

From: Harrington-McKinney, Barbara
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 9:26:03 PM
To: Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen
Subject: Re: Police Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee Final Report

Please add to Legistar.

Barbara Harrington-McKinney
Alder, District 1
Cell: [1-608-228-8683](tel:1-608-228-8683)

Get Connected to Receive Updates from District 1 Alder.
www.cityofmadison.com/council/District1/update

Common Council Office:
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd
Room 417
[Madison, WI 53703](http://www.cityofmadison.com)
Phone: [\(608\) 266-4071](tel:608-266-4071)
Fax: [\(608\) 267-8669](tel:608-267-8669)
[WI Relay Service](#)

On Feb 10, 2021, at 5:03 PM, Harrington-McKinney, Barbara <district1@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Thank you.

Barbara Harrington-McKinney
Alder, District 1
Cell: [1-608-228-8683](tel:1-608-228-8683)

Get Connected to Receive Updates from District 1 Alder.
www.cityofmadison.com/council/District1/update

Common Council Office:
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd
Room 417
[Madison, WI 53703](http://www.cityofmadison.com)
Phone: [\(608\) 266-4071](tel:608-266-4071)

Fax: [\(608\) 267-8669](tel:(608)267-8669)
[WI Relay Service](#)

On Feb 10, 2021, at 4:54 PM, Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen <KKapusta-Pofahl@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Dear Alder McKinney,
I forwarded your message to the Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee members, as listed in your message below.
Best,
Karen

From: Harrington-McKinney, Barbara
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2021 4:43:08 PM
To: Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen
Cc: Hardiman, Emily; All Alders; Bottari, Mary
Subject: Re: Police Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee Final Report

TO: Body Worn Camera Committee Members

One way Communication - Intended for Information
Co- Chair: Tom Brown
Co-Chair: Keith Findley
Feasibility Review Committee Members:
Veronica Figueroa
Kim Jorgensen
Charles Myadze (Vice Chair: PSRC)
Luke Schieve

I want to personally thank you for your work as members of the Police Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee.

I observed many of the Police Body-Worn Camera meetings and presentations and reviewed any of the meetings I missed. Let me be transparent; I was never against the work of the OIR Report and Recommendations, the Writing of the OIR Final Report which some of you also served on. My concern has always been that the integrity of the body of work be maintained. Thank you for maintaining the integrity of the body of work above Dr. Gelembiuk's personal biases to do otherwise. I invite Alders to read the Police Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee Final Report. I have supported public safety and the police body worn camera pilot for the MPD since elected into office in 2015. It is time we launch a pilot and recommend that the PSRC support the integrity of the body-worn camera and accept the committee's Final Report.

Disagreement with the final recommendations of the committee is an individual choice, but to label the body of work as biased when not allowed to dominate, sway, misrepresent or add one's personal biased interpretation when the data conflicted with his hypothesis is concerning. The

data says what the data says. The use of BWCs was never presented as a panacea but described as another tool that to be governed by carefully crafted policies and the facts of interactions encountered between police and civilians. I reviewed the many hours of rigorous presentations, research and community input that went into the completion of the Police Body Worn Camera Final Report of the Feasibility Review Committee. There were numerous instances when exceptions were made to accommodate Dr. Gelembiuk's editing, revisions and/point of view in the document. There were also numerous examples when the committee firmly rejected Dr. Gelembiuk's biased editing when unsupported by the research or data.

This has been a very complex and challenging work. We are at a time in our City when we have decided to take bold strides with intent to recreate the vision for all in our city to thrive. The committee has completed and submitted its work. I urge the Alder and the PSRC to accept the body of work as submitted they have completed. It is time for us to move forward and to determine what works and what does not work for our city as it relates to a BWC investment. Thank you.

