

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

[About Shakopee](#) | [Calendar](#) | [News](#) | [City Code](#) | [Community Center](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Search...

SHAKOPEE

MINNESOTA

[CONNECT WITH US](#) | [LIVING HERE](#) | [RECREATION](#) | [BUSINESS](#) | [PUBLIC SAFETY](#)

[Connect with Us](#) > [Participate](#)

Shakopee Pulse

Font Size: [+](#) [-](#) [+](#) [Share & Bookmark](#) [Feedback](#) [Print](#)



Welcome to Shakopee Pulse! We invite you to share your feedback and input on current city initiatives, such as budget, development and more. Weigh in through polls and online forums. Feedback will be shared with city leaders.

You must have a website account to participate in the discussion. [Create or sign into your account.](#)

Body Worn Cameras

In 2016, the Shakopee Police Department received a \$60,000 body worn camera grant from the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance. The grant will help the department fund 50 body cameras and accessories, as well as necessary server storage equipment.

As part of the grant, the city must develop a body worn camera policy. The department is currently seeking community input on its proposed policy (see below). We'd love to hear your thoughts, concerns or ideas. Feedback will be considered as we finalize our draft policy.

[City of Shakopee Body Worn Camera Policy - Draft \[PDF\]](#)

[Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule \[PDF\]](#)



Subscribe Today!

[SUBSCRIBE TO TOPIC](#)

[Create an Account](#)

Timeline

- ☒ Upcoming
- ☒ Currently Open
- ☐ **3 Closed**

The deadline to participate has passed. To follow updates, be sure to subscribe to the topic.

Public Comments

LM

Larry Moody • 1 week ago

I believe the use of body-worn cameras is a good thing. I hope and believe it will minimize the problems of "he said, she said" types of accusations. Minimizing these along with quickly and accurately resolving them will be a significant return on investment, in addition to their evidentiary and training value.

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

Public Comments

LM

Larry Moody • 1 week ago

I believe the use of body-worn cameras is a good thing. I hope and believe it will minimize the problems of "he said, she said" types of accusations. Minimizing these along with quickly and accurately resolving them will be a significant return on investment, in addition to their evidentiary and training value.

And now my comments and suggestions regarding the Policy:

In the Definitions section, F. Adversarial... I STRONGLY object to assuming any and every time a citizen records an interaction that the encounter is automatically deemed adversarial. Why? Since more and more people have dashcams that record continuously, is it to be assumed that every encounter is adversarial? It should not be thusly assumed. THIS PORTION OF SECTION "F" NEEDS TO BE REWRITTEN!

General Guidelines for Recording section, C. Needs some additional language to the effect of at least acknowledging that: "Citizens have no affirmative duty or obligation to inform an officer that he/she is being recorded." ...If it's fair for one, it's fair for the other. Fairness for everyone, officer and citizen alike, should be a societal goal, a goal of the City, and a goal of the Department.

• 1 reply

CR

Craig Robson Mod  **Larry Moody** • 3 days ago

Larry

Sorry it took so long to get back to you on your comments. It has been my experience that the overwhelming majority of citizen contacts are/have been agreeable but on occasions we are involved in some heated situations. The court has recognized the rights of citizens to film police officers in public areas. As more technology enters our daily lives undoubtedly there will be more decisions, direction and guidance here. Our

daily lives undoubtedly there will be more decisions, direction and guidance here. Our objectives implementing a BWC program are to promote accountability, build on our strong community relationships, enhance safety for our officers and produce an over-all better police product/service.

Thank you for your comments. I plan on sharing all the public comments during our BWC training.

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

Public Comments

MC

Michael Cycles • 1 week ago

I support the use of BWC so long as the footage is properly stored & secured and non-essential footage is purged on a routine basis.

ER

Erin Raw • 3 weeks ago

What would be interesting and perhaps valuable is to know what other similarly sized cities have for policies if they've already introduced BWCs, and what the costs of storage are. We also seem to be adding time to the admin duties of an officer during shift. they are now responsible for verifying the BWC works and then for transferring and labeling video capture at the end. I assume the average "checking time" is less than 5 minutes, but how long to download/transfer/label? Downloads can take forever, depending on bandwidth...

Also - in checking a scorecard (<https://www.bwcorecard.org/>) there seems to be some differences between this policy and the scorecard. For example - this policy doesn't say that vulnerable individuals should have the right to not be recorded (our policy just says to label it after the fact). Another glaring one is that the scorecard says that the officers should not be able to watch the video before previewing. There are more discrepancies including not explicitly limiting the use of biometric technologies.

I don't know if the .org that i referenced should be the tried/true or not (they clearly have an agenda) but it seems like we should consider that. This one (<http://www.aele.org/iacp-bwc-mp.pdf>) which is from the IACP National Law Enforcement Policy center (funded by DOJ) says that officers viewing video before or after should be left up to the administrators. It also says that people should be (when possible) told they are being recorded... Food for thought

• [2 replies](#)

LM

Larry Moody → Erin Raw • 1 week ago

Erin,

On one of your points I disagree with you:

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

Public Comments

differences between this policy and the scorecard. For example - this policy doesn't say that vulnerable individuals should have the right to not be recorded (our policy just says to label it after the fact). Another glaring one is that the scorecard says that the officers should not be able to watch the video before previewing. There are more discrepancies including not explicitly limiting the use of biometric technologies.

