

St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department Body-Worn Camera Pilot Program

Final Report

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Pilot Program	4
Pilot Program Design.....	4
Policy Development	5
BWC Technology	5
BWC Training.....	6
Survey Development.....	6
Equipment Installation and Set Up	6
User Set Up	6
Camera Set Up	7
User Management	7
Pilot Program Evaluation	8
Group Use Statistics	8
User Survey Results.....	9
Community Involvement	10
Website	10
News Coverage	10
Public Survey Development and Results.....	11
Assessing the Data	12
Annual Video/Evidence Estimations	12
Information Technology Needs Assessment	13
Network Hardware Needs	13
Bandwidth Needs.....	14
Broken/Lost Equipment	15
Information Technology Staffing Needs	15
Department-Wide Staffing Needs.....	15
Proposed Budget.....	15
Summary	17
Recommendations	19
Attachments.....	20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) began a Pilot BWC Program after months of planning and development in December of 2015. The goals of the Pilot Program were to assess the technology, assess the needs of the Department to fully implement a BWC program, and to gauge public and officer opinion on the use of the technology.

The Pilot Program was designed to last 90 days. SLMPD Sergeants were outfitted with either a chest mounted or eye-glass mounted BWC provided by a single BWC manufacturer and wore them for 30 days, before passing them on to the next group. Prior to beginning the Pilot Program, all participating Sergeants were provided training on the policy, the operation of the camera technology, and how to manage evidence generated from the BWC Program.

The first step in the development of the Pilot Program was the development of a policy that would guide BWC use during the Pilot. In the weeks and months following the events in Ferguson, many agencies including the IACP, DOJ, PERF, and many others released recommendations for the formation of BWC policy. SLMPD also consulted with over 20 other law enforcement agencies in the development of the policy.

The BWC technology for this Pilot Program was supplied by TASER at no cost to the Department. The SLMPD field tested the TASER Axon-Body and the TASER Axon-Flex (eye-glass mounted) BWCs. The Department also utilized TASER's Evidence.com.

The SLMPD completed the BWC Pilot Program in March. Three groups of Sergeants representing a broad range of ages and experience tested the technology and provided their feedback. SLMPD surveyed both the Sergeants and the community, and it is clear that both the community and officers have very similar concerns. SLMPD, SLPOA, and Citizens all have similar concerns regarding video retention, use, and privacy.

For SLMPD, Cloud storage of video evidence is the only feasible option given the amount of data SLMPD will amass. A back-end solution that ties the video evidence to calls for service in CAD and I/LEADS is imperative to guarantee proper classification of videos, evidence retention, efficient data management, and efficient use of limited man power. It is clear that the costs of purchasing cameras are relatively small compared to the monthly costs of maintaining and managing the video recordings.

The implications of launching a BWC program are very significant. If an agency deploys BWCs, the agency creates a reasonable expectation that the videos will be made available to the news media and the public. The Department will need to set strict policies on when officers must turn the cameras on and off. However, the Department must consider Officer safety. Will officers be required to turn on BWCs regardless of the incident? Will officers be expected to turn on the BWC first and worry about defining themselves or the victim of a crime second? If there is a critical incident but the officer failed to capture it on video, the camera program may actually damage the Departments relationship with the community. Decisions about whether to release a particular video to the public can be complex, balancing the public's interest in seeing a video against a crime victim's privacy, for example.

A more detailed description of the Pilot Program, an analysis of the data collected, and recommendations can be found in the following report.

INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 2014, the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (SLMPD) began the process of evaluating the need and the feasibility of beginning a Body-Worn Camera (BWC) program. As Planning and Research began the process of collecting preliminary information on the topic of BWCs, one of the most significant events in policing in the last few decades occurred just 8 miles outside of the City of St. Louis. The reverberations of that event could be felt in communities and police agencies across the country, and most notably in the St. Louis Region. The changes to policing in the coming months and years would be profound.

One notable change was the increased emphasis on creating trust and transparency in law enforcement agencies. While it has always been the case for SLMPD, many law enforcement agencies are not as open as accessible as they could be. One option that had been explored and put in place by many agencies was BWC technology. The thought was if the community is able to see what an officer sees, there can be some understanding of the decision making process in police/public interactions.

A growing body of empirical evidence points to the effectiveness of BWCs in reducing use of force incidents and complaints against officers. According to a 2012 study of the Rialto, CA Police Department, use of force incidents declined by 60 percent across the entire department after the implementation of a BWC program. In a comparison of shifts that utilized BWCs and shifts that did not utilize BWCs, use of force incidents were 50 percent lower in shifts that utilized BWCs. Perhaps most impressively, the Rialto department saw an 88 percent decrease in complaints compared to the year prior to BWC deployment. Results from the Mesa, AZ Police department's BWC deployment corroborate the encouraging effects observed in Rialto: Just eight months after the BWC deployment, officers without cameras had 300 percent more complaints filed against them than officers with cameras; during the entire course of the pilot program, there were 40 percent less complaints against officers who utilized BWCs; use of force complaints for officers that utilized BWCs decreased by 75%. Similar effects have been seen in jurisdictions across the country.

Though the mechanisms by which BWCs elicit the positive effects discussed above are not yet fully understood, there are several plausible explanations. BWCs seem to have a civilizing effect on both police and citizens during encounters (i.e., both officers and citizens might behave better due to being on camera). As Chief William Farrar of Rialto put it, "Whether the reduced number of complaints was because of the officers behaving better or the citizens behaving better—well, it was probably a little bit of both." Beyond the purported civilizing effect of BWCs, camera footage provides an objective record of police-citizen encounters. The very existence of such a record might discourage the filing of false complaints. Finally, BWC footage is sometimes incorporated into police training routines and can yield significant benefits. BWC footage provides vivid first-person accounts of encounters that can bolster scenario-based training. Moreover, BWC footage provides officers an opportunity to engage in self-critique and self-evaluation of performance, an integral part of any educational process.

The implications of launching a BWC program are very significant. If an agency deploys BWCs, the agency creates a reasonable expectation that the videos will be made available to the news media and the public. The Department will need to set strict policies on when officers must turn the cameras on and off. However, the Department must consider Officer safety. Will officers be required to turn on BWCs regardless of the incident? Will officers be expected to turn on the BWC first and worry about defining

themselves or the victim of a crime second? If there is a critical incident but the officer failed to capture it on video, the camera program may actually damage the Department's relationship with the community. Decisions about whether to release a particular video to the public can be complex, balancing the public's interest in seeing a video against a crime victim's privacy, for example.

Though increasingly more police departments throughout the United States are beginning to make use of body-worn cameras, no consensus has emerged regarding best practices for program administration. As one might expect, program administration approaches vary along with departmental characteristics such as size, urban versus rural policing environment, and budgetary constraints. Moreover, many well-documented body-worn camera programs have been pilot programs rather than programs operating at full-scale. Obviously, such pilot programs are considerably less-resource intensive, and while these programs are deeply informative in many ways, it is unclear whether their administrative procedures are replicable for department-wide programs.



Following seven years of testing and evaluation, San Diego's Police Department is proceeding with a full-scale body worn camera program. The SDPD is outfitting their entire patrol staff with 1,000 body-worn cameras. To administer their program, the SDPD is relying on a single officer who is solely dedicated to body worn cameras, and is responsible for most equipment maintenance and the training of all officers excluding detectives. That officer will be aided by three officers who will assist with equipment issues but are not

specifically assigned to the body worn camera program. All SDPD officers are responsible for uploading videos generated during their shift to a cloud-based storage system.

For these reasons the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) recommends a careful, thoughtful approach to body cameras, in which the community, officers, and other stakeholders are consulted. PERF argues that departments should consider piloting the program and evaluating the results before implementing it department-wide.

Taking into consideration all of the above and the importance of "getting it right" the SLMPD began a Pilot BWC Program after months of planning and development in December of 2015. The goals of the Pilot Program were to assess the technology, assess the needs of the Department to fully implement a BWC program, and to gauge public and officer opinion on the use of the technology.

PILOT PROGRAM

The SLMPD began the BWC Pilot Program on December 14, 2015.

PILOT PROGRAM DESIGN

The Pilot Program was designed to last 90 days. SLMPD Sergeants were outfitted with either a chest mounted or eye-glass mounted BWC provided by a single BWC manufacturer and wore them for 30 days, before passing them on to the next group.

