



Edward M. Augustus, Jr.
City Manager

CITY OF WORCESTER

cm2020jul13050254

Attachment for Item # 9.10 A

July 21, 2020

TO THE WORCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COUNCILORS:

The attached communication relative to a report regarding information on the Body-Worn Camera Pilot Program, as received from Steven M. Sargent, Chief of Police, is forwarded for the information of your Honorable Body.

Body-Worn Cameras (BWC) are an effective tool to preserve factual representations of officer/civilian interactions. BWCs are also effective in capturing video and audio evidence for use in criminal investigations, internal investigations, officer training and increasing transparency.

Chief Steven M. Sargent has provided an extensive report on the completed six month Body-Worn Camera (BWC) Pilot Program. The program was implemented with the goal of achieving the greatest public safety benefits. Prior to deploying the technology, the department reviewed best practices, developed a policy, and trained officers in the use of BWC. During the pilot program, the department evaluated the overall performance of the technology.

The findings of the program are outlined in this comprehensive report which will be used when carefully considering whether the Worcester Police Department should adopt body-worn cameras.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward M. Augustus, Jr.
City Manager



OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER, CITY HALL, WORCESTER, MA 01608
TELEPHONE (508) 799-1175 | FAX (508) 799-1208
EMAIL: citymanager@worcesterma.gov





**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE
CITY OF WORCESTER**

MASSACHUSETTS 01608 -1172

508-799-8600

STEVEN M. SARGENT
Chief of Police



To: Edward M. Augustus, Jr., City Manager

From: Steven M. Sargent, Chief of Police

Date: June 18, 2020

Re: Body Camera Report

Relative to your request for a report regarding information on the Body-Worn Camera Pilot Program the following information is respectfully submitted.

Body-Worn Cameras (BWC) are an effective tool to preserve factual representations of officer/civilian interactions. BWCs are also effective in capturing video and audio evidence for use in criminal investigations, internal investigations, officer training and increasing transparency.

The Worcester Police Department researched the use and application of Body Worn Cameras (BWC) prior to the launch of the Body Camera Pilot Program. Members of the Worcester Police Command Staff worked with the city administration, experts, and law enforcement partners to examine best practices, challenges and benefits of the technology. This phase also involved taking a look at other police agencies that are utilizing the technology, and learning from their experiences. The background work and preparation ensured that the pilot program was successfully launched in May of 2019.


Twenty officers, including sixteen from the Operations division, two from the Traffic division, and two from the Neighborhood Response Team, volunteered to wear the cameras for their regular tour of duty during the six month pilot program. In addition, I assigned two lieutenants and four officers to oversee the program and assess the overall performance of the technology.

The company Axon provided twenty body cameras to the participating officers, and twenty extra cameras in case of malfunction. The city did not pay Axon for any aspect of the pilot program.

The cameras recorded audio and video, and data was uploaded when placed in the docking bay at the end of the officers' shifts. The officers in the pilot program were thoroughly trained in the operation of the cameras and the department's policy about their proper use.

The complete and comprehensive Body Camera Pilot Program Report is attached to this document for your review. The report provides: an overview, a review of the company Axon, evidence collection, potential benefits of body-worn cameras, potential drawbacks and other program conclusions.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steven M. Sargent". The signature is written in a cursive style with a small dot at the end of the last word.

Steven M. Sargent
Chief of Police



Worcester Police Department



Body Worn Camera Pilot Program Report

Steven M. Sargent
Chief of Police

Edward M. Augustus Jr.
City Manager

Body Worn Camera Pilot Program Report

Overview

On May 1, 2019 the Worcester Police Department (WPD) began a 6-month Body Worn Camera (BWC) Pilot Program. The pilot ran from May 1, 2019 to October 31, 2019 and consisted of 46 WPD volunteers. The WPD had 20 police officers wearing a camera, 20 sergeants assigned to assist the 20 officers, along with the BWC Unit, comprised of 2 lieutenants and 4 officers to oversee and evaluate the entire program.

The 20 BWC officers were assigned to the following divisions or units: 16 from Operations Division, 2 from Traffic Division, and 2 from the Neighborhood Response Team. The BWC officers were required to wear the BWC every regularly scheduled work day throughout their entire shift. The BWC officers did not wear the BWC at any other time, such as off-duty assignments or assignments outside the standard 40 hour work week.

