

Public Safety Committee Meeting Transcript – 09/28/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 9/28/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/28/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[4:03:37 PM]

>> Zimmerman: Hello, everyone. I'm the chair. Thank you for being here. I'm joined by councilmembers ora Houston and Leslie pool, and we do have a quorum, so we're going to go ahead and get started. The time is 4:03, and we're meeting at city hall in the main auditorium. Our first order of business here is our approval of minutes, agenda item one, approve the minutes of the public safety committee meetings of August 24th, 2015. And September 11th, 2015. Are there any comments or questions, or corrections to the minutes? Hearing none, is there a motion to approve the minutes? So moved by councilmember human, and seconded by councilmember pool. All in favor? It's unanimous on the dais, with councilmember Casar not yet joining us. We've heard he'll join us a little later. Item number 2, we have an agenda item for general communication here. Joe is in the back. Anyone who would like to speak, the pink forms can be filled out, and we'll hear from you. Is there anybody so far, Joe? Looks like there's not, but we'll keep that open, there. We had agenda item 3 for staff briefing recommendation to the committee regarding austin-travis county emergency medical service, the franchise applicant acute medical services. So, if we could hear from them at this time, that would be terrific. >> Thank you, Mr. Chair, and committee members. James, assistant chief and chief of staff for your ems department. Mr. Rick branding, the customer care program manager, is going to make a short presentation reviewing the history of this franchise, and the details of the applicant. Mr. Branning. >> Good afternoon. Is it up yet?

[4:05:38 PM]

Originally, the original franchise was started in 1967. In 1975, ems was the sole emergency provider, and the sole nonemergency provider. Since then, the city has had two current franchisees being Amr medical response, and acaddian in 2007. And in September of 2014, we received an application. The initial review was completed in February of 2015. The final review and vehicle inspection was completed in April. We found the deficiencies of vehicles missing medications, insufficient liability insurance, and the ability to demonstrate a public convenience. The next step is for us to set a hearing on the franchise application on the meeting on October the 1st and a public hearing for October the 15th of 2015. Oh, we did? Sorry. We did have a staff report and recommendation submitted by the advisory board that was to disapprove the application. >> Zimmerman: Thank you. Are there any questions? Councilmember Houston. >> Houston: Thank you so much for being here. This may not be something you could talk about, but why is it that the recommendation was made not to approve the . . . >> Due to the deficiencies. >> Houston: And they couldn't address the deficiencies? >> Well, it's an original inspection. So they are advised that we're going to do the inspection. They brought their ambulances here, and they had the deficiencies. They are provided what is required under the insurance policies for the franchise. They did not meet that. And so, those were the deficiencies that -- and they have to prove a public

convenience so that they're going to add additional trucks.

[4:07:39 PM]

It's going to be more convenient for the public. And none of those were met. >> Houston: Okay, thank you. >> Pool: Question. >> Zimmerman: Yes. >> Pool: Thanks for the report. We have a public hearing on the franchise application on Thursday, and then a public hearing on October 15th. Is the recommendation coming out of atcmes that we deny this application? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Pool: Okay. And the reasons for that were the deficiencies that were not addressed despite the fact that they had plenty of time in order to have a clean bill of health, so to speak. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Pool: Okay. All right. >> Zimmerman: Okay. If there's no other questions at this time, thank you very much for the presentation. >> Thank you. >> Zimmerman: Thank you all for coming. >> Pool: Chair, would it be appropriate for us to make a recommendation to the full council -- on this matter going forward? They may look to us for some direction. >> Zimmerman: I think so, if you'd like to make any kind of motion. Sure. >> Pool: Okay. What I would do is move to deny this application based on the work that was submitted and the inspection done by our austin-travis county ems staff. >> Zimmerman: Okay. A motion has been made to accept the staff's recommendation to deny the application. Is there a second? Seconded by councilmember Houston. And is this -- this was the recommendation that would go to full council. Does full council have to act on denying the -- >> It does, following the flick -- public meeting. That is correct. >> Zimmerman: Okay. If there's no more discussion, to vote on that resolution to move forward. All in favor? It's three in favor, and none opposed. Councilmember Casar is still not on the dais. Thank you very much. >> Pool: I just have one last question for you. If it happens that acadian comes

[4:09:41 PM]

back with an improved situation, would they be able to make that -- demonstrate that at the public hearing, or do they have to go back through an inspection process over again? >> They have to go back through the process. >> Pool: Okay. But they do have the ability to come back and say, we realize we weren't able to check all the boxes off, but we'd like to try again? >> Yes. And I also want to mention, it wasn't in the report, that we provided the more detailed information to the austin-travis county ems advisory board, who, in review of that, also supported the decision to not -- to disapprove this additional franchise. >> Pool: Could you make sure that is all provided to the full council so they have a fuller, documented case to review? >> We will, yes, councilmember. >> Pool: Okay. Thank you so much. >> Zimmerman: Okay. Thank you very much. At this time, I'd like to invite -- we have some invited testimony I'd like to ask to come up if we could. We have a 4:30 time certain here. So, it's up to our counselor. We don't need anybody to speak yet, do we? There's no public commentary to be made? I've got 4:10, 20 minutes until 4:30. I think we're going to have to recess for 20 minutes and come back at 4:30. And hopefully, councilmember Casar will be here to join us at 4:30. [Off mic] >> Zimmerman: I'm sorry? Item 5. We could have a discussion of future items, absolutely. So, our plan today was to do a detailed dive into the policy questions of body cameras, that was the main point of today's meeting. Does anybody have some topics

[4:11:41 PM]

for the next meeting you'd like to see as priorities? >> Pool: I do have a question, maybe not so much of a topic, but the calendar for the rest of the year. December, specifically, I know that I have -- and hopefully y'all's staff have gotten that. I think you're on my open space committee. I am not going to have a committee meeting in December for open space. >> Zimmerman: I would think the question is

about the scheduling for December. I would expect we would probably cancel our meeting, as well. I don't see us being able to have one the last Monday of the month of December, so. [Chuckling] >> Pool: That's also the case for me in November. So I moved that committee meeting to the third Wednesday. That may or may not be possible here. But it could be that the work that we have in front of us could pend into January and give staff time to work on the body camera information that we've been collecting. >> Zimmerman: So the fourth Monday, would that be the 23rd? >> Pool: That'll be Thanksgiving week. >> Zimmerman: But it is the Monday before. >> Pool: Right. >> Zimmerman: Well, what's the sense of the committee? Councilmember Casar has joined us. We were talking about looking ahead to meetings. And we thought it might be a bad idea to try to have a committee meeting the last Monday of December. [Chuckling] So we were talking about the November -- the fourth Monday would be November the 23rd. Which is Thanksgiving week. Anybody have any thoughts on that? I would be okay doing it, because it's Monday. It's not the Wednesday before, but it's Monday, so. Does anybody plan to be absent that last week? >> Pool: I may. Yeah. >> Casar: [Off mic] >> Zimmerman: November 23rd, yeah.

