CALL TO ORDER
Chair Sheehan called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, in Conference Room A at the Honolulu Police Department Alapai Headquarters

PRESENT
Loretta A. Sheehan, Chair
Steven H. Levinson, Vice-Chair
Shannon L. Alivado, Member
Karen Chang, Member
Jerry Gibson, Member
Richard T. Grimm, Member
James K. S. Yuen, Executive Officer
George P. Ashak, Investigator
Denise W. Wong, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Duane W. H. Pang, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Erin Marie Yamashita, Secretary

EXCUSED
Max J. Sword, Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT
Susan Ballard, Chief of Police
John D. McCarthy, Deputy Chief of Police
Jonathon B. Grems, Deputy Chief of Police
Lynne Uyema, Legal Advisor

ASSENTMENT OF QUORUM
Counsel Wong ascertained that a quorum was present

Chair Sheehan called for a moment of silence for fallen Officer Bronson Kaliloa of the Hawaii Police Department.

Chair Sheehan announced Commissioner Max Sword has submitted his letter of resignation to Mayor Caldwell effective July 31, 2018. She also thanked Commissioner Sword for his years of service to the community and it will be difficult to replace his kindness, experience, and knowledge of community.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Ms. Francine Guzman
Mr. Shawn Luiz, attorney for Ms. Guzman, thanked commissioners for allowing Ms. Guzman to address some of her concerns. He provided an overview of Ms. Guzman’s educational background and explained she began making complaints in 2010 about actions she believed did not show integrity and honesty by HPD employees. As a result of her complaints, she was iced out and given the cold shoulder by other employees.
Ms. Francine Guzman (Continued)
Before Mr. Luiz continued, Vice-Chair Levinson informed Mr. Luiz that he is aware of the pending litigation in which the Honolulu Police Department (HPD) is a named defendant. He also explained that the Honolulu Police Commission is one of only two named components of the Honolulu Police Department stated in the City Charter and that Mr. Luiz is talking to an instrumentality of an adversary in litigation.

Mr. Luiz thanked Vice-Chair Levinson for making that observation and said the Department of the Corporation Counsel (COR) has already reached out to Ms. Guzman for early settlement conferences and Ms. Guzman continues employment with HPD. They are in early settlement talks in order to try and resolve Ms. Guzman’s grievances, and that is why he thought attending the Commission meeting may assist in resolving grievances allowing everyone to come together in order to find an amicable resolution.

Mr. Luiz informed commissioners his client was assigned to the airport and was subsequently transferred to the Kapolei Police Station after bringing her complaints forward. Ms. Guzman feels she should have been able to stay at the airport location and that the work environment should have been corrected. The environment should not have been what she had perceived, or what a reasonable employee would have perceived to be a hostile work environment. Ms. Guzman would like a chance to return to the airport and have her concerns considered, rather than transferring her to another station.

Mr. Luiz also noted that the Civil Service Commission had agreed with Ms. Guzman on some of her concerns relating to a lateral transfer application when she had applied for another clerk position. Within a month of the Civil Service Commission’s decision, two of Ms. Guzman’s fellow employees said they did not feel comfortable working with her, as a result of the decision. Ms. Guzman was restricted from certain parts of the police station and required an escort to/from other areas.

Chair Sheehan informed Mr. Luiz that the Commission does not adjudicate claims like Ms. Guzman’s and cannot get involved in the day-to-day operations of the HPD. She further explained the Commission does have ongoing supervision of the Chief and assured Mr. Luiz and Ms. Guzman that commissioners have brought Ms. Guzman’s case up in the past and will continue to monitor the situation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Commissioner Grimm made a motion to approve the June 6, 2018, meeting minutes. Commissioner Gibson seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: By a unanimous vote, the motion carried.
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Questions/Comments from Commissioners
Commissioner Grimm asked Chair Sheehan if she could provide some information on Ms. Guzman’s complaint because he was not a member of the Commission when she sent her complaint to the Commission. Chair Sheehan explained Ms. Guzman had written to her (Chair Sheehan) in 2017 concerning what she felt was unfair treatment when she applied for a position with HPD. Ms. Guzman felt the position was unfairly filled with someone related to a police officer. Chair Sheehan brought Ms. Guzman’s complaint to the attention of Acting Chief Okimoto.

