

Fiscal Estimate - 2019 Session

Original
 Updated
 Corrected
 Supplemental

LRB Number **19-0396/3** Introduction Number **SB-050**

Description
 body cameras on law enforcement officers

Fiscal Effect

State:

No State Fiscal Effect
 Indeterminate

Increase Existing Appropriations
 Increase Existing Revenues
 Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget

Decrease Existing Appropriations
 Decrease Existing Revenues

 Yes No

Create New Appropriations
 Decrease Costs

Local:

No Local Government Costs
 Indeterminate

1. Increase Costs 3. Increase Revenue
 Permissive Mandatory
 Permissive Mandatory

2. Decrease Costs 4. Decrease Revenue
 Permissive Mandatory
 Permissive Mandatory

5. Types of Local Government Units Affected
 Towns Village Cities
 Counties Others UW System
 School Districts WTCS Districts Police

Fund Sources Affected **Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations**

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS

Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date
DOA/ Josh Bachert (608) 261-2292	Colleen Holtan (608) 266-1359	3/8/2019

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOA 3/8/2019

LRB Number	19-0396/3	Introduction Number	SB-050	Estimate Type	Original
Description body cameras on law enforcement officers					

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

2019 SB 50 is a bill that seeks to regulate the use of body cameras among all law enforcement agencies statewide. The goal of the proposed legislation is to create a uniform set of guidelines across all State law enforcement. Specifically, the bill would require all departments to develop a formal, written set of guidelines for the use of body cameras. Such written policies would need to address: the maintenance, storage, and use of cameras, the limitations imposed on when an officer may use a body camera, and limitations that may be applied to certain situations or persons that may be recorded on body cameras.

The bill creates a further set of guidelines about the storage and release of body camera data. The bill would require that all body camera data be retained for 120 days after the date of recording. The bill establishes exceptions to the storage rule: if the video is the subject of a criminal proceeding, if an encounter resulted in a death, if the video resulted in a custodial arrest, searches authorized during temporary questionings, or is the subject of a civil or administrative proceeding. The bill proposes to require that body camera data be open to inspection and copying under the Open Records Law, and it stipulates exceptions to data release.

At this time, the Department of Administration's Division of Capitol Police (DCP) currently does not utilize body cameras on its officers, and has no body cameras in Divisional supplies. The general nature of the type of interactions DCP has does not currently necessitate body cameras. Thus, DCP does not anticipate any future purchases of body cameras in the near or long term. DCP does not receive requests for such video data and therefore the proposed legislation is not anticipated to have any operational or fiscal affects on the DCP.

While DCP does not have any plans to purchase body cameras, if statutory changes required DCP's use of body cameras, a fiscal impact analysis would be conducted at that time.

The Division of Legal Services (DLS) handles legal matters for DOA and for the Enterprise. Currently, because DCP does not use body cameras on its police officers, DLS has no annual case requests of this type. Legal Services anticipates at this time that the change in the bill will have no operational impact on the Division.

The proposed legislative changes could result in financial and operational impacts on local law enforcement agencies. One national study has found that the cost of a police body camera is estimated at \$1,000 per unit, and that the cost of storing camera data is equal to approximately \$100 per month per unit. In larger municipalities comparable to the City of Milwaukee, nearly 10,000 hours of footage can be generated per week. In addition, the majority of body cameras on the market record in a resolution ranging from 720p to 1080p. At 1080p, this would require potentially twice the data storage capacity of a traditional security camera system. Police body cameras also record at a significantly higher frame rate than traditional security cameras which would generate a significantly higher amount of data. Law local enforcement with police body cameras may need to purchase new computer servers capable of storing the amounts of data generated.

In the event that DOJ or another State Agency with Law Enforcement personnel made changes to their data storage as a result of the proposed legislation, increased appropriation expenditure authority within the Division of Enterprise Technology Department of Administration may be required for agencies to be charged for the increased use of camera data storage. Since the impact to other agencies is not currently known, the need for additional DOA program revenue expenditure authority, if any, is indeterminate.

In addition, local units of government may also be impacted by the legal and administrative need to promulgate, administer and maintain policies and guidelines governing the use, maintenance, data storage, and data release of police body cameras. However, there may be cost savings associated with law enforcement's use of video

records of the incidents that officers encounter and for training on the response to and handling of incidents.

It is not currently known how, and to what extent, local law enforcement utilizes body cameras, nor is it known how their agency currently aligns with all proposed requirements. Therefore, the modifications required to operationally, legally and financially align with the proposed statutory requirements for body camera use, storage, and data retention and release are indeterminate. As such, the fiscal impact on local units of government is indeterminate at this time.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

At this time, given the amount and variability of factors affecting costs for state and local law enforcement agencies, the long range fiscal implications are indeterminate.