



---

## Community Advisory Committee on Law Enforcement Oversight

November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Nick Bowman  
Principal Legislative Analyst  
King County Council  
516 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Suite 1200  
Seattle, WA 98104

Thank you again for reaching out earlier regarding the body-worn and dashboard camera policy.

CACLEO would like to highlight two things for the Council: First, we believe that until the body-worn and vehicle dashboard cameras policy (“police cameras”) is finalized and reviewed by independent community groups, releasing any funds would be a mistake. Second, a funding increase such as this should be matched with equal or more significant funding for alternatives to traditional law enforcement.

Since the most recent proposal for police cameras was introduced, no meetings have been held to gather input from the community that is not hand-picked by the sheriff's department. CACLEO -- the organization created to advise the King County Sheriff's Office and the King County Council on matters of equity and social justice related to law enforcement and on systemic problems and opportunities for improvement within the Sheriff's Office -- has not been given updates to the policy as it stands or how it has been changed, and it stands true that the community is also in the dark. Implementing a policy meant to increase transparency in the community becomes less impactful if deciding how the policy will be finalized and adopted is shrouded in secrecy without any meaningful consideration of the opinions of those most likely to be impacted by the policy. Accordingly, we strongly recommend a robust and thorough Council review of community input before implementing the policy.

Additionally, we remain concerned about KCSO's and the Council's lack of responsiveness to CACLEO on this topic. Since our initial memo to the Council and the Sheriff in November 2020, CACLEO has yet to receive a response to our inquiries regarding the issues outlined in the initial policy of body-worn and vehicle dashboard cameras. Namely, our significant concerns with the problems associated with an underdeveloped and vague “Failure to Activate,” which only notes a possibility of discipline in the instances of willfully shutting off police cameras. The language in the “Subjective Standards” section raised serious questions related to public safety because they lack misconduct review standards and assurances that civil liberties are not infringed upon. It is now completely removed from the report given to the council to review the pilot program. Any program implemented without a standard of care that prioritizes the protection

of community members first will demoralize public trust, the county's commitment to transparency, and the program's purpose.

Moreover, the program's initial \$5 million request does not include the significant follow-up funding request for video and data storage and management. We believe Council should be looking for alternatives to policing to fund community programs that proactively support solving social issues resulting from the inequalities that place our community members in the criminal legal system.

The Councils' commitment to oversight and public safety has not been overlooked. We have seen this effort not to repeat the cycle of historical issues in the appointment process and funding for restorative justice. But police cameras are not a remedy or solution for all difficulties faced within police accountability or police-community relations. There may be competing community interests that we hope Council considers.

Sincerely,

Community Advisory Committee for Law Enforcement Oversight:

Abiel Woldu, Chair

Nick Allen

Mark Toner

Vicente Omar Barraza

Steve Miller

Daniel Martin

Ruby Welloffman