Each group consisted of 24 Sergeants with 12 wearing a chest mounted BWC and 12 wearing an eye-glass mounted BWC. Sergeants were selected from all six Districts, SWAT, and Special Operations and all three watches; specifically, three Sergeants from each District, three Sergeants from SWAT, and three Sergeants from Special Operations. The Sergeants from SWAT and Special Operations wore their cameras for the full 90-day Pilot Program.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The first step in the development of the Pilot Program was the development of a policy that would guide BWC use during the Pilot. In the weeks and months following the events in Ferguson, many agencies including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Department of Justice, Police Executive Research Foundation, and many others released recommendations for the formation of BWC policy.

SLMPD began by reviewing the International Association of Chiefs of Police Model Policy on BWCs released in 2014. SLMPD also reviewed a number of reports including:

- Police Executive Research Forum's, *Implementing a Body Worn Camera Program*;
- Office of Justice Programs', *Police Officer Body Worn Cameras Assessing the Evidence*;
- National Institute of Justice's, *Body-Worn Cameras for Law Enforcement*;
- International Municipal Lawyers Association's, *A Model Act for Regulating the Use of Wearable Body Cameras by Law Enforcement*; and
- Fraternal Order of Police, *Body-Worn Camera Recommended Best Practices*.

After reviewing hundreds of pages of reports and recommendations, the SLMPD reached out to a number of jurisdictions around the country that had deployed BWCs prior to the events in Ferguson, Mo. SLMPD requested sample policies for review and inquired about the overall process for implementing a BWC Program in their given departments. The resulting responses were significant. SLMPD received feedback from over 20 agencies including:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| • Aberdeen, SD PD; | • Lake Havasu City, AZ PD; |
| • Aransas Pass, TX PD; | • Louisville, KY PD; |
| • Arizona DPS; | • Merced, CA PD; |
| • Austin, TX PD; | • Mesa, AZ PD; |
| • Caldwell County, NC Sheriff's Office; | • Miami-Dade, FL PD; |
| • Chesapeake, VA PD; | • Modesto, CA PD; |
| • Chocktaw, OK PD; | • New Orleans, LA PD; |
| • Fort Worth, TX PD; | • Newport News, VA PD; |
| • Hartford, CT PD; | • San Diego, CA PD; |
| • Johnson City, TN PD; | • Seattle, WA PD; and |
| • Johnson County, KS Sheriff's Office; | • Topeka, KS PD. |

Representatives from SLMPD participated in other opportunities to meet with and discuss BWC deployment and policy development including professional conferences in Arlington, Texas and Albuquerque, New Mexico. In Arlington, the International Association of Law Enforcement Planners hosted a round table discussion with representatives from multiple Texas law enforcement agencies on

the topic of BWC deployment. SLMPD representatives spoke directly to senior command staff in Albuquerque again to discuss deployment and policy development.

Finally, SLMPD reviewed the laws currently in place that would affect any policy created to manage a Department BWC program. One of the major concerns facing SLMPD is the Missouri Secretary of State's retention schedule. Given the evidentiary requirements from the Secretary of State requiring video to be retained for at least 30 days and evaluated prior to purging, the Department would need to dedicate staff to managing and reviewing the digital evidence created by the BWC program. The Police Clerks Retention Schedule provided by the Missouri Secretary of State, states:

POL 011 Audio/Video Recordings

Also Called: Car Audio/Video recording; Booking Surveillance; Surveillance

Function:

Content:

*Retention: 30 Days--Evaluate**

Disposition:

*Note: *Managers should extract significant information that may impact criminal or major case investigation prior to deleting video/re-using the tape. Extracted video must be retained until administrative/judicial proceedings are complete. This retention does not apply to interrogation videos which are by their nature evidentiary and should be part of the investigative files—See POL001*

Approval Date: August 25, 2009; Revised August 23, 2011 Updated December 1, 2015

SLMPD Planning and Research spoke with Jon Korasick of the Secretary of State's Office specifically about the *Evaluate* term. He said that the initial policy was developed with In-Car video in mind. The term *Evaluate* was used to allow for each department to handle video in the way it sees fit. However, it does imply that before any video is deleted or any portion of a video is deleted, it must be reviewed. He said that this requirement helps in handling the short retention period and reduces the appearance of purging video for questionable reasons, such as destroying evidence.

Pending an opinion from the City Counselor's Office or changes in Missouri State Law, it seems as though the Department must review all video prior to purging it. Jon Korasick did state that it is up to the Department to draft policy and procedure, but he would be more than happy to help out and provide any guidance whenever needed.

Taking all of the above into consideration, SLMPD Planning and Research Staff developed the current BWC policy (Attachment 1) covering camera position, mandatory recording, prohibited recording, and evidence/video management. Building heavily on the strengths of other successful programs and policies and while trying to address the requirements of the State of Missouri, the current policy went in to effect on December 5, 2015.

BWC TECHNOLOGY

The BWC technology for this Pilot Program was supplied by TASER at no cost to the Department. The SLMPD field tested the TASER Axon-Body and the TASER Axon-Flex (eye-glass mounted) BWCs. The Department also utilized TASER's Evidence.com. Specifications for each model are in Attachment 2.

BWC TRAINING

Prior to beginning the Pilot Program, all participating Sergeants were provided training on the policy, the operation of the camera technology, and how to manage evidence generated from the BWC Program. Each group took part the training prior to beginning their 30 day participation in the program.

The policy portion of the training consisted of reviewing the Pilot Program Special Order (SLMPD Department Policy). Important areas of consideration were the circumstances requiring the camera to be recording, how to document the existence of a video in the incident report, and how to review video evidence.

Each group received training from the BWC technology provider on how to operate the BWC's including: turning the device on, turning the device off, charging the device, and how to handle any malfunctioning technology.



Finally, each group was trained on how to appropriately access and view evidence created by the BWC and the requisite process for tagging and documenting the BWC video evidence. All evidence generated during this pilot was stored in *The Cloud* via Evidence.com and Sergeants were directed on the process for accessing the video through the provider's website.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

In order to effectively assess the attitudes of the Sergeants participating in the Pilot Program, weekly surveys were given. The survey was developed using questions that had been used in other BWC Program evaluations.

The Sergeants were asked to complete a pre-test survey prior to beginning the Pilot Program. Each Sergeant was sent a link to the 42 question (37 Likert and 5 Free Response) survey via email each week during the 4 weeks they were assigned a BWC.

EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION AND SET UP

The BWC provider sent SLMPD the equipment prior to the start of the Pilot Program. It was the job of SLMPD Information Technology Staff to set up all the cameras and docking stations prior to deployment.

USER SET UP

User groups and assigned permissions were setup by Information Technology, Planning and Research, and the BWC Project Manager by looking through each option in the user roles and deciding what that particular group would need.

User setup involved getting a list of the users compiled into a spread sheet with their full name, email address, and DSN. This list was then imported to Evidence.com.

Email invitations were sent from Evidence.com to new users to instruct them to setup their new account. This invitation expires after 48 hours. Anyone that didn't setup their account before that expiration had to be sent a new invitation email. This was a manual process performed by Information Technology staff. Some users contacted the BWC Project Manager, and he would contact Information Technology Staff directly to resend invitations. A few users contacted the Help Desk and an issue would get escalated to the appropriate staff to resend the invitation.

This initial set up required 9 man hours, with an additional 4 man hours per week for the duration of the Pilot Program.

CAMERA SET UP

All cameras had to be manually registered into Evidence.com. This required two Information Technology staff connecting each camera to their computer and launching the Sync software and then assigning it to the Evidence.com user that had already been created. This was a time consuming process initially.

When the cameras were reassigned after 4 weeks and then again after 8 weeks this process had to be repeated to reassign all cameras to the Sergeant that would be beginning their portion of the Pilot.



Each camera was labeled with the DSN of the assigned officer. This also had to be changed each time the assigned Sergeants were changed.

During the Pilot, since SLMPD tested two different models of cameras, it was very frequent that we were asked to swap the cameras between users as one would prefer to test a different type.

Each docking station was setup with a static IP address and Information Technology staff had to permit this device to access Evidence.com through the firewall.

Each docking station slot was labeled with which camera was to dock in that particular slot so that officers wouldn't accidentally grab the wrong camera.

This initial set up required 48 man hours, with an additional five hours per week for the duration of the Pilot Program.

USER MANAGEMENT

Management of users and cameras after the initial setup required little additional attention. Overall Information Technology only had three instances that required a technician to go on site and troubleshoot a camera. In each case, resetting the unit fixed the issue.



Account lockouts were infrequent. Messages are sent to the administrator accounts reporting a lockout event. Evidence.com would lock the account for 60 minutes, then unlock it, and the user could try again. Otherwise, the users reached out to one of the two Information Technology technicians that were responsible for this system.

One Information Technology technician would train officers that had missed the main training events on how to use the cameras, start and stop

recording, and upload. He also walked them through signing into Evidence.com.

This process required three man hours per week for the duration of the Pilot Program.

