



---

**REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL**

**FROM: Dorothy Ann David, City Manager**

**DATE: July 22, 2016**

**SUBJECT: Champaign Police Body Camera and In-Car Video Purchase SS 2016-038**

**A. Introduction:** The purpose of this Study Session is to inform Council about body cameras and seek Council direction for the Champaign Police Department to purchase body cameras in conjunction with the scheduled replacement of its current in-car video system.

**B. Recommended Action:** The Administration recommends purchasing body cameras for police officers in addition to the scheduled upgrade of the current in-car video system.

**C. Prior Council Action:**

- On January 15, 2002, Council approved Council Bill 2002-011, which authorized the purchase of 36 in-car video cameras from the State Joint Purchasing Program. The cost for the initial purchase was \$129,707.80.
- Council approved Council Bill 2008-222 and 2008-223 on October 21, 2008, which authorized the purchase of video equipment, computers to support said equipment, and video equipment installation services for the Police Department, at a cost of \$274,846.
- In Council Bill 2016-107, Council approved the Budget for FY 16/17 on June 21, 2016, which included funding for one full-time evidence position at the Police Department to assist with video evidence, at a cost of \$71,327 (salary and benefits).

**D. Summary:**

- Body cameras may provide an increase in accountability and transparency, as well as possibly protect the public, City, and officers.
- The “Law Enforcement Officer-Worn Body Camera Act” (50 ILCS 706/10 et seq.), which became effective January 1, 2016, applies to any law enforcement agency which employs the use of body cameras, and provides minimum standards for written body camera policies. The Act would dictate many facets of the Department’s body camera program, including any necessary revisions to the current Mobile Video Recording Policy (See Attachment A).
- A body camera program would be an additional cost and require additional server storage.
- The current in-car video system is due for scheduled replacement.
- As part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) process for new in-car systems, the Department also tested body cameras.

## **E. Background:**

**1. Body Camera Technology.** There are several manufacturers of body cameras and the technology varies. Generally, body cameras are self-contained units that record audio and video. These devices can be attached to the officer's body by various mounting hardware or some can mount to eyeglasses. Many cameras can be started manually by the officer or set up to be triggered by an external source such as turning on a squad's emergency lights or the speed of a squad car. The recordings are stored on the device internally until they are downloaded via a secured wireless connection or a wired connection to a server. The recordings are then either stored on a local server or off-site on "cloud" storage. The recordings are then retrievable for court purposes, investigations, or other needs. The software available from most body camera companies allows a police agency to dictate various roles for users, permissions for users, and retention periods for recordings.

**2. Law Enforcement Officer - Worn Body Camera Act (50 ILCS 706/10 et seq).** In January 2016, a comprehensive new state law took effect, which included a section regulating the use of body cameras by police departments. It did not require that police departments purchase and use the cameras, but it did outline various requirements and regulations for departments that do have a body camera program. Some of those requirements and regulations are:

- Cameras must be capable of recording at least 30 seconds prior to camera activation (pre-record) and for a period of ten hours or more.
- Cameras must be turned on at all times when the officer is in uniform and is responding to calls for service or engaged in any on-duty law enforcement-related encounter or activity.
- If exigent circumstances prohibit the camera from being activated, the camera must be turned on as soon as possible.
- Once activated, the camera may be turned off at the request of the victim of a crime, a witness of a crime, or a community member who wishes to report a crime, or if the officer is interacting with a confidential informant. However, an officer may continue to record or resume recording if exigent circumstances exist or if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the witness, victim, or confidential informant has committed a crime or is in the process of committing a crime.
- The camera may be turned off in community caretaking functions, such as welfare checks. However, cameras must be turned on if the officer has reason to believe the person on whose behalf the officer is performing a community caretaking function has committed or is in the process of committing a crime
- Officers must provide notice of recording to any person if the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy; proof of notice must be evident in the recording.
- The recording officer and his or her supervisor may access and review recordings prior to completing incident reports and must disclose that review in the report.
- Recordings must be retained by the department on a recording medium for a period of 90 days and cannot be altered, destroyed, or erased prior to 90 days.
- Following the 90-day storage period, any and all body camera recordings must be destroyed unless they are flagged for any of the following reasons:
  - A formal or informal complaint has been filed.
  - The officer discharged his or her firearm or used force during the encounter.
  - Death or great bodily harm occurred to any person in the recording.

- A detention or arrest was made, excluding traffic stops, which resulted in only a minor traffic offense or business offense.
- The officer is the subject of an internal investigation or otherwise being investigated for possible misconduct.
- The video is determined to have evidentiary value in a criminal prosecution.
- The officer requests the video be flagged for official purposes related to his or her official duties.
- If a video is flagged for any of the above-mentioned reasons, it may not be altered or destroyed prior to two years after the recording was made.
- A supervisor may designate the recording for training purposes and retain the video.
- Recordings shall not be used to discipline officers unless:
  - A formal or informal complaint of misconduct has been made.
  - A use of force incident has occurred.
  - The encounter could result in a formal investigation under the Uniform Peace Officers’ Disciplinary Act.
  - As corroboration of other evidence of misconduct.
  - However, nothing shall prohibit a law enforcement officer from being subject to an action that does not amount to discipline.
- No officer may hinder or prohibit any person (not a law enforcement officer) from recording a law enforcement officer in the performance of his or her duties in a public place or when the officer has no reasonable expectation of privacy. The policy must specifically indicate the potential criminal penalties, as well as any departmental discipline, which may result from unlawful confiscation or destruction of the recording medium of a person who is not a law enforcement officer.
- Recordings are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) except that:
  - Any recording which is flagged due to the filing of a complaint, discharge of a firearm, use of force, arrest or detention, or resulting death or bodily harm shall be disclosed in accordance with FOIA.
  - If the subject of the encounter has a reasonable expectation of privacy at the time of the recording, any recording which is flagged due to the filing of a complaint, discharge of a firearm, use of force, arrest or detention, or resulting death or bodily harm, shall only be disclosed if the subject of the encounter is a victim or a witness, and the law enforcement agency obtains written permission from that subject or the subject’s legal representative. A subject of an encounter does not have a reasonable expectation of privacy if the subject was arrested as a result of the encounter.
- The department shall release any video requested by the subject of the encounter or that subject’s attorney, or the officer or his or her legal representative, in accordance with FOIA.
- Any recording disclosed under FOIA shall be redacted to remove identification of any person who appears on the recording and is not the officer, a subject of the encounter, or directly involved in the encounter.
- Nothing in the Act will require disclosure of any recording which would be otherwise exempt under FOIA.
- The department must provide an annual report to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board (ILETSB) on or before May first each year, which must include:
  - A brief overview of the makeup of the agency and the number of officers using body cameras.
  - The number of body cameras used by the agency.

- Any technical issues with the equipment and how the issues were remedied.
- A brief description of the review process used by supervisors.
- For each recording used in prosecutions of conservation, criminal, or traffic offenses or municipal ordinance violations:
  - The time, date, location, and precinct of the incident.
  - The offense charged and the date charges were filed.

The law also states that the ILETSB shall develop basic guidelines for the use of body cameras and those guidelines shall be the basis for the written policy governing body cameras. As of the writing of this memorandum, no such guidelines have been published.

### 3. Perceived Benefits of Body Camera Technology.

**a. Increased Transparency and Accountability.** Body cameras would increase the likelihood that officers' interactions with citizens are recorded. Right now, the in-car system's field of view is stationary and forward-facing. It captures what happens in front of the squad car. The audio recording from the officer's transmitter is synced to the video, but the transmitter's range is such that audio is often lost if the distance between the officer and the squad car is too great. An officer with an active body camera would have a recording of the incident with a field of view generally in front of the officer. As with any video recording device, the view can be obstructed by weather elements; lack of light; barriers in front of the officer; or, in the case of a physical struggle, the little to no separation between the officer and subject. The distance issue with the audio in the current system would be eliminated with body cameras, as audio would be recorded at the same time as video on the device. The recordings would be closer in proximity to the incident but will not always record everything an officer hears, or sees, or be a 100% accurate depiction of what the officer experienced.

