



City of Wilmington

Robert A. Williams
City Council Member, 7th District

Louis L. Redding City/County Building
800 N. French Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801-3537

phone (302) 576-2140
fax (302) 571-4071
www.WilmingtonDE.gov

Public Safety Committee

Robert A. Williams, Chair
Loretta Walsh, Vice Chair
Ciro Adams
Charles M. "Bud" Freil
Michelle Harlee
Yolanda McCoy
Dr. Hanifa Shabazz, Ex-Officio Member

➤ **REVISED NOTICE**

Public Safety Committee Meeting

June 10, 2019

5:00 p.m.

1st Floor Council Committee Room

Agenda

- A Resolution Approving the Wilmington Fire Department's Grant Application to the Delaware Emergency Management Agency for Secured Communication Radios and Transceivers
- A Resolution Approving the Wilmington Fire Department's Grant Application to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for a Radiation Detection System
- A Resolution Approving the Wilmington Police Department's Grant Application to the Criminal Justice Council for a Sexual Assault Kit Initiative
- A Resolution Approving the Office of Emergency Management's Grant Application to the State of Delaware for Funds Allocated Pursuant to the 2019 Emergency Management Performance Grant
- A Resolution Approving the Office of Emergency Management's Grant Application to the State of Delaware for Funds Allocated Pursuant to the 2019 Homeland Security Grant Program
- A Resolution Recognizing the Month of June as Re-Entry Month for the City of Wilmington, and Encouraging the General Assembly to Recognize the Month of June as Re-Entry Month for the State of Delaware
- A Resolution Approving the Wilmington Police Department's Grant Application the Department of Safety and Homeland Security for Cold Case DNA Testing
- Update on body cameras for Wilmington Police Department

(Rev. 1, 6/07/19)

If public comment is permitted during this committee meeting, any member of the public who wishes to speak during the committee meeting will be limited to three minutes per agenda item. If the public's permission to comment is abused, the Chair may exercise greater discretion in limiting public comment

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Fire Department, applied for a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") in the amount of \$24,000; and

WHEREAS, the Fire Department intends to use the grant money to fund two separate communication security projects, and

WHEREAS, a portion of the grant, in the amount of \$10,000, will be used to outfit both Fire Boat 7 and Marine 7 with Class A Automatic Identification Systems ("AIS") with secure text messaging and interagency operations;

WHEREAS, AIS are intended to allow ships to view marine traffic in their area and to be seen by that traffic; and

WHEREAS, the new secure AIS will be used to replace the current Class B AIS system with the new enhanced system; and

WHEREAS, the new enhanced AIS will enable Fire Department vessels to communicate with Coast Guard and public safety boats using a secure encrypted messaging system; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the grant, in the amount of \$14,000, will be used to acquire two multi-band portable radios for Marine 7 and Fire Boat 7 for use with multi-jurisdictional interoperability communications; and

WHEREAS, the current portable vessel radios are technologically limited and are unable to function in other jurisdictions that do not utilize the 800 MHz radio system. The new multi-band portable radios would enable Marine 7 and Fire Boat 7 to operate in other jurisdictions without utilizing a radio patch from a 911 center; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the Wilmington Fire Department's grant application to FEMA in the amount of \$24,000 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief of the Wilmington Fire Department, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Wilmington Fire Department's application for a grant from FEMA in the amount of \$24,000. The grant will enable the City to fund two separate communications projects that will allow secure communications within the agency and with other public safety agencies.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City as no local matching funds are required.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Fire Department, applied for a pass-through grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") which will be awarded to the State of Delaware and administered by the Delaware Emergency Management Agency ("DEMA") in the amount of \$108,700; and

WHEREAS, the Fire Department intends to use the grant money to purchase a vessel mounted radiation detection system, and

WHEREAS, the radiation detection system would enhance the safety of the personnel and patients on board the vessel by alerting to a potential radioactive source; and

WHEREAS, the radiation detection system would also enhance the vessel capabilities by alerting the crew of a radiation source on or nearby the water during an environmental release; and

WHEREAS, the radiation detection system is designed to detect the movement of nuclear material used for weapons of mass destruction or a radiological dispersal device and would be able to interrogate and categorize the source as either innocent, suspicious or a threat; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the Wilmington Fire Department's grant application to FEMA and DEMA in the amount of \$108,700 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief of the Wilmington Fire Department, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Wilmington Fire Department's application for a grant from FEMA in the amount of \$108,700. The grant will enable the City to obtain a vessel-mounted radiation detection system which will increase the safety of passengers and will also be able to identify potential weapons of mass destruction.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City as no local matching funds are required.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Wilmington Police Department, applied for a grant from the Delaware Criminal Justice Council ("CJC") in the amount of \$100,000; and

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Police Department intends to use the grant money to address the growing number of unsubmitted Sexual Assault Kit ("SAK") in law enforcement custody, and to help provide resolution for victims of sexual assaults when possible, and

WHEREAS, there is broad consensus that this must be accomplished through a comprehensive approach to the problem; and

WHEREAS, grant funding will be used to inventory the existing numbers of untested SAKs, test these kits, and pursue new investigative leads and potential prosecution, and ensure that support is provided throughout the investigation and prosecution process; and

WHEREAS, the grant funds will allow the Wilmington Police Department to coordinate with the CJC to help create or improve an evidence-tracking system, provide training on sexual assault investigations, and increase the collection of offender DNA for Combined DNA Index System ("CODIS") evidence upload purposes; and

WHEREAS, this may lead to the identification of potential suspects and even serial sex offenders; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the Wilmington Police Department's grant application to the CJC in the amount of \$100,000 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief of the Wilmington Police Department, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Wilmington Police Department's application for a grant from the Delaware CJC in the amount of \$100,000. The grant will enable the Wilmington Police Department to fund the testing of Sexual Assault Kits ("SAK") to identify evidence, prosecute suspects, and provide support to victims of sexual assault.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City as no local matching funds are required.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Office of Emergency Management, applied for the 2019 Emergency Management Performance Grant ("EMPG"), a pass-through grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") which will be awarded to the State of Delaware ("SOD") and administered by the Delaware Emergency Management Agency ("DEMA") in the amount of \$211,905; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management intends to use the grant money to assist in providing a system of emergency preparedness for the protection of life and property, and

WHEREAS, the EMPG program plays an important role in the implementation of the National Preparedness System. The program supports the building, sustainment and delivery of core capabilities essential to achieving the National Preparedness Goal of a secure and resilient nation; and

WHEREAS, the EMPG program's allowable costs support efforts to build and sustain core capabilities across the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery mission areas; and

WHEREAS, through the EMPG program, the Federal government provides coordination, guidance, and assistance to support a comprehensive emergency preparedness system to address all hazards; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management intends to provide \$105,952.50 of already budgeted funds to meet the grant's matching funds requirement; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purpose.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the Office of Emergency Management's grant application to FEMA/SOD/DEMA in the amount of \$211,905 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director of the Office of Emergency Management, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Office of Emergency Management's application for a grant from FEMA/SOD/DEMA in the amount of \$211,905. The grant will enable the City to provide a system of emergency preparedness for the protection of life and property. There is a 50% local match requirement.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City. Although the grant requires that the City provide 50% in matching funds, the Office of Emergency Management intends to provide \$105,952.50 from already budgeted funds.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Office of Emergency Management, applied for the 2019 Homeland Security Grant Program grant ("HSGP"), a pass-through grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") which will be awarded to the State of Delaware ("SOD") and administered by the Delaware Emergency Management Agency ("DEMA") in the amount of \$26,600; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management intends to use the grant money to assist in preventing terrorism and other catastrophic events and to prepare the Nation for the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk to the security of the United States, and

WHEREAS, the EMPG program plays an important role in the implementation of the National Preparedness System. The program supports the building, sustainment and delivery of core capabilities essential to achieving the National Preparedness Goal of a secure and resilient nation; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management will be using the grant monies to fund two separate projects; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management will use \$14,000 of the grant monies to purchase two APX 8000HXE All-Band Radios that will increase communications interoperability with local, State, and Federal agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Emergency Management will use \$12,600 of the grant monies to contract with a vendor to provide Cyber Security training to employees throughout City government; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purpose.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the Office of Emergency Management's grant application to FEMA/SOD/DEMA in the amount of \$26,600 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director of the Office of Emergency Management, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Office of Emergency Management's application for a grant from FEMA/SOD/DEMA in the amount of \$26,600. The grant will enable the City to upgrade communications interoperability with local, State, and Federal agencies, and to provide Cyber Security Training to City Employees.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City as no local matching funds are required.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#XXXX

Sponsors:

**Council
President
Shabazz**

**Council
Members**

**Gray
Congo
Oliver
Harlee
Turner
McCoy
Williams
Freel
Adams
Dixon
Guy
Walsh**

WHEREAS, the Delaware Department of Corrections (DOC) Annual Report of 2017 identified through its Unified System, that The DOC operates a unified correctional system (includes detention, jail & prison populations) that in FY 2017, DOC incarcerated approximately 6,400 offenders within its ten correctional facilities (4 prisons; 4 community corrections centers; 2 violation of probation centers). There are six Probation & Parole offices. DOC also supervises approximately 14,500 offenders in the community; and

WHEREAS, within this unified system, DOC maintains 5 offender supervision levels:

- Level V – 24 Hour Incarceration
- Level IV – Work Release Centers, Home Confinement (electronic monitoring), Residential Drug Treatment, & Violation of Probation Centers
- Level III - Intensive Probation Services
- Level II – Standard Probation
- Level I - Administrative Probation