Ms. Guzman had also filed a complaint with the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission ruled there was a violation of Ms. Guzman’s due process rights and ordered that the HPD review and change portions of its hiring procedures. Chair Sheehan said from what she can remember, this is a small part of Ms. Guzman’s concerns and there is now a lawsuit against HPD, which is the reason Chief Ballard and other HPD staff members were not in attendance for this part of the meeting as they are, technically, opposing parties.

NEW BUSINESS
Welcome Mr. James Yuen, Honolulu Police Commission Executive Officer
Chair Sheehan introduced Mr. Yuen to the Commission and Chief Ballard. She encouraged Executive Officer Yuen to build independent relationship with the HPD and other agencies because commissioners come and go but HPC staff are the day to day operators of the Commission, and it is important for him to have direct lines of communication with the Chief and other divisions as it will provide stability to the commission.

CHIEF OF POLICE REPORT
Body-Worn Camera Presentation
Chief Ballard introduced Major Rade Vanic who provided commissioners with a presentation on the body-worn cameras. Major Vanic then provided commissioners with a presentation and answered questions from commissioners. A copy of Major Vanic’s presentation is attached to the minutes.

The presentation provided commissioners with the HPD’s purpose of the program, how the vendor, (Axon) was selected, the benefits of the body-worn cameras, the cost to begin and maintain the program, maintenance of equipment, information sharing, and how personnel will be utilized until positions can be created to manage and maintain the videos.

Vice-Chair Levinson suggested HPD consult with the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney and Attorney General’s Office to discuss issues of foundation and potential questions of proper operation, accuracy, and maintenance of the cameras. Chair Sheehan was of the opinion the officer simply would have to testify that he/she viewed the video and that it accurately portrays what he/she saw.
Body-Worn Camera Presentation (Continued)
The following is a breakdown of questions from Commissioners:

Q. What is the weight of the body-worn camera?
A. Very light, about four to five ounces.

Q. What is the field of view and is it a 1080 pixel?
A. The field of view is 143 degrees, 1080 pixel (customizable) with a standard .mpeg video format.

Q. Will HPD be using helmet-type cameras?
A. The helmet-type cameras require additional devices (wires) which may get in the way of an officer during an apprehension. For officer safety reasons, HPD will not be using helmet-type cameras.

Q. Where are the videos stored?
A. The vendor, Axon, provides secure cloud storage.

Q. Will officers have access to videos?
A. Officers will have access to the videos with their mobile data computers.

Q. What is the retention schedule?
A. The retention schedule of the video is set by policy and built into the storage system by classification of the case/category.

Q. Is it up to the officer whether he turns the camera on when he gets out of the car or not or is it mandatory?
A. The policy requires officers upon each call for service or any law-enforcement interaction to begin recording at the beginning of the interaction until the end of the encounter.

Q. How can the camera record 30 seconds prior to being turned on?
A. The camera constantly records at 30-second intervals. If the officer does not turn on/initiate recording the camera knows it does not need the recording and will write over the recording. If the officer does turn on/initiate the camera the camera knows to attach the 30-second recording to the video.

Q. What happens when a person keeps appearing in videos categorized of having no evidentiary values?
A. The retention period for videos having no value is 13 months. If there are no connections found with that particular video it will be queued for deletion.

Q. Is there technology available or the possibility of using the stored videos with facial recognition?
A. There is technology available; however, HPD has no plans to use the body-worn camera video and facial recognition.
Body-Worn Camera Presentation (Continued)

Q. At the end of 13 months who reviews the videos scheduled for deletion?
A. Based on the category of the video, the system will notify the video management unit administrator of the videos queued for deletion. The videos will be reviewed to ensure there is no report number or name affiliated with an ongoing case. If there is any information associated to a police report, name, or ongoing case the video will be retained.

