
Excused: Chris Meade, Yvonne Braun, Kevin Reed, Cpl. Josh Nascimento, Matt Roberts

SUMMARY:
Welcome new members: UO Student Ben Brodka, SRC Lead Ian Winbrock, and Dir. Risk Management/Insurance Deb Donning

This meeting will focus specifically on our current policy that addresses body worn cameras

The recommendation to discuss arose from an agenda item with the Complaint Resolution Committee. Captain Wade provided some background to the prompting of this meeting. Ian Winbrock also attended the CRC meeting; Captain Wade gave him an opportunity to share any added information. Ian believed Captain Wade covered the subject.

Specifically, we discussed the wording that addresses when body worn cameras should be activated, and the type of Calls for Service, in which a camera would be activated

Corporal Barrett pointed out to the workgroup the location on the vest where the camera is generally worn

Policy 446 Mobile Audio Video and Policy 447 Portable Audio Video Recorders

Policy 446 - MAV – Mobile Audio Video. 2018 seems to be the last update to this policy and appears directed towards in-car cameras, although it does mention body worn cameras. When an officer ‘should’ activate – Policy 446, 4.1
Policy 447 - Specifically addresses digital recorders, cameras and other

Prior to the meeting, the workgroup was able to review the policies. It seemed clear to the workgroup there may be holes in this policy when it comes to ‘when’ to activate, and all seemed to agree this is a real gray area

Captain Riley provided the workgroup the definition for ‘field’ for policy; field used in both policies.
Generally, we address one policy at a time but these two seemed so closely related and intertwined that they were discussed together -

Several good questions arose. The whole workgroup contributed to the discussion with thoughts, ideas and more questions that Captains Riley and Wade would take back to the UOPD Command Policy work group

Some of those questions were followed by some tentative answers and good discussion:

- Due to the nature of what prompted this meeting, the question of ‘How many times do we think that an officer has UO contact with another UO member that this one instance (complaint) came in? Statistical or percentage would be enlightening
- Revisit and keep in mind the question ‘what is our goal with the body worn camera?’
- To mute or not to mute? Either by an officer or by request of subject
  - More information requested for when to turn on than when to turn off –

Suggestions offered by the work group:

- More than one suggested or voiced support of the idea of having one policy for vehicle cameras, one for body warn cameras–
  - More distinction, more stand alone for body warn
- Would like to see some positives for turning on the camera but only seeing crime related reasons
  - Overarching contact with anybody is too much
- Would like to see some wording or language for witnesses
- Be in the best interest to match the policy to the equipment we are currently utilizing
- Policy Workgroup should meet again, not attempt to resolve in one meeting. Meet and make it better and better; do it the best we can
  - Workgroup to look through the policies again and email Capt. Riley
  - Capt. Riley to take back to internal command workgroup and bring back their thoughts
  - Capt. Riley to reach out to Lexipol also

Shared comparisons of EPD/UOPD policy activation along with some examples of both departments on when activation may occur and some concerns too

Many thanks to all who are participating!

**Next Meeting Date:** TBD

**Workgroup Members:**