0	0	0
Taunton	10	4	14
Templeton	0	0	0

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Tewksbury	0	3	3
Tisbury	0	0	0
Tolland	0	0	0
Topsfield	0	0	0
Townsend	0	0	0
Truro	1	0	1
Tyngsborough	0	0	0
Upton	0	0	0
Uxbridge	0	0	0
Wakefield	0	0	0
Wales	0	0	0
Walpole	8	0	8
Ware	0	1	1
Wareham	4	2	6
Warren	0	0	0
Warwick	0	0	0
Watertown	0	0	0
Webster	6	11	17
Wellesley	0	0	0
Wellfleet	0	0	0
Wenham	0	0	0
West Boylston	0	0	0
West Bridgewater	1	0	1
West Brookfield	0	0	0
West Newbury	0	0	0
West Springfield	5	30	35
West Stockbridge	0	0	0
West Tisbury	0	0	0
Westborough	2	0	2
Westfield	10	5	15
Westford	0	0	0
Westhampton	0	0	0
Westminster	0	1	1
Westport	0	1	1
Westwood	0	0	0

**Appendix Table 9. (continued) Municipal ECW Deployments by Agency, 2023**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Probe Cycles</b>	<b>Stuns</b>	<b>Total Deployments</b>
Weymouth	1	2	3
Whately	0	0	0
Whitman	0	1	1
Williamsburg	0	0	0
Williamstown	1	0	1
Wilmington	1	0	1
Winchendon	1	0	1
Winchester	0	0	0
Woburn	0	0	0
Worcester	17	11	28
Worthington	0	0	0
Wrentham	0	0	0
Yarmouth	0	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>702</b>

## **TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

These terms and definitions are provided to law enforcement agencies on the ECW reporting application where the report is submitted.

**Electronic Control Weapon (ECW):** A stun gun as defined in M.G.L. c. 140, § 121, or any portable device or weapon, regardless of whether it passes an electrical shock by means of a dart or projectile via a wire lead, from which an electrical current, impulse, wave or beam that is designed to incapacitate temporarily by causing neuromuscular incapacitation or pain so that an officer can regain and maintain control of the subject.

**ECW Agency:** A law enforcement agency in Massachusetts with electronic control weapons.

**ECW Contact:** Each individual officer's deployment, warning, or display of an ECW towards a single subject. (Example: Four officers respond to one call and only one officer issues a warning and a second officer deploys a weapon on a single subject. This would be reported as one incident and two contacts.)

### **ECW Deployment:**

**Probe Deployment:** The act of firing two small, dart-like probes from the ECW that attach to the subject. The device then delivers a 5-second electrical cycle, which can be repeated in order to incapacitate the subject to the point of submission.

**5-Second Cycle:** A 5-second electrical charge resulting from a probe deployment, which can be repeated.

**Stun Deployment:** The act of bringing the ECW device into direct contact with the subject's skin or clothing in order to induce pain to the point of submission. Stuns can be repeated if the subject does not initially submit.

**ECW Incident:** An event in which an officer or group of officers issue a warning and/or deploy an ECW towards a single subject. The following are the four types of reportable ECW applications:

**ECW Display:** The ECW is removed from the holster and displayed in any manner to the subject to gain a subject's voluntary compliance without actual use of the ECW.

**ECW Arc Display:** The ECW device is activated to demonstrate the device's electrical arcing to gain a subject's voluntary compliance without actual use of the ECW.

**ECW Deployment/Probe Mode (Device Fired):** The ECW is fired at the subject with the intended effect of the two wired probes making separate contact with the body to complete the electrical circuit causing neuromuscular incapacitation (NMI)

of the subject.

**ECW Deployment (Drive Stun):** The ECW is activated and applied in direct contact with the subject's body causing localized pain and discomfort to that immediate area of the body. This method will not normally immobilize a subject unless the drive stun also completes the electrical circuit in conjunction with at least one wired probe that remains connected between the subject and the ECW.

#### **ECW Warning:**

**Laser Warning:** A visual warning whereby an officer employs the laser function of the ECW device to indicate that an ECW will be deployed.

**Spark Warning:** A visual warning whereby an officer employs a spark on a handheld stun device in order to demonstrate its effectiveness. Also known as an Arc Display.

**Verbal/Visual Warning:** Any spoken words or display of the ECW that would indicate to a subject that an ECW may be used. This warning can include: 1) Any direct wording to a subject indicating or implying that an ECW will be used. (Example: Displaying an ECW and shouting "Stop!"), 2) Any indirect wording that a subject may overhear indicating or implying that an ECW is about to be deployed. (Example: A warning to other officers that an ECW is about to be deployed by saying "Taser, Taser, Taser").

## **ABOUT THE RESEARCH AND POLICY ANALYSIS DIVISION**

The Research and Policy Analysis Division (RPAD) is a division within OGR). The RPAD and its Statistical Analysis Center use research and evaluation to promote public safety to evaluate the effectiveness of grant-funded programs and provide deeper understanding of public safety issues. The RPAD works on a number of projects including Electronic Control Weapons reporting, Provider Sexual Crime Report analysis, and the development of criminal justice data standards.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are grateful for the 300 municipal and non-municipal law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts that contributed the ECW data used for this report. We appreciate the ongoing cooperation and support of agency officers, administrators, and officials who ensure submission of the ECW information despite many competing priorities.

This project was supported by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs federal grant number 2022-15PBJA-22-GG-00645-JAGX. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice.