**b. Improved Officer Behavior.** Two studies, discussed later, found a decrease in complaints against officers when the departments were using body cameras and one study, also discussed later, noted a decrease in use of force incidents. There are no clear scientific studies on the links between body cameras, complaints, or use of force, but proponents argue the use of body cameras has a positive impact. The belief is that officers are more attentive to detail and approved procedures when they know they are being recorded.

**c. Improved Citizen Behavior.** Proponents believe that when people know they are being recorded they tend to be more compliant and reasonable. Again, there has not been a scientific study on this claim, only anecdotal evidence that could help explain a reduction in citizen complaints and use of force.

**d. Expedited Resolution of Citizen Complaints.** Incidents that do generate citizen complaints are likely to be better documented by body camera video and audio. Such recordings could reduce the amount of time spent on investigations because of the potential for impartial evidence captured by the body camera.

**e. Evidence for Arrest and Prosecution.** A project in Plymouth, England, reported that incidents recorded on cameras were more likely to be resolved through guilty pleas than criminal trials. In Renfrewshire, Scotland, body-worn camera cases were 70% to 80% less

likely to go to trial. What benefit we might experience in Champaign will depend on the specific case and the evidentiary value of the recording.

**f. Opportunities for Police Training.** Videos are sometimes shared with officers who were not present during an incident to highlight effective communication or tactics, or to demonstrate areas of improvement.

**4. Potential Issues with Body Cameras.** Many of these issues are addressed in the Illinois Law Enforcement Officer-Worn Body Camera Act and will also be addressed in department policy.

**a. Citizen Privacy.** Critics of body-worn cameras are concerned about recording people in places where they have a reasonable expectation to privacy. Furthermore, some believe that citizens, especially those who wish to remain anonymous, will be less likely to speak with officers when they know the encounter is being recorded and can be viewed later by others. The reality is that body cameras often capture in real time the traumatic experiences of citizens who are victims of crimes, those who are involved in medical emergencies and accidents, or those who are being detained or arrested. Being recorded could magnify the emotional trauma they are already experiencing. Recording people in their homes is a sensitive subject and would be limited by Illinois statute. Additionally, State law has safeguards in place that allow for a victim or citizen to request that the camera be turned off as long as they are not suspected of committing a crime.

**b. Officers' Privacy.** Because cameras will be turned on only during law enforcement encounters, no video should capture an officer's private moments or private conversations.

**c. Substantial Financial, Resource, and Logistical Commitment.** The National Institute of Justice states this is one of the more important items for an agency to consider before purchasing body cameras. If body cameras were implemented at the Police Department, the number of physical recordings of each incident would double from just an in-car recording to an in-car recording and a body camera recording. Moreover, the resolution in today's in-car and body camera technology compared to that of the outdated in-car system is noticeably greater, which means more information is contained in a recording and must be stored. Therefore, it is estimated that if the in-car system is upgraded and body cameras are implemented, the Department's required server storage would triple, which comes at an increased cost.

It has been estimated that it takes five to ten hours to redact one hour of video. We do not know what impact video management will have, but other departments have reported that they have had to devote "considerable staff and resources" to manage video data, conduct video redaction, and coordinate with prosecutors.

**5. Body Camera Studies.** Several years ago, police agencies in various municipalities began testing and using body cameras. Several events in the last few years have spurred many conversations about body cameras and their benefits and limitations. There have been two noted studies of the technology in the United States.

**a. Rialto, California.** The first study was an evaluation by the Rialto (CA) Police Department from February 2012 to July 2013. Half of Rialto's 54 officers were randomly

assigned to wear a body camera. The study tested the impact of the cameras on citizen complaints and police use of force incidents, comparing officers who wore the cameras with officers who did not. The Rialto Police Department saw an 88% reduction in complaints, from 24 the year before the study to three during the study. Also, use of force incidents fell 60% from 61 to 25. The study does cite lingering questions regarding the behavior dynamics that may have contributed to the decline in use of force and complaints. For instance, were the declines in use of force incidents involving a body camera the result of officer behavior, citizen behavior, or some combination of the two?

**b. Mesa, Arizona.** A 2012 study conducted by the Mesa (AZ) Police Department assessed the impact of body cameras on officer behavior as measured through citizen complaints. During the first eight months of the evaluation there was a 60% decline in complaints against officers who were wearing the cameras compared to the same officers the year before, and 65% fewer complaints against officers who were wearing the cameras compared to the officers who were not wearing cameras.

**6. Current In-Car Video Technology.** The Department has had video cameras in squad cars since 1992. The current system, Panasonic Arbitrator, was installed in 2008. This permanently mounted video system also records audio from a wireless transmitter that the officers wear on their person. The system also records the rear seat area of the vehicle when subjects are transported in the squad car. Officers are required to record enforcement stops and other investigative activity including traffic stops, field interviews, and responses to requests for emergency service. These recordings are maintained on a City server. Recordings are retained depending on their use. For example, a recording that documents parking enforcement is retained for 90 days. A recording that is marked as part of a criminal arrest is retained for seven years. Recordings are used as evidence in the prosecution of traffic violations and criminal cases, during complaint and internal investigation proceedings, and for training purposes. These recordings are public records and subject to FOIA and state records acts.

The current in-car systems are past their five-year replacement schedule deadline. As part of our commitment to transparency and accountability, we wanted to research and test the best technology we could afford.

**7. Request for Proposals.** An RFP was prepared seeking qualified vendors to provide in-car audio/video systems, body cameras, and a digital asset management software system. The RFP was posted to the City's website on December 1, 2015, and proposals were due on January 11, 2016. The Department emailed the proposal packet to 48 vendors all of which requested the packet via the City's website. Seven vendors replied to the RFP and submitted proposals.

**8. Summary of Scope of Proposal.** The Scope of Proposal Summary described the main components of the RFP in which vendors were asked to submit proposals. Requirements to include in the proposals were:

- A five-year warranty for hardware and software.
- Thirty-five front-facing in-car video cameras and twenty-six rear-facing cameras for the back seat of squad cars.
- Ability of in-car cameras to activate by a variety of external triggers such as the use of emergency lights, speed, etc.
- Ability to wirelessly upload video from the in-car camera system into the digital asset management system.

- Ability to wirelessly upload body camera video into the digital asset management system.
- Video system software compatibility with squad car Windows laptop or tablet.
- Provide 125 body cameras.
- The body camera internal storage must be capable of recording a minimum of 10 hours of video.
- Body camera and in-car camera must have a pre-record option of at least 30 seconds prior to camera activation.
- Ability of body camera to activate the in-car camera system and vice versa.
- Provide solutions for a digital asset management software system for in-car video, body camera video, and other electronic evidence and documents.
- Storage solution for video could be cloud-based or locally-hosted storage.
- Software solution must have ability to provide an audit trail to determine who has opened, viewed, or copied specific videos.
- Ability to electronically share video files with State’s Attorney’s Office.
- Ability of software to integrate with the local Computer Aided Dispatch system and Records Management System.