The sergeants were required to assist the officers with compliance of the BWC Pilot Program Policy, but more specifically to audit the officer's activation of the BWC in accordance with the policy. Once a week the sergeants would compare two random incidents within our Records Management System (RMS) to Axon's Evidence.com account. This was one way to identify if the BWC officers complied with the policy as to when to activate the BWC and create a video. The sergeants were also required to distribute videos to non-BWC officers, when appropriate, and to review Uses of Force (UOF) videos identified by policy before signing off on UOF reports.

The BWC Unit was originally responsible for identifying which BWC company to utilize. This was done through research and communications with other police departments who previously conducted their own research and pilots with various companies to determine the best product. The BWC Unit chose AXON. The clear picture that presented itself was that AXON was considered the industry gold standard for not only their BWC, but for their Tasers as well.

Next, the BWC Unit was tasked with creating a policy for the BWC Pilot Program and developing a department-wide training program. Both tasks were completed before the start of the pilot. Members of the BWC Unit attended several trainings provided by AXON and Force Science Institute prior to developing the training program for the department. All 46 law enforcement officers discussed above received 16 hours of department-sponsored training that consisted of policy training and review of the BWC Pilot Policy, UOF Policy, and Officer Involved Shooting Policy. The officers also received training on the BWC equipment's hardware/software and participated in numerous practical exercises. The remainder of the WPD officers (approximately 300) received 4 hours of training focused on the policies and the BWC equipment.

Once the 6-month BWC Pilot Program began, the BWC Unit was responsible for the overall implementation and day-to-day operations. The BWC Officers created approximately 7,707 videos while performing their law enforcement duties. These videos equaled approximately 1,100 hours of recorded

video and amounted to over 4,000 Gigabytes of data. When broken down per day, the 20 officers created 43 videos, amounting to 6 hours of video and 22 Gigabytes of data. The BWC Officers were provided 9 categories in which to catalog and identify their 7,707 videos. Those categories were, (1) use of force, (2) arrest, (3) reports, (4) criminal summons/warrants, (5) traffic stops, (6) investigative stops, (7) no report/code 160 (8) assisting officer/no report, and (9) training. For a review of the specific data points mentioned, see exhibits 1 and 2.

AXON Company Review

During the 6-month BWC Pilot Program, AXON provided training, equipment, both hardware and software, storage of all video evidence, along with continuous customer service and support. An AXON representative was onsite and provided basic hardware/software training for the 46 members participating in the pilot. The representative also trained the BWC Unit personnel to become the trainers to train the WPD officers not involved in the BWC pilot program. This same representative became our point of contact and our customer service representative throughout. Overall, the customer service was exceptional and provided immediate assistance whenever needed.

The hardware that was provided consisted of the docking stations, the AXON Body 2 and Body 2 Flex Cameras, various mounting clips, I-Pods and all the appropriate cables. Axon provided more than enough equipment and we never needed more. During the pilot we had two body cameras that stopped working, but we had 20 spare cameras, so we were able to immediately swap them out. The company does have a percentage rate of failure with their cameras, which is extremely low and it is important to point out that the equipment we were using was used continually for other pilots across the country. If WPD decided to continue with AXON, all new equipment would be issued. Since the pilot program began, AXON released a new model, the Body Camera 3. This new camera is included in the quote listed below. One of the new features with the Body 3 is additional microphones to capture higher quality audio. We did notice incidents where excessive noise conditions distorted the sound while using the Body 2 Cameras.

The software was as reliable as the hardware. The company provided SYNC Software, which was an application installed in the laptops inside the cruisers that provided officers access to their footage. AXON was responsible for all data storage, which we uploaded daily to the company's website, Evidence.com. This application is very user friendly and allowed easy access to navigate our videos. AXON also provides several other software applications that our pilot did not utilize, but would be a potential benefit going forward. One of the applications is AXON Performance, which allows integration with our RMS system, and will allow efficient merger of data. This relieves officers from having to enter Metadata.