PILOT PROGRAM EVALUATION

In order to effectively evaluate the BWC Pilot Program, SLMPD collected multiple forms of data throughout the Pilot. SLMPD collected survey data from the Sergeants wearing cameras, use statistics, and random audits of video.

A weekly audit was completed for the duration on the Pilot Program to include a review of video evidence, use reports, and updated survey information.

GROUP USE STATISTICS

The following tables illustrate the overall use statistics for the duration of the Pilot Program. Also included are tables illustrating use by Pilot group. Each group consisted of three Sergeants from each District, three from SWAT, and three from Special Operations. The cameras were evenly distributed across watches for each group.

Table 1. Total video collected during the Pilot Program

	Total Uploads
Number of Videos	1114
Hours of Videos	161.43
GB of Videos	119.83
	Average Per Day
Number of Videos Uploaded	13.11
Hours of Video Uploaded	1.9
GB of Video Uploaded	1.41

Table 2. Total video collected Group 1

	Total Uploads
Number of Videos	300
Hours of Videos	47.31
GB of Videos	34.84
	Average Per Day
Number of Videos Uploaded	10.34
Hours of Video Uploaded	1.63
GB of Video Uploaded	1.2

Table 3. Total video collected Group 2

	Total Uploads
Number of Videos	408
Hours of Videos	53.82
GB of Videos	40.19
	Average Per Day
Number of Videos Uploaded	14.57
Hours of Video Uploaded	1.92
GB of Video Uploaded	1.44

Table 4. Total video collected Group 3

Group 3	Total Uploads
Number of Videos	406
Hours of Videos	60.3
GB of Videos	44.8
	Average Per Day
Number of Videos Uploaded	14.5
Hours of Video Uploaded	2.15
GB of Video Uploaded	1.6

USER SURVEY RESULTS

Results for the 37 Likert Scale questions can be found in Attachment 3.

The information collected in the free response portion of the weekly surveys provided vital information regarding the day-to-day use of the BWCs. Specifically, Sergeants provided feedback on the mounting systems. For example, Sergeants noted that there was no option for mounting the chest mount model on the outside of SLMPD winter jackets. This information is important because it will help SLMPD find a system that provides the best mounting option to fit the needs of the officers.

Similarly, a number of Sergeants expressed their dislike for the cords associated with the glass mount model. They found the cords to be cumbersome and often times the cords became caught on other equipment. Some Sergeants did prefer the glass mount option to the chest mount option according to their responses. Given the information gleaned in the surveys, it would seem appropriate to select a BWC manufacturer that offers multiple options and allow officers to select which model they prefer.

Also included in these responses were comments regarding training benefits, evidentiary benefits, safety concerns, and citizen/officer contact concerns.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

In January 2016, SLMPD Public Information began planning for the community input portion of the BWC Pilot. Public information contacted Mike Bush of KSDK-Channel 5 News and offered him an up-close and personal opportunity to showcase the Pilot Program, talk to Sergeants involved in the program, and ultimately help garner public feedback.

Public Information also developed a survey available on the SLMPD website to be completed by community members wishing to provide their opinions.

WEBSITE

In late February, 2016, Public Information met with Information Technology to discuss plans for the body camera webpage. A Programmer Analyst I, developed the webpage. He spent 32 hours and 45 minutes on the project. This includes the removal of the survey and taking Body Camera off of the storyboard at the conclusion of the open survey.

The body camera website went live on Sunday, March 13. The BWC portion of the SLMPD website is still active. It currently includes the SLMPD Special Order governing BWCs, photos, and a couple articles discussing BWC programs.

NEWS COVERAGE

On February 9, a KSDK photographer was allowed to record the training process for approximately an hour. On February 22, Public Information met with Mike Bush to discuss logistics for the body camera story. The meeting took about 90 minutes.

The Public Information staff then set up interviews with Sergeants that had taken part in the Pilot Program and on March 3. Mike Bush conducted interviews with Police Commissioner, Colonel Samuel Dotson and the two selected sergeants that had participated in the Pilot Program. Mike Bush also followed one of the sergeants in his patrol car and recorded his interactions and experiences with the BWC. The entire interview process took approximately two hours.

Later in the evening on March 3, Mike Bush was allowed to take a BWC with him to record while he broadcast the evening news. Mike Bush recorded with the camera for approximately 2-3 hours. The footage captured during the shadowing of the Sergeant and the broadcast was downloaded and given to KSDK for their use.

The story was slated to air on Sunday, March 13. The story encouraged viewers to visit the SLMPD website where they could take a survey to provide feedback. Mike Bush spent approximately 4-5 hours editing and producing the news story.

PUBLIC SURVEY DEVELOPMENT AND RESULTS

Public information developed a short survey to be used to gauge community support for BWC deployment in St. Louis. The survey consisted of 12 questions regarding the interactions had by the public with Sergeants wearing BWCs. Also, included were questions covering general approval or disapproval of BWC technology.


The survey was active on the SLMPD website from March 13 through April 4. Just over 800 citizens responded to the survey. However, it is important to note that 83.6% of respondents had not interacted with an officer wearing a BWC.

Responses are illustrated in the below graphs and table


Table 5. Public Survey Question

If you have interacted with a St. Louis police officer who was wearing a body camera, how did you become aware you were being recorded?	Number	Percent
Missing	2	.2
I asked the officer if I was being recorded	9	1.1
I have not interacted with a St. Louis police officer wearing a camera	676	83.6
Other	92	11.4
Someone else present during the interaction asked the officer if he or she was being recorded	5	.6
Someone else present during the interaction told me I was being recorded	5	.6
The officer told me I was being recorded	20	2.5
Total	809	100.0

HAVE YOU INTERACTED WITH A ST. LOUIS POLICE OFFICER IN THE PAST?




DO YOU THINK BODY CAMERAS WILL HAVE AN INFLUENCE ON OFFICERS' BEHAVIOR OR COMMUNICATION WHEN INTERACTING WITH THE PUBLIC?




DO YOU THINK BODY CAMERAS WILL HAVE AN INFLUENCE ON OTHERS' BEHAVIOR OR COMMUNICATION WHEN INTERACTING WITH OFFICERS?

■ Missing ■ No ■ Yes




DO YOU FEEL SAFER KNOWING YOUR INTERACTIONS WITH OFFICERS ARE BEING RECORDED?

■ Missing ■ No ■ Yes




DO YOU BELIEVE ALL BODY CAMERA VIDEO RECORDINGS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE UNDER THE MISSOURI SUNSHINE LAW (FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT), INCLUDING VIDEOS DEPICTING VICTIMS AND JUVENILES?

■ Missing ■ No ■ Yes



SHOULD OFFICERS HAVE THE ABILITY TO TURN OFF VIDEO RECORDING AT THE REQUEST OF CITIZENS?

■ Missing ■ No ■ Yes



The public opinion survey free response questions also provided insight in to the opinions of the public regarding privacy concerns, cost, and storage/retention of video evidence.

ASSESSING THE DATA

The following assessment is based on the deployment of 800 BWCs.

ANNUAL VIDEO/EVIDENCE ESTIMATIONS

Using the data collected during this BWC Pilot Program, SLMPD calculated an annual estimation on the number of videos and amount of data for a deployment of 800 cameras.

Table 6. Data Estimations based on Pilot Data and Calls for Service Data

Annual Estimations	Sergeant Pilot [^]	Calls For Service Data ^{^*}
Number of Videos Uploaded	151,122	531,442 ^{**}
Hours of Video Uploaded	21,586	311,746 ^{***}
GB of Video Uploaded	16,015	779,365 ^{****}

[^]estimations based on a deployment of 800 cameras

^{*}2013 calls for service and self-initiated activities

^{**}calculated w/ only one officer per event

^{***} calculated w/ an average call time of 35 minutes

^{****}24min/GB

The estimated number of videos and amount data of expected per year based on Calls for Service data is also included in the above table.

The large difference in these two estimations can be attributed to multiple factors. The primary reason is the difference in the nature of work completed by a Sergeant and a Patrol Officer. Sergeants in this Pilot Program were not answering Calls for Service as a Patrol Officer does each shift. Looking at the video and the associated use data, it was evident that basing the estimated number of videos and data expected annually on the Pilot data alone would produce a significantly lower estimation than what SLMPD should expect. In both cases (using Pilot data and Calls for Service data), the estimations are low due to the calculations assuming one Officer/one camera/video per call. Often times there are multiple Officers responding to a Call for Service.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Information Technology needs assessment is based on 800 cameras distributed throughout the 3 area stations, Special Operations, and HQ locations. It should be noted that the following assessment is based on utilizing a cloud storage solution. Information Technology does not recommend the use of an on-premises storage solution for video evidence generated by BWCs. The below estimates do not include the man power to perform evidence management tasks including: Investigation, seizure, redaction, supplemental reporting, and submission. Information Technology would recommend that evidence seizure be handled by a commissioned unit with a background in investigative police work.