Barbara Harrington-McKinney
Alder, District 1
Cell: [1-608-228-8683](tel:1-608-228-8683)

Get Connected to Receive Updates from District 1 Alder.
www.cityofmadison.com/council/District1/update

Common Council Office:
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd
Room 417
[Madison, WI 53703](http://www.cityofmadison.com)
Phone: [\(608\) 266-4071](tel:(608)266-4071)
Fax: [\(608\) 267-8669](tel:(608)267-8669)
[WI Relay Service](#)

On Feb 9, 2021, at 2:19 PM, Keith Findley <keith.findley@wisc.edu> wrote:

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear PSRC Members,

I see on Legistar that Greg Gelembiuk's 48-page letter attacking the process and product of the Body-Worn Cameras Feasibility Review Committee has been attached to Agenda Item 8. I write, as co-chair of the Body-Worn Cameras Committee until it completed its work and dissolved, to

respond to the misleading and inaccurate assertions Greg has made in that letter and in his numerous social media posts. Pasted below, and attached, is a letter to all City Alders signed by all six of the members of the Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee (including the member who voted against Body-Worn Cameras) responding directly to Greg's 48-page letter. We wrote:

February 4, 2021

Dear Alders,

We, the former members of the Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee, feel compelled to write, jointly and unanimously, to respond to the letter Gregory Gelembiuk has submitted to the Common Council challenging the integrity of our Committee's process and final product. We do not respond here to his arguments about the merits of body-worn cameras (BWCs)—our Report fully addresses our views about the potential strengths and weaknesses of BWCs, and reveals that we were not of one mind about the final recommendation to undertake a BWC pilot project. We stand behind that Report fully. We respond instead to his attempts to undermine our integrity as individuals and as a group.

Greg complains that the Report is biased and one-sided. We urge all Council members to read the full Report, watch the recordings of our deliberations, and decide for yourselves. We worked hard to address both sides of the debates about BWCs, and to present fairly and neutrally the social science research findings, both when they supported BWC usage and when they did not. We fully acknowledge that, as human beings, we are all subject to cognitive biases. But there is irony in Greg's claim that our Report is the product of confirmation bias, given that from the first day on the Committee Greg has attempted to slant everything we did and said in ways that would portray BWCs as a fool's errand, or worse. The reality is that many members of the Committee were truly on the fence about what final position to take on BWCs until the very end, and one of us from the beginning to the end was opposed to BWCs, as is reflected in our final 5-1 vote. And yet when the Committee at times rejected Greg's edits, or modified them in ways to enable consensus (keep in mind, as Greg himself acknowledges, we very frequently *accepted* his edits or additions to the Report), we did so *unanimously* virtually every time. Given all of our varied perspectives, it is hard to see how all of those unanimous votes could have been little more than expressions of pro-BWC confirmation bias.

Greg asserts that the Committee "foreclosed the possibility of submitting edits to correct the errors and omissions [in the draft report], on the grounds that there was no time to do so before the report deadline," and that that gave him "no ethical choice but to resign." This is a continuation of an even more overt and relentless effort Greg has chosen to make in social media to fight against BWCs by attacking the integrity of the Committee's process. We must set the record straight. The Committee never foreclosed the possibility of submitting edits, or attempted to "muzzle" Greg, as he has asserted on Facebook. The reality is, the Committee met regularly precisely in order to permit Greg to submit edits, and to go over in painstaking detail the many, many edits he suggested. The Common Council created our Committee over the summer and gave it a six-month time frame to complete its work, with a deadline of the end of December 2020. The Committee initially met every two weeks into the fall, but then as the deadline

approached, started meeting even more frequently, primarily specifically so that we could accommodate Greg and his extensive requested edits. As we started considering the draft Model Policy in November, and thereafter the full Draft Report, we started meeting more frequently, often weekly, and even twice a week. Even with the holidays, in November and December 2020 the Committee met nine times, on November 5, 11, and 19, and then December 3, 9, 16, 17, 21, and 22—almost all of it devoted to addressing edits to the Policy and Report, most of which were proposed by Greg. At Greg’s request, we then *unanimously agreed* to seek an extension of time until the first Common Council meeting in February (about a one-month extension), and Greg told us that should be sufficient time for him to complete his edits and allow us to consider them all. Almost entirely to accommodate Greg’s growing list of proposed edits, the Committee then picked up the pace even more in January, meeting January 4, 7, 11, and 15, with meetings still planned for January 19, 22, 25, and 26. As the extended deadline for completing our Report was approaching, and as Greg continued to produce more and more edits, the Committee could see no way to finish its work on time unless we set a timeline for completing the process of considering new edits. The Committee therefore voted at its January 15 meeting to set a deadline of January 19 for the submission of any final edits, so we would have time to consider them all and finalize the report in the last week of the Committee’s work. The Committee voted *unanimously* (with Greg abstaining)—including the Committee member who on the merits of was opposed to BWCs—to set that deadline.