WHEREAS, within this unified system, DOC statistics from FY 2017 indicated that in the Level V offender supervision category there were 5,500 inmates of which 61% were serving sentences longer than 1 year; 9% were serving sentences of a year or less; 21% were Detainees awaiting trial; 9% were serving Life Sentences; and

WHEREAS, within this unified system, DOC statistics from FY 2017 indicated in the Level V offender supervision category by Sex there were 5,111 Males comprising 93% of the population and 389 Females comprising 7% of the population; and

WHEREAS, within this unified system, DOC statistics from FY 2017 indicated in the Level V offender supervision category by Race and Ethnicity there were 1,949 White inmates, 3,316 Black inmates, 225 Hispanic or Latino inmates, 7 Asian/Pacific Islander inmates, 1 American/Alaskan Native inmates; and, 2 Unknown/Missing Race/Ethnicity inmates; and

WHEREAS, in FY 2017, the DOC Annual Report indicated there was an Admissions number of 16,368 inmates into Delaware prisons and a Release number of 16,437; and

WHEREAS, thousands of people return to Wilmington annually from federal, state, and local prisons each year; and

WHEREAS, Wilmingtonians returning from Delaware jails and federal prisons also experience high rates of recidivism; and

WHEREAS, high recidivism rates carry heavy consequences for the individuals, families, and communities most directly impacted; and

WHEREAS, reducing recidivism can produce cost savings that can be invested in preventive approaches to enhance public safety; and

WHEREAS, in Wilmington nonprofits, government and businesses are coming together to create better opportunities for returning citizens to fully re-integrate into their communities; and

WHEREAS, Wilmington's increasing focus on Re-Entry is occurring in the context of a growing understanding of the importance of Re-Entry at the national level, as evidenced by the announcement by the U.S. Department of Justice of the inaugural National Reentry Week in April 2016; and

WHEREAS, Re-Entry advocates support the recognition of June as Re-Entry Month in the City of Wilmington, as a time to remind us that returning citizens should always be afforded the full rights of a citizen, be prepared for and find life supporting employment and access decent, affordable housing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON, that this Council hereby recognizes June 2019 as Re-Entry Month and strongly encourages the Delaware General Assembly to also recognize June 2019 as Re-Entry Month in Delaware.

Passed by City Council,

Attest: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution recognizes June 2019 as Re-Entry Month and strongly encourages the Delaware General Assembly to also recognize June 2019 as Re-Entry Month in Delaware.

Wilmington, Delaware
June 20, 2019

#xxxx

Sponsor:

**Council
Member
Williams**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2-363 of the City Code, the Council deemed it necessary and proper to specify the requirements for review and approval of City-sponsored grant applications and proposals, including authorization for expedited grant applications when necessary prior to Council's approval by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the City, through the Wilmington Police Department ("WPD"), applied for the Cold Case DNA Grant from the Delaware Department of Safety and Homeland Security ("DSHS") in the amount of \$50,000; and

WHEREAS, the WPD intends to use the grant money to assist with DNA testing and related expenses for the investigation of open cold case; and

WHEREAS, related expenses may include travel for witness interviews, supplies, attendance at seminars related to cold case investigation techniques, and the submission of DNA evidence to an appropriate nationally accredited laboratory facility; and

WHEREAS, unsolved violent crime cases continue to amass annually. As crimes occur, unresolved crimes accumulate, adding to an expanding caseload for prosecutors and law enforcement. Once the investigation leads to the identification of a suspect, prosecuting agencies may experience an accumulation of cases to be prosecuted due to limited resources. The purpose of this grant award is to make funding available to prosecuting agencies for projects that will assist in the resolution of the nation's violent crime cold cases

WHEREAS, the goals of the Cold Case DNA Grant are to prosecute violent crime and to decrease the number of violent crime cold cases awaiting prosecution; and

WHEREAS, the Council deems it necessary and proper to authorize the grant application, for the aforesaid purpose.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WILMINGTON that the WPD's grant application to DSHS in the amount of \$50,000 is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief of the Wilmington Police Department, or his designee, shall be authorized to take all necessary actions to accept any and all funds associated with the grant application and to fulfill the grant requirements.

Passed by City Council,

ATTEST: _____
City Clerk

SYNOPSIS: This Resolution authorizes the Wilmington Police Department's application for a grant from the Delaware Department of Safety and Homeland Security in the amount of \$50,000. The grant will enable the Wilmington Police Department to prosecute violent crime using DNA and other forensic testing to identify suspects and to decrease the number of violent crime cold cases awaiting prosecution.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT: There is no negative fiscal impact on the City as no local matching funds are required.



Wilmington Police Department
Body-Worn Camera Implementation and Cost Analysis



Report to the
Wilmington City Council
Public Safety Committee

May 2019

Request from City Council Public Safety Committee

This implementation and cost analysis has been prepared following requests for additional information about body-worn cameras made by members of the Wilmington City Council Public Safety Committee during its March 11, 2019 meeting.

While the department has not fielded requests for body-worn cameras from members of the public or in our frequent interactions with community members at civic association and neighborhood planning council meetings, we do recognize the value of this technology for law enforcement and do not see a negative of implementing body-worn cameras in our department.

This report includes cost estimates related to a comprehensive review of this technology – including the cost of equipment as well as fees for the storage of video footage and the review of footage pursuant to requests and investigations. The objective behind providing this comprehensive report is to provide members of City Council with as much information as possible as the body weighs the financial costs associated with this technology and the feasibility of implementation.

Background

Over the past several years, the Wilmington Police Department has engaged in a pilot program for body-worn cameras in the Uniformed Services Division. Between 2016 and 2017, the department deployed four models of cameras from three manufacturers in an attempt to test various models – (1) Taser Axon; (2) WatchGuard Vista; (3) Intrensic/GoPro; and (4) Taser Axon 2. In 2018, Wilmington Police pilot tested a camera from Visual Labs.

Officers participating in the pilot program reported mixed reviews about camera functionality; some models had physical issues over time (mounting components failing, battery not lasting an entire shift), while others reported technical issues regarding categorizing video footage and uploading footage.

The Wilmington Police Department has conducted a review on the feasibility of implementing body-worn camera technology, and this review has included an analysis of research reports as well as the experiences of partner law enforcement agencies.

Key considerations include:

- **Physical feasibility** – Many agencies have had similar challenges as we experienced in our pilot program, related to mounting location and functionality of some models.
- **Cost for storage of video footage** – These costs have quickly mounted for agencies using Body Worn Cameras, and have caused budget shortfalls in some agencies.

- **Cost for review and dissemination of video footage** – Departments utilizing Body Worn Cameras have had to, in many cases, hire additional personnel or reassign patrol officers to the function of reviewing footage and redacting uninvolved parties or victims for the purpose of fulfilling requests and providing footage in the course of investigations. In some cases, costs associated with review and dissemination have been reported to be substantial.
- **Establishing policies that account for privacy concerns** – Policies would need to take into account privacy concerns and govern the use of cameras and the collection of footage, particularly during incidents involving victims and juveniles.
- **Overall effects on behavior of officers and members of the public** – Research is mixed on whether Body Worn Cameras are effective in improving behavior by either officers or civilians.

This analysis has also included considerations of alternative measures that our department has taken to bolster community engagement and strengthen relationships between police officers and members of the public. These efforts have included:

- Instituting directed foot patrols in neighborhoods throughout the City, based upon reported criminal activity and requests from members of the public
- Deploying officers in the same neighborhood each time they report for work, in an effort to build connections and increase the familiarity of residents to the officers working in their community
- Ensuring that police officers and sector commanders attend all community meetings to hear the concerns of residents and share information about their work across Wilmington
- Providing all WPD personnel with additional training around police/law enforcement legitimacy, procedural justice, implicit bias and other relevant topics

Body-worn camera technology continues to be a topic of considerable discussion and debate across the country, with some jurisdictions rolling back programs and others considering expansion not only within police departments, but to other public employees as well.

Relevant Research

There exists a range of studies and reports that have opined on the effectiveness of body-worn cameras, and have assessed the effects of this technology on use of force, citizen complaints, assaults on police officers and public trust, among others. A brief review is offered here not in an effort to put forth a singular position on the topic, but rather to outline key research findings

that have been cited by law enforcement agencies and municipalities across the country that have considered this technology.

Generally, this body of research presents mixed reviews of the effectiveness of body-worn cameras in law enforcement agencies. Some research studies have identified reductions in use of force and citizen complaints, while others have not found conclusive evidence related to those factors. Some have revealed increases in assaults on police officers wearing cameras, while others have found fewer complaints are filed against officers wearing body-worn cameras. In some cases nationally, police officers have expressed their preference for wearing body-worn cameras, and at least one study has found that body-worn cameras are used more frequently in prosecutions of members of the public than of police officers.

In short, there remains ample ground for further research on the topic. In a report published by the United States Department of Justice' Office of Justice Programs/National Institute of Justice, the conclusion is stated that "the increasing use of body-worn cameras by law enforcement agencies has significantly outpaced the body of research examining the relationship between the technology and law enforcement outcomes."