[4:13:41 PM]

>> Casar: I can. >> Zimmerman: Okay. We don't have to decide right now. It looks like there's three of us that will be here. >> Pool: That's great. >> Zimmerman: We were talking about future agenda items. We're going to recess until 4:30, when we start the body camera discussion. Do you have anything else, looking ahead to future agenda items, especially this year, that you'd like to prioritize? >> Casar: Certainly, I'll think about that over the next 15 minutes here, and perhaps at the end of the meeting we can circle back. >> Zimmerman: If there's no objection, we'll be recessed until 4:30 P.M. And at 4:30, we're going to start with a panel. We have . . . Let me find that again right quick. We wanted to start with the public safety commission chair, Kim. Then we want to hear from Mr. Kim Cassidy, followed by Mr. Nelson lender, followed by Margo Frasier. And then commander Eli Reyes. So, those will be our five invited testimonies, and then we'll open it up for a forum discussion. That's what we'll start at 4:30. So we're recessed.

[4:31:04 PM]

>> Zimmerman: We're going to resume the public safety committee meeting. Our next agenda item at 4:30 certain, staff briefing, invited public comment, regarding Austin police department's request for a proposal update. Thank you all for being here. I want to ask, if we could, for each one of you -- in case viewers are not familiar with you you are, starting with you, to just give a brief introduction of your background, and then start your comments. Let's try to do maybe 8 or 10 minutes for each person. Then we'll open it up in forum style and have some q&a. >> Good afternoon, my name is Kim, chair of the Austin public safety commission. I'm a professor in the school of criminal justice at Texas state university. Before coming to Texas, I was a member -- a detective inspector with the Vancouver police department in Canada for 21 years. I worked as the research director in between those two stints. >> I'm ken, president of the Austin police department association, representing the officers of the police department for the past nine months as their president. And I've been an Austin police officer and detective for the past 18 years with APD. >> Good afternoon, Mel, president of the Austin naacp. This is the 15th year, I recall having the same conversations about dash cams in 2001. Happy to be here, looking forward to an informative conversation. Thank you. >> My name is Margo Frasier, the police monitor here in the city of Austin, and also the former

[4:33:05 PM]

sheriff of Travis county. >> I'm Eli Reyes, I've been with the Austin police department for 19-year-old, I'm the commander for -- 19 years. >> Zimmerman: Terrific. Thank you. Kim, we'll start with you. I'll start the timer for eight minutes. Maybe we'll have some questions and go down the line. Thank you. >> In May of this year, the public safety commission made a recommendation to council -- I would just like to explain our position on this. The recommendation was, while there are significant advantages to body-worn cameras, there are important issues that need to be addressed. The public safety commission makes the following recommendation to the Austin city council. We recommend that the city council direct the city manager to work with the Austin police department to proceed carefully and systematically with the implementation of body-worn cameras. Full consideration should be given to the evaluation and scientific research on body-worn cameras. Second, a comprehensive privacy policy to protect victims and witnesses need to be developed. Fourth, full cost of implementation and operation of the body-worn camera program should be determined. And these funds should be in addition to the Normal police budget, and should not impact safety service delivery. I'd like to explain our reasoning behind this in terms of three categories, expectations, privacy, and cost. Let me be clear, we support the idea of body-worn cameras, but, like any new implementation, that come with the potential for unintended consequences. It would be a lot wiser to think about these, to plan for them, and try to prevent some of the

[4:35:05 PM]

larger issues from happening in the first place rather than go back afterwards and try to close the barn door. So, first is expectations. A lot of media attention, especially post-ferguson, on how body-worn cameras can solve police problems. Most of this is overstated, and under researched. Much focus has been on one study done in California. A number of other studies have occurred, which provides a more comprehensive picture about some of the issues. Generally, body-worn cameras lead to a lot of positives in terms of relationships with the community and a reduction in complaints about excessive police force. It's not known whether the actual number of police excessive force incidents drop, but, the complaints have dropped. It is -- would be wrong to assume that this will solve all potential conflicts and issues. A camera only picks up something within its field of view. In a fight, cameras can get broken or be blocked. A camera records something that's not how the human mind perceives or interprets them. So, there will be still questions raised. However, it is also clear that they can help resolve a lot of investigative and police disciplinary matters. So, a lot of positives, but they're not going to be a silver bullet. On a negative side, there's a serious potential for infringement of privacy, so much so that in some places, where there's commissioners of privacy, they've warned the police to proceed carefully to develop comprehensive policies. I've taken a look at some answers APD has provided to city council, or to this committee regarding some of their strategies. And it looks good. But I would say that there will be a lot of situations that have not developed. So, if we think of sensitive victims or witnesses,

[4:37:08 PM]

informants, someone who was a witness to an organized crime, or any sort of gang incident, if we think about domestic violence victims, or someone whose been a victim of a sexual assault, they may be very hesitant to talk to the police if they know the matter is going to be recorded. And possibly released. And the open records act of Texas, I think, creates challenges that do not exist in many other places. For example, Washington, D.C. Is actually the chief place. They have said, for reasons I'll get to in a moment, they don't want to have to release this information to the public. Only if there's a specific complaint that needs to be investigated. So, what information gets released, who can see the video, who can actually

have a file copy of the video, are all questions that need to resolve. Some places are putting these file copies available to anybody. Some places, like Seattle, are posting it on YouTube. Other places are saying, no, you can come in and you can watch it, but you don't get an actual software copy of the video, and you have to watch the video from beginning to end. So, there's a lot of issues there, but I think it's most important that there be no unintended consequences in terms of damage to the victims and the witnesses that use police services, that they feel protected, that the privacy be protected. No one wants to see their broken nose all over YouTube. And we just have to recognize that these people have rights as well. Unfortunately, we are going to have mixed situations. Situations where there could be a victim, maybe a sensitive victim, at the same time there would be police conflict going on, for example, at a large party, or a large street altercation. I don't think that it's going to be possible to implement

[4:39:09 PM]

policies that will have all the answers at the start. So, if nothing else, consider testing, reviewing, and revising things as the experience in Austin grows. And I think I've already touched on this, but the other important part of the privacy thing is, who do you release that information, who do you release that video to? Any reporter that asks for it, any curious person? And, you know, someone comes into my home, is that going to be something that can be exposed? What if there's an altercation with the police in my home? These types of things. It is complicated. I can tell you, no one has the perfect answer right now. There are some model policies implemented by the United Kingdom, who have been testing this for ten years. The National Institute of Justice has a primer on this. The body-worn video steering group, and I think the ICP is developing policies. All of these can be looked at as some of the existing research. I will point to professor Michael White at Arizona State University who did one of the more definitive studies, published by the Office of Community-Oriented Policing, that is probably the single-best document that captures some of these things. But, I will point him to someone who knows more than I do, and might be able to answer some questions. My final point -- and I think I have one minute left -- is cost. And people often talk about the cost being the cost of the cameras. That's the single smallest cost. There's the maintenance, up-keep, replacement. There's the training time. The biggest expenditure, 90% of any police budget, is people. It's salaries. When you put people away for training, there's a cost associated with that. Then there's the cost of data storage. For example, Calgary, which is a very similar-sized police force to Austin, collected 2.3