Information Technology also recommends that there be an assignment responsible for storage of all associated equipment including: black cases that contain the camera accessories, spare clips, USB cords, car charger, and mobile devices.

NETWORK HARDWARE NEEDS

At the time of this report, there is currently an inadequate amount of network drops and network hardware to support a full BWC deployment. Additional network drops and switches will need to be

installed for a full implementation with multiple docks at each site. The (one-time) costs for this are listed in the table below:

Table 7. Network hardware needs

Location	Item needed	Quantity	Cost
North Patrol	Network drops	20	\$6000
North Patrol	Network switch	1	\$2000
Central Patrol	Network drops	20	\$6000
Central Patrol	Network switch	1	\$2000
South Patrol	Network drops	20	\$6000
South Patrol	Network switch	1	\$2000
Special Operations	Network drops	15	\$4500
Special Operations	Network switch	1	\$2000
SWAT (HQ)	Network drops	10	\$3000
SWAT (HQ)	Network switch	1	\$3000
Total			\$36500

BANDWIDTH NEEDS

Similarly, additional bandwidth will be needed at each location where cameras will be docked. See the recurring monthly costs in the table below:

Table 8. Bandwidth needs

Location	Current Bandwidth	Proposed Bandwidth	Monthly cost increase
South Patrol	50Mbit/s	100Mbit/s	\$1000
North Patrol	50Mbit/s	100Mbit/s	\$1000
Central Patrol	50Mbit/s	100Mbit/s	\$1000
Special Operations	20Mbit/s	50Mbit/s	\$750
HQ (SWAT)	300Mbit/s	300Mbit/s	\$0
Total cost			\$3750 (recurring)

BROKEN/LOST EQUIPMENT

Camera mounting clips broke frequently or were misplaced. Cords for the glass mounted cameras were also easy to break and required multiple replacements. During the Pilot, Information Technology kept spare equipment at the Help Desk so Sergeants could get replacements 24 hours a day and 7 days a week.

When it was time to return equipment or to give equipment to the next group of Sergeants that were testing, Information Technology staff often had to hunt down equipment.

This process required one man hour per week for the duration of the Pilot Program.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STAFFING NEEDS

Finally, in order to adequately handle the assumed increase in workload, Information Technology would need to increase staffing. Overall staffing needs are below.

Table 9. Estimated number of staff needed for Information Technology

Position	Current FTE Count	Proposed FTE Count	Hours dedicated to BWC per week
Network Admin II	2	5	161
Network Admin I	3	5	138

DEPARTMENT-WIDE STAFFING NEEDS

The costs of purchasing cameras are relatively small compared to the monthly costs of maintaining and managing the video recordings. SLMPD has also already experienced a number of open records requests regarding BWCs. Sunshine requests for video and video related information will require a substantial amount of Department time and resources to fulfill.

Requests of this nature and other administrative tasks (video redaction, assigning cameras, managing evidence requests, etc.) associated with BWCs have led to other agencies hiring staff to handle the increased workload. A rough estimate on staffing required, taking into account about 20 other agencies, would be one full-time person per 100-150 cameras deployed. With a deployment of 800 BWCs, SLMPD would need to employ six to eight fulltime staff to handle the administrative tasks associated with BWCs. These estimations are heavily dependent on type evidence management and redaction software utilized by the Department.

PROPOSED BUDGET

The budget for any Body Camera Program is dependent on a number of factors. The proposed budget below is estimated based on costs from other Police Departments including San Diego, New Orleans, Seattle, Phoenix, Los Angeles and others.

Technology costs were variable from department to department. Cameras ranged from \$400-\$1000 per unit. The below estimation was based on SLMPD purchasing 800 units at a cost of \$800 per unit with an

expected life-cycle of two years. The camera docks were a little more consistent in price at \$1200 per dock. With a deployment of 800 cameras, SLMPD would need at least 134, 6 slot docks.

Evidence storage is the most costly part of the BWC Program. The cost for unlimited Cloud Storage is \$100 per camera per month.

In total, the cost for the technology and Information Technology infrastructure upgrades (Tables 7 and 8) will be an estimated \$1.84 million for the first year and between \$1 million and \$1.8 million for the following 4 years.

Staffing is another significant cost. This cost is however flexible depending on type and number of staff assigned, but the success of any BWC Program is heavily dependent adequate staffing. The staffing estimates below are conservative based on other Departments. SLMPD would need to create a unit to manage all facets of the BWC Program, requiring a Sergeant, six Officers, and one administrative person.

Table 10. Proposed Budget for BWC Program

Technology	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Camera Technology	\$640,000.00	\$0.00	\$640,000.00	\$0.00	\$640,000.00
Camera Docks	\$160,800.00	\$0.00	\$160,800.00	\$0.00	\$160,800.00
Network Hardware	\$36,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bandwidth needs	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$45,000.00
Evidence Storage	\$960,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$960,000.00	\$960,000.00
Technology Total	\$1,842,300.00	\$1,005,000.00	\$1,805,800.00	\$1,005,000.00	\$1,805,800.00
Staffing (Base Pay)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
1 Sergeant	\$56,570.00	\$56,730.00	\$59,996.00	\$62,346.00	\$64,773.00
6 Police Officers	\$239,304.00	\$256,152.00	\$263,640.00	\$277,212.00	\$283,920.00
1 Admin. Staff	\$23,712.00	\$24,076.00	\$24,440.00	\$24,804.00	\$25,168.00
2 IT Staff	\$72,800.00	\$73,892.00	\$74,984.00	\$76,128.00	\$77,272.00
Staffing Total	\$392,386.00	\$410,850.00	\$423,060.00	\$440,490.00	\$451,133.00
Annual Total	\$2,234,686.00	\$1,415,850.00	\$2,228,860.00	\$1,445,490.00	\$2,256,933.00

SUMMARY

The SLMPD completed the BWC Pilot Program in March, 2016 after 90 days of deployment. Three groups of Sergeants representing a broad range of ages and experience tested the technology and provided their feedback. SLMPD surveyed both the Sergeants and the community, and it is clear that both the community and officers have very similar concerns. SLMPD, SLPOA, and Citizens all have similar concerns regarding video retention, use, and privacy.

There are a number of considerations to take into account when evaluating the success of this Pilot Program. The primary concern to keep in mind is that this Pilot Program involves Sergeants and not Patrol Officers. The nature of call response and responsibilities differ for Patrol Officers when compared Sergeants. Also, Sergeants are typically not the first person on the scene resulting in shorter video duration during the Pilot Program.

Secondly, it is important to note that many calls require/have more than one officer responding; which will result in 3,4,5, etc. videos per call when cameras are rolled out to officers. When reviewing video captured during this Pilot Program, the majority of videos had at least two to three officers in them illustrating that the video evidence generated will be exponentially more than what SLMPD experienced during the Pilot Program

As a result, the experiences during this Pilot Program are difficult to generalize. SLMPD has attempted better estimate the annual evidence/data generated by using Calls for Service data to supplement.

The Pilot Program has provided SLMPD with some very important information regarding the day-to-day use of the cameras. Based on comments from the Sergeants involved, it is evident that SLMPD needs to find a solution that allows for cameras to be mounted on the officers' outermost garment. Also, Officers tend to prefer the chest mount option over the eye-glass mounted camera. However, depending on the assignment the eye-glass mounted option provides a better view.

For SLMPD, Cloud storage of video evidence is the only feasible option given the amount of data SLMPD will amass. Also, Cloud storage makes video review and evidence handling process more efficient and safe for both the officer and public. During the Pilot Program, Sergeants were required to manually review and tag video in Evidence.com. This is an administrative task that will take a significant amount of time depending on the amount of video generated. Estimates from other law enforcement agencies are from 30-90 minutes per shift on administrative tasks related to BWCs. A back-end solution that ties the video evidence to calls for service in CAD and I/LEADS is imperative to guarantee proper classification of videos, evidence retention, efficient data management, and efficient use of limited man power.

The costs of purchasing cameras are relatively small compared to the monthly costs of maintaining and managing the video recordings. SLMPD has also already experienced a number of open records requests regarding BWCs. Sunshine requests for video and video related information will require a substantial amount of Department time and resources to fulfill. Requests of this nature and other administrative tasks (video redaction, assigning cameras, managing evidence requests, etc.) associated with BWCs have led to other agencies hiring staff to handle the increased workload. Even if the SLMPD contracts out the task of storing the data, the SLMPD may need to hire or re-assign staff to respond to public requests for particular videos. This can involve the time-consuming task of redacting certain sections of a video. A rough

estimate on staffing required, taking into account about 20 other agencies, would be one full-time person per 100-150 cameras deployed.