AXON has three cell phone applications titled AXON View, AXON Capture and AXON Device Manager. AXON View allows officers to watch their videos on a cell phone and make Metadata entries. AXON Capture allows officers to capture photos, video recordings, audio recordings and citizen evidence on a cell phone, and allows immediate upload of evidence into evidence.com. AXON Device Manager allows

administrators immediate access to manage a host of items from a cell phone without having to log into a desktop. An example would be assigning or reassigning cameras to officers from the field. All three of these applications are valuable tools that would enhance evidence collection and camera management and should be seriously considered going forward. Effective use of these applications would require department-issued cell phones for BWC officers.

AXON provides different levels of data storage. During our pilot, we had unlimited storage. Based on the amount of data the 20 officers created and the anticipated high volume of data our department would generate, it appears necessary to have an unlimited data storage package per officer/department. AXON provided the data storage platform and handles all data security issues. The company does not release any data, and only the department creating the videos has exclusive access and control of their evidence. The company reports that they have never had any security breach or loss of evidence, nor have they been compelled to release any police department's evidence in response to any outside requests. Simply stated, they just store the data.

Evidence Collection

Every video is a potential piece of evidence, but every video associated with an arrest or criminal charge is in fact evidence. During the 6 months, the 20 officers created a total of 602 videos under two categories. Under category (2) arrest, 489 videos were created and under category (4) criminal summons/warrant, there were 113 videos. The length of the average arrest was 19 minutes and the average criminal summons was 15 minutes. The 602 videos provide about 183 hours of viewable evidence. Throughout the pilot, officers were required to view all UOF videos and were encouraged to view all videos associated with arrests and criminal charges. If viewing had been required, the officers would have been tasked with an additional 183 hours of work during the 6 months. Some videos will also have to be viewed by assisting officers.

The BWC Unit viewed all UOF videos and had a goal of viewing all arrest videos. Because the BWC Unit was comprised of officers permanently assigned other jobs, the unit fell short of this goal and viewed approximately 85% of the arrest videos. In addition to the potential for many new hours tasked to officers, supervisors and BWC Unit personnel to review the videos, the evidence also creates significant discovery issues.

The video evidence was shared in three ways during the pilot. The evidence can be requested through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), an internal request from one officer or department to another, or through an evidentiary discovery request by the District Attorney's Office (DA's). WPD received 3 FOIA requests during the pilot and provided approximately 12 videos and several months' worth of the sergeants weekly audit reports. Since the number of FOIA requests were limited, it was difficult to put a number on the amount of time it would take to process. However, a rough estimate could be, for every hour of video requested it would take approximately 2-3 hours to completely process the request. This

is because each request needs to be researched by reviewing reports and reviewing the video several times to identify any audio or video that must be redacted.

The internal sharing of video, for example from one officer in one unit to another officer in a different unit, is fairly simple as long as all persons have an evidence.com account. An official or administrator can quickly grant authority to another with a click of the mouse, allowing others the authority to view.

During the pilot, one of the biggest and most time-consuming tasks was handling requests for video evidence from the DA's Office. When the BWC unit broke down these discovery requests by month, we determined the average monthly request was 20. However, due to the slow nature of cases beginning, we anticipate this number of requests will increase per month. For example, the month of May had 0 requests, June =13, July = 18, August = 21, September = 22, October = 18, and November = 22. The total number of requests from the DA's Office was 114, however this doesn't mean there were only 114 videos. Any time the incident was captured by multiple BWC Officers, all videos under one request had to be processed. With only 20 BWC Officers working during the pilot, this only occurred a handful of times. The real concern would be during a full implementation where it would be commonplace to have 2, 3 or even 4 cameras at every incident. The BWC Unit was also tasked with processing these discovery requests and each request averaged approximately 15 minutes. With 114 requests, this amounted to approximately 28.5 hours of additional manpower hours. If the WPD continued to use BWC's, this process wouldn't be sustainable. The easy solution would be to have the DA's Office create and maintain their own evidence.com account. This did not take place during the pilot, but would be essential to the success of any BWC implementation going forward. This would allow an administrator within the BWC Unit to authorize immediate access to prosecuting attorneys within the DA's Office when requested.