[4:41:12 PM]

gigabytes per hour per person. And so, where do you store that, how long you store that, do you put it on the cloud, how secure is the cloud? These are all things that need to be considered. And the single-biggest expenditure is going to be redaction -- processing of redaction of the video if you are going to release it. This is why chief in the Metropolitan Police of D.C. said they don't want to release it. Her estimate is 17 hours per four-minute reduction. [Beeping] >> Four minutes. I'll let you do the math. Thank you. >> Zimmerman: Are there any questions before we move on? We can always come back. You want to wait until the end? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Cassidy. >> All right. Won't use nearly as much time. I'm going to talk about some of the things that we like about body cameras. I've been working with the San Diego Police Officers Association, I provided you guys with a one-year study they did, some of the encouraging things that we're seen are citizen complaints decreased by 23%, allegations of misconduct by officers decreased by 44%, and not sustained findings decreased by 84%. And what that is, is when somebody makes a complaint, and there's not enough evidence either way to make a ruling, so it's just not sustained. Some of the things that the Association of Officers is concerned about -- I know this seems minor to some people in the public, but no red lights on the camera. We've

talked about the red lights and what -- you know, if you have that red light on at night, that's just a target for the officers to have right in the middle of their chest. We're coming up on bargaining here in a year and a half. Depending on how the policy looks, we're going to have to make changes to the officer's rights section depending on how this turns out. One of the things we think you should do before we start with

[4:43:14 PM]

this program, a couple months out, the city needs to pay for psas to inform the public you are going to be recorded every time you deal with a police officer. That's the way we see it. It doesn't matter what the 911 call is, in someone's residence, in a church, in a hospital, it does not matter to us. It needs to be recorded. You know, we realize people have HT to privacy, but if it is a 911 call, it needs to be recorded. One of the big issues -- I know this is for the department and for the officers -- we've had problems in the past where officers were involved in critical incidents. And they weren't recorded with a dmav camera in the car. If we can't have a body camera that activates with lights and sirens, or the opening of the door, the Austin police association will not be in sort of body cameras. That is a must for us. And I know it's a must for the police department. From what we're understanding, we think the in-car camera policy is fair to citizens and police officers, and we think the policy should look much like that. We've already got a policy that's been written for that. We've been living by it for five or six years now. There's no reason we can't go by that model. We're often criticized that we don't want body cameras. Well, I'm here today to tell you that we are in support of it, it just has to be done right. And following W the professor says, one of our biggest concerns is the cost, I don't think we even know how much this is going to cost. So, I think before we get this started, we need to find out the true cost of how much this program's going to cost the city, because it could cause some serious financial impacts on the city of Austin. Thank you.

[4:45:16 PM]

>> Zimmerman: Any questions for the next speaker? I have one, just one question. We have a policy out here that the public is allowed to film. It was my understanding, some of the officers are already cameras for their own protection. >> Yes. >> Zimmerman: Do you have any idea how many officers might be having cameras already? >> Right now, commander, you can correct me if I'm wrong, I believe it's six street officers. I think it's been successful so far. I know some of the complaints I've heard is it bounces around too much. It's attached to the shirt, so we'll have to come up with a way -- sometimes you get into foot pursuits and fights and the body camera is torn off. One thing that I'll add, a lot of people think this is going to fix all issues with police accountability. It's not. It will help, but there are things that happen behind police officers. There are things that happen that the body camera doesn't pick up, which is going to bring lots of questions into what happened. So, this is not going to be cure-all for police accountability. Imok THAs. One final quick question is, has there been any public information request so far for the -- any of the images that have been captured, or is it just considered personal property of the officer? >> Commander Reyes would have to answer that. >> Zimmerman: That's fine. We'll just wait on that. Thanks. Okay. Mr. Lender? >> A report from the department of justice. They have a system called on-call. And it talks about this issue from every perspective. By the way, the FBI is pretty balanced. I think they have a lot of data that's fairly comprehensive. So, they talk about the risk and have the benefits. Some of them mention the on-call system. As a comment, think about the cameras. If you think about the Mike Brown case, for example, in Ferguson, it's been an issue because we didn't see what actually happened.

[4:47:16 PM]

But when I mentioned Boston, Massachusetts, people said, what are you talking about? There's a reason for that. There was a shooting in Boston that was recorded. The community was upset. People pointed fingers. When the report came out, they saw the camera vindicate police. Truly, this data, when you look at the country, these cameras have a positive benefit for everybody. I think there's a fear based on the public getting information, but there's a whole chapter on privacy considerations. So the things that we talk about, the things the chief mentioned, have been addressed all over the country. There are models out there. You can look at every worst, best case scenario. That's not my concern. My concern is, unfortunately in this country today, there has been distrust built based on some bad incidents that got a lot of attention all over the country. While most instances are good, that's all people are concerned about. There's social media, we see a lot of stuff. This is a very high-tech society. So, there's everything to gain by showing policing. It's not an indictment of police officers, it just protects everybody involved. When you look at this situation from every perspective, given the fact that cameras are almost everywhere anyway, and there's high-profile situations out there that have caused riots, mistrust, and a lot of ill feelings, I think when you have these things recorded, take precautions, it solves problems. Folks can't point fingers if it's recorded. You brought up data, battery life, it addresses that. It addresses privacy issues. These things can be looked at and managed. I think the real issue is, if not for the national advocacy of this country, if not for the history of distrust in many communities with police, we wouldn't be having this conversation. So, I think the issue itself has demanded this kind of attention. So, I feel very certain, very proud to say, the city ought to

[4:49:18 PM]

have cameras. It's been a great improvement in terms of transparency and showing incidents that would've been questioned otherwise, and raising and addressing people's concern. My question was, why are we taking so long in the first place? I had this conversation four years ago with then mayor pro tem Sheryl Cole. Unfortunately, the national incidents got everybody's attention, but, the truth is, this preceded those, for good reasons. I think it's time for this city to look at being the best department it can be. And part of that is transparency. We're human beings, we make mistakes. But, if you look at the national data, it shows what happened. If you can show an unbiased point of view, it calms a lot of nerves. So, I don't see any reason why we can't -- shouldn't do this, based on the national database and the fact that when we've had information available to the public, quickly, that it solves a lot of problems. If events, name-calling, riots, it prevents people being hurt. So, I just feel very, very certain about the importance of body cameras. And I think if you have reservations, look at the national data. It's not biased. It's pretty clear. When the problem of justice is, here's our experience, based on 2014. And in many cities around this country, when they come up with a system, they've already answered these questions. They're saying, this helps this country address these issues, given the fact law enforcement is being questioned. It's a win all the way around. Thank you very much. >> Zimmerman: Sorry. Before we go on, can you give me more detail? You referred to the FBI, ow you said on-call? Do they have a policy written? I just googled, I didn't see it. >> I'm looking at it here. It's called body-worn camera implementation program. They have a whole program, about

[4:51:20 PM]

90 pages. >> Body-worn -- >> Camera program, department of justice. >> Zimmerman: Doj. >> It's called recommendations and lessons learned, it's about a 90-page report that covers everything we just talked about. >> Zimmerman: It's the doj, not the FBI? >> They're in conjunction. They're the same thing. Field

trips. >> Zimmerman: Okay, thanks. >> Councilmember Zimmerman, I should point out, on-call is a private company. The FBI would not endorse any private company. So, I'm pretty familiar with the literature. I know the cop's office has done this, and the nij has done a few things. But, I think we should not conflate the FBI's name with some private company. >> Zimmerman: That's why I asked for clarification. But let's not go there yet. That's the forum. >> This was a national study done by the department of justice. I think it was >> Zimmerman: Got it. >> Let's not confuse this issue. I'm not recommending a product, this is a report to the whole country from the doj. >> Zimmerman: This is forum stuff, that's good, but hang on to that. Let's go to Margo for a minute, and then we'll get back around. >> Good afternoon. I'm the police monitor here in Austin, Margo Frasier. I had the opportunity last Monday to be in Washington, D.C. For the first meeting of the task force on body cameras that was put together by the American bar association. The thing about this task force is that was quite impressive to me is that they had everybody at the table. It had people that were there representing, you know, the labor points of view. You had the iacp was there, a representative of the major county police chief's association, people from the major county sheriff's association, national sheriff's association, people from the media. I'm sorry. >> Houston: Excuse me, I have no idea what iacp. >> I should've looked right at you. International association of chiefs of police, the major

