










Possible Pros:

-  • **Increased transparency for law enforcement (Neutral to Likely)** - Residents are more comfortable having visibility into police work
-  • **Increased trust (Neutral)** - Residents may trust police more knowing that they are being held accountable
-  • **Increased accountability (Police) (Likely)** - Police who violate the law or abuse their authority will be more easily held accountable
- **Increased accountability (Bad Actors) (Very Likely)** - People who make false or exaggerated claims against police are more easily held accountable
- **Increased civility (Unlikely)** - If both parties know their actions are being recorded, they may be less likely to act poorly
-  • **Fewer resident complaints (Likely) – Reduces frivolous or exaggerated complaints**
- **Deaths at police hands (Unlikely)**
 - Justin Ready and Jacob Young from Arizona State University found that officers with body-worn cameras were more cautious in their actions and sensitive to possible scrutiny of video footage by their superiors
 - Barak Ariel and colleagues found that use-of-force incidents may be related to the discretion given to officers regarding when body-worn cameras are activated during officer-resident encounters
- **Quicker case resolution (Likely)** - Some studies have shown that citizens are less willing to go to court. Results in quicker filing decisions and more plea bargains
- **Training opportunities (Very likely)** - Other officers may be able to use body cam footage to learn from officer experiences and refine their techniques
- **Reduced court burden (Likely)** - Provides objective evidence that may help bring
- **Provides more evidence (Likely) – Provides additional evidence**

Possible Cons:

-  • **Decreased civility (Neutral to slightly likely)** - Some residents may become belligerent if informed they are being recorded
-  • **Decreased trust (Unlikely)** - Residents may perceive police as less trustworthy based on Body Camera presence and usage
-  • **Abuse of purpose (Neutral)** - As frontline users of the technology, police will quickly become experts on the body cameras selected. They may discover techniques that violate the objectiveness of the cameras; For example, erasing footage of a scene where they are at fault.
-  • **Selective Usage (Neutral) –** Without any guardrails in place, police may simply use body camera footage when it benefits them, and block access when it does not. Leaving the footage solely in the hands of police may create a conflict of interest
- **Resident intimidation (Neutral to likely)** - Some residents may feel fear due to the body camera recording them. This may lead them to act irregularly or drive them to not reach out to the police even when otherwise appropriate out of fear. It is possible that police might use the threat of recording to intimidate residents.
- **Perception Bias (Likely) –** Body cameras only show the perspective of the police wearing them, and may fail to capture critical context
-  • **Diminishing effect** - It is possible that while effective initially, body-worn cameras will have a less pronounced effect over time
- **Cost (Very Likely)** - Body cameras can be expensive to purchase and maintain.



- **Surveillance system (Neutral)** – Residents may feel that they have reduced privacy
- **Increased criminalization (Likely)** – Body cameras will lead to higher criminalization of groups. Two categories:

- **Increased criminalization**
- **Innocent people pleading out**



- **Decreased complaints (Likely)** – May discourage residents from making complaints against officers because



- **Facial Recognition Technology used against residents (Unlikely)** – Facial recognition technology may be utilized through the body camera in the future to locate residents