Seven reports are included as appendices to this implementation and cost analysis:

- Police body cameras aren't having the effects many expected – *Governing Magazine* – March 25, 2019
- Body-worn cameras: what the evidence tells us – *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice* – December 2018
- Body cameras work – just not in the way you think – *National Police Foundation* – November 10, 2017
- Body cameras have little effect on police behavior, study says – *The New York Times* – October 20, 2017
- There is no such thing as a free body camera – *National Police Foundation* – May 26, 2017
- Study finds negative effects of police-worn body cameras – *Government Technology Magazine* – June 2, 2016
- Body-worn cameras – *NYU School of Law/Policing Project*

These reports have been selected for inclusion due to the range of considerations they raise, and the overviews they offer of existing scholarship on this topic.

General Costs of Body-Worn Camera Programs

Generally, body-worn camera programs implemented in law enforcement agencies encompass two primary categories of costs that are factored into this implementation and cost analysis:

- **Equipment costs**

- This category includes expenses related to the body cameras themselves, as well as necessary cables, mounting apparatus and other required equipment
- Dependent upon the vendor, this category could include the cost of purchasing servers to store video footage
- Dependent upon the vendor, this could also include the purchase of smartphone devices used to hold or transfer video files, along with the expenses related to purchasing monthly data and cellular access plans
- **Administrative costs**
 - This category encompasses costs associated with administering a body-worn camera program, including personnel assigned to the following functions:
 - Program management
 - Technical assistance
 - Review and redaction of video for investigations, trials and records requests
 - Some departments around the country have reported substantial administrative costs, and in some agencies, the assignment of dozens of sworn personnel
 - We are projecting, preliminarily, that we would need to assign a unit of four sworn personnel (one sergeant and four officers) to administer and support a body-worn camera program for the Wilmington Police Department

It is critical to note that, in our agency's review of various products and pricing estimates, they widely varied. Some vendors offer comprehensive packages that include camera equipment, storage, technical support and other necessary services, while others offer less-encompassing packages that could lead to the imposition of additional fees that can be unpredictable. While the latter category might at the onset appear to be less expensive, in the long run they can wind up being more expensive. Packages that could include additional, unanticipated costs would present a challenge in estimating and budgeting for the full expense of such a program, and could lead to unexpected budget shortfalls and financial hardship for the City.

Proposal

With the abovementioned factors in mind, and after a comprehensive review and evaluation of pilot testing experiences, the Wilmington Police Department would recommend Axon as the vendor for a body-worn camera program, if adopted by the City. The experience of WPD users testing Axon cameras was more positive than with other vendors and camera models, and led to fewer technical and mechanical issues and concerns.

Further, the Axon proposal furnished to the Wilmington Police Department includes:

- Body-worn camera equipment, including all required mounting equipment, cables and docking stations; spare cameras and equipment will also be provided, and the contract includes upgrades for equipment in the third and fifth years
- Storage for video footage

- License agreements for camera software, including technical support

The cost estimates provided by Axon are spread over a five-year initial program term, with a total of \$1,999,346 for that duration (\$603,986 for the first year, and \$348,840 for each of the subsequent years in the five-year program).

Additionally, administrative costs would include the assignment of four sworn police officers to manage this program, provide technical and policy support, and to review and redact video footage for investigations, trials and records requests. Estimated costs acquired from the Office of Management and Budget include:

- 1 Sergeant to supervise the program and assigned personnel (total \$135,125)
 - \$92,242 (Salary)
 - \$42,883 (Pension and Benefits)
- 3 Police Officers to administer the program (total \$124,105 per officer)
 - \$82,949 (Salary per officer)
 - \$41,156 (Pension and Benefits per officer)

Administrative expenses would contribute an additional \$507,440 per year to the costs of a body-worn camera program. The Wilmington Police Department would continually monitor program costs and time commitments to determine if additional personnel would be warranted in subsequent years in order to appropriately staff and administer such a program.

Summary of Total Anticipated Project Costs, Years 1-5

Year	Axon	Administrative	Total
1	\$603,986	\$507,440	\$1,111,426
2	\$348,840	\$507,440	\$856,280
3	\$348,840	\$507,440	\$856,280
4	\$348,840	\$507,440	\$856,280
5	\$348,840	\$507,440	\$856,280

Federal Grant Opportunity

In an effort to secure external funding and to reduce the potential impact on the City's budget should a body-worn camera program be implemented by the Wilmington Police Department, we are exploring a federal grant offered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance that could cover some costs regarding program implementation. The deadline for that application is June 5, 2019, and departments of our size seeking to implement a new program are eligible to apply provided that programming include the development of comprehensive policies, and regular review of programs, policies and footage for potential improvements along with officer safety.

Appendices 1-7
Relevant Research Reports

Police Body Cameras Aren't Having the Effects Many Expected

What's likely the most comprehensive review of research on body cameras shows that they're most often used to prosecute citizens, not police. And while they've led to fewer citizen complaints, their impact on other aspects of policing, such as use of force, is less certain.

by [Mike Maciag](#) | March 25, 2019 AT 3:00 AM



Footage from a Las Vegas police department body camera demonstration is projected on a screen. (AP/John Locher)

For years, many people hailed body-worn cameras as a potential key to improving police transparency and strengthening often-fractured relationships with the communities they serve. But so far, academic research suggests the technology largely hasn't lived up to those expectations.

That's the conclusion of a [new report](#) from the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University.

Researchers reviewed 70 empirical studies on body cameras' effects, ranging from officer and citizen behavior to influences on law enforcement agencies as a whole. While much of the research remains mixed, it counters some promised benefits of body cameras at a time when departments are increasingly adopting the technology.

"There is an incongruence between people's expectations of cameras, police expectations of cameras and what they think they're being used for," says Cynthia Lum, the center's director and a co-author of the report.

Mixed Results on Use of Force

One of the top-cited reasons behind the push for body cameras has been the potential to limit officers' use of force. Six of the reviewed studies suggested officers wearing cameras were less likely to use force, but another eight studies found no statistically significant effects.

One study offered a possible explanation for the discrepancy: Officers required to wear and turn on their cameras used force less frequently than those given more discretion.

One impact the cameras do seem to have is a reduction in the number of citizen complaints. The vast majority of the studies reviewed show that officers wearing body cameras receive fewer complaints against them than those not being recorded.

The reasons for that remain unclear. It's possible that officers change their behaviors, leading to fewer complaints. But officers have suggested that citizens are less likely to file unfounded complaints when they know incidents are recorded.

"Officers are liking body-worn cameras more and more because they see it as protection against frivolous complaints," Lum says.

More Prosecutions, But Not For Police

The introduction of body cameras is also having an effect on criminal investigations. But while many anticipated that camera footage would lead to more prosecutions of police misconduct, they're instead being used more often against citizens.

In one study, 93 percent of prosecutors' offices used camera footage primarily in prosecutions of civilians. Findings from three British studies similarly suggest cameras might play a role in raising clearance rates and producing more guilty pleas. Other reports showed cameras were particularly useful in domestic violence cases, leading to increased arrests, charges, guilty pleas and guilty verdicts.

Still, there's no strong evidence that body cameras reduce crime. The most rigorous study the George Mason University researchers reviewed didn't find any "general deterrent effects."

De-Policing Didn't Happen

Perhaps the most commonly cited potential drawback of body cameras has centered around claims that officers would pull back on enforcement activities, effectively leading to de-policing. But the majority of studies reviewed don't support this concern. In fact, three studies suggested officers wearing cameras actually might initiate more total contacts than those without them.

Lum says the research suffers from a shortcoming, though, in that it doesn't distinguish between all the different types of actions officers take. Little research, for instance, examines whether body cameras encourage types of activities that might promote community policing.

Many hoped the arrival of body cameras would foster greater accountability within departments. Research to date hasn't concluded that any such shifts have occurred.

"Agencies influence technology, not the other way around," Lum says. "The culture and other aspects of the agencies will really determine how it is used."

One study, for example, concluded that cameras [increased officer burnout](#) and that better organizational support could help mitigate it.

Some officers may perceive cameras primarily as a punitive measure. Rather than only using camera footage for disciplinary reasons, Lum recommends departments employ it as a learning tool for officers and their supervisors.

“The body-worn camera footage could provide a forum that increases the communication between the supervisor and the officer. And that might be a lever to strengthen the accountability structure,” she says.

Citizen Interactions

One of the main goals of body cameras is to increase the public's trust in police. The research shows that hasn't happened.

One study reported no links between deployment of body cameras and citizens' views of police legitimacy, professionalism or satisfaction with police interactions.

Meanwhile, studies examining their effects on resisting arrest or assaults on officers were mixed, and no definitive conclusions could be made about whether body cameras influenced numbers of arrests and citations.

Body Cameras Are Here to Stay

Despite their uncertain effects, body cameras will likely continue to proliferate across police departments. A Bureau of Justice Statistics [survey](#) published last year reported 47 percent of general-purpose law enforcement agencies had already acquired the technology as of 2016, and studies consistently show that officers' views of the cameras improve over time as they begin using them.

But Lum cautions that police departments shouldn't pursue body cameras merely because other agencies are doing so.

“Agencies really have to think carefully about the goals they have for the cameras and whether they're achieving those goals,” she says. “Just because it reduces frivolous complaints or helps prosecute crimes better may not necessarily do anything to the relationship between the citizens and police.”



[Mike Maciag](#) | Data Editor | mmaciag@governing.com | [@mikemaciag](#)

Body-Worn Cameras: What the Evidence Tells Us

Current research suggests that body-worn cameras may offer benefits for law enforcement. However, additional research is needed to understand the value of the technology for the field.

