

**The Florida Senate**  
**BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

---

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Criminal Justice

---

BILL: SB 418

INTRODUCER: Senator Smith

SUBJECT: Law Enforcement Officer Body Cameras

DATE: January 29, 2016

REVISED: \_\_\_\_\_

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Erickson	Cannon	CJ	<b>Favorable</b>
2.			CA	
3.			FP	

---

**I. Summary:**

SB 418 creates s. 943.1715, F.S., pertaining to body cameras. The bill requires a law enforcement agency that authorizes its law enforcement officers to wear body cameras to establish policies and procedures addressing the proper use, maintenance, and storage of body cameras and the data recorded by body cameras. The bill specifies what must be included in those policies and procedures, such as general guidelines for the proper use, maintenance, and storage of body cameras and limitations on recording law enforcement-related encounters and activities.

The bill also requires these agencies to conduct training, retain audio and video data recorded by body cameras, and perform periodic review of practices.

The bill specifies that ch. 934, F.S. (interception of communications), does not apply to body camera recordings made by law enforcement agencies that elect to use body cameras.

**II. Present Situation:**

**Body-Worn Cameras**

Body-Worn Cameras (BWCs) or “body cameras” are currently being used or considered for use by many law enforcement agencies. BWCs are mobile audio and video devices worn by officers to record what they see and hear. They can record officer interactions that previously could only be captured by in-car or interrogation room camera systems.<sup>1</sup>

A 2014 recent study of BWCs noted some of the perceived benefits and perceived concerns and problems regarding their use:

---

<sup>1</sup> National Institute of Justice, A Primer on Body-Worn Cameras for Law Enforcement, p. 5 (September 2012), available at <https://www.justnet.org/pdf/00-Body-Worn-Cameras-508.pdf> (last visited on January 26, 2015).

***Perceived Benefits:***

- BWCs increase transparency and citizen views of police legitimacy;
- BWCs have a civilizing effect, resulting in improved behavior among both police officers and citizens;
- BWCs have evidentiary benefits that expedite resolution of citizen complaints or lawsuits and that improve evidence for arrest and prosecution; and
- BWCs provide opportunities for police training.<sup>2</sup>

***Perceived Concerns and Problems:***

- BWCs create concerns for citizen and police officer privacy;
- BWCs create concerns for officer health and safety;
- BWCs require investments in terms of training and policy development; and
- BWCs require substantial commitment of finances, resources, and logistics.<sup>3</sup>

Data provided by the Florida Police Chiefs Association in October of 2015 indicated that out of 301 police departments in Florida, 18 police departments used body cameras, and another 10 agencies had pilot body camera programs in place.<sup>4</sup>

Florida law does not currently require agencies to have policies in place that govern the use of such BWCs.

**2015 Legislation on Body Cameras**

During the 2015 Legislative Session, legislation was passed and signed into law that makes audio or video data recorded by a law enforcement body camera confidential and exempt.<sup>5</sup> The body camera recording is confidential and exempt if it is taken:

- Within the interior of a private residence;
- Within the interior of a facility that offers health care, mental health care, or social services; or
- In a place that a reasonable person would expect to be private.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> White, Michael D., 2014, *Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras Assessing the Evidence*, Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, p. 6-7 (2014), available at <https://ojpdiagnosticcenter.org/sites/default/files/spotlight/download/Police%20Officer%20Body-Worn%20Cameras.pdf> (last visited on January 26, 2015).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at pp. 7-9.

<sup>4</sup> Telephone communication with staff of the Florida Police Chief Association (FPCA) (January 27, 2015); Analysis of HB 93, House Appropriations Committee (January 21, 2016). Additionally, FPCA staff indicated that in 2015 that there were 262 police departments in Florida, as well as an additional 39 law enforcement agencies that serve university and college campuses and airports. FPCA staff informed Senate Criminal Justice staff that the 2015 data provided may not reflect current data (if collected) but FPCA staff does not believe that any changes in the 2015 data would alter the statement in this analysis that only a small number of Florida law enforcement agencies have elected to use body cameras. Data was also requested from the Florida Sheriffs Association but a response to this request was not received prior to completion of this analysis.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. 2015-41, L.O.F. Section 119.071(1), F.S. The exemption is also retroactive. Section 119.071(1)6., F.S. “Body camera” means a portable electronic recording device that is worn on a law enforcement officer’s body and that records audio and video data in the course of the officer performing his or her official duties and responsibilities. Section 119.071(1)1a., F.S.

<sup>6</sup> Section 119.071(1)2., F.S.