If 200 BWC officers create videos at the same rate as the 20 did during pilot program, they would create approximately 159,000 thousand videos a year, amounting to 23,000 hours of video. These numbers would reflect all the videos created in all 9 categories and not just arrest and criminal charges. As stated above, the DA'S Office requested an average of 20 discovery requests a month with 20 BWC Officers. If we have 200 BWC Officers, conservatively we can expect 200 discovery requests a month. However, when we add multiple videos at every incident this number could double or triple. 400 discovery requests a month would average out to 13 discovery requests a day. These numbers are large, but manageable with a BWC Unit staffed with appropriate personnel.

Potential Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras

Training – Throughout our program, perhaps the most useful and underrated application of the technology has been for training purposes. We have seen three major uses of body-worn cameras for improving our training:

1. Officers' self-critique – After reading the surveys and speaking with the participating officers, we saw that they appreciated the ability to watch their own work. They often said things like “I let people get too close to me” or “I wait too long to put handcuffs on.” This type of self-critique has the potential to dramatically improve the tactical performance and safety of our officers. Officers must always actively fight against complacency, and having their performance captured on camera is an incentive against taking shortcuts with their safety.
2. Officials and training division – During the pilot program, the BWC Unit was able to see the strengths and weaknesses of our officers in tactical situations. These conclusions can be used to give feedback to officers, and to notify commanders and/or the Training Division if additional training is needed. The Training Division could focus In-Service training on issues that they see in the footage, and the Command staff could adjust policies.
3. Training exercises - Officers wore body-worn cameras during our active shooter training, and found them to be extremely useful. Tactical training can be much more valuable when officers can review their behavior and see things that they might have missed in person. Cameras have the potential to greatly amplify the effect of our training, which is often undertaken at significant effort and cost.

De-escalation – We hoped that the presence of body cameras could help to calm angry citizens, who might behave better knowing that their conduct will be captured on camera. The Pilot program indicates that the presence of a camera does not affect everyone's behavior, but does cause some people to calm down. Some officers said that upset individuals on motor vehicle stops often calmed down when they saw that the BWC officers had a camera. However, another officer pointed out that the majority of people with whom he has confrontations have mental illness, and they generally do not change their behavior because of the presence of a camera. At the very least, BWC's have the potential to de-escalate some citizens.

Resolving Complaints – Citizen Complaints often involve two different accounts of an officer's behavior. BWC footage has the potential to quickly resolve these complaints, one way or another. Knowing that the incident is captured on film reduces the incentive for citizens to fabricate stories about an officer's behavior. None of the BWC officers in the pilot program received any complaints, but we have no way of knowing if this was due to the presence of the cameras.

Evidence collection – BWCs have the potential to significantly aid in the prosecution of many different types of crimes. Documenting the way officers speak to suspects and victims can significantly reduce potential suppression of admissions and confessions. Because of the lag in cases going to trial, we did not see the full benefit of this yet. In the months to come, the changes caused by BWC's should become more apparent.

Community Support – The increased transparency associated with BWC’s has the potential to lead to more community confidence in and support for the police department. Research at the national level on this question has been mixed, but most polls show that the public generally likes the idea of BWCs on officers. The BWC pilot program was too brief to notice significant differences in community support in Worcester, but the program appears likely to improve citizen confidence in the police department.

Improving officer comfort with recording devices – Although most police have gotten more comfortable with the presence of cell phone cameras and recording devices over the years, some officers still show some discomfort at being recorded while doing their jobs. Officers who are uncomfortable can be slower and less confident in making necessary decisions. A BWC turns every call into a “recorded” call, which makes being recorded a non-issue for officers.

Objective record of critical incidents – BWC footage has the potential to provide an objective record of critical incidents that lead to officer or citizen injury. This will reduce the potential for rumors, damaged community relations, lawsuits and other negative side effects of critical incidents.

Reducing Liability – By showing the true nature of a citizen-police interaction, BWC footage has the potential to end many lawsuits before they begin. This could save the city money and save officers the stress of dealing with false accusations.

Potential Drawbacks:

Cost and manpower – The BWC program requires a significant investment in training and personnel. Time spent watching videos is time not spent on enforcement, community policing, etc. To administer the program effectively, we expect that a unit with roughly five officers and two officials will have to be established.

BWC’s create public records – Currently, the majority of BWC footage is considered a public record. This means that any member of the public who wants footage can ask for access to it. Managing public records requests creates a significant workload for the police department, and creates the possibility of public embarrassment for officers or citizens.