[By Brett Chapman](#)

In 1829, Sir Robert Peel — regarded by many as the father of modern policing — developed what came to be known as the Nine Principles of Law Enforcement, which were given to British law enforcement officers as general instructions. Peel’s second principle stated, “The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon *public approval* of police existence, actions, behavior and the ability of the police to secure and maintain *public respect*.”^[1]

Nearly 200 years later, Peel’s principle still holds true: The ability of law enforcement to fight crime effectively continues to depend on the public’s perception of the legitimacy of the actions of officers. A number of recent civil disturbances across the United States subsequent to instances of lethal use of force by officers highlight the ongoing challenges in maintaining the public’s perceptions of law enforcement legitimacy, particularly as it concerns the use of force.

Body-worn cameras have been viewed as one way to address these challenges and improve law enforcement practice more generally. The technology, which can be mounted on an officer’s eyeglasses or chest area, offers real-time information when used by officers on patrol or other assignments that bring them into contact with members of the community. Another benefit of body-worn cameras is their ability to provide law enforcement with a surveillance tool to promote officer safety and efficiency and prevent crime.

This technology has diffused rapidly across the United States. In 2013, approximately one-third of U.S. municipal police departments had implemented the use of body-worn cameras.^[2] Members of the general public also continue to embrace the technology. But what does the research tell us? Current studies suggest that body-worn cameras may offer benefits for law enforcement, but additional research is needed to more fully understand the value of the technology for the field.

Potential Benefits

Proponents of body-worn cameras point to several potential benefits.

Better transparency. First, body-worn cameras may result in better transparency and accountability and thus may improve law enforcement legitimacy. In many communities, there is a lack of trust and confidence in law enforcement. This lack of confidence is exacerbated by questions about encounters between officers and community members that often involve the use of deadly or less-lethal force. Video footage captured during these officer-community interactions might provide better documentation to help confirm the nature of events and support accounts articulated by officers and community residents.^[3]

Increased civility. Body-worn cameras may also result in higher rates of citizen compliance to officer commands during encounters and fewer complaints lodged against law enforcement. Citizens often change their behavior toward officers when they are informed that the encounter is being recorded. This “civilizing effect” may prevent certain situations from escalating to levels requiring the use of force and also improve interactions between officers and citizens.^[4]

Quicker resolution. Body-worn cameras may lead to a faster resolution of citizen complaints and lawsuits that allege excessive use of force and other forms of officer misconduct. Investigations of cases that involve inconsistent accounts of the encounter from officers and citizens are often found to be “not sustained” and are subsequently closed when there is no video footage nor independent or corroborating witnesses. This, in turn, can decrease the public’s trust and confidence in law enforcement and increase perceptions that claims of abuse brought against officers will not be properly addressed. Video captured by body-worn cameras may help corroborate the facts of the encounter and result in a quicker resolution.

Corroborating evidence. Footage captured may also be used as evidence in arrests or prosecutions. Proponents have suggested that video captured by body-worn cameras may help document the occurrence and nature of various types of crime, reduce the overall amount of time required for officers to complete paperwork for case files, corroborate evidence presented by prosecutors, and lead to higher numbers of guilty pleas in court proceedings.

Training opportunities. The use of body-worn cameras also offers potential opportunities to advance policing through training. Law enforcement trainers and executives can assess officer activities and behavior captured by body-worn cameras — either through self-initiated investigations or those that result from calls for service — to advance professionalism among officers and new recruits. Finally, video footage can provide law enforcement executives with opportunities to implement new strategies and assess the extent to which officers carry out their duties in a manner that is consistent with the assigned initiatives.



[Download and print \(pdf, 5 pages\).](#)

#©iStockPhoto.com (see [reuse policy](#)).

Current Research Findings

The increasing use of body-worn cameras by law enforcement agencies has significantly outpaced the body of research examining the relationship between the technology and law enforcement outcomes. As detailed below, although early evaluations of this technology had limitations, some notable recent research has helped advance our knowledge of the impact of body-worn cameras.

In a 2014 study funded by the Office of Justice Programs Diagnostic Center, researcher Michael White noted that earlier evaluations of body-worn cameras found a number of beneficial outcomes for law enforcement agencies.^[5] The earliest studies conducted in the United Kingdom indicated that body-worn cameras resulted in positive interactions between officers and citizens and made people feel safer. Reductions in citizen complaints were noted, as were similar reductions in crime. The studies found that the use of body-worn cameras led to increases in arrests, prosecutions, and guilty pleas.^[6] From an efficiency standpoint, the use of the technology reportedly enabled officers to resolve criminal cases faster and spend less time preparing paperwork, and it resulted in fewer people choosing to go to trial.

Studies that followed in the United States also provided support for body-worn cameras; however, a number of them were plagued with dubious approaches that called the findings into question. According to White, the few studies that were conducted between 2007 and 2013 had methodological limitations or were conducted in a manner that raised concerns about research independence. For example, several studies included small sample sizes or lacked proper control groups to compare officers wearing body-worn cameras with officers not wearing them. Some studies were conducted by the participating law enforcement agency and lacked an independent evaluator. Finally, a number of the studies focused narrowly on officer or citizen perceptions of body-worn cameras instead of other critical outcomes, such as citizen compliance and officer or citizen behavior in instances involving use of force.

Over time, scientific rigor improved, and studies conducted in U.S. law enforcement agencies produced findings that indicated promising support for body-worn cameras. For example, in 2014, researchers at Arizona State University (funded through the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Smart Policing Initiative) found that officers with body-worn cameras were more productive in terms of making arrests, had fewer complaints lodged against them relative to officers without body-worn cameras, and had higher numbers of citizen complaints resolved in their favor.^[7] Another study conducted with the Rialto (California) Police Department noted similar decreases in citizen complaints lodged against officers wearing body-worn cameras as well as decreases in use-of-force incidents by the police.^[8] In addition, Justin Ready and Jacob Young from Arizona State University found that officers with body-worn cameras were more cautious in their actions and sensitive to possible scrutiny of video footage by their superiors. Also, contrary to initial concerns, officers who wore cameras were found to have higher numbers of self-initiated contacts with community residents than officers who did not wear cameras.^[9]

Recent randomized controlled trials, which are considered the scientific gold standard for evaluating programs, have also been conducted on body-worn cameras. Of the various scientific methods available, these trials have the greatest likelihood of producing sound evidence because random assignment is able to isolate a specific treatment of interest from all of the other factors that influence any given outcome. In a 2016 global, multisite randomized controlled trial, Barak Ariel and colleagues found that use-of-force incidents may be related to the discretion given to officers regarding when body-worn cameras are activated during officer-citizen encounters. The researchers found decreases in use-of-force incidents when officers activated their cameras upon arrival at the scene. Alternatively, use-of-force incidents by officers with body-worn cameras increased when the officers had the discretion to determine when to activate their cameras during citizen interactions.^[10]

In 2017, with NIJ support, researchers from CNA conducted a randomized controlled trial on 400 police officers in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. The research team found that officers with body-worn cameras generated fewer use-of-force reports and complaints from citizens compared to officers without body-worn cameras. Additionally, officers with body-worn cameras issued higher numbers of arrests and citations compared to officers without body-worn cameras.^[11]

More Research Is Needed

An increasing number of studies have emerged to help fill knowledge gaps in the current body of research on body-worn cameras. Researchers at George Mason University noted that 14 studies have been completed and at least 30 others are currently examining the impact of body-worn cameras on various outcomes.^[12] The most common outcomes examined include the impact of body-worn cameras on the quality of officer-citizen interactions measured by the nature of the communication, displays of procedural justice and professionalism, and misconduct or corruption; use of force by officers; attitudes about body-worn cameras; citizen satisfaction with law enforcement encounters; perceptions of law enforcement and legitimacy; suspect compliance with officer commands; and criminal investigations and law enforcement-initiated activity.^[13]

However, knowledge gaps still exist. The George Mason University researchers highlighted the need to examine organizational concerns regarding body-worn cameras. For example, little attention has been focused on improvements in training and organizational policies. Additional information is also needed on how body-worn cameras can help facilitate investigations of officer-involved shootings or other critical incidents, and on the value of video footage captured by body-worn cameras in court proceedings.

Current research varies by level of rigor and methods used, but the results continue to help law enforcement executives decide whether to adopt this technology in their agencies. Overall, the research on body-worn cameras suggests that the technology may offer potential

benefits for law enforcement. However, the true extent of its value will depend on the continuation of research studies to keep pace with the growing adoption and implementation of body-worn cameras by law enforcement agencies in the United States.

For More Information

[Read more about NIJ's work in body-worn cameras.](#)

[Visit the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Body-Worn Camera Toolkit.](#)

About the Author

Brett Chapman is a social science analyst in NIJ's Office of Research and Evaluation.

This article discusses the following grant:

- [“Research on the Impact of Technology on Policing Strategies,” grant number 2013-IJ-CX-0016](#)

NIJ Journal No. 280, posted December 2018

NCJ 252035

[Back to the top.](#)

Notes

[note 1] Italics in quote are from original publication, *Sir Robert Peel's Principles of Law Enforcement 1829*, Durham Constabulary, Durham, England.

[note 2] Brian A. Reaves, [Local Police Departments, 2013: Equipment and Technology](#), Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, July 2015, NCJ 248767.

[note 3] Michael D. White, *Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2014.

[note 4] Changes in the behavior of citizens may result from the presence of body-worn cameras on officers coupled with citizens being informed in certain encounters that they are being recorded. However, researchers have noted that this civilizing effect is complex and additional research is needed to examine the issue.

[note 5] White, *Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras*.

[note 6] The use of body-worn cameras was found to be particularly helpful in improving the overall strength of prosecution cases involving domestic violence because the cameras documented the victims' demeanor and language and recorded the crime scenes and overall emotional effects on the victims.