Q. Is there any way to improve the audio?
A. Certain things affect the way the microphone picks up the sounds as noticed in the sample video. Placement of the body-worn cameras will be addressed during officer training; however, audio will be affected when the camera is recording indoors or outdoors or in a crowded area.

Q. What is the picture quality at night?
A. There are models with night vision/video enhancement; however, the Department of Justice has recommended and what the best practices across the nation suggest is not to use night vision/video enhancement technology because you want the camera to see what the officers see in order to provide a realistic view.

Q. How long does it take to upload a video to the cloud?
A. It takes approximately 1 ½ hours to upload a one-hour video.

Q. Is there a way to alter the videos in any way once uploaded?
A. The system will always keep the original, uploaded video. If a video needs redaction, it would be saved as a separate file. The videos have a detailed audit log of when the file is accessed or modified.

Q. If an officer is entering a private residence, is it permissible for the occupant(s) to tell the officer they do not have the right to take photographs?
A. If the officer is there on official police business/police-related incident, the officer is not required to get consent to record.

Q. If someone calls the police to their home and the police officer is in the home, can someone request the officer turn off the camera?
A. The policy does allow for certain circumstances such as the interview of a victim, the officer can ask the victim if they would like the camera turned off. The policy requires the officer to provide the reason of why the camera was turned off, and the officer must notify his/her supervisor.

Q. Will the cameras be issued to plain-clothes officers or is the purpose to issue them to just uniformed/patrol officers?
A. The initial idea is to issue the cameras to uniformed patrol officers. Further roll out to plain-clothes officers could be considered; however, there are some local as well as national issues with plain-clothes officers using the cameras.
Body-Worn Camera Presentation (Continued)

Q. What is the response from officers on the program?
A. There are mixed responses from officers. Officers that are tech savvy are excited and those that are not so tech savvy are cautiously optimistic.

Q. If there is a request for a copy of a video, is there a charge for the video and where does the money go?
A. The Office of Information Practices has a set schedule HPD can apply. The schedule dictates what fees can/cannot be charged as well as who can/cannot be charged. If there is a charge, the money goes into the City's general fund.

Q. What parts of a video would need to be redacted?
A. Anything not generally releasable to the public would be redacted.

Q. Will dashboard cameras be the next equipment to be used by officers?
A. One part of Chief Ballard's goals is to increase the use of technology to promote public relations and solve crimes. There is a plan for dashboard cameras in the future; however, the rollout of the body-worn cameras is a priority.

Q. Were there any lessons learned from the Kauai Police Department's use of body-worn cameras?
A. Prior to selecting the camera HPD would use, HPD conducted a pre-study and found a preference for a one-piece camera rather than a two-piece camera. Inclusion of the union in the process could have been different. HPD has a very strong communication with the union in implementing the body-worn camera program. It is hard to compare Kauai with Honolulu because HPD has a higher volume of cases and will deploy more cameras.

Q. How will the plan be rolled out to the public?
A. Media interviews, attending community meetings, and the HPD's website.

Q. Will the use of body-worn cameras create more work?
A. With the addition of another piece of equipment there will be more work, but hopefully there will be less confrontational interaction between officers and the public and complaints will reduce.

Q. Will the Commission have access to the video files?
A. The policy dictates the body-worn camera administrator will serve as the point of contact for video requests.

Q. What is the initial budget as well as they yearly budget cost for the program?
A. Due to implementation costs such as equipment and infrastructure the cost is high. Funds from last fiscal year encumbered totaled $1 million, there is $2.5 million slated for this year's budget and the ongoing cost will be approximately $1.5 million per year.
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Body-Worn Camera Presentation (Continued)
Q. Does the contract include maintenance and repair?
A. The five-year contract includes maintenance for all equipment (cameras and other related devices). Midway through the contract the vendor will refresh all of the cameras and replace/repair defective cameras.

Q. Have any of the other departments that use the same system experienced compromised files?
A. Major Vanic was not aware of any incident.