**9. Proposals from Vendors.** Seven vendors responded with proposals. Four of those vendors provided multiple proposals. The proposals varied in cost depending on different storage options that included local storage servers versus cloud-based storage and the amount of cloud-based storage offered per officer. The following table illustrates the proposals submitted by each vendor:

| <b>Vendor</b>         | <b>Local Storage Option</b> | <b>Cloud Based Storage Option</b> | <b>Amount of Cloud Storage</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| CDS Office Technology | \$517,600                   | \$586,900                         | 60 GB per month/per user       |
| Coban                 | \$604,974                   | \$1,143.784                       | Not Stated in Proposal         |
| Digital Ally          | \$350,939                   | \$410,329                         | 600 GB per user per year       |
| Motorola              | N/A                         | \$1,031.283                       | 100 GB per user per year       |
| Utility, Inc.         | N/A                         | \$741,000                         | Unlimited                      |
| Taser-Axon            | N/A                         | \$593,067.02                      | 85GB per user per year         |
| Taser-Axon            | N/A                         | \$715,211.80                      | 100 GB per user per year       |
| Taser-Axon            | N/A                         | \$812,232.83                      | Unlimited                      |
| Watch Guard           | \$366,791                   | N/A                               | N/A                            |

After reviewing submitted proposals, the Police Department narrowed the list of companies to the four that best met the requirements of the RFP. Taser, CDS Office Technology (CDSOT), WatchGuard, and Coban were invited to give presentations on their specific proposals. In February 2016, each of those four vendors gave in-depth demonstrations of their products to members of the Police Department’s administration. Based on the capabilities of the complete systems compared to the requirements outlined in the RFP, staff narrowed the selection to two vendors: Taser and CDSOT. CDSOT is a distributor of the Panasonic Arbitrator video camera

system, which is the current in-car video system used by the Department. Both vendors were invited to conduct a six-week testing and evaluation process of their in-car camera, body camera, and digital asset management software system.

**10. Vendor Selection Process.** Eight police officers from across the four shifts were selected to participate in the testing and evaluation process, which lasted six weeks for each vendor. Taser and CDSOT installed in-car camera systems in two Department squad cars and provided body cameras to each of the eight officers to test. The officers provided constant feedback to command staff and completed system evaluation forms at the conclusion of the testing process. The table attached to this report illustrates a summary of the pros and cons of each system (See Attachment B).

At the conclusion of the testing and evaluation period, police command staff met and reviewed the results of the testing process. The Panasonic Arbitrator in-car, body-worn camera, and digital management system, with the local storage option, supplied by CDSOT was the system which best fit the needs of the Department based on feedback from the testing officers, the system's overall performance, and its compliance with the RFP requirements (See Attachment C). Panasonic's digital management system is expected to include basic redaction software by the end of 2016. The cost was a consideration as well. The Panasonic system cost less than the majority of the other vendors that responded. Also taken into consideration was that since 2008 CDSOT has been a good partner and has been responsive to the Department's needs.

**11. Equal Opportunity in Purchasing Ordinance.** CDSOT has complied with the City of Champaign Equal Opportunity in Purchasing Ordinance. CDSOT received an Annual Certificate of Compliance from the Champaign Community Relations Department on June 30, 2016. CDSOT employs 123 individuals: 33 white females, 86 white males, and 4 minority males.

**12. Funding.** \$384,525 of funding is currently available for this project. This consists of \$291,625 of Capital Equipment Replacement Funds (CERF) earmarked for the in-car video system replacement, \$42,000 of DUI equipment funds which have been set aside for this project, and \$50,900 of 2015 JAG Grant funds. The total purchase price for the project will be approximately \$550,000. The Police Department proposes using money from the Capital Equipment Replacement Fund Balance to cover the one-time funding need of approximately \$165,475 for the initial purchase. The DUI equipment funding and the 2015 JAG funding are currently included in the adopted budget expenditures.

The body cameras and in-car video cameras are expected to have a five-year life cycle, plus there is an anticipated annual recurring cost of \$7,175 for licensing and software renewal. Currently, there is \$58,325 of recurring funds included in the Police Department target budget that is transferred annually to CERF for the replacement of the in-car video system every five years. The Police Department's target budget is included in the General Fund. To fund the replacement of body cameras and the increased licensing and software fees, the Police Department's target budget will need to be increased by approximately \$51,675 recurring funding.

Upon Council's approval, a budget amendment will be included with the proposed contract to use funding from Capital Equipment Replacement Fund balance for the purchase and to increase the Police Department's target budget by moving funding from the General Fund's balance to cover the increased recurring costs.



**13. Next Steps.** If Council supports this proposal, the following steps will be necessary to accomplish the purchase of body cameras and new in-car systems:

**a. Budget Amendment.** A budget amendment will be included with the proposed contract to use funding from Capital Equipment Replacement Fund balance for the purchase and to increase the Police Department's target budget by moving funding from the General Fund balance to cover the increased recurring costs.

**b. Purchase.** The Administration will return to Council soon to seek approval of a Council Bill to purchase Panasonic body cameras and in-car systems from CDSOT. If that Council Bill is approved, installation of new in-car video cameras and the digital asset management system would occur within approximately three months. Panasonic is currently preparing for the release of upgrades to the body cameras, which will improve the battery life of the camera. This release is scheduled to occur in fall 2016, and staff intends to take delivery of the body cameras after the upgrades are complete. Also, since the completion of the testing process, Panasonic started production on a magnetic mount for the body cameras. This new mount will provide additional locations where the officer can wear the camera.

**c. Policy.** Modifications will be made to the Department's existing Mobile Video Recording policy (See Attachment A) to reflect the change in technology and upgrades of the in-car video system to include:

- When officers will be required to wear the cameras.
- When officers will turn on the cameras and when they will not.
- The situations in which the officer will be required to announce that the encounter is being recorded.
- Retention schedule.
- Evidence handling.
- Prohibition of officers being allowed to delete recordings.

Modifications to the existing policy will be reviewed by City Legal for compliance with federal, state, and local law.

**d. Training.** Before the body cameras can be deployed and the in-car system can be installed, personnel will need to be trained on both platforms and the new body camera policy. It is estimated that each officer will receive two hours of training on body cameras and one hour of training on the in-car system.

**F. Alternatives:**

1. Direct staff to prepare a Council Bill authorizing the purchase of Panasonic body cameras and in-car video cameras from CDSOT.
2. Do not direct staff to prepare a Council Bill authorizing the purchase as described, and provide further direction.

**G. Discussion of Alternatives:**

**Alternative 1** directs staff to prepare a Council Bill authorizing the purchase of Panasonic body cameras, in-car video cameras, and digital asset management system from CDSOT.

**a. Advantages**

- The addition of body cameras will provide better documentation and a more accurate record of interactions between officers and the public.
  - Body camera footage will be used to assist in the prosecution of criminal cases, prove or refute allegations of officer misconduct, and possibly improve accountability and trust between the Department and the community.
  - The new in-car systems will replace the outdated technology that is two years past its scheduled replacement.
  - Awards the contract for the purchase to a company that best meets the technology requirements of the Department and at a lower cost than other vendors.
  - Department personnel have been using the Panasonic Arbitrator system for almost eight years and are familiar with the system.
- Based on public comments there is community support for the purchase of body cameras.

**b. Disadvantages**

- Requires the expenditure of approximately \$550,000, which is approximately \$176,000 more than purchasing only the in-car video system.
- Requires additional work to handle the redaction of videos requested through FOIA.

**Alternative 2** allows Council to provide other direction as to how to proceed with the purchase of body camera and/or in-car video technology systems.

**a. Advantages**

- The Department could still obtain the necessary upgrade of outdated in-car systems in need of replacement separate from the purchase of body camera technology if so desired.
- The replacement of the in-car video system only would not require the additional expenditure of approximately \$176,000 to purchase the body cameras.
- Other advantages would depend on Council direction provided.

**b. Disadvantages**

- If the City does not proceed with the purchase of body camera technology, the Department and City would not be able to best document officer-citizen interactions.
- The Department and City might have one less tool to gather evidence to assist with the prosecution of criminal cases, internal investigations or the investigation of citizen complaints.
- The Department and City would be missing an opportunity to possibly increase accountability, transparency, and build trust with the community.