[note 7] Charles Katz, David Choate, Justin Ready, and Lidia Nuno, “Evaluating the Impact of Officer Worn Body Cameras in the Phoenix Police Department” (Phoenix, AZ: Center for Violence & Community Safety, Arizona State University, 2015).

[note 8] Barak Ariel, William A. Farrar, and Alex Sutherland, “The Effect of Police Body-Worn Cameras on Use of Force and Citizens' Complaints against the Police: A Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 31 no. 3 (2015): 509-535.

[note 9] Justin T. Ready and Jacob T.N. Young, “The Impact of On-Officer Video Cameras on Police-Citizen Contacts: Findings from a Controlled Experiment in Mesa, AZ,” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11 no. 3 (2015): 445-458.

[note 10] Barak Ariel, Alex Sutherland, Darren Henstock, Josh Young, Paul Drover, Jayne Sykes, Simon Megicks, and Ryan Henderson, “Report: Increases in Police Use of Force in the Presence of Body-Worn Cameras Are Driven by Officer Discretion: A Protocol-Based Subgroup Analysis of Ten Randomized Experiments,” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 12 no. 3 (2016): 453-463.

[note 11] Anthony Braga, James R. Coldren, William Sousa, Denise Rodriguez, and Omer Alper, *The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: New Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, December 2017.

[note 12] Cynthia Lum, Christopher Koper, Linda Merola, Amber Scherer, and Amanda Reiou, “Existing and Ongoing Body Worn Camera Research: Knowledge Gaps and Opportunities” (New York: The Laura and John Arnold Foundation, 2015).

[note 13] Lum also noted an increase in randomized controlled trials among the growing number of body-worn camera studies.

Date Created: November 15, 2018

Body Cameras Work – Just Not in the Way You Think

National Police Foundation / Blog / Body Cameras Work – Just Not in the Way You Think



**By Dan Honig
and Jayme Johnson**

Much has been written in the past few days about a recent study of 2,600 police officers in Washington, D.C.'s Metropolitan Police Department, which concluded that body cameras have no statistically significant impact on police officers' use of force.

This is perhaps less surprising a finding than some commentators suggest.

A body camera might prevent the odd swear word or inappropriate comment when an officer is relaxed while conscious of the device attached to their ballistic vest. But in a heated situation where force becomes necessary, it is instinct rather than careful consideration that takes over, with more deeply ingrained behaviors coming to the fore. If the instinct to use force is deeply ingrained, it doesn't matter whether a camera is rolling.

That said, cameras are not useless. They just serve a different purpose: rather than changing ingrained behaviors, they illuminate them for police and public scrutiny.

Well-led police departments shape ingrained behaviors in their officers in two ways. Specialist training in communication, self-defense and firearms is intended to increase a police officer's capacity to make the right decisions and actions under pressure. When a police officer uses force, the situation is often tense, Adrenalin is running high, and the instinctive responses of fight or flight kick in.

Primarily it is police training – honed over decades – that prevents a police officer from fighting or running away. Techniques like role play introduce scenarios to the brain in a controlled, safe environment so when a similar scenario occurs on the job, the police officer is more likely to act in a proportionate, measured, legal and professional manner.

The methods of recruitment and selection into a police department are also crucial aspects in shaping the behaviors of officers. Behavior is, of course, dictated by the police officers themselves – their character, values and innate abilities. Some people process information in a crisis better than others. Some people remain calm. Others tend to panic. Recruitment and selection into a police department remains one of the most critical and challenging elements of modern policing: police departments must select rookies based on their character, ethical values and decision-making under pressure. At entry, departments are able to select for the behaviors they wish to foster.

But the question remains: if body cameras don't actually influence officer behavior in the ways some hoped, what is their value?

We need to question the assumption that transparency and accountability tools will directly improve performance. Indeed, emerging literature suggests transparency and accountability practices may actually

Recent Blog Posts

- Utilizing Data and Science to Reduce Serious Injury and Fatality Crashes on Rural Roads
- Enhanced Interviewing Techniques to Improve Memory Recall
- "Peace Officers" Are The Guardians of Our Society
- Getting Ready for the NIBRS Transition
- Community Policing and Public Transportation
- Technology and police operations
- The school shootings that don't happen
- The missing link in policing
- The top 5 policing essays of 2017
- Tactical lessons from San Bernardino attacks
- A Hippocratic Oath for policing
- When did 'community' get dropped from policing?
- Mindful leadership
- 5 things to consider before posting cops in schools
- How educated should police be?

change the behavior of those observed for worse, rather than better, in the private and public sectors.

But simply because an oversight practice does not directly change behavior does not mean it serves no useful purpose.

It may be helpful to view body cameras like any other transparency or accountability tool: as both a “disinfectant” (removing unwanted bad actions before they occur due to knowledge of being observed) and “flashlight” (revealing information that can be used later, e.g. the recordings of body cameras). It seems body cameras may lack potency as disinfectant. But being a bad disinfectant actually increases cameras’ usefulness as a flashlight.

So the apparent failure of body cameras as disinfectant ought to give us more confidence in their role and value as a flashlight. The tapes produced by body cameras show us what police would do even in the absence of cameras as regards the use of force—what their ingrained behaviors are. This makes these video records all the more valuable in understanding police performance.

The value of body cameras as flashlights cannot be underestimated. More accurate criminal investigations, protection against miscarriages of justice for both the public and police officers, and improved training and standards through analysis of incidents are all real, tangible benefits. This treasure chest of footage is a long way off being mined to its full potential, and was no doubt discussed by the 15,000+ delegates in the workshops and hallways at the recent International Association of Chiefs of Police annual conference in Philadelphia

Body cameras have been sold as a silver-bullet solution, a newfangled quick fix to cure policing of its public trust deficit. Instead, police behavior will continue to be shaped most by recruitment, selection, and training of police departments. But the footage gathered from body cameras may yet prove a valuable tool for understanding where training fails and where recruitment and selection can be improved. Body cameras can be useful as diagnostic rather than prescription: they can show us where ingrained police behavior has gone awry. All the better that they produce public video that police forces and critics alike can observe and interrogate.

That body cameras are more a flashlight and not disinfectant as an accountability or transparency tool, if confirmed by further research, does not make them less useful; only differently useful. We as a society are still exploring where, when, and how they add most value.

Dan Honig is an assistant professor of international development at Johns Hopkins SAIS. His forthcoming book explores when top-down controls and reporting undermine performance in the delivery of foreign aid.

Jayme Johnson is an adjunct professor in the Department of Justice, Law and Criminology at American University in Washington, DC. He previously worked for 10 years in London’s Metropolitan Police.

Leave a comment

Your email address will not be published.

Please allow some time for your comment to be reviewed prior to posting.

Name

Email

Website

I'm not a robot

reCAPTCHA
Privacy - Terms

Submit Comment

Mission

The Police Foundation was founded in 1970. Its mission is to improve policing through innovation and science.

Find out more about us.

Website Development by:



Connect



Donate

Contact

Address:

1201 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036-2636

Phone: (202) 833-1460

Fax: (202) 659-9149

E-mail: info@policefoundation.org

Transit: Farragut North Metro Station

Requests for Reproduction/Copyright

Menu

- [Home](#)
- [About Us](#)
- [What We Do](#)
- [Projects](#)
- [Featured Publications](#)
- [News & Announcements](#)
- [General Resources](#)
- [Contact](#)

Body Cameras Have Little Effect on Police Behavior, Study Says

By Amanda Ripley and Timothy Williams

Oct. 20, 2017

After a series of high-profile police shootings, police departments across the nation turned to body cameras, hoping they would curb abuses. But a rigorous study released Friday shows that they have almost no effect on officer behavior.

The 18-month study of more than 2,000 police officers in Washington found that officers equipped with cameras used force and prompted civilian complaints at about the same rate as those who did not have them.

Advocates for body cameras — including police officers, lawmakers and citizens in high-crime neighborhoods — have long argued that requiring officers to wear the devices would have a “civilizing effect” on both officers and the civilians who encounter them. After the 2014 fatal police shooting of Michael Brown, an unarmed African-American man, in Ferguson, Mo., calls for their use became more widespread.

By 2015, 95 percent of large police departments reported they were using body cameras or had committed to doing so in the near future, according to a national survey. The federal government has given police departments more than \$40 million to invest in body cameras, and state and local authorities have spent many millions more.

But, the authors of the new study cautioned, “these results suggest we should recalibrate our expectations” for body cameras to lead to “large-scale behavioral change in policing, particularly in contexts similar to Washington, D.C.”

Chief Peter Newsham of the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington said the results were surprising. “I thought it would have a difference on police and civilian behavior,” he said. “Particularly for officers — and this is the exception — who might be more inclined to misbehave.”

You have 2 free articles remaining.
Subscribe to The Times

But Chief Newsham said the cameras had a number of benefits that could not be easily measured: more accurate investigations, better training and at least one case in which the footage exonerated an officer accused of shooting an unarmed suspect (who was indeed armed). Most important, he said, they bolstered the trust of the community.

“You have to be legitimate and trusted,” he said. “You can’t underestimate the value these cameras bring to that.”

Behavior modification has never been the sole argument for body cameras. Their most important function may be to create an independent record of police shootings and other encounters with the public. But in some of those areas, too, videos have proved ambiguous: In the courtroom, for example, they have repeatedly failed to persuade juries.