Q. Are there any departments that have discontinued a body-worn camera program because it is too costly?
A. Yes, Seattle discontinued its body-worn camera usage. The reason it was discontinued was the number of public requests for videos was overwhelming. The cost of labor was almost as much as storage and the ability to respond to requests was hard to keep up which causing scrutiny.

Q. How will success be measured?
A. Number of complaints, use of force issues, and prosecutions will be used to evaluate the program.

(Recess: 3:20 p.m. to 3:27 p.m.)

NEW BUSINESS (Continued)
Sunshine Law Update
Deputy Corporation Counsel Denise Wong provided commissioners with an update on the changes to the Sunshine law that have been in effect as of July 1, 2018, due to Act 64. HPC staff has been implementing its provisions for any meetings that take place on or after July 1, 2018.

Changes include the requirement of any board packet put together for the meeting to be made available for public inspection in the board’s office at the time it is distributed to board members. It also requires meeting notices to be posted electronically to state or county calendars. A new option is to allow a board to use a recording of its meeting along with a written summary as its minutes, as an alternative to creating written minutes. Boards are now required to post its minutes online within 40 days after the meeting.

Report on Actions Taken at the Executive Session of May 16, 2018
Commissioner Allivado reported at the Executive Session of May 16, 2018, commissioners approved the April 18, 2018, executive session minutes and took action on two cases involving one officer.

Complaint number 18-010 involved one complainant and one officer. The officer was exonerated of the conduct unbecoming an officer allegation.

Complaint Number 18-011 involved one complainant and one officer. The officer was exonerated of the partiality and conduct unbecoming an officer allegations.
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Report on Actions Taken at the Executive Session of May 16, 2018 (Continued)
Commissioners were provided with the confidential portion of the report from the permitted
interaction group formed to interview and recommend selection of an executive officer. After
receiving the report, a motion was made to vote on the recommendation at the May 18, 2018
meeting. There was no executive session held on May 18, 2018; therefore, there is no report.

Commissioner Alivado then made a motion to accept the report. Commissioner Grimm
seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: By a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

Discussion with Chief of Police Concerning Letter from Ms. Lynn Schneider
This item was deferred to the August 1, 2018 Commission meeting.

CHIEF OF POLICE REPORT (Continued)
Bumpstock Bill
Chief Ballard reported that she attended the bill signing for the bump-stock bill with Governor
Ige.

HPD worked with the neighbor island police chiefs and a 30-day amnesty period was agreed
upon from the time the bill was signed. Persons with weapons that have bump stocks or
modified triggers could turn in the weapon to a police station or call 911 to have an officer to
receive the weapon. The amnesty deadline is August 8, 2018. As of today, HPD has not
received any weapons.

HB2071, Law Enforcement Standards Board
Chief Ballard also reported HB2071, Law Enforcement Standards Board passed without
Governor Ige’s signiture. She thanked Vice-Chair Levinson and Chair Sheehan for their input
and said there were discussions with the ACLU and Civil Beat, and she appreciated hearing the
different views. Chief Ballard appreciated Governor Ige’s communication with the chiefs and
HPD supports the bill going through. The matter is now in the hands of the Attorney General’s
Office who will serve as the lead agency.

Vice-Chair Levinson added that after he and Chief Ballard spoke, he received a phone call from
Mike McCartney on behalf of Governor Ige. Mr. McCartney informed Vice-Chair Levinson that
Governor Ige would veto the bill and wanted Vice-Chair Levinson’s thoughts on the subject.
Mr. McCartney’s thought process changed over the course of their conversation and it was clear
to both men the bill’s timeline was unrealistic, there was insufficient funding, and administrative
requirements were not addressed. There was discussion of the bill possibly becoming law
without his signature and Governor Ige issuing an executive order that would constitute a
working group to consider the important issues and make recommendations.
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HB2071, Law Enforcement Standards Board (Continued)
Chief Ballard informed commissioners the governor chose to let the bill become law without his signature and decided not to issue an executive order. HPD has always supported the intent; however, there is concern because the board, comprised of 14 individuals, will be issuing standards for all of the counties yet, each county police department (Honolulu, Kauai, Maui, and Hawaii) have one vote each and comprise 90 to 95 percent of all the law enforcement officers, which seems unfair.