[4:53:20 PM]

county sheriff's association, the national sheriff's association, the American civil liberties union. There were also some prosecutors there, some people that were there with media interests. So, the idea being that it was a very diverse group to discuss these different issues. And what became very apparent to me is, the key thing is not only the type of technology that you pick, but also the policy that you put in place. And one of the things that I would bring to you from that meeting is, the policy needs to develop not within APD's own little silo, that it's a situation that while you're developing the policy, it's an important question of when shall the camera be turned on. And then also the question of when does an officer have discretion to turn the camera off? That those things are not just a police decision, that they're also a community decision, and quite frankly, I'd suggest a policy -- council policy decision, perhaps. And so the discussion needs to be much broader as far as how we look at these things. You know, I think one of the first questions you have to ask is, why is it that you're developing -- you know, where you're going to have the body cameras? We already have the in-car video cameras, which now are almost, kind of, passe, you know. They've been around for so long. We first put them in sheriff's vehicles -- I think the first ones we put in were like '98. So those have been around for a long time. The public, quite frankly, is used to being recorded. They often ask if they're being recorded. There's almost an expectation of it being recorded. A lot of these issues have been dealt with. The change is the fact that the body camera has the potential for taking the camera portion, the audio portion, quite frankly, was already taken into

[4:55:20 PM]

people's homes, because the audio from the vehicle often would be carried into the home, and you could hear the whole disturbance, you just couldn't see the disturbance. And so -- but there are some privacy issues that need to be dealt with as far as the fact that if somebody says, perhaps, as a witness, they say, I don't want you to film me, the person has the right to say that. And then we need to make sure we give the officer guidance as to when the officer can say, sorry, then we can't have this interview. Or, this interview will -- I can turn off the camera and make some sort of announcement. One of the things I think we need to be careful about when we start talking about expectations -- and I echo some of the things that have been said earlier. It's not a panacea, it doesn't solve all the problems, but part of that has to do with just educating the public. You know, the public is going to wonder why, when

something happens, why there isn't a video. And I think that's why it's important to recognize that the way that the thing comes on is often so important. And we also need to realize before we go too far on this whole idea of, you know, when the vehicle's speed gets a certain height and the door opens and all these sorts of things, we have a lot of officers who go around who have contact with the public who are not attached to a vehicle. Walking beat officers down the 6th street area, which our highest-complaint area, are not attached to a vehicle. Some of the officers we have that we also get a lot of complaints on that have to do with some of the other sort of task force things are not people who necessarily have a vehicle that have a dmap in them. So, we need to -- before we become so reliant on the attachment to the car, we need to recognize some of these issues that we're going, you know, to have to face. But, the reality of it is, I agree with Mr. Lender.

[4:57:22 PM]

Often, you can quickly resolve an issue. But in that case, one of the things that often you see -- and we see it sometimes even with dmap or other video -- is that you have to have a policy, and then you have to follow it. It can't be a situation that you choose to release video, if you're the police chief or the police department, that it puts you in a good light and then not release it when you don't think that it's so favorable and all of a sudden cite an investigation privilege. What other communities have found is that creates distrust. Commander? >> Zimmerman: Are there any questions before we go on? Okay. Commander, go ahead. >> Thank you for having me here. I'm pretty excited to be having this conversation. I'm glad that the council has given the department the funding to proceed forward with the body camera project. As Mr. Lender said, you know, this conversation has been occurring for several years now. The police department tested body cameras about three years ago, and at that time, the test results that we came out with at that time is that that body camera technology was not ready for the often police department to deploy at that time. There were a lot of issues with security, a lot of issues with battery life, and so we put that project on the back burner for several years. And then the last year, because of the things that were going on, the national model, that conversation was reinvigorated. And the Austin police department's police technology team has been working very hard in the last year to learn from the early adopters of this type of technology, to understand what the industry best practices are. And we did an rfi last December to get what capabilities do body camera vendors have. We also met with any vendor that wanted to come in and show us a demo of their product, and what their back end client looked

[4:59:23 PM]

like, and were able to have conversations about what the Austin police department needs when we talk about body camera technology. And one of the things that we need is an automatic trigger. We don't necessarily need a speed or a lights trigger. We all have in-car camera systems already. If I turn the lights on and my body camera comes on, then I'm going to be recording the steering wheel for however long. Duplicate footage of, you know, something that we don't really need. And as we've had the discussions before, one of the high costs for body cameras is storage. So, recording that information while you're behind the driver's seat when you have an in-car camera is really not necessary. So, having the door trigger when the officer opens the door and gets out of the car, and then start recording at that point is something that we believe is necessary in order for us to proceed forward with this project. In the research we've done in meeting with different vendors and going to police technology conferences, we do believe that that technology is available at this time. There are several vendors that do offer that. I know something came up there about redaction. There's also several vendors that have built-in redaction to their software. I've seen it work. It's very simple to use. And it's not this 17 hours for four

minutes of video. You put a square around somebody's face, hit go, it redacts it for the whole video. You don't have to do anything else. I think the technology has come a long way. And I'm glad that we didn't jump into it too soon, that we waited for the technology to develop to meet the needs of our department and city. Our city is unique when it comes to everything that we do here. We've had the in-car camera systems for over a decade now, and so having those in-car cameras is going to make the move to the body cameras that much more seamless for the officers. We had an in-car camera policy for over ten years. That policy itself has changed over time and become better to what we need here in the Austin police department about when the

[5:01:24 PM]

camera turns on, when the officer can turn the camera off. And at this point, our plan is to develop a draft policy that mirrors what our in-car camera policy is, because we believe that that has done well for the Austin police department. To my knowledge, we haven't received any complaints about the in-car camera policy from anybody, or recommendations for any changes to our in-car camera policy, the way it reads right now. So we believe that's a good model to move forward with when we're allowed to record and when we can't record. This year, we were fortunate enough to have some input on the Texas state legislature, when they were going through senate bill 158, and developing that law as it relates to body camera technology. And in that law, there are some -- a lot of protections in there for private residences. In that law, it defines what a private space is. It also says that if a recording occurs in a private space, that that recording cannot be released to the public without the written consent of that person. Those are the type of protections that we have here in Texas that other states don't have. So I think that when we come from a privacy standpoint, and body cameras, I think that the legislature has done a great job giving us protections to make sure citizens have privacy, and concerns are addressed with them. Moving forward, we're looking at developing our request for proposal within the next couple of weeks. IACP, the international association of chiefs of police, their conference is coming up at the end of the month. A lot of these body camera vendors and vendors in general release new technology and updates at that conference. So, at the conclusion of that conference is, kind of, our timeline when we will go out for competitive bid process for the body cameras. If we did it prior to that, we would be in a no contact period and nobody would be able to talk to any of the vendors, which kind of doesn't make any sense. So, after that, what we want to do is do the competitive bid