At the time of this report, Missouri Law is woefully behind regarding the handling of video evidence and retention. There have been some suggestions made to the legislature in the spring of 2016 regarding BWCs including agencies required to use them, what should be recorded, what should be available in open record requests, and many others. What is clear is that BWCs are a very controversial issue and legislation is needed to help guide the direction of BWC use and evidence handling.

Based on the experience gained from this Pilot Program and learning from other agencies, it is clear that taking the requisite time to fully plan and develop a BWC Program is imperative for success. As previously stated, San Diego took seven years to plan their program, and as a result, San Diego is considered to be a model nationwide for BWC deployment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Following the St. Louis City RFP process, SLMPD should field test BWC technology provided by the top two proposals to evaluate usability, real-time viewing, technical attributes, In-Car Video system integration, use of “triggers” for activating BWCs such as exiting a vehicle and drawing a service weapon, and technical assistance across models and manufactures.

Recommendation 2: SLMPD should review and evaluate other Law Enforcement agencies systems and experiences with BWC and CAD/RMS integration to allow for proper assessment of administrative time.

Recommendation 4: SLMPD needs to evaluate the use of BWCs based on the daily use of Patrol Officers. SLMPD needs to begin discussions with the SLPOA and create work groups for selecting technology, weighing in on policy decisions, and other administrative functions.

Recommendation 5: SLMPD needs to assess redaction software solutions in accordance with State Law. A significant amount of time managing BWCs and evidence requests will be the process by which SLMPD redacts video evidence.

Recommendation 6: SLMPD should coordinate semi-annually with the City Counselor’s Office to ensure policy is in accordance with State and Federal Laws regarding privacy and retention.

Recommendation 7: SLMPD needs to develop a process for evidence sharing with the Circuit Attorney’s, the City Counselor’s, and the US Attorney’s Offices.

ATTACHMENTS



ATTACHMENT 1: SPECIAL ORDER 5-34

**METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT – CITY OF ST. LOUIS
OFFICE OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER
SPECIAL ORDER**

Date Issued: December 10, 2015 **Order No.:** SO 5-34
Effective Date: December 10, 2015 **Expiration:** Indefinite

Reference:

CALEA Standards:

Cancelled Publications:

Subject: SUPERVISOR PILOT BODY WORN CAMERA PROGRAM

To: ALL BUREAUS, DISTRICTS AND DIVISIONS

PURPOSE: To provide guidelines and procedures for the Department's Body Worn Camera (BWC) pilot program.

By Order of:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Samuel Dotson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "D." and last name "Dotson" clearly distinguishable.

D. SAMUEL DOTSON
Colonel
Police Commissioner

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT – CITY OF ST. LOUIS
OFFICE OF THE POLICE COMMISSIONER
SPECIAL ORDER

Date Issued: December 10, 2015 **Order No.:** SO 5-34
Effective Date: December 10, 2015 **Expiration:** Indefinite

Reference:

CALEA Standards:

Cancelled Publications:

Subject: SUPERVISOR PILOT BODY WORN CAMERA PROGRAM

To: ALL BUREAUS, DISTRICTS AND DIVISIONS

PURPOSE: To provide guidelines and procedures for the Department's Body Worn Camera (BWC) pilot program.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. The Department's BWC pilot program is a limited deployment of BWCs to Department Sergeants that is designed to explore BWC usage. In other police departments, BWCs have proven effective in reducing violent confrontations and complaints against officers. Cameras provide additional documentation of police/public encounters and may be an important tool for collecting evidence and maintaining public trust.
2. Failure to properly follow the procedures contained in this Order, to include the intentional or accidental misuse of the equipment and recordings, could result in the loss of valuable evidence in a criminal prosecution and/or a significant risk to the Department. Failure to comply with these directives will be reviewed and subject to disciplinary action.

B. DEFINITIONS

1. Body-Worn Camera (BWC) – A camera worn on an individual officer's person that records and stores audio and video.
2. Buffering Mode – A standby mode in which the camera is on but not activated to record. When in buffering mode, the camera is not saving any captured video to permanent memory. No audio is captured when the camera is in buffering mode.
3. Event Mode – The mode in which the camera is activated to record to permanent memory. Event mode is activated by pushing the Event button on the BWC. When in event mode, the camera records both audio and video. The buffered video (not audio) captured directly before the event will be saved and attached to the event in permanent memory. Repeated pressing of the Event button turns the recordings on and off and creates separate media segments.
4. Digital Evidence – BWC files, including photographs, audio recordings, and video footage, which are captured by a BWC and stored digitally.
5. Evidence.com – A digital evidence management service. The service stores digitally encrypted data in a highly secure environment that is accessible only to personnel granted access.

SO 5-34

6. Evidence Docking Station (EDS) – A multi-ported docking station installed at Area Stations and various Headquarters locations. The EDS simultaneously recharges the BWC while uploading all digitally encrypted data from the device. The docking station then transfers the digitally encrypted data to Evidence.com.

C. GENERAL PROCEDURES

1. Public safety and officer safety take precedence over recording events.
2. Officers will follow existing officer safety policies when conducting enforcement stops as outlined in Department policies and procedures. Officer safety and the safety of the public will be the primary considerations when contacting citizens or conducting vehicle stops, not the ability to record an event.
3. BWCs will be used to capture audio and visual evidence for investigations and enforcement encounters. Officers will not provide narration or dictate their actions to the camera. Detailed police reports are still required and are the appropriate place to document the totality of the circumstances for the incident.
4. Only authorized personnel will use or be in possession of a BWC device.
5. All officers issued a BWC are required to wear and use their BWC while working in any uniformed assignment. This applies to overtime assignments, out of class assignments and special details.
6. BWC equipment is for official use only and will not be utilized for personal use.
7. Officers will not tamper with or dismantle any hardware or software component of any BWC device.
8. The use of any other personal recording device for the same purpose is not authorized without permission of the Commissioner of Police or designee.
9. All digital evidence collected using the BWC is considered an investigative record for the SLMPD and is for official use only.
10. Accessing, copying, forwarding or releasing any digital evidence for other than official law enforcement use and contrary to this procedure is strictly prohibited. Public release of digital evidence is prohibited unless approved by the Police Commissioner or designee.
11. Personal computer equipment and software programs will not be utilized when making copies of digital evidence. Using a secondary recording device such as video camera, cell phone or other device to record or capture digital evidence from Evidence.com is strictly prohibited.

D. STORAGE

When not in use, the BWC devices will be stored in the designated EDS. Officers will ensure the BWC is properly seated into the EDS to allow for proper downloading, charging, and updating. Other BWC-related equipment, such as Axon Flex mounts, should be stored in the cases provided.

E. PRE-SHIFT INSPECTION

SO 5-34

1. Officers will inspect their assigned BWC devices daily to ensure there is no visual damage and the device is in working order.
2. Visual damage will be documented in a police report.
3. Inoperable equipment will be tagged and returned to the Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit. If the Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit is unavailable, the equipment will be returned by the start of the officer's next work day.

F. CAMERA POSITION

1. Officers will wear the BWC above the midline of their torso. Officers using Axon Flex units may utilize whatever mounting system (e.g., glasses) they find most practical.
2. Officers will ensure the BWC is in a position where the field of view provides for effective recording.
3. Officers will not intentionally obscure the view of their body worn camera.

G. EQUIPMENT REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, AND MAINTENANCE

Any and all concerns regarding equipment repair, replacement, and maintenance will be directed to the Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit.

H. PRIVACY CONCERNS

1. Private citizens do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy when talking with police officers during the scope of an officer's official duties, even when the contact is in a private residence. When officers are lawfully present in a home (warrant, consent, or exigent circumstances) in the course of official duties, there is no reasonable expectation of privacy. Therefore, officers are not required to give notice they are recording. However, if asked, officers will advise citizens they are being recorded.
2. Officers are not required to initiate or cease recording an event, situation, or circumstance solely at the demand of a citizen.
3. Officers and supervisors involved in the investigation of a complaint against a member of the Department must inform complainants and complaint witnesses they are being recorded.