Unfortunately, instead of continuing to work with the Committee constructively to finalize its Report, Greg then chose to resign, permitting him to write his own lengthy missive attacking the integrity of the Committee’s Report and process, without Committee input, and outside the transparency otherwise guaranteed by the open meetings law. There is again irony in Greg’s complaint that he did not have sufficient time to write his final edits to an already largely edited Report, and yet he had time to write his own 48-page complaint about the Committee’s Report prior to the February 2 Common Council meeting.

Greg raises in particular, as illustrations, two matters that he says show the Committee’s bias. First, he notes that the research shows that both prosecutors and public defenders, by large majorities, believe that BWCs help them win their cases. Greg wanted to include an *interpretation* of that data, arguing that the results showed that public defenders and prosecutors were both overly optimistic about the utility of BWCs, because both could not be right. It was not apparent to us, however, that the survey responses were inherently contradictory, as it was possible that the survey respondents were saying that BWCs would help them win their cases when BWC footage backed up their version of events, and they both could be right about that. The research at issue did not claim to show that either public defenders or prosecutors were right or wrong, or that either group was overly optimistic. It just reported their views. And so that was what the Committee chose to do as well—just report the data and let the reader decide what to make of it, without speculating one way or another about why the lawyers responded the way they did, or whether their responses were irreconcilably contradictory.

Greg then goes to great lengths arguing the cost estimates the Committee provided are too low. But those are not the Committee’s cost estimates; the Committee made no cost estimate. Instead, the Committee reported on estimates provided by the MPD and by nearby police departments (Milwaukee and Fitchburg), which have actual experience implementing BWCs, and added other

cost insights gleaned from the research. Greg might not like the numbers these police departments provided the Committee, and he is free to challenge them, but the numbers included in our Report are indeed the numbers that were provided to us—not our interpretations of those numbers. It is unfortunate Greg chose to resign from the Committee instead of making his full argument about costs to the Committee, so we could fully and publicly explore those numbers.

In sum, please do not accept at face value Greg's attempt to discredit our work and divert your attention from the substance of our Report. Please read the Report, and if you have concerns about its accuracy or the fairness of our process, watch the recordings of our meetings.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Findley (past co-chair)

Tom Brown (past co-chair)

Veronica Figueroa

Kim Jorgensen

Charles Myadze

Luke Schieve

I ask that you consider this unanimous response from the Committee, and that it be posted in the legislative file along with Greg's letter.

Keith A. Findley
Professor of Law
University of Wisconsin Law School
975 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53705
O: 608-262-4763
C: 608-335-4544

Dear PSRC members,

Please see below an additional letter I sent to alders Tuesday, concerning the Bodycam Committee report.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gregory Gelembiuk

From: Gregory Gelembiuk
Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Madison Alders <allalders@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Further correspondence on the BWC Committee report

Dear Alders,

Regrettably, I feel I must respond to a letter written by Bodycam Committee Chair Keith Findley and signed by other committee members. It does not address the substance of what I said in my prior letter.

Facts matter. The Findley letter completely ignores both examples I provided of clear scientific errors/misrepresentations in the Bodycam Committee report. See "*Appendix 6: Potential increase in rate of assaults against officers with BWCs*" and "*Appendix 7: Concerning adverse impact of BWCs on overcriminalization*" in my prior letter. For example, a major concern with BWCs is overcriminalization of marginalized communities, given the vast increase in surveillance video. The report claims that the key study it discusses found that the availability of BWC video did not increase prosecution rates when prosecutors reviewed the video before issuing charges. The study's actual finding was the opposite, with major implications for recommendations. The draft report was riddled with such errors.