Bank Robbery Cases
The case involving a male committing six bank robberies has been turned over to the U. S. Attorney’s Office. Chief Ballard also informed commissioners consideration is being made to possibly assigning an attorney from the U. S. Attorney’s Office to HPD, so they can help review cases and see what can be taken federally.

Officer Bronson Kaliloa
Chief Ballard reported Hawaii County Police Officer Bronson Kaliloa was killed in the line of duty on July 17, 2018. He is the brother-in-law of an HPD officer. HPD is working closely with the Hawaii County Police Department in providing assistance.

Assistance to Maui Police Department
Four tracking dogs from the HPD’s Specialized Services Division have been sent to Maui to assist in the investigation of the assault of a park ranger at Haleakala National Park.

NEW BUSINESS (Continued)
Civil No. 18-1-0751-05 Complaint for Declaratory and Other Relief (Louis M. Kealoha and Katherine E. Kealoha v City and County of Honolulu, Honolulu Police Commission
Deputy Corporation Counsel Duane Pang explained to commissioners the complaint, Civil No. 18-1-0751-05, was served on July 9, 2018. He explained that both Louis and Katherine Kealoha asked for legal counsel to be paid for by the City in Puana v. Kealoha.

The request for legal counsel from Chief Kealoha was processed through the Commission and the Commission denied his request. Katherine Kealoha’s request was processed through COR pursuant to the City Charter and was denied.

This lawsuit challenges both denials. COR’s position is that the process for Chief Kealoha was incorrect and COR will file proceedings challenging his complaint and that the process he chose to file in court is an incorrect process.

Vice-Chair Levinson asked if he filed an agency appeal in Circuit Court. Counsel Pang responded that he did not file an agency appeal, but it was noted in paragraph seven of the complaint that he wants to appeal the Commission’s decision. Counsel Pang stated and Vice-Chair Levinson agreed the process was improper.
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Commissioner Individual Reports on Commission Business
Commissioner Alivado reported she is currently attending the HPD’s Citizen Police Academy (CPA). She enjoys the interaction with the different commanders and community participants. The program provides HPD a way to interact with community members and for community members to better understand police work.

Commissioner Alivado has also participated in two ride-alongs in District 4 and District 6. Her first ride-along was in District 4 (Windward) and she was able to tour the entire district with Lieutenant Asing. Commissioner Alivado’s second ride-along was in District 6 (Waikiki) with Officer Sterrett. The experience was eye-opening, and she was able to observe the apprehension of a suspect and what an officer has to deal with during an urgent situation and/or arrest. Vice-Chair Levinson agrees with Commissioner Alivado and that the CPA is a valuable experience and encouraged commissioners to enroll in an upcoming class.

Requests for Legal Counsel
Sergeant Leonard Nishimura, USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC
Commissioner Gibson made a motion to approve the request for legal counsel from Sergeant Leonard Nishimura for USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC. Commissioner Alivado seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: The motion carried with Commissioners Gibson, Alivado, Chang, Grimm, and Levinson voting in favor of the motion. Chair Sheehan abstained. A letter will be sent to the requesting officer informing him of the Commission’s decision.

Lieutenant Mikel A. Frederick (Ret.), USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC
Commissioner Gibson made a motion to approve the request for legal counsel from Lieutenant Mikel A. Frederick (Ret.) for USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC. Commissioner Alivado seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: The motion carried with Commissioners Gibson, Alivado, Chang, Grimm, and Levinson voting in favor of the motion. Chair Sheehan abstained. A letter will be sent to the requesting officer informing him of the Commission’s decision.