[5:03:26 PM]

process, have purchasing review of those responses with the needs that we have come up with. We have got some rfp samples from other agencies that have already gone through the process. So we want to learn from them things that they liked well, things that didn't go well in their process for the competitive bid so that we develop the most comprehensive and get the best product available for us. The door trigger I talked about before, we have to have that. If we don't have that, I think it's going to be more damaging than it is helping us build bridges with the community. We have to make sure that camera is on. If we say we're going to have body cameras, then we need to make sure they're on. It's going to be more damaging if an officer has a body camera on and he's involved in a critical incident and we say, "It didn't turn on." Once we have that door trigger, it takes it out of the hands of the officer and makes it automatically turn on, so there is no, "Well, the body camera wasn't on." We also have protections in our current policy now that if the body camera doesn't work that they turn it in and get issued a different one. That's what's in our policy now for our in-car systems. So, we are going to make sure that we have a comprehensive policy. It is going to mirror what our in-car policy is right now. We do believe that the technology has come to where we're ready to move forward with this now. And we're

happy that the council has given us the funding to do so. And we're looking forward to this project. >> Houston: Thank you so much for that information. One of the concerns that has been expressed was about officers that are not in cars. How do you hope to address their -- when does their camera come on? >> The time that you turn the camera on is going to be the same for everyone. The manner in which it is activated is going to be different. If you're a walking beat officers, the door trigger is not there, but, the one thing that is going to be requested to be built into the camera is the

[5:05:26 PM]

same setup in the vehicles. When the camera gets turned on, it actually recorded the 30 seconds previously. So it's called a buffering of a 30-second pre-event. So when the officer hits record, it actually started recording 30 seconds prior to the time he hit record. So, for those officers that aren't in a car, having the ability to hit the record button and then have the previous 30 seconds captured is going to be in place. Now, there are some products out there that do offer some other type of higher technology, such as a built-in accelerometer into the camera that when an officer's speed reaches walking speed, reaches faster than a walk and it turns into a run, such as pursuing after somebody -- [beeping] >> Then the body camera automatically comes on. So, there are other technologies available. There's also some - like, if you pulled your weapon, the camera would come on. A remote trigger that way. So, there are those technologies developing, but the ones that we know for sure are there now are the triggers in conjunction with the car. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Pool: Question. >> Zimmerman: Go ahead. >> Pool: When I was looking at this item during budget, I got some interesting information about the shelf life of the cameras. Is anybody here able to talk about how long the body cameras last, how long they are warranted for? >> You know, there was some discussion about that when I was in Washington. And one of the things -- the body camera itself is, quite frankly, the cheapest part of this whole process. You can get one that's literally \$100, or you can get it up to a thousand dollars, but quite frankly, it has become almost like your cell phone in the fact that it will probably last as long as it would last before there was new technology out and you would want to get the new one. But, you know, part of it

[5:07:27 PM]

depends on how it's taken care of. I'm aware of some places that have had their initial groupings of body cameras in place for like three years, and they don't have to -- unless something, kind of, catastrophic happens, it's not like they wear out. But I would expect that, quite frankly, four years down the road, you know, as you're finding that you're having to replace some of them, there will also be some new technology that Eli has decided he wants to take advantage of. >> Are you also addressing battery life? Because that's a big issue. The system I mentioned, which is not a private id, the doj, they talk about ten hours, really accessible, rechargeable. I hear the ten-hour timeframe a lot, especially if you go to www.justice.gov, you can see more about the issue, but, I hear ten hours is pretty adequate. And also, the need to have these cameras recharge has to be very simplistic and timely. >> Pool: And very much like a cell phone. So when you get off of your day, then you would charge it. I did hear seven years was the life span, the replacement span for the body cameras. And I don't know what the timeframe was. Like, if that was a five-year estimate of seven-year life span? Do you know? >> I just think we should be clear here that the doj does not make body cameras, does not recommend a specific vendor. By law, they cannot. And so, it's going to really depend, are you looking at taser, or any of the other ones. And I think as Margo said, a lot will depend on how much money you spend in the first instance. >> Pool: It's just one of the aspects of, down the road when we start comparing things. Yes. >> First of all, they're not recommending the system. I'm talking to everybody in this

[5:09:29 PM]

room. I can tell you something, last year, at a national convention, they were all over the place. Even the president is recommending these cameras. This is not about private versus public. We get this stuff in memos all the time, saying, here's a system that meets the standard. It's all over the internet. I've got memos. I have no idea what you're talking about. I'm not recommending any corporation. It's available. The DOJ, because of complaints and requests, took a lead role in doing the investigation. >> I'm saying the federal government cannot recommend. >> I talk to them all the time, sir. Because of some plants and complaints and concerns -- clearly, we disagree. >> Zimmerman: Hang on a second, I can probably interject. The issue here is that technology does have some interconnection with the policy. And one instance of that is we were talking about triggering. Somebody had mentioned the door opening as a trigger. Somebody else says, what if you don't have a door? Maybe what you're talking about, Mr. Lender, the DOJ has done some work, the idea of a system, technology plus policy for how it works. One of the issues there, if you're the DOJ, you're talking about the whole country. And that doesn't take in individual state laws that might differ on privacy things. So, there's -- we're just getting started on this. >> Clearly in Austin, Texas, in any city, you have to compete. You have many manufacturers out there. You want the best system available. >> Zimmerman: But it's kind of a chicken and egg problem. You want to know what technology is out there, but you need to set the policy to know what you're looking for in the technology. And on that subject, has anybody looked into night vision? The fact that if you have a dash camera right now, you can have a big spotlight on your cruiser, and that spotlight can illuminate what's in front of you. Camera is pointing this way, light is pointing this way. At nighttime, once you get out

[5:11:30 PM]

of your vehicle and you're in darkness, how do we get illumination? >> Night vision is not recommended for a body camera. When the body camera footage was released, it would give the public the false misconception that the officers have night vision. You'll be able to see things on the footage you will not be able to see with the naked eye. We want to make sure the recording is similar to what the officer is seeing. In order to do that, the body camera will consist of low light capabilities similar to what we have now, but will not have infrared technology. Does that make sense? >> Zimmerman: Yes, and that's a fascinating point to make. That's why you're here. Because, you can get non-visible infrared that would illuminate the subject, but the human eye won't be able to see it. >> I describe it as if you're watching a golf tournament. Yeah, you'll see the ball, and you're talking about it's almost too dark for them to play, what are you talking about, I can see the ball. The reason is because of the camera capturing the additional light. There is the problem -- it depends on whether you're using the camera for evidence-gathering or accountability purposes. If it's for accountability purposes, the low light is perfectly acceptable. If you're talking about for evidence-gathering, then you might make a very different decision. >> Casar: Sure. And you primed my memory of my question by mentioning the evidence-gathering. I've heard us describe a good bit some of the policy questions that will arise. But one you haven't mentioned, that I have heard some conversation about and read almost too little about, so I'm going to risk asking a question about something I haven't read or talked that much about, is the evidence-gathering and who will get a chance to see the footage and when. We know that there's some number of folks that they take plea