Contrary to what the Findley et al letter implies, I researched and provided a great deal of BWC cost information to the committee. That information was included in my letter to alders and much of it can be found in Bodycam Committee documents uploaded on legistar. I attempted to engage the committee regarding this information, mostly unsuccessfully. The choice could have been made to adequately explore, consider, and incorporate much more of that cost information, but that path was not taken.

As an ancillary point I'll note that the fiscal note for this item appears not to take into account that the report specifies a requirement for "*a rigorous, randomized controlled trial as a pilot program, with tracking and analysis of data on key outcomes, and particularly prosecutorial charging rates.*" The full cost of such a trial, including analysis, is not estimated in the report and thus is not provided in the fiscal note (which appears to assume a cost of only \$136,000, as MPD projected for its original North Side Pilot Project concept). The cost specified for full city-wide implementation, which is based on MPD's projection, is much further off – omitting the vast bulk of personnel costs. MPD wants BWCs and appears to be severely lowballing the cost. As I've noted previously:

[Here is a grant application](#) for an initial randomized controlled trial of BWCs in Milwaukee. The grant specifies 50 cameras. The total cost is \$624,206, including a \$399,746 contract with the Urban Institute to administer/analyze the trial, and \$124,455 in overtime costs (the Madison estimate assumes only \$53,045.42 in personnel cost for a pilot). \$136,000 is much lower than what the actual cost of a proper randomized controlled trial pilot program would be in Madison.

In a classic example of motivated reasoning, Findley et al provide a strained reinterpretation of survey data I cite, regarding unrealistic expectations of BWCs. Findley writes, "*[Greg] notes that the research*

shows that both prosecutors and public defenders, by large majorities, believe that BWCs help them win their cases....it was possible that the survey respondents were saying that BWCs would help them win their cases when BWC footage backed up their version of events." This misrepresents the survey data and what I stated. The survey questions specifically asked public defenders and assistant district attorneys about objective outcomes – the effect of BWCs on the overall likelihood of acquittals, convictions, and dismissals (not whether “BWCs would help them win their cases when BWC footage backed up their version of events”). There were sharply differing expectations between public defenders and assistant district attorneys in jurisdictions that had recently implemented BWCs. For example, 67.5% of public defenders believed that BWCs would increase the likelihood of dismissals while only 30% of assistant district attorneys believed this, and the study noted that such “*divergences in ADA and PD views on the impact of BWC and video evidence are notable*”.

The Findley et al letter contains implicit contradictions. It asserts “*The Committee never foreclosed the possibility of submitting edits*” then implicitly acknowledges the opposite. As the letter further acknowledges, I had already submitted edits for most of the report (actually ~80% of it). On January 15, the committee passed a motion to not consider any edits submitted after the next meeting, following the weekend. I had work commitments for all my waking hours that weekend, which would have completely precluded me from editing further. As I had noted at the time, completion of editing for the remainder would have taken only an additional week to week and a half (i.e., to, at most, January 25). This was laborious, time-consuming work, which required properly reviewing the scientific literature. The report was supposed to be on the Council agenda, for referral without deliberation, on Feb 2. That date could feasibly still have been met and, if not, the item could easily have been deferred to the next Council meeting.

For context, I will note that Keith had unilaterally and unexpectedly produced a draft report on December 9, then stated immediately thereafter, on December 16, that he was strongly opposed to seeking an extension, to permit the time needed to meaningfully edit the report. Thereafter he relented, though with a demeanor of indulging me. By January 15, I had already corrected numerous errors and omissions in the report. If there were concern for accuracy, the committee would have allowed this process to go to completion. The decision to curtail submission of edits appears to have been related primarily to the unwelcome content of my edits and the scientific information I was bringing, not the timeline. As Steve Verburg, retired award-winning Wisconsin State Journal reporter, commented, “*In my limited observations of the committee I saw members following a chairman who was at times dismissive and condescending in response to constructive criticism of serious flaws in his draft report.*”