Officer morale – Officers in the pilot program felt less able to use their discretion at times. They thought that cameras caused them to become more “robotic,” and less able to joke around and have fun while doing their jobs. Some officers felt pressure to maintain the demeanor of someone testifying in court. This has the potential to hurt officers’ enjoyment of their jobs, and to reduce community engagement.

Privacy concerns – BWCs capture the public and officers during intense situations, often on citizens’ worst day. The current public records law does not exempt the vast majority of footage, which could lead to a reduction in citizen privacy.

Potential effect on victims – Widespread adoption of BWCs has the potential to reduce witness cooperation, especially with serious and gang-involved crimes. Witnesses often want to stay anonymous, and the presence of cameras could make them afraid to speak to officers at all.

De-policing – Some officers might be less willing to engage in proactive policing when they are afraid that every mistake they make has the potential to subject them to public criticism.

Officers' hesitation in using necessary force – In policing, use of force usually looks bad to the public when captured on camera. Some officers might be hesitant to use necessary force because they do not want to be portrayed negatively in the media. In the early days of the pilot program, we noticed some officers being overly accommodating to suspects, perhaps because of a preoccupation with how things “look.” We expect this to become less of a problem as officers become more comfortable with the technology.

Potential for officer distraction – Every additional piece of equipment that officers carry adds complexity to their job, and has the potential to cause confusion and hesitation in critical moments.

Other Program Conclusions

1. **The administration of the program was more time-consuming than we expected.** The six members of the BWC Unit found it difficult to watch all of the arrest and use of force videos, and still perform their regular duties. There were only three public records requests during the pilot, but this is likely to go up significantly if there is widespread adoption of BWCs. Between training, discovery requests, public records requests, equipment management, and supervision of the officers, BWCs create a significant amount of administrative work.
2. **Prior to widespread adoption of BWCs, the DA's office will need access to Evidence.com for video sharing.** The DA's office had a technical issue during the pilot program preventing them from utilizing the Evidence.com system, and all video evidence requested for discovery had to be burned to disc and sent over physically. This clumsy system resulted in a lot of unnecessary work for WPD administrators. Widespread adoption would render it unsustainable.

Estimated Cost

The BWC unit had AXON provide 3 different quotes for 3 different packages. Below is an estimate of all 3 quotes, which cover a 5 year period. Currently the WPD has 374 funded police officers, 55 sergeants, 24 lieutenants, and 8 captains, for a total of 461 positions.

Various packages:

453 Body Camera 2, with Officer Safety Plan 7 software, including 150 Taser 7s. 5 year total: 4.4 million dollars

453 Body Camera 2, 453 Taser 7s with Officer Safety Plan 7. 5 year total: 5.5 million dollars

453 Body Camera 3, 453 Taser 7s with Officer Safety Plan 7. 5 year total: 5.7 million

In addition, the administration of a fully implemented body camera program would require additional personnel. We determined that the program would require one captain or lieutenant, one sergeant, and five patrol officers. The additional personnel would have a total cost of \$811,212 per year, or \$4.06 million over 5 years. To make the program run effectively, we recommend department-issued cell phones for all officers. This vastly increases the potential of the body worn cameras in several different areas. Providing department phones to all officers would cost approximately \$150,000 a year, or \$750,000 over 5 years. Due to the time spent by patrol officers watching their video, it is likely that additional patrol officers will become necessary, but these estimates do not include their cost.

Extensive training of the whole department is needed to ensure that the cameras are used to the best of their ability. This would be a one-time cost in the first year of the program.

Officer BWC training OT = \$56.59/hour = \$240,395
Officials BWC training OT = \$73.24/hour = \$101,950
Trainers BWC OT = \$56.59/hour = \$29,880

Officer Taser training OT: \$126,988
Officials Taser training OT: \$38,231
Trainers Taser OT: \$7920

Total one-time training cost: \$545,364

Total cost over 5 years:

Package 1 + personnel + phones + training = \$9.75 million

Package 2 + personnel + phones + training = \$10.85 million

Package 3 + personnel + phones + training = \$11.05 million

WPD currently has 104 - X26P Tasers, through AXON, deployed amongst our members. The above Taser quotes include the Taser 7s, Axon's latest model. On average, it takes 6 hours to certify a user on the new Taser 7s. If the department decided to implement BWC's, we recommend a cost analysis of our current spending on Tasers compared with potential camera/Taser bundles.