**H. Community Input:** During the spring and early summer of 2015, more than 175 citizens and 90 students attended a series of community meetings, which were hosted by the Police Department. During those dialogues, the Administration openly discussed the Department's intention to research and implement new squad car and/or body cameras. The Administration described the increased resources necessary to implement body cameras, especially in the

archival and retrieval of the projected increase of recorded video. Community members in attendance appeared to be largely supportive of the Department's efforts to pursue the implementation of body cameras. Also, during public comment portions of past Council meetings about other police-related topics, community members have suggested to Council that the City look into body cameras for officers in an effort to increase accountability, trust, and transparency, as well as build stronger relationships with its citizens. The public will have an additional opportunity to provide input during the Council study session.

**I. Budget Impact:** With Council's approval, funding for this project has been identified for the initial purchase through the Capital Equipment Replacement Fund, DUI equipment funds, and 2015 JAG funding. Also, General Fund support is recommended to cover the increase in the annual replacement costs. The specific funding strategy is outlined in the Funding section of this Council Bill. A budget amendment will be included with the contract approval to appropriate the funding in the Capital Equipment Replacement Fund and the General Fund for the initial purchase and annual recurring replacement needs.

**J. Staffing Impact:** The planned implementation of body cameras includes a body camera for all sworn officers. All officers, regardless of rank or assignment, will be expected to use the body camera when they are in uniform engaging in law enforcement activities, consistent with Illinois law. The implementation of body cameras in addition to the in-car video cameras will increase the amount of digital evidence that will need to be managed. In response to this, a full time Evidence Technician was added with the adoption of the FY 16/17 budget. This full time position was added at a cost of \$71,327 in salary and benefits. The primary responsibility of this full time position will be the management of digital evidence. Additionally, all sworn personnel at the Department will receive approximately two hours of on-duty training about the proper use of the body cameras and the body camera policy. Officers will also receive approximately one hour of training on the proper use of the new in-car systems. All command officers, evidence technicians, and the Department's Network Administrator will receive supplemental, on-duty training about the software, rights and permissions, and technical specifics of the system. The staffing impact regarding FOIA requests and redaction are unknown and dependent on the number and scope of requests.

Staff from the Police Department, City Legal, and Finance has worked an estimated 500 hours on the purchasing process for the in-car and body camera project.

Prepared by:

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

Nathan Rath  
Lieutenant

Anthony D. Cobb  
Chief of Police

Molly Talkington  
Financial Services  
Manager /  
Budget Officer

Attachments:

Attachment A - Current Mobile Video Recording Policy 41.11

Attachment B - In-Car, Body Camera, Digital Asset Management Pros and Cons

Attachment C - Request for Proposal

# CHAMPAIGN POLICE DEPARTMENT

## POLICY and PROCEDURE

POLICY NUMBER: 41.11

SUBJECT: MOBILE VIDEO RECORDING

EFFECTIVE DATE: 10/01/09  
REVISED DATE: 11/04/14

REFERENCE ILEAP: OPR.01.11

REFERENCE CALEA: 41.3.8

## INDEX AS:

- 41.11.1 IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEMS INSTALLATION
- 41.11.2 RESPONSIBILITIES
- 41.11.3 SITUATIONS FOR USE
- 41.11.4 ROTATION, SECURITY, and DETENTION

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for the use and operation of mobile video recording units.

## DEFINITIONS:

**Audio Recording:** Electronic recording of conversation or spoken words.

**Eavesdropping:** As outlined in 720 ILCS 5/14. Exceptions to the Eavesdropping statute are outlined in 720 ILCS 5/14-3, specifically in 720 ILCS 5/14-3(h)

**Inoperable:** The mobile video system is incapable of recording audio and video from the front (main) camera and the officer's transmitter.

**Mobile Video Recording System (MVR):** A departmentally provided video recording system mounted in a police vehicle.

**Operator:** An employee driving or otherwise occupying the squad with the mobile video system installed.

**Video Recording:** Electronic recording of visual images, with or without and audio component.

**Wireless Microphone:** The manufacturer's recommended microphone and antenna assembly, which is designed to be worn on the person of the officer utilizing the Mobile Video Recording System.

## POLICY:

**41.11.1 IN-CAR VIDEO SYSTEMS INSTALLATION**

- A. Installation and service of Mobile Video Recording Systems (MVR) will be in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Installation of the system will include linking brake applications and siren activation coding onto the video recording.

**41.11.2 RESPONSIBILITIES**

- A. Only officers properly trained in the operation of the Mobile Video Recording System (MVR) will operate

the system. Operation of the system will follow manufacturer's recommendations.

- B. At the beginning of each shift the driver of a vehicle equipped with a Mobile Video Recording System (MVR) will inspect the system to ensure that it is in proper operating condition. Inspection will consist of checking the audio and video components of the system and verifying that the correct time and date are displayed. Any damage, defect, or malfunction which cannot be fixed and renders the mobile video system inoperable will immediately be brought to the attention of a supervisor and documented through the completion of a maintenance request. The vehicle will be dead-lined and another vehicle will be assigned by the supervisor.

**41.11.3 SITUATIONS FOR USE**

- A. The Mobile Video Recording System will automatically turn on any time the squad's overhead lights are activated. The system can also be activated by manually turning on the transmitter.
- B. Officers shall activate both the audio and video components of their Mobile Video Recording System whenever an enforcement stop is conducted. An enforcement stop is defined as a non-consensual contact with an individual in relation to enforcement or investigative activity, including but not limited to traffic stops, "terry stops," pedestrian stops, field interviews, abandoned vehicle contacts, motorist assists, commercial motor vehicle stops, roadside safety checks, requests for identification, or responses to requests for emergency service.
  1. For primary officers, activation will occur prior to contact with the violator.
  2. For back-up or assisting officers, activation will begin prior to or upon arrival at the scene of the enforcement stop.
- C. In some circumstances it is not possible to capture video images of an incident due to conditions or the location of the camera. However, the audio recording may be valuable and is subject to the same activation requirements as described above.
- D. An officer may activate the audio and/or video components of the Mobile Video Recording System any other time the officer believes it would be appropriate or valuable to document an incident.
- E. In all circumstances, once an officer's audio and/or video components have been activated the officer shall not cease recording until a reasonable and

prudent person would consider the stop or contact to be completed.

- F. Any officer driving a police vehicle which is equipped with a mobile video recorder and a rear seat camera and who is responsible for transporting a prisoner, or other subject lawfully taken into custody, shall audio and video record the transport. This will be accomplished by activating both the rear seat camera and the rear seat microphone ("Audio 2").
- G. Any officer driving a police vehicle which is equipped with a mobile video recorder and a rear seat camera and who is responsible for the transportation of any person not in police custody shall in all cases record the transport in the same manner as described above.

**41.11.4 STORAGE DEVICE ROTATION, SECURITY, and RETENTION**

- A. Whenever an incident is recorded, the officer making the recording shall "classify" the stop. The classification shall include at least the event number from the CAD system. When a file number is drawn that file number will also be referenced in the note field. The name and date of birth of the subject/arrestee and other pertinent information may be included at the officer's discretion.
- B. Officers are responsible for classifying all recordings made prior to the end of their tour of duty.
- C. Whenever an incident is recorded and a report is written regarding that incident, the recording shall be noted in the corresponding police report.
- D. Whenever an incident is recorded and the recording is entered as evidence, the officer making the recording will complete an evidence tag for the recording and submit it into evidence.
- E. The Mobile Video Recording System will wirelessly download digital recordings onto the server through the Mobile Data Computer, when it is on, each time a squad car returns to the police department.
- F. Recordings will be maintained on a time schedule which has been approved by the Chief of Police.
- G. Only the Chief of Police may authorize the deletion of digital recordings from the system.