In a Madison 365 video op-ed posted on January 20, former Bodycam Committee member Matthew Braunginn states:

I was an original member of this committee but I had to resign for health reasons, but even then there was some insight and some pretty early suggestions of how this would go, in that it is a frickin mess. My perception pretty early on was that the general group would have a hard time confronting their biases about bodycams, particularly the early impressions that folks have had that body cameras are good for police accountability and so on and so forth. There seemed to be a lot of ways that folks were twisting and turning to arrive at the predetermined conclusion that Madison should adopt body cameras. It really felt like there were core folks on the

committee lining up a process that that was going to be the recommendation without fully reviewing the data.... And those concerns have been realized.

Matthew Braunginn further notes:

There was a draft report I was able to read.... The report, or at least written aspects of it, weren't reflective of the data it was citing or misinterpreted the data it was citing, and this is true. There were multiple examples of wrong information, wrong interpretation of information...

Creating time constraints to make sure the product isn't accurately reflecting the information is at best neglect of the job. And I say this as someone who was also on the Police Policy & Procedure Ad Hoc Committee. We took it very seriously. We wanted to produce the best product we can. Which is part of why it took five years, in that we didn't want to misrepresent any data. We didn't want to misrepresent the things that we were looking at.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gregory Gelembiuk

Dear Public Safety Review Committee,

I see that the topic of body cameras is on your agenda tonight.

I am writing to point out that one of the most prominent organizations representing the Black Lives Matter movement has changed its position on body cameras. Campaign Zero had previously called for body cameras as part of its "comprehensive platform of research-based policy solutions to end police brutality in America". Campaign Zero is also the organization responsible for the 8 Can't Wait police reform agenda.

Campaign Zero has now come out against starting any new body camera programs. It states "▲□Due to a range of research studies finding no evidence that body cameras reduce police use of force, we caution cities *against* adopting new body camera programs."

This is consistent with the position of the Movement for Black Lives. The Movement for Black Lives has always opposed body cameras, as part of its call to end surveillance on Black communities.

With body cameras, we've been sold a false bill of goods. We were told they'd reduce police use of force, produce accountability after police killings, improve police behavior, and increase trust. But none of that appears true. They're mostly a surveillance tool, mostly used to collect evidence against civilians, especially in overpoliced Black and Brown communities. That will just make things worse.

Thank you,

Sue Nelson

PSRC Chair and Committee Members:

Item #8 on February 10th Agenda:

I support the hard work of the Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee. Their report should be Accepted today. Your acceptance proves the Review Committee with a well-earned acknowledgement of their exhaustive review of this topic.

I look forward to providing MPD with cameras and the ability to increase the trust of the community.

Janet Hirsch
Madison Resident

Dear Alders, Mayor and Committee Members:

The police body-worn camera program and pilot project need to move forward and be implemented. The body-worn camera program will bring clarity and transparency to police/public interactions. We do not have that clarity today but, once implemented, it will rightfully identify any police misdeeds. This will help build trust with the Madison community. Many Wisconsin police departments have already implemented this technology. Also, body-worn cameras have been positively vetted by various city committees over the last several years with the most recent committee, the Body-worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee, giving its approval with its final report. There has been a question as to the cost of the program. Reliable cost estimates were gathered by the Body-worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee from the manufacturer and those Wisconsin police departments which have deployed them. This is not the only cost to be considered. What cannot be overlooked is the cost of civil liability when the city cannot substantiate the circumstances of a police encounter. Approving the body-worn camera program is the right thing to do. It is the right action to take now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joseph Keyes
District 11

Dear Mayor Rhodes-Conway, Alders and Committee Members:

Please accept the Body-worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee's report so our police department can begin implementing a camera pilot program in the North District.

Thank you!