I. MANDATED RECORDING

1. Enforcement Related Contacts
 - a. Officers will use the event mode to record enforcement related contacts. The event mode should be activated prior to actual contact with the citizen, or as soon as safely possible thereafter, and continue recording until the contact is concluded or the contact transitions from an enforcement contact into intelligence gathering.
 - b. Officers are strongly encouraged to inform citizens they are being recorded in an effort to de-escalate potential conflicts.
 - c. Enforcement related contacts include the following:
 - 1) Traffic stops,

SO 5-34

- 2) Field interviews,
 - 3) Detentions,
 - 4) Arrests,
 - 5) Persons present at radio call, who are accused of crimes, and
 - 6) Consensual encounters in which the officer is attempting to develop reasonable suspicion on the subject of the encounter.
 - d. Assisting another City employee or law enforcement officer (ie. Parking Enforcement, Park Rangers, etc.) during an enforcement contact.
2. Arrests
- a. Officers may stop recording in the event mode when the arrestee is cooperative and safely secured inside a law enforcement facility. If an arrestee becomes uncooperative, or if there is some evidentiary purpose, officers should resume recording in the event mode.
 - b. If an officer resumes recording in the event mode, the camera will remain in event mode until the officer no longer has contact with the subject.
3. Searches
- a. When searching a prisoner and without sacrificing officer safety, it is advantageous to position the search so that it is captured on camera. This starts the chain of custody by allowing any contraband or weapons found to be documented on the BWC recording.
 - b. Officers should record during the execution of a search warrant, an arrest warrant, a Fourth Amendment waiver search, knock and talk, or a consent search in which the officer is looking for a suspect, evidence or contraband.
 - c. During searches of commercial buildings or residential dwellings when there is a strong indication of encountering a suspect, while keeping officer safety as the primary concern, officers should activate their body worn cameras prior to making entry into the building. The recording of a suspect confrontation normally outweighs tactics potentially shown in the recording.
4. Transporting Prisoners
- a. Officers equipped with BWC will record all prisoner or passenger transports, regardless of the gender of the prisoner or passenger. The entire transport will be recorded. Two officer units will be required to record with at least one BWC during transports.
5. Suspect Interviews
- a. Officers are encouraged to fully record suspect interviews. Officers will not stop and start the recording during a suspect interview. The only exception to recording a suspect interview would be if the suspect declines to make a statement due to the body worn camera being activated.
 - b. When recording interviews, officers will ensure they record any admonishments prior to the start of an interview.

6. Special Events

Officers assigned BWCs will occasionally assist specialized investigative units and agencies in sensitive operations where confidentiality is imperative to the operation. If there is a specific reason in the interest of the investigation for officers involved in the operation to not activate their BWCs, the supervisor in charge must give his or her approval. Absent any specific reason to not activate the BWC approved by the supervisor in charge, officers will record any instances listed in this procedure.

J. DISCRETIONARY RECORDING

1. Victim and witness interviews will generally not be recorded.
2. Domestic violence victims often recant their statements as early as the following morning after a crime. Some victims go so far as to testify that the officer fabricated their statement. Victims may also make their children unavailable for investigators or court to avoid their providing statements. For these reasons, domestic violence victims of violent felonies such as strangulation, assault with a deadly weapon, or anything requiring hospitalization should be recorded. Officers should also record the statements of children of domestic violence victims who are witnesses in these types of cases.
3. BWCs will not be used during Sex Crimes or Child Abuse investigations to include statements of victims, witnesses, and interactions with parents of victims.
4. Officers occasionally respond to dynamic and chaotic crime scenes. The initial encounters with the victim, and witnesses, including their location and any spontaneous statements made, can be important to the overall investigation. Therefore, officers may use their BWCs to record these types of scenes for evidentiary purposes.

K. PROHIBITED RECORDING

1. BWCs will not be used to record non-work related activity.
2. BWCs will not be used to record in areas or activities such as pre-shift conferences, Department locker rooms, break rooms, restrooms, or other activities not related to an enforcement contact or a criminal investigation.
3. BWCs will not be used during Department administrative investigations.
4. BWCs will not be used during line-ups or briefings.
5. BWCs will not be used during major crime briefings, homicide briefings, or during a homicide walk-through.
6. BWCs will not be used during contact with confidential informants.
7. Patient Privacy
 - a. Officers will not record patients during medical or psychological evaluations by a clinician or similar professional, or during treatment. Officers will be aware of patients' rights to privacy when in hospital settings. When recording in hospitals and other medical facilities, officers will be careful to avoid recording persons other than the suspect.

SO 5-34

- b. Officers will not record while in a facility whose primary purpose is to provide psychiatric or medical services unless responding to a radio call involving a suspect or taking a suspect statement.
 - c. Officers will not regularly record while inside jail facilities.
 - d. However, in any setting, if confronting a violent or assaultive suspect, or in an anticipated use of force instance, officers will, when reasonably able to do so, activate their BWCs to record the encounter.
8. Demonstrations
- a. As a general policy, Department personnel should refrain from video recording or photographing peaceful demonstrations.
 - b. When there is reason to believe that a planned event has the potential for unlawful activity, Commanding Officers should make the determination whether visual recording or photographing is appropriate.
 - c. During demonstrations, officers should operate cameras in the buffering mode. If officers witness crimes occurring among the demonstrators and/or believe an arrest is likely, they should begin recording in the event mode.
9. Officers will not record informal or casual encounters with members of the public. Officers should consider that recording people in some circumstances may inhibit sharing neighborhood information or developing strong ties between members of the community and officers.

L. DOCUMENTATION OF EXISTENCE OF RECORDINGS IN INCIDENT REPORTS

- 1. I/LEADS reports will clearly indicate the presence of BWC video, both in the narrative section and by clicking the “In-Car Video Available” field.
- 2. All BWC video file numbers associated with an event that is documented in an I/LEADS report must be entered into the relevant field or narrative in I/LEADS.
- 3. If a video is generated and there is no corresponding event that requires an I/LEADS report, the file will remain in the Evidence.com cue until at least the end of the pilot program.

M. UPLOADING PROCEDURES

Officers will place the BWC into a slot on the EDS and ensure it is properly seated at the end of their shift. This will allow for the battery to recharge. The data will automatically be transferred from the BWC through the EDS to Evidence.com. The data is considered impounded at this point.

N. ENTERING EVENT DATA

- 1. Each recorded segment requires metadata be entered after uploading, even if the segments are of the same event. All officers are required to add metadata after the video has been uploaded to Evidence.com.
 - a. Metadata consists of an identification field, retention category, and recording title.
 - b. Officers will add their DSN to the end of the recording title.

SO 5-34

- 1) The default recording title will be in the format: Axon Body Video YYYY-MM-DD HHMM (eg. Axon Body Video 2015-12-02 0815).
 - 2) The final recording title after the officer adds a DSN will be in the format: Axon Body Video YYYY-MM-DD HHMM DDDDD (eg. Axon Body Video 2015-12-02 0815 01234).
- c. Officers will select the retention category that most accurately fits the recording.
2. Viewing or adding metadata will not alter the video recording as it is protected with multiple layers of encryption on the aforementioned devices, the BWC itself and at Evidence.com.
- O. BWC FILE RETENTION
1. Recordings generated on Departmental equipment will be retained for at least ninety (90) days.
 2. The officer must complete the Video File Request form and notify his supervisor of the need to retain the video as soon as practicable in order to prevent valuable evidence from being lost.
- NOTE: The BWC file number will need to be put in the “REMARKS” section of the Video Request Form.
3. BWC files that have been designated as evidence, needed for investigative purposes, or needed for civil litigation purposes will be exported to a physical data storage device (for example a DVD, CD, USB flash drive, VHS tape, etc.) and will be submitted to the proper repository and handled in accordance with existing evidence handling procedures.
- P. ACCESSING DIGITAL EVIDENCE
1. Officers given permission associated with Evidence.com may review digital evidence.
 2. Using a Department computer, enter <https://stlouismetropd.evidence.com/> in the browser.
 3. Enter assigned user name and password. For help with problems, contact the Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit.
 4. Depending on given permissions, digital evidence can be viewed and/or copied from this location.
- Q. REVIEWING DIGITAL EVIDENCE
1. Officers may review their own digital evidence. Digital evidence can provide a cue to an officer’s memory to recall more facts and greater detail of an incident.
 2. Detectives are responsible for reviewing, updating and tracking digital evidence associated with their assigned cases.
 3. BWCs have a field of vision of either 75 degrees for the Flex or 130 degrees for the Axon. While human beings have a field of vision of 180 degrees, the human brain has a field of attention of 50-60 degrees. Under stress, this field can narrow down to a ½ degree. Stress

SO 5-34

also induces auditory exclusion and prevents the brain from analyzing and remembering all the stimuli that it takes in through the senses.