[5:13:31 PM]

bargains because they don't think they can prove themselves innocent, even though we have a system

that's supposed to work the other way around. And the ability of prosecutors, perhaps, of having seen video and having some level of evidence that a person who has committed a crime or is alleged to have committed a crime may or may not have. So, is there some best practice policy about how we work with the evidence-gathering portion beyond the accountability part, who gets to see the video, and when? >> Those are one of the things that the prosecutors that were on the task force that we're talking about is the fact that when you're figuring out the true cost of everything, you've got to remember, in our state, we have the Michael Morton --act, which is the reflection of the conviction of an innocent person just north of us here. And so part of it is, there's an obligation on the part of prosecutors to release. There always was a constitutional provision, but it's even stronger under Texas law to release to the defense anything that might help to clear the person, and to release it early. And so part of the thought was the fact of having to look at not only the in-car camera, but also the body camera footage to see whether or not it is something that would help prove somebody's innocence, or go towards the issue of innocence or guilt. And so, yeah. I mean, it will be a concern. And what I heard the prosecutor say is that they're not -- they don't feel that they've fulfilled their obligation if they leave it to the police to tell them whether or not there's something on that footage that would point to somebody's innocence, that they need to lay their own eyes on it. So there will have to be a process by which video is forwarded to the district

[5:15:43 PM]

attorney's office. But that occurs already when you're talking about dmav. >> This is one thing the research is clear on, that they do help resolve these types of complaints. They've also found that they lower false complaints against police. However, one caveat is that there -- Denver, for example, has done a large study. And they found that there were a number of incidents where body cameras didn't come into play, either because the officer was off duty, or the relevant issues that were germane to that complaint weren't captured by the camera. But, it is definitely a major help in investigating these complaint issues. >> Casar: Sure, and I guess what I was trying to get at more is, evidence-gathering when an officer has arrested someone for allegedly committing a crime, how prosecutors have access to that, and when the person who is arrested had access to that. Commander? >> Now, the prosecutors do get access to the evidence. In our current system now, they don't have the ability to access it directly. So I have four full-time employees that burn DVDs. So, our goal is that when we do the body camera rfp, there are several vendors out there that do offer -- a back end client that has a web-based process. That's the advantage of having a cloud storage system, is that you can send a secure link to the prosecutor, or to the defense attorney, for that matter, through discovery. I would give them a link to every single video that was associated with that case number. And that would be -- as soon as they asked for it, you could give it to them. Or they could get on the system and search themselves by the case number, and then every video associated with that case number would show up, and the prosecutor would have access to every one of those videos. The good thing about that is that everything that occurs on the back end client of any of these systems is all tagged as to what person looked at it, what person saw it, and one of the lessons learned over the years that they've seen is that there was the issue of people actually recording footage off of screens to not show a record of them burning a copy of it. So, what a lot of vendors have

[5:17:44 PM]

now built into their software is a watermark of the name or employee number of the person that is watching the video at the time. So there are a lot of protections that are in place now in the back end client. A lot of them are web-based through a secure browser, either using Amazon or Microsoft cloud.

So, it gives us that ability for instant access for the prosecutors. >> Casar: And under our policy that we would have -- or at least what we have for the dash cams is the prosecution and defendant's side both have access at the same time? >> That's the prosecutor office that will determine through discovery what types of evidence is released to the defense attorneys. That's not the police department's decision. >> Dr. Rosma mentioned Denver. One of the things, Denver recently made a change to require the wearing of body cameras on officers when they were performing off-duty law enforcement work. Obviously, not when they're at home barbecuing. But, if they were performing, essentially, wearing a police uniform, performing as police officers, they were required to have the body cameras and have the same rules apply to them. I will tell you that we get a fair number of complaints. The complaints that we get that are the hardest to resolve are in which there is no video. Often, we get a complaint and we're able to work with the police department to watch the video and have a discussion with the complainant and say, we realize this is what you think may have happen, but this is what appears to have really happened. That's one of the reasons the complaints have been down over the last few years. But when we get complaints about officers who are off duty working security somewhere and take law enforcement action and have no video, then it turns back into the "He said, she said," sort of thing and we're trying to find video from Walmart and things like that. >> Casar: I have two last questions, but I don't want to

[5:19:47 PM]

monopolize folks' time. >> A quick question -- quick. >> Casar: Quick question. >> Houston: Thank you. Something that Ms. Frasier said about community stakeholders. I know we've been having this conversation for a long time, but as these other concerns come up about, what does media get an opportunity to see, what about the victim's privacy, and the advocate's privacy, before you do the request for proposal, will there be an opportunity to, kind of, circle back through these stakeholder groups and say, this is what we're going to recommend, because these policies address privacy and media, so that everybody understands what we're going to be asking for in that request for proposal? Or are you all just going to draft that up and send it out? >> The request for proposal is separate from policy. So request for proposal -- >> Houston: I'm sorry. Guides? >> The request for proposal is what we're going to be asking for from vendors, what they can provide us in a body camera. Our policy that we have is our Austin police department policy about the use of the camera. So you have two separate things we're talking about. We're talking about request for proposal, which is our competitive bid process. And then we have our policy, which is the Austin police department's policy. So. >> Houston: Okay. But I think that the policy should guide what the request for proposal is looking for. >> Zimmerman: I was shaking my head with exactly the same thing councilmember just said, because there's a connection between the policy and the request for the technology you're requesting. They can't be divorced. They have to be integrated. And I'm seeing some -- yes. Okay. Yeah. Don't they have to be integrated? You can't -- because what could happen is, if you do the request

[5:21:47 PM]

for proposal, with certain technology items you're asking for, such as triggering, such as the duration of your battery -- you know, how long can it record -- you know, these important questions that guide the technology questions that are connected to the policy. I don't see how you can divorce them. >> We can have discussions with the public about guiding our policy. And then move forward with our request for proposal. But because of purchasing requirements, what's going to be included in the request for proposal, that's controlled until that rfp is put out for bid. >> Zimmerman: But you understand that you could write the rfp such that you cannot do certain policies, right? If the rfp says, my battery is going to

be six hours, you can't have a policy that says it has to be eight hours. You see where I'm going? >> Right, I understand. >> Zimmerman: Okay. >> Go back to my earlier comment, this is not a new endeavor. There are places around the nation that have done this. Almost every system I've seen, there's a policy implementation. They show you the policy issues, a, B, C, D, E, F. You're right, when you put these things into effect, you have to explain the policy. When does the footage become available, who maintains it, based on state laws? That's why it's so important to get a comprehensive assessment, who has the best practices? Call other cities and see what they're going through. They can tell you the policy is critical. It's critical. >> I think the issue that you raised is even more important when it comes to the problematic issues like privacy and cost. So, just quote from -- and there's the latest government publication from the federal government. Given the lack of research, there is little evidence to support or refute many of the claims that are outstanding

[5:23:48 PM]

questions regarding the impact and consequences of body cameras. However, police departments should be cautious and deliberate in their exploration of technology given the lack of research. They recommend the importance of consultation with all stakeholders. So, while some might be just concerned about those who have complaints against the police, the responsibility here is to the citizens, to the victims, to witnesses, to the accused people, to the police, to the court. So, many different groups have to be consulted and brought into the fold. So, what we don't want is people, for example -- many crimes do not get reported, especially things like domestic assault or sexual crimes. We don't want to see those reporting rates drop because people are scared of being recorded. No one knows the answer to that anywhere in the world at this point in time. Another factor might be, let's say you assign -- you provide the money for five people to do video redaction. And you end up, then, with a six-month backlog because the demand is greater than what those five people can do given some of these estimates. What will that do -- need to give the resources for more people, are people going to be happy to wait? There's no right or wrong answers here, but at least by talking to the different groups like you suggest you can get input on a number of the more contentious issues and figure out where best to draw that line. >> Casar: So it sounds to me like having some answers, some preliminary answer from the police department about what the -- sort of, frequently asked questions or the contentious issues, how the department intends to implement that on body cams. I know we have a template with the dash cams, but obviously there's some range of difference. Do you all have a timeline for when you would have those questions answered in a way that they could be digestible for the council and for the public so that potentially, when the rfp