A body camera recording may be disclosed by a law enforcement agency:

- In furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities; or
- To another governmental agency in the furtherance of its official duties and responsibilities.<sup>7</sup>

A body camera recording, or a portion thereof, must be disclosed by a law enforcement agency:

- To a person recorded by a body camera; however, a law enforcement agency may disclose only those portions that are relevant to the person's presence in the recording;
- To the personal representative of a person recorded by a body camera; however, a law enforcement agency may disclose only those portions that are relevant to the represented person's presence in the recording;
- To a person not depicted in a body camera recording if the recording depicts a place in which the person lawfully resided, dwelled, or lodged at the time of the recording; however, a law enforcement agency may disclose only those portions that record the interior of such a place.
- Pursuant to a court order.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to any other grounds the court may consider in determining whether to order that a body camera recording be disclosed, the court must consider whether:

- Disclosure is necessary to advance a compelling interest;
- The recording contains information that is otherwise exempt or confidential and exempt under the law;
- The person requesting disclosure is seeking to obtain evidence to determine legal issues in a case in which the person is a party;
- Disclosure would reveal information regarding a person that is of a highly sensitive personal nature;
- Disclosure may harm the reputation or jeopardize the safety of a person depicted in the recording;
- Confidentiality is necessary to prevent a serious and imminent threat to the fair, impartial, and orderly administration of justice;
- The recording could be redacted to protect privacy interests; and
- There is good cause to disclose all or portions of a recording.<sup>9</sup>

A law enforcement agency must retain a body camera recording for at least 90 days.<sup>10</sup>

This exemption does not supersede any other public records exemption that existed before or is created after the effective date of this exemption. Those portions of a recording which are protected from disclosure by another public records exemption continue to be exempt or confidential and exempt.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Section 119.071(1)3., F.S.

<sup>8</sup> Section 119.071(1)4., F.S.

<sup>9</sup> Section 119.071(1)4.d., F.S.

<sup>10</sup> Section 119.071(1)5., F.S.

<sup>11</sup> Section 119.071(1)7. For example, an exemption that may apply to information in the recording is the exemption for active criminal intelligence information or active criminal investigative information (s. 119.071(2)(c)1., F.S.).

The General Records Schedule, issued by the Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services, establishes the requirements and timelines for agencies to maintain public records.<sup>12</sup> General Records Schedule GS2 governs the records maintenance and retention requirements for law enforcement, correctional facilities, and district medical examiners.<sup>13</sup> Schedule GS2 does not currently specify a retention requirement for video or audio recordings from body cameras.<sup>14</sup> However, a recording from a body camera could fall under existing areas of the retention schedule, depending on what is recorded. For example, if a body camera records a criminal incident, retention of the recording for most offenses is governed by Item # 129, Criminal Investigative Records, in the Retention Schedule, and must be retained for four anniversary years after the offense is committed.<sup>15</sup>

### **Interception of Communications**

Chapter 934, F.S., governs the security of various types of communications in the state, and limits the ability to intercept, monitor, and record such communications. Chapter 934, F.S., also provides for criminal penalties<sup>16</sup> and civil remedies<sup>17</sup> when communications are intercepted in violation of the chapter. For example, it is a third degree felony<sup>18</sup> to intentionally “intercept”<sup>19</sup> an “oral communication.”<sup>20</sup>

The statute provides for a number of exceptions to this general prohibition.<sup>21</sup> For example, it is lawful for:

- A law enforcement officer to intercept an oral communication if the officer is a party to the communication or one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to the interception and the purpose of the interception is to obtain evidence of a criminal act;<sup>22</sup> or
- A person to intercept an oral communication when all of the parties to the communication have given prior consent to the interception.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Rule 1B-24.003, F.A.C.

<sup>13</sup> Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services, General Records Schedule GS2 (2010).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, at p. 7.

<sup>16</sup> Sections 934.04, 934.21, 934.215, 934.31, and 934.43, F.S.

<sup>17</sup> Section 934.05, F.S.

<sup>18</sup> A third degree felony is punishable by up to 5 years in state prison and a fine of up to \$5,000. ss. 775.082 and 775.083, F.S. However, if total sentence points scored under the Criminal Punishment Code are 22 points or fewer, the court must impose a nonstate prison sanction, unless the court makes written findings that this sanction could present a danger to the public. s. 775.082(10), F.S.

<sup>19</sup> Section 934.02(3), F.S., defines “intercept” as the aural or other acquisition of the contents of any wire, electronic, or oral communication through the use of any electronic, mechanical, or other device.

<sup>20</sup> Section 934.03(1)(a) and (4)(a), F.S. Section 934.02(2), F.S., defines “oral communication” as any oral communication uttered by a person exhibiting an expectation that such communication is not subject to interception under circumstances justifying such expectation and does not mean any public oral communication uttered at a public meeting or any electronic communication.

<sup>21</sup> Section 934.03(2)(a)-(j), F.S.

<sup>22</sup> Section 934.03(2)(c), F.S.

<sup>23</sup> Section 934.03(2)(d), F.S.

The contents of an intercepted communication and any evidence derived from the contents may not be received in evidence in court proceedings and other specified proceedings if the disclosure of the information would violate ch. 934, F.S.<sup>24</sup>

Florida state courts have not addressed whether a body camera recording that records “oral communications” constitutes an “intercept” within the meaning of that term in s. 934.02, F.S. However, the Florida Supreme Court has previously held that other recordings of “oral communications” constituted an “intercept.”<sup>25</sup> Body camera recordings are not expressly addressed in any existing exception in ch. 934, F.S., or otherwise excluded from ch. 934, F.S. Assuming body camera recordings are an “intercept,” some recordings might fall under an existing exception but others might not. Absent the recording falling under a current exception or otherwise being excluded from ch. 934, F.S., it might be in violation of ch. 934, F.S., and therefore inadmissible.