During the pilot program, we used the Body Camera 2, which has since been replaced by the Body Camera 3. The third quote above includes the newer Body Camera 3 model, which has various improvements over the Body Camera 2.

Exhibit 1

	Total Uploads	
Number of Videos		8046
Hours of Videos		1149.67
GB of Videos		4175.80
	Active AXON Evidence	
Number of Active Videos		7965
Hours of Active Videos		1146.43
GB of Active Videos		4163.82
	Average Per Day	
Number of Videos Uploaded		43.49
Hours of Video Uploaded		6.21
GB of Video Uploaded		22.57

Exhibit 2

Categories	Files	GB	% Files	% GB
No Report/160	2983	1027.18	34.57	22.03
Assisting Officer/No report Reports	1898	1020.98	22.00	21.90
Traffic Stop	1792	1369.30	20.77	29.37
Arrest	966	481.27	11.20	10.32
Training	489	525.63	5.67	11.27
Training	258	68.20	2.99	1.46
Criminal Summons/Warrants	113	94.86	1.31	2.03
Investigative Stops	80	39.13	0.93	0.84

Uncategorized	25	5.87	0.29	0.13
Use of Force	24	30.48	0.28	0.65

Exhibit 3

Bellow Exhibit 3 identifies the 20 BWC Officers based on their shift and unit assignments and the number of videos, arrests, criminal applications and uses of force.

Operations Days	Videos	Arrest	Crim App	UOF
Officer 1	478	21	4	1
Officer 2	50	7	0	0
Officer 3	505	68	9	3
Officer 4	612	34	13	1
Officer 5	333	14	2	0
Officer 6	390	28	5	1
Operations 1st Half				
Officer 1	450	23	7	0
Officer 2	530	30	17	4
Officer 3	660	42	0	2
Officer 4	743	91	20	4
Officer 5	178	7	2	0
Operations Last Half				
Officer 1	552	24	7	3
Officer 2	472	23	3	1
Officer 3	476	22	7	0
Officer 4	317	7	4	0
Officer 5	200	7	3	2
Traffic				
Officer 1	145	0	0	0
Officer 2	406	0	2	0
Neighborhood Response Team				
Officer 1	79	31	3	0
Officer 2	100	6	2	1

Exhibit 4 - Pre and Post Combined Survey

Below is a combined survey that was given before starting the pilot and again after the pilot ended. The first set of numbers are the results of the pre survey and the second set of the numbers are the post survey results. The comments captured in quotations and highlighted in red are from the pre survey and the comments in blue are from the post survey.

1. Do you agree or disagree with officers wearing BWCs?

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|-----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree | (8) | (7) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree | (2) | (5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral | (10) | (7) |

Comments:

“Cameras help us by protecting us but it limits our ability to use discretion”

“I think BWC’s have a positive impact on officers but are not needed”

“I believe the cameras are useful when it comes to protecting us from false accusations, complaints and when UOF is used but it limits discretion”

“Takes away discretion”

2. Do you think BWCs will increase or decrease citizen complaints against officers wearing BWCs?

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase | (1) | (11) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease | (15) | (5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No change | (4) | (3) |

Comments:

“BWC’s will show how difficult people are”

“I think citizens will still complain and try to spin the story even with video evidence”

“Citizens will see cameras and provoke officers more than usual”

“BWC’s will lower the amount of frivolous complaints”.

“I feel actions worth filing a complaint about will still be brought to superior’s attention but false complaints will decrease because citizens are aware that they are being recorded and it will be their word against actual footage of what occurred”

“The BWC will show how bad the public can be and what we are faced with everyday”

3. Do you think disciplinary action will increase or decrease against officers wearing BWCs?

- Increase (5) (6)
- Decrease (8) (6)
- No change (7) (7)

Comments:

“I feel false allegations are already realized by investigations and BWC’s are not needed for this”

“Everything is being recorded, actions will be held accountable and backed by video”

4. Do you think officers wearing BWCs are more likely or less likely to use a reportable use of force?

- More likely (5) (4)
- Less likely (7) (8)
- No change (8) (7)

Comments:

“I think some will hesitate and 2nd guess themselves”

“The presence of the BWC changes your way of policing, or at least it has for me. I found myself using more verbal judo to deter situations that may have warranted some kind of use of force. I believe the majority of BWC Officers have found themselves doing this more than they normally would”

“I think officers are more likely to exhaust all means before using force”

“I think they worry too much about using force when on camera, causing safety issues”

5. Do you feel officers wearing a BWC will use a lower force option, higher force option, or same force option than an officer not wearing a BWC?