ISSUING AUTHORITY



Anthony D. Cobb  
Chief of Police  
Champaign Police Department

## In-Car, Body Camera, Digital Asset Management Pros and Cons

### Taser

| Pros  | Cons   |
|---|--|
| Quality of video.   | LED lights on body cameras were too bright and could not be adjusted.  |
| Number of mounting options for body cameras.                                | Not able to charge body cameras in the squad car.  |
| Ease of Use.  | Body camera video did not integrate during the upload process with the in-car video.   |
| Ability to share video with State's Attorney's Office via a secure website. | Body camera and in-car system did not interface with the squad car computer.   |
| Ability to activate the in-car camera from the body camera and vice versa.  | No option for the wireless uploading of body cameras video.  |
|   | No zoom feature on the in-car camera system.   |
|   | In-car system relied on the body camera for audio recording. If body camera broke, the squad car system recording had no audio recording.                    |
|   | When a recording was longer than 30 minutes, the software separated the video into 30-minute segments, and officers had to classify each segment separately. |
|   | In-car video system was not secure in the squad and could easily be removed.   |
|   | Required separate IPod device to classify body camera video and in-car video.  |
|   | A few body camera videos had audio recording malfunctions and were barely audible.   |

### CDSOT (Panasonic)

| Pros   | Cons   |
|--|--|
| Excellent video and audio quality.   | Battery life of body camera - did have the ability to charge while in squad car.   |
| Ability to upload in-car and body camera video wirelessly.   | Mounting options for body camera were limited.   |
| Officer familiarity with the Panasonic in-car camera and software, which will reduce learning curve of a new system. | Record button on body camera was sensitive, which may result in inadvertent recordings. (This was caused by the available mounts at the time. The addition of a magnetic mount discussed later would likely solve this issue.) |
| In-car and body camera integrated with each other through squad car computer   |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| software.  |  |
| In-car system did not rely on body camera for audio recording. In-car had separate wireless microphone, which meant squad car can be used without a body camera. |  |
| Ability to sync two body cameras and two wireless microphones with the in-car system.  |  |
| Ability to activate the in-car camera from the body camera and vice versa.   |  |
| Ability to share videos with State's Attorney's Office in a non-proprietary format.  |  |



## **Request for Proposal**

The City of Champaign is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to provide in-car audio/video cameras, body worn cameras and a Digital Asset Management software system for the Champaign Police Department.

Request for Proposal Date: December 1, 2015

Proposal Due Date: January 11, 2016



## **Table of Contents**

- Section 1 – Request for Proposal
- Section 2 – Background Information
- Section 3 – In-Car Video Camera Specifications
- Section 4 – Body Worn Camera Specifications
- Section 5 – Digital Asset Management Software  
Specifications
- Section 6 – Technical Specifications



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Proposals for the following item(s) or service are sought:

The City is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to provide in-car audio/video cameras, body worn cameras and a Digital Asset Management software system for the Champaign Police Department.

Requesting Department:

Champaign Police Department  
Attention: Lt. Jim Clark  
82 E. University Ave  
Champaign, IL 61820  
(217) 403-7040

Date of Request:

December 1, 2015

**The original plus two (2) copies of your proposal(s) MUST be submitted to the Requesting Department at or before the date and time specified below to receive full consideration:**

**PROPOSAL DUE DATE: January 11, 2016**  
**PROPOSAL DUE TIME: 5:00 PM PREVAILING TIME**

All proposals submitted in response to this Request shall be irrevocable for a period of One Hundred Twenty (120) days after the Proposal due date and may not be withdrawn by the Vendor during this period. After such time has elapsed, the Vendor may withdraw the proposal if it has not been selected prior to the request to withdraw. Such withdrawal shall be requested in writing.

**The City reserves the right to waive technicalities or to accept or reject any proposal or combination of proposals based upon the City's determination of its best interest.**

## SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION

### **1.1 Standard Terminology**

The term "City" refers to the City of Champaign, except that when a Request is issued by Metcad or the Champaign Public Library, it shall mean "City of Champaign on behalf of" the relevant agency. A prospective Contracting Agency will be referred to as the "Vendor" or "Contractor". "Proposal" shall refer to all proposals, quotes, and/or qualifications submitted in response to this Request.

### **1.2 Vendor Questions**

ALL questions pertaining to this Request (RFP or RFQ) must be submitted in writing by December 18, 2015 to:

Jim Clark  
Lieutenant  
City of Champaign  
82 E. University Ave.  
Champaign, IL 61820  
Facsimile: 217-403-6924  
Email: Jim.Clark@ci.champaign.il.us

Vendors are prohibited from contacting staff of the City of Champaign regarding this Request except as specifically set forth herein. Failure to comply with this provision may result in rejection of any or all proposals.

### **1.3 General Instructions**

- A. All proposals should follow the format described in this Section and in "Content and Format" Section of this Request. Vendor shall provide information requested by this Request in a direct and concise manner. Responses shall refer directly to section numbers in this Request and meet or exceed the requirements as described.
- B. The requirements stated herein are mandatory unless stated otherwise. It should be understood that failure to respond to a specific requirement may be the basis for eliminating a Vendor from consideration during comparative evaluation of proposals.
- C. The City of Champaign reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals, or portions thereof.
- D. When a package proposal is made for a package price, the package price shall be taken to include all items referenced in the package.
- E. The Vendor may submit multiple proposals involving various methods of meeting proposal objectives. However, each submitted proposal shall be complete in every respect and marked as Proposal No. 1, No. 2, etc. on the cover page.

- F. Subsequent to receipt of proposals, the City or its authorized representative may require the Vendor to make oral presentations or to respond to telephone calls or clarify its Proposal.
- G. Section and subsection numbering should be in a consistent format using the numbers indicated in the "Content and Format" section of the Request and beginning each section on a new page.

#### **1.4 Content and Format**

An original plus the required number of copies of the proposal shall be submitted along with all the required documentation. The original and copies of the proposal shall be packaged separately and securely bound and sealed. Each shall show the name and address of the Vendor submitting the proposal on the front cover.

Proposals should include the following in the order listed. Each section should be labeled.

**Section 1. Vendor Information:**

- (A) Name, address, phone number, email and website of the Vendor;
- (B) Name of the contact person for the Vendor;
- (C) A brief company profile describing the chain of command for each person assigned to the project. Document the availability of all persons assigned to the project and whether the Vendor has sufficient resources to complete the project within the City's time constraints.
- (D) A Statement of Qualifications, including a narrative or other statement by the firm of its qualifications for the proposed project.

**Section 2. References:**

List of three (3) references that may be contacted. Include the name, address, phone number, website and a contact person for each reference.

**Section 3. Acknowledgments:**

Acknowledgment of any response to questions or addenda sent by the City.

**Section 4. Proposal Information:**

- (A) Address each and every requirement listed in the Specifications by providing:
  - (i) An overview of the proposal
  - (ii) Detailed technical response
  - (iii) Detailed costs
- (B) Proposal Form(s) if provided by the City.

**Section 5. Contract Documents:**

The selected Vendor will be required to execute a contract with the City in substantially the form provided. The person or persons signing on behalf of the selected Vendor must be authorized by said Vendor to sign such a contract. If the person signing for the Vendor is not a corporate officer in the case of a corporation, a partner in the case of a partnership, or a member in the case of an LLC, then the Vendor shall provide documentation of that person's authority to execute the contract on behalf of the Vendor. Acceptable documentation of said authority shall include a resolution adopted by the board of the business entity in question or bylaws of that entity granting said authority, or a cover letter signed by a corporate officer, a partner or a member as the case may be, granting said authority.

