



**MINUTES OF THE  
POLICE RISK MANGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
MAY 7, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

John Ruffcorn, City of Auburn  
Tim Albright, City of Elk Grove  
Jason Browning, City of Folsom  
Sharon Blackburn, City of Folsom  
Cynthia Renaud, City of Folsom

Allen Byers, City of Oroville  
Greg Bowman, City of Rio Vista  
Ron Lawrence, City of Rocklin  
Chad Butler, City of Rocklin  
Steve Rowe, Town of Paradise

**GUESTS & CONSULTANTS**

Marcus Beverly, Alliant Insurance Services  
Michelle Minnick, Alliant Insurance Services

Tom Kline, Bickmore Risk Services  
Jennifer Nogosek, York

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**C. CONSENT CALENDAR**

*A motion was made to approve the Agenda as posted.*

**MOTION:** Ron Lawrence

**SECOND:** Jason Browning

**MOTION CARRIED  
UNANIMOUSLY**

**D. RISK MANAGEMENT**

**\*NOTE:** At this point the PRMC requested a review of Item D.2. Legislative Update prior to discussing Item D.1. Body Camera Update as there is legislation that could potentially affect the use of body cameras.

**D2. Legislative Update**

Tom Kline from Bickmore Risk Services presented four Assembly Bills which are currently in the legislature and concern the use of body cameras.



### **Assembly Bill AB65 – Grants**

Assembly Bill 65 establishes the development of a grant program to make funds available to local law enforcement entities to purchase body-worn cameras and related data storage and equipment which Tom Kline noted could be a potential source of funding for the purchase of more body cameras. John Ruffcorn noted that the language of the bill indicates a state penalty in the amount of ten dollars for every ten dollars which indicates that every fine will be doubled (i.e. \$500 ticket then becomes a total of \$1,000 fine to comply with AB65).

### **Assembly Bill AB66 – Policy**

Assembly Bill 66 describes the policies and procedures that are required by law to be in place for Police, Law Enforcement Officials, and Peace Officers when using the body cameras. The bill establishes how the body cameras may be used and what uses are prevented. It was highlighted by Tom Kline that this bill allows a peace officer to review a body-worn camera video after first making a written statement.

### **Senate Bill SB175 – Policy**

Senate Bill 175 also addresses the policy and procedure regarding where the body cameras should be worn, where the video will be stored and who would have access to the video. Tom Kline indicated that in the event both AB 66 and SB 175 pass there will need to be some legal discussion as to the differences between the two pieces of legislation.

### **Assembly Bill AB1118 – Training**

Assembly Bill 1118 addresses training issues and establishes the Procedural Justice Task Force who would provide grant funding to local law enforcement agencies with a procedural justice training program that meet the requirements set forth in AD1118.

## **D1. Body Camera Update**

### **Loss Analysis**

The Committee was asked to share any anecdotal evidence for the VieVu Body Cameras. Steve Rowe mentioned that the Town of Paradise has recently moved to using the VieVu Body Cameras which provide good quality video but indicated that the higher resolution takes more memory space. He did note that the city is having significant issues with the clip of the body cameras breaking but other members indicated they are not having issues with the clips.

The Committee indicated broken clips, the camera cover closing to easily and the retention of video clips are the most common issues the members are experiencing. Some members indicated they have opted to not use High Definition video as a result of video storage issues and the increased cost of additional storage space quoted at approximately \$12,000 for 22 terabytes of storage. Tom Kline indicated that consideration should be given to purchasing more storage space prior to purchasing more body cameras. Jennifer Nogosek from York noted the statute of limitations in some cases is 2 years so it would be appropriate to address the long storage issues as claims can surface years after the video has been taken. Some members have opted to begin



flagging videos that could eventually lead to litigation (with the intention of retaining those videos as evidence to submit).

Jen Nogosek from York is looking into claims that are reported to determine if there has been an impact since the implementation of the VieVu Body Cameras on August 27, 2014. John Ruffcorn noted that the claims that are being prevented are not actually reported and suggested that member cities share with Jen Nogosek stories related to allegations that have been reported and subsequently went away after a review of the video- Jen agreed to keep record of these incidents to help with tracking the success of the body cameras. It was also mentioned that member cities are seeing a decrease in the number of complaints being filed as a result of having the body camera footage.

### **Budget for Body Cameras**

Tom Kline indicated that if the Committee is interested in purchasing more body cameras a discussion is necessary regarding how to fund the purchase. Tom Kline noted that Bickmore is actively monitoring the grant opportunities available to help with the purchase of additional body cameras.

John Ruffcorn indicated that storage of the videos is the most important issue at this time and Alliant was asked to research the cost of additional data storage so member cities will have additional storage space available rather than attempting to determine which claims would eventually become litigated- he noted this should be addressed prior to the purchase of additional body cameras.

### **D3. Round Table Discussion**

Tom Kline mentioned that there have been positive impacts captured on video as a result of body and dashboard cameras and provided two examples: one where an officer approached a vehicle that had been pulled over only to discover that the woman that was driving was choking on food and the officer preformed the Heimlich maneuver. Another example was an officer who pulled someone over for a traffic violation who discovered the man driving had suffered a heart attack and the officer proceeded with CPR- the man driving survived.

It was noted that the Committee discussions surrounding the use of body cameras has been primarily focused on the reduction of claims and complaints. However it should be noted that we can also capture positive events that are recorded to help counter the anti-police rhetoric that is in the social media at this time. IT was noted that there needs to be a coordinated effort about vocalizing the positive interactions that are a product of using body cameras. John Ruffcorn recommended a meeting with all Committees of NCCSIF to discuss the use of body cameras as the topic of body cameras relates to all members.

Elk Grove shared that they have been attempting to change the culture and shared a story of a police officer who was waived down in a parking lot and helped deliver a baby in the parking



lot- he noted that the delivery was all captured on the body camera and the story was highlighted on the Today Show.

The Committee was reminded that the next Police Risk Management Committee Meeting will take place on August 6, 2015 and members would be receiving a Save the Date email.

**D4. Critical Incident Command: Leading in the Edge of Chaos**

Folsom Police Chief Cynthia Renaud provided a presentation which included her experience working with law enforcement agencies regarding critical incident command.

**D. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING DATE:** June 18, 2015 in Rocklin, CA

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Michelle Pellegrino", is written over a horizontal line.

Michelle Pellegrino, Secretary

8/6/15

Date