Judy Bluel
26 Oak Creek Trail
Madison, WI 53717

>
> Hello,
>
> As a 26 year resident of Madison, I have had the privilege of having opportunities to be involved in my children's schools, my neighborhood's HOA, Community activities and more.
>
> I am writing today because I am concerned about the FUTURE of MADISON, the community I call HOME.
>
> Living on the Westside, I have seen the STEADY decline of living in a "SAFE neighborhood".
> All neighborhoods in Madison should be SAFE !
>
> So I am writing IN FAVOR of BODY WORN CAMERAS for the Madison Police Department.
>
> I have listened to the Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee meetings for hours. Unfortunately, their report has been picked apart way too much by one individual.
> This is SO simple and why does it have to be so HARD. If members of our community want transparency in policing LET this be one of the many tools that our MPD can use.
>
> I hope my voice will be heard.
> Thank you.
>
> Sincerely,
> Kathryn McComb
> 14 Winterset Circle
> Madison 53717

Dear committee members;

First of all, as a 64 year resident of Madison's East Side, I am PRO body worn cameras for MPD and have respectfully made my points at several committee and council meetings. I request that you accept the thorough report from the BWCFRC so the North District pilot program may begin. The funding was included in the 2021 Capital Budget, so everything is in place.

Transparency, accountability, and trust will be a result of BWCs.

In 2014, President Obama requested \$263 million to fund body camera programs and police training. As a result, between 2015 and 2019 this program has given over 493 awards, over a collective \$70 million, to law enforcement agencies in 47 states and DC.

In Miami, researchers found a 19% reduction in police officers using physical force against citizen resistance. Civil cases against the police department for use of force dropped 74%.

In Phoenix, complaints against officers wearing cameras DECREASED 23%, while complaints against officers NOT wearing cameras INCREASED 11%. The cameras also protect police officers and the public against false accusations of misconduct.

Body-cams are a good police reform tool, and have STRONG support from the public. According to New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, *"Body-cams offer transparency and accountability to the public, which is an attempt to mend the frayed relationship between the police and the community"*.

A June 2020 Reuters poll found 92% of Americans wanted federal police officers to wear body cams.

A July 2020 University of Maryland School of Public Policy survey, found almost 90% support for ALL police officers being required to wear body cameras including; 85% of republicans, 94% of democrats, and 86% of independents.

I did my own poll on a neighborhood social media page. In 12 hours it was 75-1 IN FAVOR of BWCs.

I recently made a few phone calls and I have 2 questions;

1 - What do the following 14 towns, villages and cities in and around Madison have in common? Cottage Grove, Deforest, Fitchburg, Madison TOWNSHIP, Maple Bluff, McFarland, Middleton, Oregon, Shorewood Hills, Stoughton, Sun Prairie, U.W. Police Department, Verona, Waunakee.

Answer; All of these police departments utilize body worn cameras. In addition, Cross Plains PD has a new chief who wants them and is going forward to introduce them.

2 - So who does that leave out? The City of Madison & The Dane County Sheriff's Office. **That's it.** Why? Pure & simple it's politics. For ONCE in Madison, I urge you to put politics aside in lieu of accountability, transparency and, safety. The status quo is ridiculous.

I have questioned those in opposition, why they **DEMANDED** body-cams a few years ago, but not today. What has changed? Data and polling have not. There are arguments fueled by ONE person being used against BWCs simply as stall tactics. Let's go forward with this **beyond the pilot program and get it done.** Listen to the people of Madison. Enough putting up with stalling tactics.

Kim Richman
16th District - Madison
kritchman@pm.me

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to ask that you support the Body Worn Camera Report you received recently. It is important that we begin the Pilot Program that is already in the 2021 Budget and gather data that is appropriate for Madison. Many studies have been reviewed with pros and cons identified. The next step, which the Council identified when planning the 2021 Budget, is to conduct a pilot study in Madison. Until we conduct this pilot study we are not going to know if the benefits outweigh the cost for Madison. (Cost is the only reason there was not a unanimous approval of the report by the Body Worn Camera Review Committee.)

Once we have Madison specific data a decision can be made about outfitting the remainder of the police with body worn cameras. The Budget is going to be tight over the next few years. Even if the Council determines that body worn cameras are needed does not mean the entire police force must be outfitted in one year. The cost can be spread over several years outfitting one Police District a year.

