

SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

TO: Councilmember Bruce Harrell
Chair, Energy, Technology & Civil Rights Committee

DATE: July 28, 2011

FROM: Assistant Chief Dick Reed
Field Support Bureau

PAGE: 1 of 3

SUBJECT: **Body-Mounted Camera Pilot Project**
Council Question #15

In response to your request, please find attached our response to your questions regarding the body-mounted camera pilot project.

Should you have any questions on the information provided or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. This matter is referenced as Council Question #15 in the Department's internal recordkeeping system.

Attached: Council Question #15 and SPD Response

Cc: Chief John Diaz file
D/C Clark Kimerer file
Carl Marquardt, Mayor's Office
Tim Killian, Mayor's Office
Beth Hester, Mayor's Office
Michael Katz, City Budget Office
Bruce Hills, SPD Project Manager
Council Questions file

Council Question #15:

Councilmember Harrell has requested answers for the following questions, as a follow-up on the Department's response to Statement of Legislative Intent #56-1-A-1, Body-Mounted Camera Pilot project.

- 1. Expand the size of the trial to equip 30 patrol officers and 12 motorcycle officers.** A trial of body-mounted cameras involving only 12 motorcycle officers is too [small] to effectively evaluate the devices. We need the participation of an additional 30 patrol officers to get a robust picture of how the technology would work in a variety of situations, including non-traffic stops and arrests. If you find this expansion objectionable, please explain how a trial of only 12 motorcycle officers will suffice in testing these devices.
- 2. Explain what steps have been taken to solicit volunteer officers for the trial.** This should include how many officers have been asked to participate in the trial, how many have agreed, and how the Department plans to continue seeking volunteers for the trial.
- 3. Provide cost estimates for equipping officers in the trial.** This should include a budget of 42 (30 patrol officers and 12 motorcycle officers) camera devices and the administrative/software costs associated with the devices.
- 4. Explain the process of replacement for Digital In-Car Video systems.** Please include the schedule for replacement of the aging devices, the costs associated with the redeployment, and whether body-mounted cameras might be a better option given that they can be used in the same manner as Digital In-Car Video.
- 5. Update Councilmember Harrell's office and the ETC on current and future funding efforts.** We applaud your application for the federal earmark to provide \$243,000 towards the project. Please advise on the status of this application and let us know which other funding opportunities you will pursue.

SPD Response to Council Question #15:

- 1. Size of Pilot project.** We agree that testing the technology with only 12 officers in a single unit would not furnish an adequate basis for expanding use of the cameras to all officers or even first responders. However, per the SLI and the Department's response, it was never our intent, as an initial step, to produce findings adequate to that purpose. Rather, as set forth in the pilot project charter that accompanied the SLI response, the pilot project was intended, in large part as a result of budget constraints, to examine the ways in which the cameras would or would not fit into officers' daily work routines, including an examination of logistical questions having to do with how and where the cameras and audio units would be mounted, how long they would last, the quality and utility of images produced in a range of situations. The Department's federal grant application envisioned an expanded pilot with 70 officers that would encompass a variety of unit types. The results of such an expanded pilot would be sufficient for judging possible expansion of the technology to the entire force.
- 2. Solicitation of Officer Volunteers.** As noted in our SLI response, the Department is fully committed to testing body-mounted cameras. Pending the outcome of ongoing mediation with the Seattle Police Officers Guild, we will seek volunteers as soon as possible.

3. **Cost of Pilot.** The initial pilot project will be completed at nominal cost by the Department with no outside funds. An expanded pilot, with either 70 or 42 cameras, would require outside funding. The attached estimate, which was submitted with our federal earmark request, would cover the costs of equipping and training officers together with back office costs of storing and managing the resulting data. We believe that these costs are scalable and could be used to estimate the cost of a 42 officer expanded pilot. In summary, it would cost about \$243,000 for a 70-officer pilot and approximately \$150,000 for a 42-officer pilot.

4. **In-Car Video Replacement Process and Costs.** The lifecycle replacement for the in-car video cameras (ICVs) also includes replacement of the mobile computer-aided dispatch (MCAD) system which allows mobile connectivity to call for service information and national and state police databases. Both of these (together referred to as Video Mobile Data Terminals, VMDTs) are considered core operational systems, essential for effective police work and officer safety. All City computer systems work on a five-year replacement cycle, and the VMDTs are due for change out in 2012, having been installed in 2007. In early 2012, SPD will query officers on existing and desired systems, publish an RFP to select a vendor, and implement the new systems in January 2013. The approximate cost of the whole package is \$4.2 million for 310 police vehicles. The Department continues to search for a funding solution, as annual replacement reserve funds were depleted due to the City's highly constrained budget situation. We are not prepared, in advance of the pilot project, to comment on the degree to which body-mounted cameras might serve as an alternative to the ICVs. Assuming we continue to require ICVs, the Department would strongly recommend against a standalone solution apart from MCAD.

5. **Future Funding.** As noted in the Department's SLI response, we have applied for a federal earmark to fund an expanded pilot project. We have checked and it will come as no surprise that our request is still "on hold" pending resolution of the federal budget impasse. The Department's Grants Unit and the City's Office of Intergovernmental relations continue to search for other possibilities, thus far without success.