### III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates s. 943.1718, F.S., pertaining to body cameras.

The bill defines a “body camera” as a portable electronic recording device that is worn on a law enforcement officer’s person that records audio and video data of the officer’s law-enforcement-related encounters and activities.

A “law enforcement agency” is defined as an agency that has a primary mission of preventing and detecting crime and enforcing the penal, criminal, traffic, and motor vehicle laws of the state and in furtherance of that primary mission employs law enforcement officers as defined in s. 943.10, F.S. A “law enforcement officer” is any person who is elected, appointed, or employed full time by any municipality or the state or any political subdivision thereof; who is vested with authority to bear arms and make arrests; and whose primary responsibility is the prevention and detection of crime or the enforcement of the penal, criminal, traffic, or highway laws of the state.<sup>26</sup>

The bill requires a law enforcement agency that authorizes its law enforcement officers to wear body cameras to establish policies and procedures addressing the proper use, maintenance, and storage of body cameras and the data recorded by body cameras. The policies and procedures must include:

- General guidelines for the proper use, maintenance, and storage of body cameras.
- Any limitations on which law enforcement officers are permitted to wear body cameras.
- Any limitations on law-enforcement-related encounters and activities in which law enforcement officers are permitted to wear body cameras.
- General guidelines for the proper storage, retention, and release of audio and video data recorded by body cameras.

---

<sup>24</sup> Section 934.06, F.S.

<sup>25</sup> For a discussion of relevant Florida Supreme Court cases, see *Guilder v. State*, 899 So.2d 412 (Fla. 4th DCA 2005).

<sup>26</sup> Section 943.10(1), F.S. This definition includes all certified supervisory and command personnel whose duties include, in whole or in part, the supervision, training, guidance, and management responsibilities of full-time law enforcement officers, part-time law enforcement officers, or auxiliary law enforcement officers but does not include support personnel employed by the employing agency.

The bill requires a law enforcement agency that authorizes its law enforcement officers to wear body cameras to:

- Ensure that all personnel who wear, use, maintain, or store body cameras are trained in the law enforcement agency's policies and procedures concerning them.
- Ensure that all personnel who use, maintain, store, or release audio or video data recorded by body cameras are trained in the law enforcement agency's policies and procedures.
- Retain audio and video data recorded by body cameras in accordance with the requirements of s. 119.021, F.S. (maintenance of public records), except as otherwise provided by law.
- Perform a periodic review of actual agency body camera practices to ensure conformity with the agency's policies and procedures.

The bill provides that ch. 934, F.S. (interception of communications), does not apply to body camera recordings made by law enforcement agencies that elect to use body cameras. This exclusion must be read together with the definition of "body camera" in the bill, which indicates that the device "records audio and video data of the officer's law-enforcement-related encounters and activities." Therefore, if the body camera recording consists of "audio and video data of the officer's law-enforcement-related encounters and activities," it is excluded from ch. 934, F.S. It is not considered an "intercept" and the general prohibition against interception of wire, oral, and electronic communications does not apply to such recording. If the body camera recording does not consist of "audio and video data of the officer's law-enforcement-related encounters and activities," the exclusion does not apply.

The bill is effective upon becoming a law.

#### **IV. Constitutional Issues:**

##### **A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

Article VII, Section 18 of the Florida Constitution (the "mandates" provision) restricts the state's ability to: require local governments to spend money; reduce local government authority to raise revenues; and reduce local governments' share of state taxes. Subsection (d) of Section 18 provides a "criminal law" exemption from the requirements of Section 18, though this subsection does not articulate what is encompassed within the term "criminal law." However, the definition of "body camera" in the bill clearly indicates that the device "records audio and video data of the officer's *law-enforcement-related encounters and activities*." (Emphasis provided.)

The bill requires county or municipal governments (local law enforcement agencies) to develop policies and procedures on body cameras, conduct training on those policies and procedures, retain audio and video data recorded by body cameras, and perform periodic review of practices. If the bill's requirements do not fall under the "criminal law" exemption, an exemption may apply if the bill requirements have an insignificant fiscal impact to county or municipal governments.

**B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:**

None.

**C. Trust Funds Restrictions:**

None.

**V. Fiscal Impact Statement:****A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

None.

**B. Private Sector Impact:**

None.

**C. Government Sector Impact:**

If an agency chooses to use body cameras, the bill may have a minimal impact on state expenditures because the bill creates a new requirement for state law enforcement agencies that use body cameras to establish policies and procedures governing body cameras and to train personnel accordingly.

The bill may also have a minimal impact on local expenditures because the bill creates a new requirement for local law enforcement agencies that use body cameras to establish policies and procedures governing body cameras, and to train personnel accordingly.

**VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

None.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None.

**VIII. Statutes Affected:**

This bill creates the section 943.1718 of the Florida Statutes.

**IX. Additional Information:****A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Changes:**

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

None.

B. Amendments:

None.

---

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.

---