- a. Officers make decisions based on the totality of the human senses. An officer's recollection of specific details may be different than what is captured in digital evidence since BWCs only capture audio and video.
 - b. Officers should review digital evidence prior to completing reports to assist in priming their recollection.
4. Officers will write their reports to what they remember and note any discrepancies from what the recording shows. Officers will not write their reports based solely on what they viewed from the BWC recording.
5. Officers will review digital evidence prior to providing testimony at hearings, trial, or depositions.
6. It is NOT the intent of the Department to review digital evidence for the purpose of general performance review, for normal preparation of performance reports, or to discover policy violations.
7. Digital evidence may be viewed for administrative purposes limited to the following:
 - a. Any incident in which a member of the Department is injured or killed during the performance of their duties.
 - b. Any incident involving the use of force by a member of the Department, including canines, which results in injury or death.
 - c. Any in-custody death.
 - d. Any police pursuit.
 - e. When any member of the Department intentionally or unintentionally discharges a firearm at a person regardless of whether an individual is struck.
 - f. When any member of the Department not involved in training intentionally or unintentionally discharges a Conductive Energy Weapon at a person, including the application of a drive stun.
 - g. Officer involved traffic collisions.
 - h. Prior to the release of recordings in response to a proper legal request (e.g., in response to a subpoena or other court order).
 - i. In preparation for a civil deposition or responding to an interrogatory where the incident arises from the employee's official duties.
 - j. When preparing to testify in a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding arising from the employee's official duties.
 - k. For investigations undertaken by the Department, for the purpose of proving or disproving specific allegations of misconduct.

SO 5-34

1. For administrative proceedings, when digital evidence is used by the Department for the purpose of proving or disproving allegations of misconduct, only digital evidence relevant to the investigative scope will be viewed and retained by investigators. Information relevant to the recordings viewed and seized as evidence by investigators will be documented as part of the chronological summary of any investigation undertaken by the Department.
 - m. Supervisors should review BWC recordings to assist citizen's complaints. Supervisors have discretion to show BWC recordings to a complainant when it relates to his or her complaint, to assist in clarifying the complaint, resolving the complaint, or having the complaint withdrawn.
8. In situations where there is a need to review digital evidence not covered by this procedure, a Captain or higher must approve the request. Each situation will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

R. DISCOVERY OF MISCONDUCT

Employees reviewing event recordings should remain focused on the incident or incidents in question and review only those recordings relevant to their investigative scope. If improper conduct is suspected during any review of digital evidence, the person who discovered the conduct in question will immediately notify a supervisor. The supervisor will report the conduct to the officer's commanding officer through the chain-of-command. Nothing in this procedure prohibits addressing policy violations.

S. COPYING AND RELEASING DIGITAL EVIDENCE

1. Digital evidence captured by BWC during the Pilot Program will be treated as an investigative record and handled in a similar fashion as In-car Camera VPU Files and pursuant to existing Department policies and procedures.
2. In cases where an arrest has been made and a warrant has been issued for a felony or non-traffic misdemeanor, the corresponding BWC file shall be considered evidence and handled in accordance with existing evidence handling procedures.
3. BWC files may be requested for IAD for investigations and by Legal Division for civil litigation.
4. In all criminal cases where a BWC file is to be retained as evidence, the Primary Investigating Officer (PIO) or other Department personnel will send the electronic Video Request Form through channels to InCarVideo@SLMPD.org indicating a BWC file is to be retained as evidence.

NOTE: The BWC file number will need to be put in the "REMARKS" section of the Video Request Form.

5. When the In-Car Video Project Coordinator is notified a BWC file exists and is needed as evidence, the In-Car Video Project Coordinator will ensure a physical video recording (for example a DVD, CD, USB flash drive, VHS tape, etc.) of the BWC file is secured as evidence, packaged and delivered to the proper repository, and prepare a supplemental police report indicating such.
6. For criminal court cases:

SO 5-34

- a. a physical video recording of the BWC File will be produced;
 - b. a supplemental report will be written;
 - c. the physical recording will be submitted to Property Custody Division; and
 - d. the physical recording will be handled in accordance with Property Custody Division policy and procedure.
7. For IAD investigations:
 - a. a physical video recording of the BWC File will be produced;
 - b. the physical video recording will be submitted to IAD;
 - c. a property receipt will be signed and retained by the In-Car Video Project Coordinator; and
 - d. the physical recording will be handled in accordance with IAD policy and procedure.
8. For civil litigation cases:
 - a. a physical video recording of the BWC File will be produced;
 - b. the physical video recording will be submitted to Legal Division;
 - c. a property receipt will be signed and retained by the In-Car Video Project Coordinator; and
 - d. the physical recording will be handled in accordance with Legal Division policy and procedure.
9. For any questions or clarification contact the BWC Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit during normal business hours.

T. USE OF DIGITAL EVIDENCE FOR TRAINING PURPOSES

Officers and supervisors may find it useful, and are encouraged, to review recordings of incidents in which they were involved when beneficial for the purpose of conducting a tactical debrief. When an incident is recorded which may be of value as a training aid for a broad section of the Department, the recording officer or that officer's supervisor should receive approval from their commanding officer to contact the Commander of the Academy who will review the digital evidence to determine the value of the incident for training. If the Commander of the Academy determines the incident would be an appropriate training aid, the Commander of the Academy will obtain approval from the Commander of the Bureau of Operations.

U. BWC PROJECT COORDINATOR, IT/HELP DESK, AND PLANNING AND RESEARCH RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The BWC Project Coordinator assigned to the Special Projects Unit is responsible for performing the following duties:
 - a. Maintain a record of assigned BWC and related equipment.
 - b. Arrange for the warranty and non-warranty repair of the BWC units.
 - c. Maintain BWC equipment repair and maintenance records.
2. The IT/HELP DESK is responsible for performing the following duties:
 - a. Maintain and troubleshoot the BWC units.
 - b. Be proactive and able to complete minor repairs.





SO 5-34

- c. Repair or replace BWC components (cameras, docking stations, etc.).
 - d. Update software and system settings as necessary.
 - e. Provide official copies of digital media when properly subpoenaed.
3. PLANNING AND RESEARCH is responsible for performing the following duties:
- a. Training officers on current policy and the proper use of BWC units.
 - b. Provide official copies of any recording audit trail when properly requested.

DSD/wcw/edo
251-15-00149

ATTACHMENT 2: BWC TECHNOLOGY SPECIFICATIONS

Title: AXON body™ Camera Specifications
Department: Research and Development
Version: 1.0
Release Date: 10.07.2013.

AXON body Camera Models			
Model		Model No.	Color
AXON body		73002	Black
Specifications		Features	
<div>1. Operating temperature range: -4 °F to 122 °F [-20 °C to 50 °C]</div> <div>2. Storage temperature range:¹ -4 °F to 95 °F [-20 °C to 35 °C]</div> <div>3. Charging temperature range: 41 °F to 95 °F [5 °C to 35 °C]</div> <div>4. Humidity: 80 percent non-condensing, with holster plug inserted.</div> <div>5. Up to 30 frames per second.</div> <div>6. 640 x 480 VGA video resolution.</div> <div>7. Approximately 4 hours video storage under highest quality recording settings; up to 9 hours storage under medium quality recording settings; and up to 13 hours storage available at lowest quality recording setting.</div> <div>8. Rechargeable lithium-ion battery. 2500 mAH capacity.^{2,3}</div> <div>9. More than 12 hours of battery life under normal operation. ⁴</div>		<div>1. EVENT button to start recording and return to buffering.</div> <div>2. On/Off slide switch to power the device.⁵</div> <div>3. Battery button and battery LED to indicate remaining battery capacity.</div> <div>4. Operation LED on the top of the housing indicates camera status.</div> <div>5. Several holster mounts are available.</div> <div>6. Configurable bit rate (multiple settings to optimize file size and upload speed).</div> <div>7. Full color audiovisual camera.</div> <div>8. 130° field of view camera lens.</div> <div>9. Retina Low-Light capability less than 1 lux.</div> <div>10. Playback and download via TASER software applications.</div> <div>11. Data stored in the device is protected by TASER proprietary security features.</div> <div>GPS tagging and streaming capability available through Android™ and iOS® AXON® Mobile applications via Bluetooth® technology.</div>	
Physical Characteristics ^{6,7}			
Dimensions			
Depth (D)	Width (W)	Height (H)	Weight
0.8 in [2.0 cm]	2.6 in [6.6 cm]	3.3 in [8.4 cm]	3.5 oz [98 g]
<div><div><p>RIGHT SIDE</p></div><div><p>FRONT</p></div><div><p>TOP</p></div><div><p>BOTTOM</p></div></div>			

¹ Less than 1 month at the high temperature. Long-term storage should be in a climate-controlled environment.