Though body cameras are now in greater use, their purpose is often left undefined, raising thorny questions about surveillance, privacy and other issues. “Police departments have been rushing to body cameras without sufficiently deciding what the goal is,” said Seth Stoughton, a former officer and a law professor at the University of South Carolina, who has studied the devices extensively. “When no one is sure what it is supposed to do, no one knows if it is working.”

In the Washington study, which was conducted by David Yokum at the Lab @ DC, a team of scientists embedded in local government, and Anita Ravishankar of the Metropolitan Police Department, more than 1,000 police officers were randomly assigned cameras, and another 1,000 were not.

Each officer was tracked for seven months, with the researchers recording use-of-force incidents, civilian complaints, charging decisions by prosecutors, and other outcomes to see if the cameras changed behavior. On every metric, the effects were too small to be statistically significant.

“The results call into question whether police departments should even be adopting body-worn cameras, especially given their high cost,” said Harlan Yu, from Upturn, a Washington nonprofit consulting company that studies how technology affects social issues. It was not directly involved in the research.

Mr. Yu said the cameras raised significant privacy issues, particularly in low-income, minority neighborhoods, and that vendors were beginning to experiment with incorporating facial recognition software. “As an evidentiary tool, they will likely get stronger over time,” he said. “But the original purpose of cameras — transparency and accountability — could ultimately get swept under the rug.”

Criminologists said there were several possible explanations for the cameras’ apparent lack of impact. The Metropolitan Police Department has a reputation for being better-than-average in terms of both training and supervision, so whether officers wear cameras or not may have made little difference in their behavior.

The department has already had to confront excessive-force problems. After a Washington Post series in 1998 revealed that the city's officers had shot and killed more people per resident in the 1990s than any other police force in a large American city, the Department of Justice entered into a memorandum of agreement with the city to reform its policing.

"We went through a transformation with regard to use of force when Justice came in here," Chief Newsham said.

Under this theory, cities that have not had such reviews and calls for accountability may find that cameras have a greater effect.

Criminologists also suggested that the effect of the body cameras diminished over time, and that officers began to behave as they had before they started to wear the devices. Although if that were true the researchers would have found a greater gulf between those with and without cameras at the beginning of the study, which they did not. Or, the effects of the cameras may have spilled over to officers who did not wear them, just because they knew their colleagues did.

"This area of police practice is under-researched, so we really don't know a lot," said David A. Harris, a professor at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law who studies police accountability. "In this police department, cameras had a certain effect, but you cannot extend that to other police departments."

Until now, the most commonly cited study on police body cameras had suggested that they did indeed have a calming effect. That experiment took place in 2012, in Rialto, Calif., where officers were randomly assigned cameras based on their shifts. Over a period of one year, shifts that included cameras yielded half as many use-of-force incidents (including the use of a police baton, Taser or gun) as shifts without cameras did. The number of complaints filed by civilians against officers also declined — by 90 percent compared with the previous year.

The Rialto study had a big impact in policing. Axon (formerly known as Taser International) has sold more than 300,000 police cameras worldwide and cites the Rialto study on its website. A federal judge also cited the study in 2013 when she ordered the New York City Police Department to conduct a yearlong pilot program using body cameras. (The department has outfitted 927 officers with cameras and will compare their performance with officers without; results are due out this spring.)

But the Rialto experiment included just 54 officers, compared with over 2,000 in Washington.

In another new study that will be published in the November issue of the journal *Policing*, researchers led by Michael White of Arizona State University interviewed 249 people who had recent encounters with officers wearing cameras. Those who were aware of the cameras perceived the encounters as more "just" than those who were not.

Monica Hopkins-Maxwell, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia, said cameras were “not a panacea” and that only more emphasis on initiatives like community policing, data collection and better training would help build good will.

“I don’t think body cameras in any way, shape or form by themselves increase trust,” she said. “The way you increase trust is through relationships and how communities are treated by police officers.”

Professor Harris, of the University of Pittsburgh, said that the impact of body cameras will remain a disappointment to many people given the hype surrounding them once video footage of police behavior — good and bad — went viral on the internet.

“We were sold on the idea that these cameras were going to bring a brand-new accountability to policing, and that isn’t entirely what has happened,” he said.

A version of this article appears in print on Oct. 21, 2017, on Page A1 of the New York edition with the headline: Body Cameras Watch Officers With Little Effect, Study Finds



There is no such thing as a free body camera

National Police Foundation / Blog / There is no such thing as a free body camera



**By Chief Brandon del Pozo
Burlington (VT) Police Department**

In the early days of police body cameras, the few companies that served the market relied on an emergency procurement model: Pioneering police departments would buy the cameras in response to crises to show the public they were engaging in the reforms necessary to keep their trust.

This typically followed an ugly use-of-force incident or a corruption scandal. Other forward-thinking chiefs paid high prices for body cameras to keep ahead of these crises, knowing they were purchasing

a technology in its earliest stages of its development, when it was likely to be the most expensive.

Police body cameras have evolved since then. They are quickly becoming a standard piece of police equipment, but in doing so they are also becoming a standard piece of consumer electronics.

Body cameras are not especially complicated devices – they comprise a camera, battery, a microphone, a button or two and a processor in a rugged case. They are like a smartphone without a screen.

It follows that, as with these phones, the profits won't come from the devices themselves, which will be basically given away for free.

Body camera makers know this, and are adjusting their plans accordingly. The present profit model for bodycams is taught in business school as the “razor and blades,” or “printer and ink” model.

We all know the drill: you buy the handle for a razor at a very low price, or you get one for free, and then you spend the rest of your life buying blades for it. Similarly, you buy a great printer cheap and then run up your expenses keeping it fed with ink. It's no surprise that both the razors and the ink come in “cartridges.” Once you buy something that you need to use every day and that requires a constant supply of a unique cartridge, you are locked into buying that cartridge at whatever price the maker feels he can sell it for. These models have a very high profit margin built into the cartridges.

Data storage is the police body camera equivalent of the razor or the ink, and vendors obscure their markup on this storage by bundling it with other costs, including hardware, software, replacement costs and even technical support. The best example is the single price per month per camera, all-inclusive.

Another tactic is to give cameras away for free for an initial period, knowing that downstream, profits will come from the storage required for their footage as agencies continue to use them and enter into contracts.

The striking thing to consider is that no police body camera company owns or operates its own data center where video footage is stored. All of them—every single one—buys cloud storage from businesses like Amazon Web Services or Microsoft Azure, both of which offer CJIS-compliant cloud solutions, and then resell

Recent Blog Posts

- Utilizing Data and Science to Reduce Serious Injury and Fatality Crashes on Rural Roads
- Enhanced Interviewing Techniques to Improve Memory Recall
- “Peace Officers” Are The Guardians of Our Society
- Getting Ready for the NIBRS Transition
- Community Policing and Public Transportation
- Technology and police operations
- The school shootings that don't happen
- The missing link in policing
- The top 5 policing essays of 2017
- Tactical lessons from San Bernardino attacks
- A Hippocratic Oath for policing
- When did ‘community’ get dropped from policing?
- Body Cameras Work – Just Not in the Way You Think
- Mindful leadership
- 5 things to consider before posting cops in schools

the storage to police departments at an extraordinarily profitable markup. Glenn Mattson, an equity analyst for Ladenburg Thalmann, said that the leading body police camera maker's gross profit margins on video storage were more than three times its gross margins for hardware.

Imagine if razor companies didn't make razor blades, but instead bought them from a handful of wholesale manufacturers, put a special receptacle on them that only worked with their brand of handles, and then sold those blades at a markup of a few hundred percent. The docking stations and software interface are that special handle for bodycams, and that is the profit margin the industry makes on Amazon's storage.

American police departments have a tool at their disposal that, if used as our standard, will ensure fair competition and save taxpayers millions of dollars. The industry's intended model only works if bidders are allowed, by the terms of a Request for Proposals ("RFP"), to bundle their charges and services in a way that doesn't require that they specifically compete with one another over storage charges. At present, vendors prefer RFPs that allow them to bury storage markups and all of their other profit margins in a bundle of services that hide them from review and comparison. Regardless, our body camera vendors are paying companies such as Amazon for the *actual* number of gigabytes they are storing, at about 3 cents per gigabyte, so police departments ought to pay according to the same model. That we pay a flat rate bundled into the overall monthly price for a phone turns over the savings on any unused storage to our vendors.

This gap between fully-competitive pricing and the prevailing pricing model has only happened because we have allowed it to.

We lay out the terms of our RFPs; it is our prerogative to write them however we want as leaders engaged in government procurement and as representatives of our taxpayers. No body camera company can set those terms for us. If one of them balks at submitting an RFP because it interferes with their profit model, the body camera industry is mature enough to ensure that competitors will submit bids in compliance with the terms of the RFP and offer prices that are competitive and easy to evaluate and compare.

This is my advice: When police departments procure body cameras, we should always solicit multiple bids via RFP. More important, we need to specify in the terms of the RFP that the costs be broken down to indicate the individual prices for:

- Each camera, given its capabilities and specifications
- Docking stations and other accessories
- Each end user software license
- Insurance or replacement
- Technical support
- *Storage, per gigabyte, for the agency, across all cameras*
- Any analytics software, i.e. computer-assisted redaction

By disambiguating storage costs and other items out of a bundled price, police departments will ensure a level of competition across bidders that will favor them and their taxpayers.

This is nothing more than free-market capitalism, where an industry reaches its peak level of efficiency through widespread transparency in pricing. It will make it impossible to disguise the markup on storage, for example, because the price offered in the RFP will be easy to compare to the ever-decreasing market rate for bulk electronic storage, which is a price that is well-known and completely transparent in the tech industry.