[5:25:50 PM]

gets formed and shaped, we have an idea of what policies we're using to go into it? >> We don't have a timeline for that. We had the list of questions -- if we did, we could develop the answers for that. What we can do is schedule a community forum sometime in the next month prior to the rfp to discuss what our recommendations are based on doj policy. And then seek some input from community, whoever shows up. You know, we can put that out through our public information office about when and where that's going to be so that we can discuss some of those concerns with the public. And then submit our final recommendations for the policy change at that time, and then answer any questions that they have. >> Casar: And that makes sense to me. I think that tackling the contentious issues head-on and understanding that there isn't going to be a right or wrong answer, but better and worse yeses, it will be better for all of us so that we can adapt and change as necessary as we roll them out. But if you can be fearless and give us your real recommendations, and the real contentious issues, that puts the onus

back on the community to fearlessly wrestle with the recommendations. Thanks for doing that, and we'll await what you guys provide. >> Pool: I agree with that. I like the idea of having a stakeholder process. I think it's a good idea to make time and opportunity for people in the community to understand what's going on, and forgive some insights that we may not have -- we feel like we fully explored the issue, or started to. And there may be some other issues out there that haven't been addressed. I just want -- I really appreciate, Mr. Osmer, that you talked about the concerns for victims of domestic violence and abuse. I'm real sensitive to that. And I want to make sure that folks in the community who may be in that situation are not

[5:27:53 PM]

intimidated, and that they feel entirely embraced and protected and safe. In those instances, no matter what the issue is, body cameras or anything. Our job is to make folks like that feel safe. >> I remember when, in my agency, they introduced what they called soft rooms for the interviewing of people that had been through traumatic experiences and were just intimidated, maybe, by talking to a male, let alone coming into a police department. The idea of a soft room which is decorated more like someone's home than a government office was to make them feel more comfortable. So I just -- you know, wonder about how they would respond being told everything is being filmed. And, you know, again this is not a right or a wrong. It's trying to figure out the best way to strike a balance between competing concerns and making sure that we don't have some negative unintended consequences that could be avoidable. >> Pool: I also think there's an element of time that's involved in that. Maybe that first presentation, the victim may not be comfortable or feel safe. But after a period of time, and talking, then that person they -- may be willing to go on a camera, and maybe that's an area that we investigate in looking at the policy. Again, I know this is a subset of the larger universe, but I think it's a really important subset, and really want to make sure that we do the right thing by these folks. Yes. >> This is a very serious issue. And we can very easily create issues that would be around the issue, and talk to a fair amount of people. When I -- look at the data, about a year now on the cities that have done that, the boogeyman is not out there. If he has, it's the folks being killed with no evidence. If you look at the cities who

[5:29:54 PM]

have done this, you have more positive results. Complaints go down. There's more trust. I don't quite get -- you've got a very good legal staff. You can make sure you protect people's rights. I'm a first amendment guy, believe me. But when you make this an issue of walking on ice, you miss the big picture, which is right now, we're in a tough situation. I support most police officers. They do a good job. If we don't have these eyes in the city, you're talking a major risk. I want to encourage people to not let fear decide your decision. Look at the evidence around the country. Look who's doing this right. I guarantee you, it's a good decision to make. >> Pool: Sure. I think that's a really good comment. I would say that I'm not coming from a place of fear, but I am very aware that some victims of domestic violence, for example, may be in a place psychologically that right then and there, having the conversation knowing that the --camera is on them wouldn't have the best outcome, but, given an hour or some period of time, they may be able to do that interview. I'm not saying don't do it, but to understand that there may be the ability -- and I don't know if that's something that this sort of a body camera situation could even accommodate. I honestly don't know, but I wanted to ask the question to we would know. >> I think there are. One of the things you have in your policy is the idea of when officers have the discretion to turn the body camera off. And I would suggest to you that there is a difference between the issue of video being filmed versus audio. And I -- you know, one of the things that law enforcement has been trained on, particularly you're talking about domestic violence, you

know, when it's been going on for the last ten years, was the idea that you really do need to capture those first few moments with the victim, because if you don't capture it then, quite frankly,

[5:31:55 PM]

an hour later, the guy has gotten to jail and he's called her back from the jail phone and intimidated her or him, and you often don't get corporation. So, I think that when I have seen as far as what model policy says is, when law enforcement is somewhere -- legally somewhere, lawfully somewhere based on a 911 call or a call for service, the camera ought to be on. That you provide no discretion to the officer, no discretion to the person, partly from the evidence-gathering, and partly because by the time that you decide, wow I should've turned it on, even with the 30 seconds, it's too late. The question becomes those issues of when you're discussing, you go to somebody's home and you're there to take a burglary report. And the officer says, oh, by the way, I've got a body camera on, if I enter your home, my camera is on. And I don't want the police filming inside my home, if, if no other reason than it's my home and I don't want them filming in my home. So those are the more difficult issues of whether you instruct officers to say, "That's fine, sir, I can turn it off." Or, that's fine, can you step outside and I'll take the report there, but I'm still going to have the body camera on so that when there's a question about my level of performance and service later. I mean, there are issues to be resolved. But, we're not going to be the first folks having to resolve them. There is a lot of good literature and studies out there already. >> A lot of the so-called model policies that have been out there are, given the circumstances in your familiar city, given the state laws, blah, blah, blah, develop your policies. They're very, very vague. And I think it's -- filming is one issue, but if you cannot then guarantee to that victim who doesn't want to be filmed or doesn't want that horrible

[5:33:56 PM]

moment in their life -- maybe the worst moment of their life -- that that's going to end up on YouTube, that's a separate issue. It's law is different -- Texas law is different than Connecticut or California law. If we can't protect the privacy of sensitive victims and witnesses, and if we end up with dramatic but horrible private events all over the internet, then that's not going to be a good thing. And we have to figure out how to resolve that. I don't have a solution. What I'm arguing is, we need to think about it and try to prevent it from being a problem in the first instance. >> I'm not saying anything different from that. >> Casar: What I'm hearing is, given Texas law, and given the controversial issues at hand, and given that we pretty much know what those are -- there are probably less than a dozen of them or so -- the police department is going to put out their set of recommendations for policy at some point in the near future, and we can all have a community conversation about it. In the end, y'all are the department. And in the end, the community can have that conversation. But, it sounds like everybody's hearing that we are working towards the same goal, but we have to touch back for y'all to get your work completed before we can move the conversation past where we are at now. >> So, we hear talk about Texas law. You know, most states have constitutions. You know. So, Texas is a little different, but there are some good attorneys here. And, again, this stuff can be looked out and worked out by intelligent people. We don't have to be incompetent, and I just want to say that. >> Casar: It looked like Mr. Cassidy had -- >> Zimmerman: Mr. Cassidy. >> Pool: I really appreciate aly'all coming today and helping with the conversation. I think definitely have moved it forward. >> In the end, everyone's going to have their opinions. You see the diverse here. It's going to be worse when we