² Rechargeable Lithium-Ion batteries have a limited life of approximately 2 years or approximately 300 full charge and discharge cycles. With age, batteries will gradually lose their capacity to hold a charge. This loss of capacity (aging) is irreversible. As the battery loses capacity, the length of time it will power your device (run time) decreases. Additionally, lithium-ion batteries continue to slowly discharge (self-discharge) when not in use or while in storage. It is advised that you routinely check the battery's charge status. The device should be recharged regularly to maintain the internal chemistry of the battery. TASER product user manuals summarize how to check battery status as well as battery charging instructions. The latest product manuals are available at www.TASER.com.

³ The AXON body camera cannot be disassembled and the battery cannot be replaced. Please contact www.TASER.com to purchase a replacement AXON body camera.

⁴ Temperature, other ambient conditions, and usage can affect battery life.

⁵ The On/Off switch is magnetically activated. Close proximity to other magnets or magnetic fields may cause the device to turn off or on.

⁶ Product specification may change without notice; actual product may vary from picture.




⁷ Dimensions and weights are for reference only.

TASER International reserves the right to change this specification without notice.



Android is a trademark of Google, Inc. Bluetooth is a trademark of the Bluetooth SIG. iOS is a trademark or registered trademark of Cisco in the U.S.

AXON body is a trademark of TASER International, Inc., and AXON, TASER and © are registered trademarks of TASER International, Inc. registered in the U.S. © 2013 TASER International, Inc. All rights reserved.

AXON Flex™ Camera Models			
Model		Model No.	Color
AXON Flex Camera ¹		73000 series	Black
Specifications		Features	
<div>1. Operating temperature range: -4 °F to 122 °F [-20 °C to 50 °C]</div> <div>2. Storage temperature range:² -4 °F to 95 °F [-20 °C to 35 °C]</div> <div>3. 75° field of view camera lens</div> <div>4. Humidity: 80 percent non-condensing, when cable is attached</div> <div>5. 30-second pre-event video buffer. Buffer does not include audio. Note: Buffer time can change depending on device state.</div> <div>6. Up to 30 frames per second.</div> <div>7. 640 x 480 VGA video resolution</div> <div>8. Up to 8 GB non-removable, solid state storage³</div> <div>9. Approximately 4 hours video storage under highest quality recording settings; up to 9 hours storage under medium quality recording settings; and up to 13 hours storage available at lowest quality recording setting.</div> <div>10. Rechargeable Lithium-Ion Battery⁴</div>		<div>1. Ambidextrous design for left- or right-side mounting.</div> <div>2. Multiple attachment options available, including: Oakley Flak Jacket® eyewear mount; Low Rider headband; Collar mount; Epaulette/shoulder mount; and Helmet mount.</div> <div>3. Playback via the AXON™ Mobile smart phone application or EVIDENCE Sync software.</div> <div>4. Several cable styles and cable lengths are available.⁵</div> <div>5. Configurable bit rate (multiple settings to optimize file size and upload speed)</div> <div>6. Full color audiovisual camera</div> <div>7. Retina Low-Light capability less than 1 lux</div> <div>8. Constructed from impact resistant polymer</div> <div>9. Data is protected by TASER proprietary security features and can be viewed and downloaded with EVIDENCE.com services through the AXON Flex Evidence Transfer Manager (ETM)⁶ and EVIDENCE Sync software.</div> <div>10. Data download to personal computer through EVIDENCE Sync software is also available.</div> <div>11. GPS tagging and streaming capability available through Android™ and iPhone® AXON™ Mobile applications.</div>	
Physical Characteristics ^{7,8}			
Dimensions			
Length (L)	Height (H)	Width (W)	Weight
3.2 in [8.1 cm]	0.8 in [2.0 cm]	0.7 in [1.8 cm]	0.53 oz (15 g)
<div><div><div>RIGHT SIDE</div></div><div><div>FRONT</div></div><div><div>TOP</div></div></div>			

¹ Requires a cable connection to the AXON Flex Controller (model number 73001) to function.

² Less than 1 month at the high temperature. Long-term storage should be in a climate-controlled environment.

³ Multi-Level Cell flash memory is rated for approximately 10,000 write cycles. The current technology along with normal usage, which includes recording and buffering and ETM sync processes, typically gives memory components a useful life of 4 to 5 years. A portion of the memory is reserved for the operating system.

⁴ The AXON Flex camera contains a non-replaceable Lithium-Ion battery. Rechargeable Lithium-Ion batteries have a limited life of approximately 2 years, and will gradually lose their capacity to hold a charge. This loss of capacity (aging) is irreversible. As the battery loses capacity, the length of time it will power your device (run time) decreases. Additionally, Lithium-Ion batteries continue to slowly discharge (self-discharge) when not in use or while in storage. It is advised that you routinely check the battery's charge status. The device should be recharged regularly to maintain the internal chemistry of the battery. TASER product user manuals summarize how to check battery status as well as battery charging instructions. The latest product manuals are available at www.TASER.com

⁵ While all TASER products are thoroughly tested to ensure product reliability, all usage conditions cannot be anticipated. User checks are recommended to ensure connections remain snug and performance is unaffected. AXON Flex cables should be replaced at the first sign of wear or breakdown to ensure reliable function and use.

⁶ User account and subscription required.

⁷ Product specification may change without notice; actual product may vary from picture.

⁸ Dimensions and weights are for reference only.

ATTACHMENT 3: SERGEANT SURVEY RESULTS

Final Survey Information:

The below table is a list of questions with the average response from the officers that completed the survey. A rating of 3 is neutral. The higher the score the more officers DISAGREED with the statement. The LOWER the score the more they AGREED.

The rating scale is as follows:

1=Strongly Agree 2= Agree 3=Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree

Question	Pre Test Average	Group 1, Final Average	Group 2, Final Average	Group 3, Final Average
I spend less time completing paperwork with a BWC	3.64	3.6	3.79	4.26
My accounts of incidents are more accurate with a BWC	2.86	2.8	2.89	3.37
Evidence quality is better with a BWC	2.64	2.67	2.58	3.32
I would voluntarily wear a BWC even if it was not mandatory	3.73	3.93	3.84	3.47
BWC's make my job easier	3.57	3.47	3.58	4.21
BWC's make it easier to work with the CAO during warrant application	2.86	3.07	3.11	3.84
Citizens are more cooperative when they know I wear a BWC	3.36	3.07	3.37	3.79
Citizens are more respectful when they know I wear a BWC	3.36	3.4	3.53	3.63
Suspects resist arrest MORE when they know I wear a BWC	3.07	3.2	3.32	3.47

Suspects are generally MORE AGGRESSIVE when they know I wear a BWC	3.15	3.13	3.21	3.26
BWC's hurt 'police-community' relations	3.27	3	3.26	3.05
Cameras will increase citizen complaints against officers	3.31	3.2	3.53	3.63
Officers will be less likely to give warnings while wearing a BWC	2.88	2.47	2.63	2.26
Officers will have fewer contacts with citizens	2.56	2.07	2.16	2.16
Officers will feel like they have less discretion	1.56	2.27	2.26	1.84
Officers will be more cautious in making decisions	2.25	2.13	2.26	2.21
Officers will act more professionally	2.63	2.93	2.74	3.11
BWC's affect an officer's decision to use force	2.31	2.13	2.42	2.21
It is easy to locate and retrieve video for a specific event	2.86	2.53	2.11	2.79
BWC Equipment is easy to use	2.8	2.93	2.53	3.26
BWC Equipment is comfortable to wear	3.27	3.67	3.26	3.53
Battery life of the camera is adequate	2.93	2.53	2.05	2.32
Video is easy to download data at the end of shift	2.93	2.2	2	2.26
The SO is easy to understand	2.73	2.67	2.63	2.84
The SO is too restrictive; officers are required to record too much	2.93	2.87	2.84	2.63
The SO is too detailed	3.27	3.13	3.16	2.68

Body cameras are well received by coworkers	4.38	4.47	4.26	4.16
Police benefit more from body cameras than citizens	3.13	3.13	3	3.26
Wearing a BWC improves officers' job satisfaction	4	4.2	3.95	4.26
Cameras improve officer training	2.67	3.07	2.89	3.47
Cameras improve overall job performance	3.56	3.53	3.47	4.11
Cameras tend to increase office safety	3.56	3.73	3.58	4.05
Cameras should be expanded to other police departments	3.38	3.53	3.42	3.79
Cameras should be worn by all sworn officers in all Police Departments	3.81	3.93	3.95	3.89
Advantages of body cameras outweigh the disadvantages	3.31	3.73	3.21	3.21
The training I received on the technology was adequate	2.94	2.87	2.37	2.79
The training I received on the SO was adequate	3.38	3	2.47	3.32