The final evolution of the body camera industry will come when there is no markup on storage costs and the devices are always given to the police for free.

I predict this is the inevitable course of things, and we will be there in about a decade.

The devices are just cameras and storage is literally just electrons in an array. The industry's profit will be based on what it costs to move footage from a camera to a cloud and then review it when needed, and, more important, on how good its overall platform is.

It will be a matter of cops finding it easy to use, reliable, and able to deliver the value they need in capturing, cataloging, retrieving, reviewing, processing and redacting bodycam footage.

It will also be a matter of how well the software has smart features that detect a deterioration in officer behavior and possible acts of corruption or misconduct, as well as cases where officers engaged in exemplary

conduct, consistently show courtesy, or have a talent for deescalating situations. This is where companies will demonstrate their value, and so in a mature bodycam market the only line in the RFP that should be a competitive one between vendors is the line for the end user software license.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake before this happens. We need to protect our taxpayers and our budgets by writing RFPs that, collectively, protect the interests of the taxpayers who fund our police departments. The first place to start is with the low hanging fruit of the extraordinary markup most of us are paying for storage that our vendors don't own or operate. They have seized on it because it is makes for easy profits and we haven't been paying close attention.

Brandon del Pozo is the Chief of Police of Burlington, Vt. Prior to this post, he served for 19 years in the NYPD. He is a Police Foundation executive fellow.

Leave a comment

Your email address will not be published.

Please allow some time for your comment to be reviewed prior to posting.

Name

Email

Website

I'm not a robot

reCAPTCHA
Privacy - Terms

Submit Comment

Mission

The Police Foundation was founded in 1970. Its mission is to improve policing through innovation and science.

Find out more about us.

Connect



Donate

Contact

Address:

1201 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036-2636

Phone: (202) 833-1460

Fax: (202) 659-9149

E-mail: info@policefoundation.org

Transit: Farragut North Metro Station

Requests for Reproduction/Copyright

Menu

- [Home](#)
- [About Us](#)
- [What We Do](#)
- [Projects](#)
- [Featured Publications](#)
- [News & Announcements](#)
- [General Resources](#)
- [Contact](#)

Website Development by:





EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

(/em)

PUBLIC SAFETY & HOMELAND SECURITY

(/em/safety)

Study Finds Negative Effects of Police-Worn Body Cameras

A new study has found that when police-worn body cameras are in play, citizen assaults on cops went up.

BY MEGAN GUZA, THE PITTSBURGH TRIBUNE-REVIEW / JUNE 2, 2016



Shelby County Sheriff's Department SRO Joseph Fox wears a personal body camera while on duty on Oct. 15, 2014.

TNS/STAN CARROLL



(TNS) -- While most research suggests that police-worn body cameras could improve cops' relations with the public, a study released this month suggests the opposite.

In any case, experts say getting the best results depends on how the cameras are utilized.

“As simplistic as it seems to put a ... camera on your hat or shoulder, the technology is out of pace with reality, and laws are out of pace with current conditions,” said John Rago, a Duquesne University law professor who studies police practices.

He noted that much of the research done shows the cameras have a calming effect on police and the public they interact with, such as a study published in spring 2015 that found officers in Mesa, Ariz., performed nearly 10 percent more controversial stop-and-frisks when they were not wearing cameras. Those wearing them initiated 13 percent more interactions with citizens — generally viewed as positive — and they were 25 percent more likely to perceive the cameras as helpful.

A new study from Cambridge University — the largest of its kind so far — suggests cameras can have some negative effects.

The study looked at eight police units in England and Ireland and two in California and found that when police-worn body cameras were in play, citizen assaults on cops went up. Police assaults on citizens stayed the same — unless individual cops could control when cameras were turned on, in which case police assaults on citizens rose dramatically.

Beth Pittinger, executive director of the Pittsburgh Citizen Police Review Board, said the data raise questions. Pittsburgh police are using cameras as part of a pilot program.

“Who knows if that increase in assaults on officers ... if it's something that's real, maybe under-reported before, or just what's going on with that reporting,” she said. “It always leads to more questions.”

Rago agreed, saying the key to positive results is proper planning and procedures.

“There's a great deal of mischief-making that could be done if we just put cameras on people and said, ‘Go out and film everything,’ ” he said. “There needs to be published protocol, adequate training and clear Right to Know standards.”

He said police officials and lawmakers must deal with privacy laws, which are at the center of the body camera debate at a statewide level. Pennsylvania wiretapping laws create a gray area on whether the cameras would be completely legal if they are worn inside a civilian's home.

State Sen. Stewart Greenleaf, R-Montgomery County, chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has been working since last year on a bill that would change the state wiretapping law to address body camera concerns.

Greenleaf said that he had not read the Cambridge study, but all data he has seen have indicated positive effects.

“Numerous studies have said the camera has ... a calming effect, and everybody is on better behavior,” he said.

State law has limited the expansion of camera use.

The Pittsburgh Bureau of Police last fall received a \$250,000 grant from the Department of Justice to buy 50 more cameras, as well as storage and equipment, adding to the 35 that motorcycle and bicycle officers use, according to Public Safety spokeswoman Emily Schaffer.

Schaffer said the department is in the pilot phase, and the department has been testing the body cameras on officers in the zones. She noted that the law keeps officers from filming inside people's homes, “so their interactions that are recorded are limited.”

Pittsburgh police Chief Cameron McLay said that while he could not comment on the Cambridge study without going through the intricacies of the data, he noted that camera technology is evolving at a rapid pace — faster than the supporting research.

He said the bureau will conduct its own control study to determine the behavioral impact on officers and the public.

Rago said that path is the way to go. He said departments are grappling with procedural variables, and while there should be a baseline best practice, the bottom line is that each individual department will have to tweak body camera policies to fit their unique department.

It's an issue everywhere, he said, but the results will be worth it: "The reality is it is amazing that virtually every state in the country is struggling with trying to come up with the right type of legislation so that full deployment of body cameras can be realized," Rago said.

©2016 *The Pittsburgh Tribune-Review (Greensburg, Pa.)* Distributed by Tribune Content Agency, LLC. (<http://www.tribunecontentagency.com>)

DISCUSS

MORE FROM PUBLIC SAFETY & HOMELAND SECURITY
([HTTPS://WWW.GOVTECH.COM/EM/SAFETY](https://www.govtech.com/em/safety))

ADVERTISEMENT

FEATURED RESOURCES

PRESENTED BY

AWS CJIS Security Policy Workbook (/library/papers/AWS-CJIS-Security-Policy-Workbook-112521.html?promo_code=channel)

How Data On Demand Empowers Police Agencies (/library/papers/How-Data-On-Demand-Empowers-Police-Agencies-112522.html?promo_code=channel)

Deploying a CJIS Security Policy (/library/papers/Deploying-a-CJIS-Security-Policy-112523.html?promo_code=channel)

PDEvidence Helps Solve Crimes Faster Using Automated AWS-Based System
(<https://aws.amazon.com/solutions/case-studies/pdevidence/>)

Richmond Police Force Seeks Faster, More Accurate Data Management (<https://aws.amazon.com/partners/success/richmond-police-dept/>)

Tweets by @AWS_Gov



AWS for Government

@AWS_Gov

Listen to your ❤️. Also, listen to this podcast episode on how @American_Heart is using the cloud to better lives.amzn.to/2ETsill



[Embed](#)

[View on Twitter](#)

ADVERTISEMENT

MOST READ

Money, Storage Primary Obstacles in Police Body Camera Implementation
(<http://www.emergencymgmt.com/safety/Police-Body-Cam-Installation.html>)

5 Robots That May Rescue You From Natural Disasters
(<http://www.emergencymgmt.com/safety/5-Robots-That-May-Rescue-You-From-Natural-Disasters.html>)

FBI Report Says Mass Shooters Obtain Guns Legally, Usually Give Off Signals Before Shooting Spree (<https://www.govtech.com/em/safety/FBI-Report-Says-Mass-Shooters-Obtain-Guns-Legally-Usually-Give-Off-Signals-Before-Shooting-Spree.html>)

How the Pentagon Names Military Operations
(<http://www.emergencymgmt.com/safety/How-Pentagon-Names-Military-Operations.html>)

Study Finds Negative Effects of Police-Worn Body Cameras
(<https://www.emergencymgmt.com/safety/Body-Worn-Cameras-Negative-Effects.html>)

[MORE NEWS \(/em/safety\)](/em/safety)

NEWSLETTERS

- ☒ GOVTECH TODAY
- ☐ GOVTECH BIZ
- ☐ EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
- ☐ FUTURESTRUCTURE
- ☐ PUBLIC CIO
- ☐ DIGITAL COMMUNITIES
- ☐ SPECIAL DISTRICTS
- ☐ K-12
- ☐ HIGHER EDUCATION

Subscribe

[ABOUT \(/about\)](/about)

[PRIVACY \(//www.erepublic.com/privacy/\)](//www.erepublic.com/privacy/)

[CONTACT \(//www.erepublic.com/contact/\)](//www.erepublic.com/contact/)

[ADVERTISE \(//www.erepublic.com/brands/govtech/\)](//www.erepublic.com/brands/govtech/)

government
technology

© 2019 All rights reserved. e.Republic (<//www.erepublic.com>)

[HOME \(/\)](#)

[FOCUS AREAS](#)

[FRONT-END VOICE \(/FRONT-END\)](#)