Let's get it done so we can move forward to see what the data will show on this issue one way or the other.

Thank you for your consideration.

Name withheld for confidentiality documents

Madison

Dear Alders, Mayor and Committee Members:

It's time to move from theorizing, analyzing and discussing the pros and cons of a police body-worn camera program and implement the pilot program that was included in the 2021 budget for MPD's North District.

Almost two-thirds of the law enforcement agencies in the state already have a body camera programs in place including local agencies like Fitchburg, Middleton and UWPD. At this rate, the state may mandate police body-worn cameras long before Madison can even get a pilot program off the ground.

President Biden is on record saying police should be required to wear body cameras to "protect the safety and rights of police officers and citizens." And this summer WI Attorney General Josh Kaul said he would like to see the state help support the purchase of body cameras for agencies that don't have them.

It's time for Madison to move forward on this issue. Please accept the thorough work done by the Body-worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee, and let's get the pilot program started in the North District.

Thank you!

Wendy Reichel

10th District

From: Charles James <cjames@wisc.edu>

Sent: Saturday, February 6, 2021 5:41 PM

To: mayor@cityofmadison.com <mayor@cityofmadison.com>; allalders@cityofmadison.com <allalders@cityofmadison.com>

Cc: eoc@cityofmadison.com <eoc@cityofmadison.com>; pdprsc@cityofmadison.com

[<pdprsc@cityofmadison.com>](mailto:pdprsc@cityofmadison.com)

Subject: BWCs

Dear Mayor Rhodes-Conway, dear Alders:

I don't understand.

I've heard that there is a question as to whether or not to give the Madison Police Department so-called "body-worn cameras" (BWCs). Across the nation, many, if not most, major police departments have BWCs and use them within strict guidelines developed at the national and regional levels. The MPD should have access to this technology, too.

I don't understand.

Opponents of BWCs say that they will be used to identify undocumented residents and that Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will have access to footage generated by BWCs. There is no evidence that this is a realistic concern. The MPD is accountable to the City of Madison, not ICE or any other federal agency. Interactions among these various agencies already operate under strict guidelines. BWCs will not create any significant new obligations. The MPD should be allowed to use this technology without interference from outsiders.

I don't understand.

Opponent of BWCs claim that the police are able to turn on and turn off BWCs at will, thus frustrating their use, or they will be able to delete footage unpleasant to the police. This is nonsense. Municipalities that currently use BWCs have guidelines that determine when and where they will be used. Recent events that involve especially officer involved shootings more often than not can be used to fire or even to criminally indict officers for abuse of use of force. The example that immediately comes to mind is the shooting of an unarmed Black man in his garage by a police officer in Columbus, Ohio. It was caught on the officer's BWC. This past week he was indicted based on that footage. If he had not been wearing a BWC, the situation would have been reported very differently..

I don't understand.

There are groups in Madison who are openly critical of the MPD. That is why you created the Police Civilian Oversight Board. Let the MPD have the BWCs, with the expectation that the PCOB will monitor their use in the months to come. I would like to think that the PCOB is interested in investigating what the MPD does with any of the tools or software they currently have. BWCs will add another layer of accountability to policing in Madison. Let the MPD have them. The PCOB will keep them honest.

I hope you understand.

Respectfully,

Charles J. James
Westmorland (District 11)

Dear Alders, Members of the PSRC, and Members of the EOC,

I have been a resident of Madison for 21 years. I became interested in the subject of body-worn cameras over the summer, in the wake of the horrible killing of George Floyd and the national concerns over injustice and systemic racism. I began attending the Body-Worn Cameras Feasibility Review Committee and have attended nearly every meeting for the past several months, and there were many. I was very impressed with the discussion and detail that went into writing up the report. As one who is strongly in support of body-worn cameras because of the accountability and transparency they provide on both ends of the camera, I can say that at times I was afraid this committee would not give a recommendation for body cameras. It was a mystery right up until the vote on January 22, 2021.