A full and valid complement of all standard Vendor warranties should be included. The contract documents shall incorporate all requirements required in this Request and all elements of the Vendor's proposal. The vendor's contract shall state that in the event of a conflict between the requirements of this Request or the Vendor's contract, the Request requirements shall govern.

**Section 6. Additional Contract Documents:**

The Vendor shall submit the following additional documents with the Proposal:

- (A) Disclosure Affidavit
- (B) Affirmative Action Report Form OR Certificate from Community Relations Office [(217) 403-8830].
- (C) Dual Representation Affidavit - Not Necessary

**1.5 Proposal Guarantee (APPLICABLE TO THIS REQUEST)**

All proposals made in response to this Request shall be accompanied by a bank draft, cashier's check, letter of credit, certified check or proposal bond issued by a licensed surety equal to ten percent (10%) of the total value of the proposal to secure a proposal bond. Any check submitted to secure the proposal must be made out to the "City of Champaign". This security will be returned upon the signing of a contract with the selected Vendor, the withdrawal of this Request, or the withdrawal of a proposal as set forth by this Request. Failure of the selected Vendor to submit any required documents in the form and time required by the City shall constitute cause for the City to retain the sum posted, not as a penalty, but as liquidated damages. By submission of a proposal, the Vendor acknowledges the impracticability of calculating the actual damages which would be suffered by the City for its failure to comply with the Request and agrees that the sum posted is reasonable.

## **1.6 Evaluation Criteria**

The City will conduct an evaluation of the proposal(s) submitted. The evaluation will be based on at least the following criteria; however, not necessarily in the order provided or with equal weight given to each criterion.

The Vendor will be evaluated based on:

- A. Compliance with the Request requirements;
- B. Cost of the specified items or services; and
- C. Other criteria as set forth below:
  - (1) The ability, capacity, and skill of the Vendor to perform the contract or provide the service required;
  - (2) The capacity of the Vendor to perform the contract or provide the service promptly or within the time specified, without delay or interference;
  - (3) The character, integrity, reputation, judgment, experience and efficiency of the Vendor including but not limited to past performance record; default under previous contracts, whether or not such contracts were with the City; competency; and failure to pay or satisfactorily settle all bills due for labor and material on former contracts;
  - (4) The previous and existing compliance by the Vendor with laws and ordinances relating to the contract;
  - (5) The quality, availability and adaptability of the supplies, machinery, plant or other equipment or contractual services to the particular use required;
  - (6) The ability of the Vendor to provide future maintenance and service for the use of the subject of the contract, including guarantees;
  - (7) The sufficiency of the financial resources and financial ability of the Vendor to enter into and perform the contract or service;
  - (8) Whether the Vendor is entitled to Local Preference pursuant to Section 12.5-34 of the Champaign Municipal Code, 1985 as amended;
  - (9) Completion and approval of the EEO/AA paperwork.

## **1.7 Customer Service**

The City expects the Vendor to deliver a high level of customer service regarding the manufacture, delivery, and installation of any equipment and the provision of any service to the City, its employees and its customers.

## **1.8 Rights to Submitted Materials**

All proposals, responses, inquiries, or correspondence relating to or in reference to this Request, and all reports, charts, displays, and other documentation submitted by the

Vendor shall become the property of the City when received and shall not be returned to the Vendor. The City reserves the right to use the material or any ideas submitted in this proposal in response to the Request whether amended or not. Selection or rejection of any proposal does not affect this right.

### **1.9 Public Records and Requests for Confidential Treatment**

Proposals become the property of the City and, along with late submissions, will not be returned to the proposing party. Your proposal will be open to the public under the Illinois Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") (5 ILCS 140) and other applicable laws and rules, unless you request in your proposal that City treat certain information as exempt.

A request for confidential treatment will not supersede the City's legal obligations under FOIA. The City will not honor requests to exempt entire proposals, and it shall be your responsibility as the proposing party to show the specific grounds under FOIA or other law or rule that support exempt treatment. Regardless the application of any exemptions pursuant to FOIA or other law or rule, the City shall disclose the successful proposer's name, the substance of the proposal, and the price.

If you request exempt treatment of a portion(s) of your proposal, you must submit an additional copy of your proposal with such exempt information deleted. This copy must state the general nature of the material redacted and shall retain as much of the proposal as possible. You, the proposing party, shall be responsible for any costs associated with the City's defense of your request for exempt treatment. Further, you agree to allow the City to facilitate evaluation, or to respond to requests for public records. Additionally, you warrant that the copy or duplication of your proposal pursuant to a request for public records will not violate the rights of any third party.

### **1.10 Proprietary Information**

Any restrictions on the use of information contained within a proposal shall be clearly stated as such within the proposal. The City will only be able to comply with a request for confidentiality to the extent allowed by law.

### **1.11 Prevailing Wage Act – David-Bacon Act (NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS REQUEST)**

- A. This contract is subject to the Illinois Prevailing Wage Act (820 ILCS 130/1 et seq), as amended to date, unless superceded by the Davis-Bacon Act or otherwise stated. Pursuant to the Illinois Prevailing Wage Act, the City of Champaign has determined prevailing rates for various classifications of workers and the latest determination of these rates is included as part of the RFP documents. The Vendor shall pay its workers not less than the prevailing rates so determined and comply with the Act's requirements, including, but not limited to, the keeping of accurate records showing the names and occupation of all laborers, workers and mechanics employed on this contract. The records shall show the actual hourly wages paid to each such person. Should the rates change during the contract period, the Vendor shall pay its workers not less than the rates in effect.
- B. To the extent it is applicable, the Vendor shall comply with the Federal Davis-Bacon Act rather than the Illinois Prevailing Wage Act referred to above.

**1.12 Affirmative Action**

If this contract will be over \$17,500, the Vendor shall comply with the Equal Opportunity in Purchasing Ordinance of the City of Champaign (Section 12.5-65 of the Champaign Municipal Code, 1985, as amended). Pursuant to the Ordinance, the Vendor must have on file a Certificate of Approval or an Affirmative Action Form plus an approved Affirmative Action Plan before a Vendor can be selected. Inquiries concerning this requirement may be directed to the Community Relations Office, 102 N. Neil Street, Champaign, IL 61820 or by telephone at (217) 403-8830.

**1.13 Acceptance of Proposal Content**

The contents of the proposal or parts thereof selected by the City will be incorporated into the final Contract Documents to the extent they comply with this Request.

**1.14 Cost of the Vendor to Respond to Request**

The City is not responsible for any cost incurred by a Vendor in the process of responding to this Request or for any pre-contract costs incurred by any Vendor participating in the selection process.

**1.15 Public Advertising**

The Vendor is specifically denied the right to use the name of the City of Champaign for public advertising or reference in any form or medium without the express written permission of the City of Champaign.

**1.16 Termination**

The City reserves the right to terminate the selection process at any time, to reject any or all proposals and to award the contract in the best interest of the City of Champaign.

**1.17. Payment and Performance Bond (APPLICABLE TO THIS REQUEST)**

The selected Vendor will be required to furnish a Payment and Performance Bond if required by the attached Agreement within fourteen (14) days of being notified in writing of its selection. Vendors making proposals shall be familiar with the Performance Bond requirement contained in the contract documents.

---



## SECTION 2 – Project Background and RFP Process

### 2.1 – Request for Proposal

|                                |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Date of Issue:                 | December 1, 2015 |
| Request for Proposal Due Date: | January 11, 2016 |

| RFP Timetable                                       |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| Activity  | Due Date                     |
| Intent to Submit a Proposal                         | December 11, 2015            |
| Questions and Request for Clarification             | December 18, 2015            |
| Response to Questions and Request for Clarification | December 23, 2015            |
| Proposal  | January 11, 2016 5:00 PM CST |

### 2.2 – Scope of Project:

Through this RFP, the City expects to select a qualified vendor to supply the City of Champaign Police Department with in-car video cameras, body worn cameras and a backend data asset management software solution to manage all video evidence. The City desires a solution that is completely integrated, with all three components of the project operating seamlessly together.