Major Thomas T. Nitta (Ret.), USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC
Commissioner Gibson made a motion to approve the request for legal counsel from Major Thomas T. Nitta (Ret.) for USDC Civil No. 18-00100 ACK-KSC. Commissioner Chang seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: The motion carried with Commissioners Gibson, Alivado, Chang, Grimm, and Levinson voting in favor of the motion. Chair Sheehan abstained. A letter will be sent to the requesting officer informing him of the Commission’s decision.
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UNFINISHED BUSINESS  
Status of the Honolulu Police Commission Rules 10 and 11 Formal HRS Chapter 91  
Rulemaking/Amendment Process  
Vice-Chair Levinson reported the formal decision making regarding Commission Rules 10 and 11 will take place during the August 15, 2018, meeting.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT  
Executive Officer Yuen reported as of July 16, 2018 there are 40 complaints registered compared to 50 in 2017. There are seven pending investigations, 14 cases referred to PSO, and one complaint withdrawn. The recruitment for the investigators positions began on July 15, 2018 and will close on July 25, 2018. Executive Officer Yuen, along with the commissioners, thanked Investigator George Ashak for his assistance 13 years of service with the Commission.

EXECUTIVE SESSION  
A 3:58 p.m., Commissioner Chang made a motion to enter into executive session to review agenda items pursuant to HRS 92-5(a), subsections (2), (4), (5), (6) and (8): to consider the hire, evaluation, dismissal, or discipline of an officer or employee or of charges brought against the officer or employee, where consideration of matters affecting privacy will be involved; to consult with its attorneys on questions and issues pertaining to the Board’s powers, duties, privileges, immunities and liabilities; to investigate proceedings regarding criminal misconduct; to consider sensitive matters related to public safety or security; to deliberate or make a decision upon a matter that requires the consideration of information that must be kept confidential pursuant to state or federal law, or a court order.

Vice-Chair Levinson seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: By a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION  
The Commission returned to the open session at 4:37 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS  
Chair Sheehan announced the next meeting Honolulu Police Commission will be on August 1, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.
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ADJOURNMENT
At 4:38 p.m. Vice-Chair Levinson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Alivado seconded the motion.

Discussion: None.

Vote: By a unanimous vote, the motion carried.
• The Honolulu Police Department (HPD) believes that transparency is critical in establishing public trust and will use body-worn camera (BWC) recordings to document police interactions.

• The BWC recordings of interactions will enhance the department's ability to provide evidence for investigative and prosecutorial purposes and enhance officer evaluation and training.
BWC Project assigned; Pre-pilot prep

Continued pre-pilot prep

Start testing first of two BWC vendors

First field test ends; prep for second vendor test

Start testing second BWC vendor

Second field test ends

July 2017

Aug 2017

Sept 2017

Oct 2017

Nov 2017

Dec 2017

Jan 2018

Feb 2018

March 2018

April 2018

May 2018

June 2018

Analyze results of BWC pilot

Start working with BFS to secure a BWC vendor

Continue working with BFS

Develop plan for department-wide roll-out

Finalize contract

Award contract, prepare for roll-out

Serving and Protecting with Aloha
- Controlled testing during active shooter training in D-4 and at the academy

- 16 cameras tested from Sept. 9 to 22, 2017

- 174 videos generated during the testing period
- Redaction of videos could only be done off-server
- Break in audit trail
- Storage issues
- Ineffective and limited share capability with external sources
- Controlled testing at academy from Oct. 20 to Nov. 8, 2017

- On-site training by Axon reps for camera and back-end users during the week of Nov. 6

- Field testing D-1/3rd Watch, morning solo bikes, and NEU officers (77 officers total)
- About 4,500 videos during pilot
  - 715 hours of video
  - 1,400 Gb of video
- Average video length – 16 minutes
- Average video size – 2 Gb
- Videos ranged from a little over 30 seconds to over 1 hour long
- Most (about 1,600 videos) were categorized as non-criminal
- Second most (about 1,100 videos) were categorized as Traffic Stop - Citation
Potential Benefits

- Improved police-community relationships
- Documentation of evidence at a crime scene
- Reduction in confrontations between officers and members of the public
- Reduction in complaints and lawsuits
- Recordings can be used to improve self-awareness and officer performance
Potential Limitations