[5:35:56 PM]

bring all the stakeholders in. >> Zimmerman: Worse or better? >> And you're going to need to trust your department on the policy they come up with. We have to do it every day, the citizens do. Because no matter what that policy says, you're going to have different stakeholders that are going to disagree with it. There's things that I agree with aclu on, there's things that aclu disagrees with Nelson on. You're not going to make everybody happy. You're going to have to trust your police department to do the right thing in the end. >> Well -- >> Zimmerman: Go ahead. >> Houston: Thank you for those comments, but, actually, I saw some great common threads among the five of you. So it was not that divergent of opinions there, it was just some cautions that people expressed. But I think it's the public that we're policing. It's not us, the city council, and it's not you all. It's the public. And so they have a right to understand what it is that we're moving forward. And if that's one opportunity to say, this is what we're proposing, and the city -- we're going to be presenting it to the council in the next month or so, then that's all I'm asking for, is you don't leave them out of the conversation, because they are the -- the community, in fact, the people we are talking about. Them being safe, and police officers being safe. So, we've got pretty good congruence among the five of you guys. It's just a matter of making sure we loop back around and include the people that we're supposed to protect and serve. >> If I could, Mr. Osma, I want to ask, you have a public safety commission meeting coming up shortly, right? In about two weeks? >> No, next Monday. >> Zimmerman: Oh, is it next Monday? Okay. >> But I think that agenda is filled with introductory stuff still. The next agenda -- should be completely open. >> Zimmerman: Okay, so would it be possible for the commission to pick this up and to maybe discuss some particulars about what policy

[5:37:57 PM]

the commission might recommend? That's a pretty good representation of the city. We have members appointed, right, by every councilmember. >> Yes. Yes, we can. Can I just follow up with you later, or with Joe to get a bit of a focus? >> Zimmerman: Sure. >> About the key things we should -- okay. >> Zimmerman: That sounds good. So, that'll happen. And I guess as far as our committee, we were talking about potential dates that we would come back. Let's talk about timelines on this. I presume there's already, probably, an rfp being drafted for the -- >> That's correct. >> Zimmerman: He says it is. Okay. And so, would a draft of that be ready on -- around the end of November, that we could discuss in a forum? >> I'm going to have to speak with purchasing about the rfp and what the process is for releasing that. I know there's some issues with going out for a competitive bid and what the rfp process is. >> Zimmerman: Okay. Let me be clear. We want to look at something before it goes out in the public bid and there's this black out period. >> Pool: I think maybe we can talk to legal about that to see how it manage that. It may be something that if it's in a public forum, then it would be public before it was released as an R -- anyway. >> Do something during executive session. >> Pool: Right. >> I'm not quite understanding what you said earlier, councilmember Zimmerman. I don't understand -- I understand why everyone needs to be a stakeholder in the policy, but I don't see why we need to slow down the rfp process. I don't think who the vendor is has anything to do with policy. To me, I see it as two separate things, I think you see it as one. >> Zimmerman: Absolutely. What it is, it's the policy of the public, the constituents, all the people being involved, that's that big very important policy discussion. And that instructs the rfp, because the policy has a direct

[5:39:58 PM]

effect on the technology, absolutely. [Chuckling] [Crosstalk] >> Some of the concerns I herd -- heard were, we don't want a camera that's filmed for seven hours, the battery life. The police department -- I'm speaking on their behalf. There's no reason we shouldn't have a camera that doesn't last at least ten

hours, because our shifts are ten hours. Then you've got to have that. Sometimes our shift go 12, 13, and 14 hours, so. I mean, there's -- you know, some of the concerns I heard just don't jive with . . . >> Pool: I think we would be very careful on this panel here not to get involved in the operational detail. So, you know, the guidance may be sufficiently broad to say the best technology that's available with the longest battery life -- [chuckling] -- And that will be some information that I suspect y'all will bring back to us to explain the various pluses and minuses of the people that are bidding. I don't want to -- I'm not interested in helping you write your rfp. And I don't think that that's appropriate for this panel to do. >> Houston: It's also about storage and what those option options are, and the cost related to storage. >> Sure, go ahead. >> Casar: I think there is the possibility that if we were to set a certain kind of policy, if the department were to or the council were to mandate a certain kind of policy, that it could throw a monkey wrench into an rfp if it was something that's really not expected. But it sounds to me like the police department is, sort of, shaping a policy on the cameras, and it is probably going to make sure we aren't putting ourselves into a box with the rfp. So, what I would suggest is we

[5:41:59 PM]

get the information that we can from the department. And if it seems like one of the decisions that might be made surrounding policy would really change the rfp, then I think it can be a conversation you could have. But what I anticipate is that they'll be taking the policy into consideration as the rfp is issued. If they bring us the policy and there's a really substantial change, or something that you think the community would really differ on, and that that would affect the rfp, I think that would be the point where you might not want to put the cart before the horse. But, it sounds to me like what we really want is a look at that policy, and to have that conversation sooner rather than later, and perhaps for the public safety commission to review what APD is looking at. >> I concur, but so far it sounds like the dash camera policy that we have now, if I heard this correctly, largely instructs what the policy would be with the additional body cameras. Is that fair to say, the dash cam policy -- >> We're using that as a guide. >> Zimmerman: Fair enough. Maybe that's the starting place. What can you send us as of right now that is a policy statement? Where is there a document that says, here's the APD's idea of the policy statement for body cameras? Do we have that already? >> No, we have the dash cam policy I can send you. We already have an existing body-worn camera policy, but, since we don't issue body cameras, it only relates to personally owned body cameras, which is very different than department-issued body cameras. >> Zimmerman: Fair enough. Can we get both of those? Why don't you forward them to the members of the committee, so we have both of those? Thank you for sending that. So, is it agreeable that we should bring -- this back for another briefing in a month, and see where we are, and if the commission has had a chance to work on is?

[5:44:01 PM]

It? What's your first opportunity to work on this? >> The first Monday in November. >> Houston: Could we bring it out after you all go to the national meeting of chiefs? When is that again? >> That's the last week of October. >> Houston: October. So, that'll be fine. October you'll have more information about the technology. See it in the public safety. And then see us. >> Pool: So that would be -- well, it would be the November meeting of this body, because you would need to also turn the information around and have it reportable. So it would be nice to put the public safety commission's input into it as well, recognizing that at your November meeting you may only just start to talk about the issue. I don't know. >> Obviously I'm not quite sure until I get a better idea of the focus from councilmember Zimmerman of what you would like, because of the things that we talked about. So, possibly. [Chuckling] >> Zimmerman: So let's talk quickly for our committee members here. Councilmember pool, if we move

that November meeting to the 30th of November, I think that would be the Monday following Thanksgiving. Would that be, maybe, a better time to have the meeting? >> Pool: Could be, yeah. >> Zimmerman: And that would buy us a little time to -- would that be okay with you, if we move it to the Monday after? We'll let people look at their schedules, but that's one of our possibilities. Are there any many questions or issues? Did we have anyone come in for communication? Joe is -- is there anybody here that would like to make public comments before we adjourn? All right. Hearing none, I've got our committee has adjourned at 5:45 P.M. Thank you all for coming.