### 2.3 – Background

The Champaign Police Department has utilized in-car video cameras for a number of years. Our current system has exceeded its service life and the City is looking to replace existing cameras with a new solution. The City has not previously utilized body worn cameras, but is now looking to equip each of our 125 sworn police officers with a body worn camera.

### 2.4 – Community Profile

#### 2.4.1 – City of Champaign:

The City of Champaign, Illinois covers approximately 22 square miles, has a population base of 85,000 citizens, and is located in East Central Illinois.

#### 2.4.2 – Champaign Police Department

The department has an authorized strength of 125 sworn police officers. The City realizes that different vendors license software in different ways. In an effort to assist vendors with providing accurate software license cost proposals, below is a breakdown of the department sworn officers.

| <b>Position</b>  | <b># of Sworn Officers</b> |
|--|----------------------------|
| Chief of Police  | 1                          |
| Deputy Chief of Police   | 2                          |
| Lieutenants  | 6                          |
| Investigation Division Sergeants   | 3                          |
| Investigation Division – Detectives<br>& Targeted Offender Unit Officers | 16                         |
| School Resource Officers   | 5                          |
| Administrative Sergeants   | 2                          |
| Patrol Sergeants   | 13                         |
| Patrol Officers  | 77                         |
| Total  | 125                        |

In addition, the department would require five (5) “view only” licenses for evidence and records personnel. These individuals would need the ability to access and copy in-car and body worn camera video for Freedom of Information Act requests and court purposes.

### **2.5 – Intention to Submit Proposal**

The City of Champaign requests that vendors acknowledge in writing or email their intent to submit a proposal for this RFP. The acknowledgement letter should identify the primary contact person, title, phone number and email, and must be received by the City on or before December 11, 2015. This will allow the City to respond to any questions received about the RFP to all vendors intending to submit a proposal, so that all potential vendors have the same information.

This acknowledgement should be sent to:

Lt. Jim Clark  
 Champaign Police Department  
 82 E. University Ave  
 Champaign, IL 61820  
 Fax: 217-403-6924  
 Email: [Jim.Clark@ci.champaign.il.us](mailto:Jim.Clark@ci.champaign.il.us)

The intention to submit proposal documents may be sent via email to meet the deadline; however the original proposal documents must be sent by mail or private carrier and received by the due date as outlined in section 2.1.

### **2.6 – Pre-Proposal Conference**

The City will not conduct a pre-proposal conference or meeting.

## **2.7 – Evaluation Process**

**2.7.1** – In addition to the requirements listed in Section 1.6, the City reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to invite any vendor submitting a proposal to participate in a field test of their proposed hardware and software solution. Vendor will provide hardware and software for testing and evaluation at no cost to the City.

**2.7.2** – Each vendor will be evaluated on the project lifecycle economics (costs and delivery of benefits) based on the one time startup cost, the annual operating cost, the five year total cost and an evaluation of the vendor's License Agreement and Maintenance Agreement. The City is not obligated to accept the lowest vendor bid proposal.

## **2.8 – Project Timeline**

**2.8.1** – Requests for Proposals are due on January 11, 2016 at 5:00 PM CST.

**2.8.2** – Once the police department evaluation team has selected a vendor, and a contract is awarded, the vendor will deliver all hardware and software within 90 days.

**2.8.3** – The City may elect to have their in-house Fleet Department install the in-car video cameras. If the City elects to have the vendor complete the installation of the in-car systems, it shall be completed within 30 days of the delivery equipment.

## **2.9 – Contract/Warranty Options**

### **2.9.1 – Contract**

The City desires to enter into a multi-year contract (5 years) for the hardware and software.

### **2.9.2 – Warranty**

Vendor should provide costs proposal for a 5-year warranty on all hardware.

## **2.10 – Configuration, Installation and Training**

**2.10.1** – The City expects the server and storage systems (cloud based or in-house storage) will be configured and all necessary software installed upon delivery.

**2.10.2** – The City desires the selected vendor provide a solution to transfer/migrate all of the existing squad car videos to the new server once installation and configuration is completed. The vendor should describe their solution to this issue within their proposal. The City is currently utilizing in-car cameras manufactured by Panasonic and the Arbitrator HD© back-end client software to manage video.

**2.10.3** – The selected vendor will provide system administrator level training to five employees of the Champaign Police Department. This training will take place at the Champaign Police Department.

**Section 3 – Specifications for the Champaign Police Department**  
**In-Car Video Camera System**

(Vendors must meet or exceed these requirements)

- 3.1 Introduction: The City is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to provide an In-Car video camera system for the Champaign Police Department. The City anticipates the purchase of approximately thirty-five (35) front facing in-car video cameras and twenty-six (26) rear facing cameras for the back seat of squad cars.
- 3.2 **In-Car Video Camera Specifications.**
- 3.2.1 Vendor should describe the in-car storage capacity of their system.
- 3.2.2 Ability for administrator to define camera resolution. Vendors should specify available camera resolutions.
- 3.2.3 Pre-Record capability of at least 30 seconds prior to camera activation.
- 3.2.4 Ability to date and time stamp video data.
- 3.2.5 Ability to automatically activate camera by a variety of external triggers. (i.e. Activation of emergency lights, speed triggers, vehicle crash, etc.) Vendor should specify number and type of external activation triggers available. Vendor should specify if the speed of vehicle, vehicle information and additional activation triggers are displayed on video on playback or when exported to another video file format.
- 3.2.6 Ability to wirelessly upload video from in-car camera system into the selected Data Asset Management system.
- 3.2.7 Ability to apply specific, searchable indexes (Classification tags, Case Number, etc.) to in-car video from squad car computer system. Vendor should specify how many user input fields are available on their system.
- 3.2.8 Video system software must be compatible with squad car laptop running Windows 7 or Windows tablet.
- 3.2.9 Officers must have the ability to view video in the squad car.
- 3.2.10 Ability to record at frame rate of 30 frames per second
- 3.2.11 Ability to seamlessly integrate in-car video data with body worn camera video data from the same incident.

3.2.12 Vendor should describe their horizontal and vertical Field of View of the in-car camera.

3.2.13 Ability to power video cameras from the squad car electrical system. Vendor should specify their systems capability to wirelessly upload video after the ignition to the squad car and/or computer have been shut off.

3.2.14 System must have wireless microphone, or other audio recording option, capable of recording an audio signal from the officer, that then becomes part of the permanent recording. Vendor should specify maximum distance transmitter will work away from squad car.

3.2.15 Vendor should specify operating frequency range of transmitters.

3.2.16 System must have the ability to record audio inside of squad car when officer is outside of the car.

3.2.17 Camera must be able to record in low-light or night conditions. Vendors should specify the lux rating of their camera.

3.2.18 City desires for camera system to have GPS capability.

3.2.19 Camera must have ability to record in color.

3.2.20 Front facing camera must have a visual indicator so officer can determine that camera is activated.

3.2.21 Vendor should specify the operating temperature range of the camera system.

### **3.3 Spare Equipment**

3.3.1 The vendor that is awarded the contract shall supply spare parts (cameras, mounts, transmitters, recorders, cables, etc.) equal to 10% of the units ordered at no cost to the City. These spare parts will be used to replace defective equipment so a squad car is not taken out of service for extended periods of time.

3.3.2 The equipment manufacturer of the awarded contract shall maintain a parts supply from which the City may order replacement parts after the expiration of the agreed upon warranty period.