- Lower force option (7) (9)
- Higher force option (0)
- Same force option (13) (10)

Comments: **No Comments**

6. Do you feel that wearing a BWC will escalate or deescalate a situation?

- Escalate (1) (1)
- Deescalate (13) (9)
- No Change (6) (8)

Comments:

“When you tell people they are being recorded they change their attitudes”

“Citizens may be more cautious in their language and actions if they know their being recorded”

“Most of my escalated situations are due to people suffering from mental health and BWC won’t change that behavior”

“I have notified several individuals that everything was being recorded and when I did, I immediately observed a difference in their demeanor. They know that their actions are recorded and will be used against them in court”

7. Do you feel wearing a BWC will distract you from your police duties causing a safety issue?

- Yes it will be a distraction (2) (5)
- No it will not be a distraction (9) (10)
- Undecided (9) (3)

Comments:

“When first issued can cause a safety issue until officer is comfortable with the camera”

“I personally felt that sometimes I hesitated because I knew everything was being recorded but I do not feel that the camera distracted me enough to where I felt that there would be a safety issue”

“At times I forget to turn on camera”

8. How concerned are you about your personal privacy while wearing a BWC?

- | | | |
|--|------|-----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very concerned | (5) | (6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally concerned | (11) | (5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not concerned | (4) | (7) |

Comments:

“Concerned personal information won’t be redacted if video becomes public”

“I was never concerned about my personal privacy”

“If you don’ think that you are already on camera, you are a fool”

9. Are you concerned about citizens’ privacy while wearing a BWC?

- | | | |
|--|------|------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very concerned | (1) | (4) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally concerned | (3) | (3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not concerned | (16) | (11) |

Comments:

“I feel if a video is to go public it should be edited for citizen privacy”

10. Do you have any other concerns in regards to wearing a BWC?

Comments:

“Will discretion be limited?”

“Throws discretion out the window when it comes to complex calls”

“Where it needs to be worn changes radio mic placement”

“Consequences if I forget to turn it on prior to an incident”

“Having to dock the unit to share video is a major time consumer. Having to individually enter data for each incident is time consuming”

“Should be able to activate when it feels necessary, not every call needs a video”

“I do not feel that the WPD is one of those departments that need BWC’s. I don’t feel that our department is involved in many UOF incidents that are questionable or excessive”

“My personal opinion is that the BWC is a positive thing. It has helped me several times. I know there is a lot of talk about transparency. The BWC provides that 100 % for the public and the police”

“The program was interesting and deescalated several situations. There are times when calls go downhill at the drop of a hat and there is so much footage that can be helpful in court”

Exhibit 5 – Survey conducted two months into pilot

1. Do you mostly use I-Pod or Sync Software to enter Metadata and watch your videos?

Sync – 7 I-Pod - 11

2. Do you watch your own videos?

Yes – 10 Sometimes – 5 Rarely – 4

3. If yes, how often, 25%, 50%, 75% or 100%, which % best fits the amount of video you watch?

25% - 12 50% - 6 75% -1 100% -1

4. What % of your arrest videos to watch?

No Arrests – 3 25% - 3 50% - 1 75% - 1 100% - 10

5. Have you identified training opportunities by watching your videos?

Yes – 13 No - 6

6. If yes, have you changed some behavior/tactics and self-trained in some situations?

Yes – 11

“I try to talk to people more”

“I Notice I allow people to get dangerously close to me, even those that don’t pose a threat”

“I’m far too patient”

“Prisoner Control”

“Improve tactics, handcuffing, prisoner control”

“Need to more aware of my surroundings”

7. Have you had any hardware problems?

No – 15 Yes – 5

“Uploading time”

