

Henderson, Maria A.

From: Gerard, Jennie
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 1:09 PM
To: Henderson, Maria A.
Subject: FW: Meeting request re: police body cameras

Jennie Gerard, Chief of Staff
Oakland District 2 Councilmember Abel Guillen
510.238.7023 (direct)
510.238.7002 (District Office)

In the office Monday - Thursday

From: Gerard, Jennie
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 10:23 AM
To: Jason Overman
Subject: RE: Meeting request re: police body cameras

Hi Jason,

Probably not. How about the first week after Labor Day?

Jennie Gerard, Chief of Staff
Oakland District 2 Councilmember Abel Guillen
510.238.7023 (direct)
510.238.7002 (District Office)

In the office Monday - Thursday

From: Jason Overman [<mailto:overman@barcoast.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2015 10:12 AM
To: Gerard, Jennie
Cc: Guillen, Abel
Subject: RE: Meeting request re: police body cameras

Jennie: Thanks for your call yesterday. I'm looking, at this point, on bringing them to town on August 17, 18, or 19. Would the councilman have availability on any or all of those days? Thank you.

Jason Overman | Barbary Coast Consulting
MAIN (415) 364-0000 | MOBILE (510) 847-7622
barcoast.com | sfusualsuspects.com | [LinkedIn](#)
Public Relations | Strategic Communications | Outreach & Advocacy

On Jul 21, 2015, at 3:15PM PDT you originally sent the below email to "AGuillen@oaklandnet.com".
2days@fut.io was bcc'ed:

Councilmember Guillén:

Hope all is well, mister.

I am working with Taser International, an industry leader in public safety technology. Like its name suggests, it provides OPD with its less-lethal conducted electrical weapons – but they're also a leading manufacturer of police on-body cameras and cloud storage for the footage.

I wanted to see if I could schedule a time in early August when I could bring them in to talk with you about Oakland's current body camera platform and ways we could work together improve it. (Back in 2010, the City Council awarded a no-bid contract to a company whose cameras are now wearing out, with a storage solution that hasn't kept pace with technology and struggles to integrate with The Cloud).

Without going into too much detail here, they'd like an opportunity to tell Oakland's elected leaders, especially members of the Public Safety Committee, about their offering: better technology at a lower cost for body cameras. (Both around equipment and video storage.)

I trust that you'd find this possibility/opportunity compelling, and promise not to take more than 30 minutes-or-so of your time. (And in a pure coincidence of timing, the Public Safety Committee heard about the shortcomings of Oakland's current technology last week by way of a staff report and presentation from OPD – so hopefully your interest on this important topic has already been piqued.)

I'm happy to work with someone in your office on the particulars of scheduling a meeting. Thank you in advance.

Warmly,
Jason

Jason Overman | Barbary Coast Consulting
MAIN (415) 364-0000 | **MOBILE** (510) 847-7622
barcoast.com | sfusualsuspects.com | [LinkedIn](#)
Public Relations | Strategic Communications | Outreach & Advocacy

OAKLAND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

July 14, 2015
Staff Report

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Public Safety Committee accept: An Informational Report from the Oakland Police Department (OPD) in Response to the Rules Request from 100 Black Men of the Bay Area (Frank Tucker) Concerning the Sending of Law Enforcement Video, Dash Cams etc. to the Cloud in Real Time, to Avoid any Tampering of Evidence

OUTCOME

This report will help facilitate discussion between the Oakland Police Department and the Public Safety Committee regarding a Rules request from 100 Black Men of the Bay Area (Frank Tucker) concerning the sending of law enforcement video, dash cams etc. to the cloud in real time, to avoid any tampering of evidence.

BACKGROUND

At the April 16, 2015 Rules and Legislation Committee, the Committee approved for scheduling the 100 Black

Men of the Bay Area Inc.'s (100 Black Men) request for a council report. The City Administrator assigned many of the 100 Black Men requests to the Oakland Police Department (OPD) for further response. This report is responsive to the sixth request, which is to "receive an informational report and possible action adopting legislation to send law enforcement video, dash cams etc. to the cloud in real time, to avoid any tampering of evidence."

ANALYSIS

OPD has been using body-worn Portable Digital Recording Devices (PDRDs) since 2011. OPD was one of the first law enforcement agencies in California - and the United States - to equip officers with these devices. Use of PDRDs is an example of OPD leading the nation by bringing transparency to local law enforcement services. While the PDRD technology continues to improve, currently there are limitations which hinder OPD from taking the actions within this request.

The current body-worn Portable Digital Recording Device (PDRD) camera system does not allow for instant upload of video as it is recorded by officers. No video from body-worn cameras has ever been permanently lost.

Video has been temporarily lost was during a system upgrade and all video was recovered. The battery life of the PDRD is generally no more than four or five hours. The battery cannot be swapped in and out of the unit for charging. The entire unit must be charged.

Video recordings resulting from body-worn cameras are uploaded by each Officer from the camera to a centralized secure video management server. OPD Department General Order (DGO) 1-15.1 (Portable Video Management System, enacted 2014) V D states officers shall upload PDRD data files on a regular basis to ensure storage capacity is not exceeded. DGO I- 15.1 is provided in its entirety as Attachment A.

The video evidence is securely stored and catalogued with a digital signature process compliant with Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140-2 to verify the video has not been altered. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) issued the FIPS 140 Publication Series to coordinate the requirements and standards for cryptography modules that include both hardware and software components. Protection of a cryptographic module within a security system is necessary to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the information protected by the module. If the camera is lost or stolen, the proprietary security software will prevent unauthorized access to video evidence by anyone other than authorized members of OPD. Any data on a lost or stolen camera cannot be recovered unless the camera is recovered. Once the data upload is completed, only authorized OPD users with proper permissions and privileges have access to the video files.

As the current body worn cameras come wear out and require replacement in the next few years, OPD will explore opportunities to replace the current system with a system that instantly uploads video feeds from officers to secure storage. At present, there are two barriers to such a system. The first is financial: the cost of instantly uploading video would require a cellular subscription at an approximate cost of thirty dollars per camera per month. Equipping all 720 sergeants and officers in OPD with this technology would cost \$21,600 per month or \$259,200 per year. This is only the cost of instantly uploading the video. Additional costs include the new body worn cameras themselves and any additional hardware and software necessary for the new system. It is hoped that the cost of such technology will decrease as OPD's current cameras wear out and require replacement.

The second barrier to instant upload from body-worn video cameras is that of certifying any offsite storage (cloud) system as compliant with the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS). Such compliance is necessary to ensure that OPD has access to critical national law enforcement data. At this time, OPD is unaware of any offsite storage system that is certified as being compliant with the standards of CJIS. Such certification is necessary to ensure access to CJIS databases by OPD.

While instant uploading of video from body-worn cameras to the cloud is not practical at this time, there are

currently safeguards in place to ensure no unauthorized access to recordings. Included in these safeguards is an inability of field personnel to tamper with video. OPD will continue to explore instant video upload and offsite storage as the current devices are replaced.

COORDINATION

The Information Technology Department and Office of the City Attorney was consulted in preparation of this report.

COST SUMMARY

There are no costs associated with this report.

The costs of upgrading to an instant-upload video system from PDRDs could exceed an additional \$259,200 per year in the future.