## **Section 4 – Specifications for the Champaign Police Department**

### **Body Worn Camera (BWC)**

(Vendors must meet or exceed these requirements)

- 4.1 Introduction: The City is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to provide Body Worn Cameras to the sworn police officers of the Champaign Police Department. The City would anticipate the purchase of approximately 125 BWC's. The Police Department is not currently utilizing a BWC.
- 4.2 **Body Worn Camera (BWC) Specifications.**
  - 4.2.1 Minimum of 10-hours of continuous video and audio recording. This may be accomplished by use of second battery that end-user is able to exchange without use of tools.
  - 4.2.2 Internal storage device that is capable of recording a minimum of 10-hours of continuous video and audio.
  - 4.2.3 Pre-Record capability of at least 30 seconds prior to camera activation.
  - 4.2.4 All BWC's must have a unique ID registered to a specific user.
  - 4.2.5 Ability to date and time stamp video data
  - 4.2.6 The ability to restrict who can alter an officer's ID on the camera
  - 4.2.7 City desires a single touch button/switch on the BWC to activate record mode. Vendor should specify activation mode for their specific BWC.
  - 4.2.8 Ability for administrator to define camera resolution. Vendors should specify available camera resolutions.
  - 4.2.9 City desires the ability to wirelessly upload video from BWC into the Data Asset Management system
  - 4.2.10 City desires the ability to apply specific, searchable indexes (Classification tags, Case Number, etc) to BWC video in the field instead of uploading video at the station and then applying specific index tags. Vendor should describe their capability to achieve this goal.
  - 4.2.11 Ability of BWC, when activated, to activate in-car camera system and vice versa.
  - 4.2.12 Ability to record at frame rate of 30 frames per second.

4.2.13 Vendor should describe their horizontal and vertical Field of View of the BWC.

4.2.14 Ability of BWC to provide a signal to the user that camera is recording. Vendor should describe signaling method.

4.2.15 Ability of BWC to provide a low battery alert to user.

4.2.16 Ability to charge the BWC in the field in event of extended incident. This may be accomplished via a spare battery that is easily replaceable.

4.2.17 BWC should be weatherproof/weather resistant. Vendor should specify standards met or exceeded.

4.2.17 BWC should withstand a drop of at least 5 feet.

4.2.19 Ability of BWC to focus on objects from one foot away to infinity.

4.2.20 Ability of BWC to capture conversational speech at a distance of three feet without wind or excessive background noise.

4.2.21 Ability of the BWC to record in low light or night conditions. Vendor should specify the lux rating of the BWC.

4.2.22 Ability of BWC to prevent deletion or overwriting of data prior to it being uploaded to the Data Asset Management system.

4.2.23 Vendor should specify the operating temperature range of the BWC.

4.2.24 BWC should have multiple mounting options for wear by officers. Vendors should specify wear options.

4.2.25 The City desires the ability to view BWC in the field. Vendor should describe their solution to this issue.

#### **4.3 Spare Equipment**

4.3.1 The vendor that is awarded the contract shall supply spare BWC's equal to 10% of the units ordered at no cost to the City. These spare BWC's will be used to replace defective equipment so an officer is never without a BWC.

4.3.2 The equipment manufacturer of the awarded contract shall maintain a parts supply from which the City may order replacement parts for the BWC after the expiration of the agreed upon warranty period.



**Section 5 – Specifications for the Champaign Police Department**  
**Digital Asset Management System**

(Vendors must meet or exceed these requirements)

- 5.1 Introduction: The City is seeking proposals from qualified vendors to provide a digital asset management system to manage in-car video, body worn camera video, interview room video, digital photographs as well as other electronic formatted documents. The City is currently utilizing a wireless network to transfer and store in-car video evidence on onsite storage servers.
- 5.2 **Digital Asset Management System Specifications.**
- 5.2.1 Ideally the City would like a cloud based storage solution, but will consider other viable storage options. Solution must meet the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) requirements.
- 5.2.2 Ability to wirelessly upload video evidence to storage servers that requires minimal interaction from end users.
- 5.2.3 Ability to have multiple indexes in which data can be identified and searched. Software should allow for administrators to customize user fields and include an open note field that is searchable. (ie: Officer ID, Date and Time, Location, Case Number, classification, etc.)
- 5.2.4 Ability to prevent modification of original video and authenticate that data has not been altered.
- 5.2.5 Ability to categorize specific video evidence. (ie: DUI, Internal Investigation, Criminal Arrest, etc.) Vendor should specify number of categories available to be programmed.
- 5.2.6 Ability to set retention periods of video evidence based on policies of the department.
- 5.2.7 Ability to automatically delete/purge video files based on set retention requirements.
- 5.2.8 Ability to lock data files so only specific individuals can view video.
- 5.2.9 Software must have ability to provide an audit trail to determine who has opened, viewed, or copied a specific video.

- 5.2.10 Ability to define security by individual employee permissions or roles.
- 5.2.11 Ability of the system to manage other digital evidence. (ie: Digital photographs, interview room video files, surveillance video, electronic documents, etc.)
- 5.2.12 Ability to share digital files with prosecutors office or other third parties with proper authorization.
- 5.2.13 Ability to export video evidence in a non-proprietary, read-only file format that can be saved to a standard video format such as AVI, MPG, MOV, etc.
- 5.2.14 Ability to extract a portion of a complete video to create a smaller video clip.
- 5.2.15 System must provide the ability to link in-car video and body worn camera video from the same incident together so they are searchable via the same index markers.
- 5.2.16 City desires a system that is able to integrate with our Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system. The Cities dispatch agency currently utilizes the Tiburon CAD system. Vendor should describe their solution to this desired outcome.
- 5.2.17 City desires a system that has the capability to integrate with our local proprietary Records Management System (RMS). Vendor should describe their solution to this desired outcome.
- 5.2.18 Ability to transfer in-car video data files from our current system, Panasonic Arbitrator, into the new solution for archival purposes.
- 5.2.19 Ability to redact portions of video in order to release to non-law enforcement sources.
- 5.2.20 Customer Support: Customer Service support must be available to assist with all software issues within one business day. Vendor should describe customer support options.

## Section 6 – Technical Specifications

- 6.1 **Introduction:** This section of the document defines the technical requirements of the proposed system. Vendor should describe the minimum technical specifications for their proposed solution.
- 6.2 **Recommended Architecture:** Provide in the response to the RFP the following architecture drawings based on the vendor's recommended solution. Architecture should include how cameras upload video to the storage system, realizing that the City prefers a wireless based upload system.
- 6.2.1 – Support for server virtualization.
  - 6.2.2 If a cloud based solution, vendor should identify bandwidth requirements to view and upload video files.
  - 6.2.3 Identify file size for one (1) hour video for each available resolution.
  - 6.2.4 Vendor should describe data security for file transmission.
  - 6.2.5 Vendor should describe data encryption during storage.
  - 6.2.6 System should provide the architecture that is modular, scalable and extensible.
  - 6.2.7 Ability to reside on any standard hardware platform and operating system (not proprietary).
  - 6.2.8 Ability to operate on most current versions of internet browsers.
  - 6.2.9 Ability to interface with standard languages and protocols (not proprietary).
  - 6.2.10 Ability to remotely manage the system from a Vendor or City IT perspective using a web interface.
  - 6.2.11 The ability to provide a redundant data storage system with either an internal storage solution or a cloud based storage solution.
  - 6.2.12 The city desires the ability to authenticate users' credentials through Windows Active Directory. Vendor should specify if this is possible with their solution.
  - 6.2.13 Vendor should specify the Operating System required for their proposed solution.
  - 6.2.14 For an on-site storage solution proposal, the current version of Microsoft Windows server and client platform has to be supported.