I don't know if the .org that i referenced should be the tried/true or not (they clearly have an agenda) but it seems like we should consider that. This one (<http://www.aele.org/iacp-bwc-mp.pdf>) which is from the IACP National Law Enforcement Policy center (funded by DOJ) says that officers viewing video before or after should be left up to the administrators. It also says that people should be (when possible) told they are being recorded... Food for thought

• [2 replies](#)

LM

Larry Moody  Erin Raw • 1 week ago

Erin,

On one of your points I disagree with you:

I, as an individual that falls into two separate categories of "vulnerable adult", do not see any reason why I should have the right to insist that an officer in the performance of his/her duties that she/he may not record our interactions. Conversely, I certainly hope they will record such.

CR

Craig Robson **Mod**  Erin Raw • 3 weeks ago

Erin

Thank you for your comments. If I was looking at the same thing that you were, the website was listing what different departments have in their policies. This is a little different than the scorecard that we received where we had to input our data. Some policy areas were mandatory and others were not. We covered all of the mandatory areas required by the DOJ and many of the non-mandatory areas too. Additionally we started writing our policy following the model policy from the League of Minnesota

Public Comments

website was listing what different departments have in their policies. This is a little different than the scorecard that we received where we had to input our data. Some policy areas were mandatory and others were not. We covered all of the mandatory areas required by the DOJ and many of the non-mandatory areas too. Additionally we started writing our policy following the model policy from the League of Minnesota Cities to make sure we were in compliance with state law.

Before starting our policy draft, we brought the Burnsville PD in to share their experiences. As part of our grant, two of our staff will attend a national conference on body cameras as well as a regional conference. We've also gone to many training sessions on the local level.

Regarding uploads/downloads and labeling files, we hope to have a upload/download that is automatic, like the one that we currently use in our squad car cameras. When the squad is in range, their footage uploads automatically. You are correct, officers will have another administrative duty and we want to make as streamline and simple as possible.

With regards to biometrics, our experience is that it is used in the redaction software. We've been told that it ensures that someone intended to be blurred from footage would not be lost if they left the frame and later returned. Biometrics would pick them up and continue to blur them out. We haven't finalized a vendor so we haven't finalized a redaction software. We've been told by a large department that they bypassed the biometrics in the redaction software because the manual version was easy to navigate and was much less expensive.

Finally if by vulnerable your talking about people in a compromised or embarrassing situation I can assure you this area will be covered in our training lesson plans. We want the camera to add value and not alienate people.

Again thank you for your comments

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

Public Comments

NR

Nate Rose • 3 weeks ago

I'm all for BWC use by the Shakopee Police. It creates more accountability and transparency which builds trust with the public.

The one question or feedback on the policy I have is that there is only the one small section about supervisory responsibility for the officers' use of the cameras. It would be great if there were additional details around how the expectations laid out for the officers on how and why they use the cameras will be monitored for compliance. For example, how will the supervisor know if the camera is used in each situation that is in the guidelines?

Thank you. This is a great thing for all Shakopee residents.

• 2 replies

CR

Craig Robson **Mod** → Nate Rose • 3 weeks ago

Nate

I wanted to make additional comments on your post. Officers using cameras will be required to tag or label their footage. Supervisors will review the footage to make sure that the footage is classified properly and that the cameras were operated in appropriate situations. In addition to policy directives, Minnesota law requires an independent audit of BWC footage. In developing our policy we were required to submit our policy to the Department of Justice for review and grading. The DOJ has a lot of mandatory language that we already had in our policy but there were some minor additions we had to make.

Thank you for your comments, I hope the additional information was helpful. If you have more questions you can send them to police@shakopeemn.gov

Craig Robson

JS

Joy Sutton **Mod** → Nate Rose • 3 weeks ago

Thank you for the feedback and support, Nate! Your suggestions regarding the supervisory responsibility for the officer's use of the body worn cameras will be given to the policy committee. Have a wonderful day!

Shakopee Pulse: Body Worn Cameras

<https://www.shakopeemn.gov/Home/Components/Topic/Topic/393/557>

Public Comments

KW

Kevin Wetherille • 3 weeks ago

I fully support the implementation of this program. I think the policy draft is excellent, though it may be prudent to define how long BWC data that has evidentiary value will be maintained. I see this policy references what appears to be a separate records retention policy, which may suffice, but it might help the public more to put that schedule into this policy explicitly, as opposed to by reference.

Kudos to Chief Tate and the Shakopee PD for being on the front lines of this type of program. I think most lawyers who have worked in criminal justice applaud the implementation of BWC's. Cities that have them have experienced far fewer court challenges to cases due to the clear nature of the evidence gathered by BWC's, just as we've seen for years with squad video.

Nice work.

• 2 replies

CR

Craig Robson Mod → Kevin Wetherille • 3 weeks ago

Thank you for your comments. We understand that the data retention schedule answers questions very broadly but because the retention rules are situational it is hard to avoid. In some cases the footage may have to be kept permanently (deaths & arsons) and in some situations the footage may be purged after a very short period of time (footage created when the camera is tested at the beginning of a shift). We are moving forward nicely with policy and product selection and will soon demo some of the systems. Again, thank you for your comments.

JS

Joy Sutton Mod → Kevin Wetherille • 3 weeks ago

Your feedback regarding having more definition on the longevity of BWC data is greatly appreciated, Kevin! It will be passed on to the policy committee. Thank you, too, for the kudos which will be passed on to Chief Tate and the Shakopee PD. Have a wonderful day!