The research, detail, and objectivity taken by committee members was impressive to watch. They heard from many members and segments of the community. They considered reports and studies on both ends of the spectrum. They brought in special guests on all sides and had Captain Brian Austin of MPD's North District on the committee in an advisory role. I was impressed with the leadership of the committee.

As with many things, there are pros and cons to body-worn cameras. There are issues and concerns with their use that warrant the use of clear policies along with accountability and oversight. Thankfully we have a robust system of accountability here in Madison as well as a very cooperative police department. There is a cost to their use, although not using them costs the city in other ways.

As time went on, one member of the committee, who was obviously opposed to body-worn cameras, seemed to become more and more determined to continue to add edits, new information and new studies to the report. There seemed no end to his quest for new and very skewed information to add. An extension was unanimously requested by the committee (and received) because of this member's desire to continue adding new research, new studies, new data, never-ending edits, and plenty of speculation to an already very extensive report. One could go on collecting data and different points of view indefinitely and never run out of research. New studies are constantly being done. There comes a time to submit the excellent work. And there comes a time to have our own Pilot Program for body-worn cameras and learn what we can from the process.

One member seemed unable to sign on to the report, even though it thoroughly reflected the many concerns and issues he had brought up regarding body-worn cameras. As the committee was so close to wrapping up its thorough and very objective document to pass on to the Common Council, this individual resigned from the committee in pretty dramatic fashion on January 15, 2021. In my opinion, he seemed

unable to see this issue outside of his own bias and when the committee seemed to be moving forward with the report, he moved on in an attempt to discredit it.

I urge you to take a careful look at this long and detailed report. Look at the time, work, and objectivity that went into this document. During the meeting where the final vote was to take place, I honestly had no idea how the committee would vote. I know how I would have voted had I been on the committee. I am in support of body-worn cameras for our MPD officers at this point of time, with all the safeguards and accountability we have. I think we are behind the times on this, and now the report seems to be all tied up, bouncing from committee to committee, as time moves on. I urge you to watch the publicly available video of their meetings, in particular the meeting on January 15, 2021, linked below. Starting around 15:00 into the video, this member shares his concerns, followed by the thoughts and perspectives of everyone else on the committee. All of the other members, on both sides of the issue, vouched for the quality and objectivity of the report and were in favor of moving forward with it.

<https://media.cityofmadison.com/Mediasite/Showcase/madison-city-channel/Presentation/1c9c0348f4474ac4bf9feb09c800f71f1d>

Another noteworthy section to watch, starting at 00:04:40 in the video linked below (from the January 19, 2021 meeting) is Veronica Figueroa, who was the sole vote against recommending body cameras, as she makes the case for the report and voices her frustration at this member's attempted discrediting of the report. She even refers to it as bullying. Although she opposes body cameras, she strongly vouches for the credibility of the report.

<https://media.cityofmadison.com/Mediasite/Showcase/madison-city-channel/Presentation/f8f6529e17c74625abc24070db4ac3881d>

The meeting back on December 17 shows additional evidence of how this report was slandered by this same committee member, starting at 58:55 in the video linked below:

<https://media.cityofmadison.com/Mediasite/Showcase/madison-city-channel/Presentation/da7600b5a22b42b6b1d2e08cd51b9cf81d>

Lastly, the vote for or against recommending body-worn cameras took place on January 22, 2021. You can hear each member's well-thought out conclusions starting at 2:10:25 in the video linked below.

<https://media.cityofmadison.com/Mediasite/Showcase/madison-city-channel/Presentation/60de1b0103634db2a8dea7c7ccb119431d>

Thank you for taking a close look at this report as you move forward with your next steps on the Body-Worn Camera program we so desperately need. Please move this along so that we can soon equip every MPD officer with a body-worn camera to help provide accountability and transparency for all and to provide crucial, objective evidence

to the Police Civilian Oversight Board and the Independent Monitor as they do their work. In my opinion, there is no time to waste.

I am happy to answer any questions about my experience observing these meetings as a community member, please feel free to contact me any time.

Thank you for your consideration,
Bonnie Roe
District 10
(608) 239-1748