[POLICING TECH \(/POLICING-TECH\)](#)

[RE-IMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY \(/RPS\)
ISSUES](#)

[DEMOCRATIC POLICING \(/RESOURCES/DEMOCRATIC-POLICING\)](#)

[BODY WORN CAMERAS \(/RESOURCES/BODY-CAMS\)](#)

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT \(/COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT-1\)](#)

[COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS \(/RESOURCES/CBA\)](#)

[YOUTH ENGAGEMENT \(/RESOURCES/YOUTH-ENGAGEMENT\)](#)

[LITIGATION \(/RESOURCES/LITIGATION\)](#)

[MEDIA \(/RESOURCES/MEDIA\)](#)

[ABOUT](#)

[OUR MISSION \(/OUR-MISSION\)](#)

[OUR TEAM \(/TEAM\)](#)

[OUR ADVISORY BOARD \(/OUR-ADVISORY-BOARD\)](#)

[PARTNERS AND FUNDERS \(/OUR-PARTNERS\)](#)

[OPEN POSITIONS \(/OPEN-POSITIONS\)](#)

[EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM \(/EXTERNIS\)](#)

[CONTACT \(/CONTACT\)](#)

[NEWS \(/NEWS\)](#)

[DONATE \(/DONATE\)](#)

Police departments, legislatures, and communities across the nation have been gripped by conversations about police use of force since the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014. High-profile incidents, including the recent second-degree murder conviction of former Chicago Police Department officer Jason Van Dyke in the on-duty shooting death of 17-year-old Laquan McDonald, have kept questions surrounding use of force at the forefront of national conversations on public safety.

Body-worn cameras (BWCs) have been a touchstone in this discussion from the beginning. Since President Obama's call for BWC funding in late 2014, hundreds of police departments have deployed BWCs as a way to improve community-police relations and interactions. Initially the evidence-based justification for BWCs was largely a study conducted in Rialto, California, which showed large decreases in both force incidents and civilian complaints (<https://www.policefoundation.org/publication/self->

[HOME \(/\)](#)

[FOCUS AREAS](#)

[FRONT-END VOICE \(/FRONT-END\)](#)

[POLICING TECH \(/POLICING-TECH\)](#)

[RE-IMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY \(/RPS\)
ISSUES](#)

[DEMOCRATIC POLICING \(/RESOURCES/DEMOCRATIC-POLICING\)](#)

[BODY WORN CAMERAS \(/RESOURCES/BODY-CAMS\)](#)

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT \(/COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT-1\)](#)

[COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS \(/RESOURCES/CBA\)](#)

[YOUTH ENGAGEMENT \(/RESOURCES/YOUTH-ENGAGEMENT\)](#)

[LITIGATION \(/RESOURCES/LITIGATION\)](#)

[MEDIA \(/RESOURCES/MEDIA\)](#)

[ABOUT](#)

[OUR MISSION \(/OUR-MISSION\)](#)

[OUR TEAM \(/TEAM\)](#)

[OUR ADVISORY BOARD \(/OUR-ADVISORY-BOARD\)](#)

[PARTNERS AND FUNDERS \(/OUR-PARTNERS\)](#)

[OPEN POSITIONS \(/OPEN-POSITIONS\)](#)

[EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM \(/EXTERNNS\)](#)

[CONTACT \(/CONTACT\)](#)

[NEWS \(/NEWS\)](#)

[DONATE \(/DONATE\)](#)

one from the Spokane Police Department in Washington. The Spokane police issued BWCs across their entire department in two phases, six months apart from each other. The trial revealed that both use-of-force and complaints against officers decreased six months post-BWC implementation, though similar reductions were not observed one year post-implementation.

The kicker? The Las Vegas officers who wore BWCs didn't just use less force and receive fewer complaints; they also issued more citations and initiated more arrests. While greater enforcement might be a benefit, it's perhaps not a result that early BWC advocates had in mind.

Further, not all studies on BWCs are drawing the same conclusions. Other departments have seen no observable results from the cameras. For example, a study performed when the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C. rolled out their body camera program across the entire department found that BWCs had no statistically significant impact (<http://bwc.thelab.dc.gov/#results/1>) on officer complaints or use of force. One multi-site, transnational randomized controlled trial led by Cambridge

[HOME \(/\)](#)

[FOCUS AREAS](#)

[FRONT-END VOICE \(/FRONT-END\)](#)

[POLICING TECH \(/POLICING-TECH\)](#)

[RE-IMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY \(/RPS\)
ISSUES](#)

[DEMOCRATIC POLICING \(/RESOURCES/DEMOCRATIC-POLICING\)](#)

[BODY WORN CAMERAS \(/RESOURCES/BODY-CAMS\)](#)

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT \(/COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT-1\)](#)

[COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS \(/RESOURCES/CBA\)](#)

[YOUTH ENGAGEMENT \(/RESOURCES/YOUTH-ENGAGEMENT\)](#)

[LITIGATION \(/RESOURCES/LITIGATION\)](#)

[MEDIA \(/RESOURCES/MEDIA\)](#)

[ABOUT](#)

[OUR MISSION \(/OUR-MISSION\)](#)

[OUR TEAM \(/TEAM\)](#)

[OUR ADVISORY BOARD \(/OUR-ADVISORY-BOARD\)](#)

[PARTNERS AND FUNDERS \(/OUR-PARTNERS\)](#)

[OPEN POSITIONS \(/OPEN-POSITIONS\)](#)

[EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM \(/EXTERNNS\)](#)

[CONTACT \(/CONTACT\)](#)

[NEWS \(/NEWS\)](#)

[DONATE \(/DONATE\)](#)

knows what it's signing up for.

Further, a benefit-cost analysis encourages policymakers to consider what complementary support might also help address the problem and prompts the police department to create comprehensive training protocols to accompany the technology. This last point is particularly crucial as having policies in place isn't just a "best practice"—it's key to achieving the right results. When the Cambridge research team controlled for officers' compliance with BWC protocol (<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11292-016-9261-3>) in a subsequent analysis of their multi-site study, the increased assaults on officers went away.

At the least, if communities are adopting BWCs for reasons of accountability and transparency, they need policies in place that provide for release of footage when appropriate, either in response to complaints about officers, or after incidents like officer-involved shootings. The Policing Project was involved in crafting what became the Los Angeles Police Department's video-release policy, which is now the law in the State of California. We suggest giving it a look (<https://www.policingproject.org/los-angeles/>).

[HOME \(/\)](#)

[FOCUS AREAS](#)

[FRONT-END VOICE \(/FRONT-END\)](#)

[POLICING TECH \(/POLICING-TECH\)](#)

[RE-IMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY \(/RPS\)
ISSUES](#)

[DEMOCRATIC POLICING \(/RESOURCES/DEMOCRATIC-POLICING\)](#)

[BODY WORN CAMERAS \(/RESOURCES/BODY-CAMS\)](#)

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT \(/COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT-1\)](#)

[COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS \(/RESOURCES/CBA\)](#)

[YOUTH ENGAGEMENT \(/RESOURCES/YOUTH-ENGAGEMENT\)](#)

[LITIGATION \(/RESOURCES/LITIGATION\)](#)

[MEDIA \(/RESOURCES/MEDIA\)](#)

[ABOUT](#)

[OUR MISSION \(/OUR-MISSION\)](#)

[OUR TEAM \(/TEAM\)](#)

[OUR ADVISORY BOARD \(/OUR-ADVISORY-BOARD\)](#)

[PARTNERS AND FUNDERS \(/OUR-PARTNERS\)](#)

[OPEN POSITIONS \(/OPEN-POSITIONS\)](#)

[EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM \(/EXTERNIS\)](#)

[CONTACT \(/CONTACT\)](#)

[NEWS \(/NEWS\)](#)

[DONATE \(/DONATE\)](#)

Newer Post

Policing Project finds Nashville traffic
stops ineffective for reducing crime
(/dispatches/Nashville-report-released)

Older Post

A Closer Look at NIBIN: A Study In
Evaluating Worth
(/dispatches/2018/10/30/a-closer-look-at-
nibin)



[HOME \(/\)](#)

[FOCUS AREAS](#)

[FRONT-END VOICE \(/FRONT-END\)](#)

[POLICING TECH \(/POLICING-TECH\)](#)

[RE-IMAGINING PUBLIC SAFETY \(/RPS\)
ISSUES](#)

[DEMOCRATIC POLICING \(/RESOURCES/DEMOCRATIC-POLICING\)](#)

[BODY WORN CAMERAS \(/RESOURCES/BODY-CAMS\)](#)

[COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT \(/COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT-1\)](#)

[COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS \(/RESOURCES/CBA\)](#)

[YOUTH ENGAGEMENT \(/RESOURCES/YOUTH-ENGAGEMENT\)](#)

[LITIGATION \(/RESOURCES/LITIGATION\)](#)

[MEDIA \(/RESOURCES/MEDIA\)](#)

[ABOUT](#)

[OUR MISSION \(/OUR-MISSION\)](#)

[OUR TEAM \(/TEAM\)](#)

[OUR ADVISORY BOARD \(/OUR-ADVISORY-BOARD\)](#)

[PARTNERS AND FUNDERS \(/OUR-PARTNERS\)](#)

[OPEN POSITIONS \(/OPEN-POSITIONS\)](#)

[EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM \(/EXTERNIS\)](#)

[CONTACT \(/CONTACT\)](#)

[NEWS \(/NEWS\)](#)

[DONATE \(/DONATE\)](#)