Strengthening CBP with the Use of Body-Worn Cameras

Cameras: A Law Enforcement Best Practice
The use of body-worn cameras is increasingly considered a best practice among law enforcement.1 Police departments across the country are using cameras as a means of reducing the number of incidents in which force is used and as an important tool to protect officers from baseless allegations of abuse.2 According to the Department of Justice, the use of cameras by law enforcement improves the judicial process by providing effective video evidence and increases officer safety by deterring violent behavior and helping to convict those who attack officers.3 In a study by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, 93% of prosecutors called video evidence an effective tool, and a majority reported reduced time spent in court.4 Moreover, 93% of police-misconduct cases where video was available resulted in the officer’s exoneration; 50% of complaints were immediately withdrawn when video evidence was used; and 94% of citizens supported the use of video.5 Body-worn cameras in particular provide important benefits that vehicle-mounted or other stationary cameras cannot, by going wherever officers go and capturing incidents that take place away from the patrol vehicle.

A study of the Rialto, California Police Department spearheaded by Police Chief Tony Farrar supports those conclusions.6 In that department, the use of officer-mounted cameras resulted in an 88% decrease in complaints filed against officers and a 60% decrease in incidents where officers used force, with those officers not wearing cameras being twice as likely to use force.7 Farrar has since called the results “quite amazing.”8 Randy Peterson, a Rialto officer who was vindicated after a false complaint of police brutality, said “I like the cameras because I don’t have to worry about what someone might say that isn’t true.”9 More recently, in an interview with the Associated Press, Dallas Police Chief David Brown indicated a desire to outfit his force with body cameras, noting the importance of having something more than officer testimony as evidence in disputed situations.10 He called such cameras “the future of law enforcement.”11

Cameras in the Border Security Context
U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the largest law enforcement agency in the nation,12 is already exploring the use of body-worn cameras. CBP has a troubling reputation when it comes to use of force: since January 2010, at least 27 people13 have died following encounters with CBP officials who used force. That number includes minors, U.S. citizens, individuals alleged to be throwing rocks, and individuals killed while on the Mexican side of the border.14 Moreover, according to administrative complaints, CBP officials at ports of entry have a pattern of using force abusively and some Border Patrol agents have improperly used force on children.15

In September 2013, CBP released a short list of actions it plans to undertake to improve its use of force policy, including a commitment to pilot the use of cameras, both vehicle- and officer/agent-mounted.16 Recently, the House Appropriations Committee included language in its FY 2015 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appropriations report commending CBP for its plans to conduct a pilot program, noting that cameras “can be useful in discouraging inappropriate conduct by law enforcement officers and have also exonerated officers accused of wrongdoing.”17

Because body-worn cameras can accompany officers into situations that take place away from vehicles, they are particularly well suited to CBP’s needs. CBP officers and agents are responsible for covering a vast terrain, both urban and rural—not just in vehicles but on foot, horse, bicycle, ATV, and boat.18 According to manufacturers, officer-mounted cameras are designed to work in a variety of situations, including nighttime encounters in low-light conditions.19 Even when Border Patrol agents conduct roving patrols in their vehicles, they are rarely behind the wheel during encounters with the public, for example pursuing a suspect on foot, thus rendering vehicle-mounted cameras ineffective. Stationary cameras at checkpoints, holding cells or ports of
entry, while necessary and helpful in many situations, are not always properly placed to provide clear or conclusive evidence about a use of force incident, simply because they cannot follow a moving subject.  

An agency-wide policy that mandates appropriate use of body-worn cameras in enforcement interactions with the public would provide much-needed oversight in response to criticisms about CBP’s track record. Cameras would help deter violence against CBP officials and exonerate those who face false accusations of misconduct.

Addressing Privacy Concerns
The use of body-worn cameras by CBP, like other types of electronic surveillance by law enforcement, raises important concerns regarding the privacy of both officers and the public. These concerns can be addressed, as they have been by police departments, using a comprehensive policy framework that strikes a balance between effective oversight and protecting the civil liberties of CBP officials and the public. As detailed in an ACLU white paper, this framework should include policies regarding control over when recordings are made, access to recordings, subject notification, recording retention and use, and strong technological controls.

Cost Analysis
The cost of body-worn cameras across CBP would depend on the technology used. Cost per unit varies greatly depending on factors such as video quality, recording time limits, audio quality, camera placement, and more, but even the more expensive body-worn units are cost-effective. In a 2012 DOJ comparison of camera systems, the Vievu and Taser Axon, two comparable models, cost approximately $900 to $1,000 per unit, though other options ranged from as low as $119. Taser currently advertises body-worn camera models for law enforcement priced at $299 and $499.

Recommendation
The use of body-worn cameras, deployed within an appropriate policy framework that includes strong privacy protections for officers/agents and the public, should be promptly piloted by CBP and then expanded to cover all CBP enforcement encounters with the public.
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18. On October 12, 2012 in Nogales, Sonora, across the border from Arizona, 16-year-old Jose Antonio Elena Rodriguez, was shot to death by U.S. Border Patrol agents in a boat who claimed that Rodriguez was part of a group throwing rocks from the Mexican side of the border fence. Witnesses caught some of the incident on video, but body-worn cameras on the agents would have provided much more...


A Border Patrol agent was acquitted in April 2013 after allegedly strangling a migrant in his custody to death. While the encounter was recorded by a stationary camera, it was recorded from such an angle as to be inconclusive. A body-worn camera likely would have provided much clearer evidence of what actually occurred. Greg Moran, *Video Released from Border Patrol Strangling Trial*, San Diego Union-Tribune (May 9, 2013), [http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2013/May/09/video-border-patrol-strangle-trial-fonseca/](http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2013/May/09/video-border-patrol-strangle-trial-fonseca/).
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