“No sound on some of the desktops in operations”

“Docking failures”

“I-Pod”

“Broking Sync cable for cruiser laptop”

8. Have you had any software problems?

No – 14 Yes – 6

“I-Pod categories not available”

“I-Pod trouble entering Metadata”

“I-Pod keyboard non-responsive or slow”

“I-Pod and camera not syncing”

9. Have you received any citizen complaints during the pilot program?

No - 20

10. If yes, has the video been used to resolve the complaint?

N/A

11. Have you identified any concerns or conflicts with the BWC Policy?

No – 17 Yes-3

12. If yes, what policy recommendations would have?

“I don’t think they (camera) should be on for every call, it creates a lot of downtime and a lot of videos that show nothing”

“Use of Force concerns, reporting for levels 4 and 5 and not level 3”

“Only activate for certain types of calls”

13. How often do you notify citizens that they are being recorded? Note the best % that accurately describes the level of notification.

Only in residence – 8 25% - 5 50% - 4 75% - 2

14. Since the beginning, has notifying citizens decreased, increased or stayed the same?

Decreased – 2 Increased – 5 Same - 12

15. When notification is made, has the citizens' response been neutral, positive or negative?

Neutral – 7 Positive – 9 Negative - 2

16. If you had a choice today, would you continue to wear the camera?

No – 9 Yes – 11

17. Please list one positive of wearing the camera?

“Once people learn they are being recorded they tend to behave in a more positive manner”

“Easier clearing of a citizen complaint”

“It captures what we encounter on a variety of calls and the citizen behavior”

“I feel that I am protected against false accusations or complaints”

“When a motor vehicle operator notices the camera they become cooperative”

“Keeps us true and helps sort things out. Also there is no disputing what is said on camera either by the arrestee, victim, or officer”

“Citizen tend to behave a bit better once they know they're being recorded”

“It ups my game. I feel that it also changes people's attitude toward us. Also it's made me more tactically sound in my performance of my duties. It will show how difficult this job can be and how people are out of control. I like the evidence it will provide in my upcoming cases”

“The camera records all that we do and say and easily able to play back”

“It's another tool that can only help you to do your job that much more thoroughly and effectively”

“Evidence”

“It's a good tool to use to remind people that they, and their actions, are being /have been recorded”

“It's nice to go back and get information I forgot or forgot to take note of”

“Filming uncooperative individuals and arrests”

“There is a comfort of knowing I’m protected from false claims”

“Good to have if a complaint is made against me”

“Iron clad evidence for court purposes”

“There is a record of the incident”

18. Please list one negative of wearing the camera:

“Having to continuously enter Metadata into the Sync software following every call”

“Seeing that our complaints are at a very low number, I don’t see the cameras being beneficial to us”

“Makes officers I’m with 2nd guess themselves in a use of force situation. I’ve been told this many times by officers I’ve been on scene with”

“You have to keep in mind that it’s constantly recording on a loop”

“My co-workers aren’t too fond of the camera and feel the need to back me off majority of calls when I’m dispatched to assist because presence of camera forces them to change their way of policing”

“Officers being unaware that a certain officer is wearing the camera or when it is on. Although they should always assume it’s on some forget and have to be reminded”

“Before BWC one could tell someone to “sit the beep down” and 95 % that’s enough to gain control of a few people. With BWC it’s “sir sit down” and 95% of the time that doesn’t work”

“There are times that a small portion of the public that doesn’t understand sir or ma’am calm down and instead strong assertive language should be used. Also the ability to Monday morning quarterback what we do worries me”

“Not knowing how command will interpret certain issues such as forgetting to turn the camera on once and a great while and the command and public assuming that the video footage tells the entire story”

“Second guessing myself due to concerns of the public perception of my actions, even though they are correct and consistent with my training and policy”

“The time it takes to upload videos. It’s not practical, particularly when another officer needs access to the video, to have to come off the road for 1-2 hours so the video can upload and be made available”

“Making judgement calls that may seem black and white on camera”

“Entering Metadata on a busy night gets tedious”

“Audible beep when doing searches”

“You can’t talk to some people like you normally would due to fear of reprimand”

“There is a record of the incident but it is from a cameras point of view and not a true representation of the officer’s mind set or totality of the incident”