- BWC may not always see what the officer sees
- Physiological and psychological stresses experienced by the officer cannot be captured
- Depending on mounting location, the camera may be obstructed by the officer’s own body
- BWCs require a substantial commitment and investment in finances, resources, and logistics
- Originally Founded in 1993 – formerly known as Taser
- Products are used by more than 6,000 law enforcement agencies around the world
- Body-camera system used in 45 major cities in North America
- Digital Evidence Management System made specifically for Prosecutors
- 5-year contract
# Axon – Equipment

## Product Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Resolution</td>
<td>1080P / 720P / 480P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Format</td>
<td>MPEG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of View</td>
<td>143°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Life</td>
<td>12+ hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>64 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Time</td>
<td>Up to 70 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Event Buffer Audio</td>
<td>Configurable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Rating</td>
<td>IP67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Standard</td>
<td>MIL-STD-810G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Test</td>
<td>6 ft [1.8 m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Temperature</td>
<td>-4° F to 122° F [-20° C to 50° C]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Costs

Funds encumbered from FY 2017-18
(June 30th – end of fiscal period)
$1,000,000

FY 2018-19
$2,500,000

$1,500,000 needed annually to support an ongoing BWC program (equipment and storage only)
Video Management Unit (VMU)

- Comprised of one sergeant and six officers (eventually create civilian positions with sworn supervisor)
- Assigned/SA to and physically located in the Records Division
- Duties include:
  - Oversee video storage, management, and retention
  - Process and log internal/external requests
  - Redaction of videos
  - Provide 24/7 support
  - Support roll-out and training
  - Produce reports and stats
  - Maintain current and future inventory
Roll-Out Timeline

- Tentative roll-out schedule
- Timeline may accelerate based on:
  - System integrity
  - Network reliability
  - Infrastructure
  - Prosecutor’s Office
  - Court system
  - Funding
Infrastructure

Internet Service Provider (ISP)

- 1 Gb per second circuit
- Island-wide coverage
- Dedicated BWC network
- Will not affect existing intranet/internet connectivity
Infrastructure

PHASE I

- D-1
- D-6
- D-7
- Traffic

LEVEL B1 PARTIAL FLOOR PLAN

Serving and Protecting with Aloha
Infrastructure

PHASE I

- D-1
- D-6
- D-7
- Traffic

SQUAD ROOM INTERIOR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Infrastructure

PHASE II

- D-8
- D-2
- D-3
- D-5
- D-4
Additional Information

• Traffic Violations Bureau BWC checkbox – request submitted for 2019 printing

• Reviewing HPD Policies for BWC specific changes

• Working with Prosecutor’s Office for roll-out
BODY-WORN CAMERAS

POLICY

A. The Honolulu Police Department (HPD) believes transparency is critical in establishing public trust and uses body-worn camera (BWC) recordings to document police interactions.

B. The BWC recordings of interactions enhance the department’s ability to provide evidence for investigative and prosecutorial purposes and to enhance officer evaluation and training.

PROCEDURE

I. DEFINITIONS

A. BWC: A department-issued, compact video-recording device worn by an officer for the purpose of recording interactions with the public.

B. BWC Administrator: An employee designated by the Chief of Police to oversee video storage, inventory, and equipment (e.g., cameras and contracts); access to BWC data; retention timelines; public requests and the release of recordings; and the audit process.

C. Categorizing: A way to classify BWC recordings by type of event or incident (e.g., felony, misdemeanor, or non-videntiary).

D. Labeling: The process of attaching identifying information to a BWC recording (e.g., HPD report number and incident date).

E. Transfer Docking Station (TDS): A device that charges the BWC and transfers the recorded video content to the BWC database.

- Supervisor notification and required documentation for malfunctions
- Periodic random audits of recordings by supervisors to ensure proper use
- Activate when responding to a call for service or initiating a law enforcement or investigative encounter
- Consent to record not required
- Exception to recordings provisions
- Retention schedules
- Review of videos / critical incidents
- Duplication and distribution
- Internal/External requests
- Officers will have to get used to BWCs – added equipment, new/additional procedures
- Creation of new positions to support program
- Integration with current, future systems
- Public records requests
- Managing expectations
- BWC video effect on criminal justice system – local effects
- Substantial annual, ongoing cost
Questions ?