

APPENDIX A CONSIDERATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

A camera doesn't follow an officer's eyes nor see as the officer sees – There can be a huge perceived difference between an officer's visual perception using all of his/her senses and the camera's field of vision.

Some important danger cues can't be recorded – Tactile cues that are often important to officers in deciding whether or not to use force are difficult for cameras to capture. Resistive tension by a suspect is a prime example.

Camera speed differs from the speed of life – Because of the time it takes for an officer's mind to process what is occurring, known as the reactionary curve, an officer can be half a second or more behind the action as it unfolds on the recording. Whether he/she is shooting or has stopped shooting, his/her recognition, decision-making, and physical activation all take time.

A camera may see better than a human in low light conditions – The high-tech recording capabilities of body cameras allows them to record with better clarity than the human eye in many low-light settings. Footage may be in sharper detail than an officer could perceive at the time the camera was activated. As an example, it may be evident that an object in a person's hand was a cellphone rather than a handgun.

Your body may block the view or be aimed elsewhere – Depending on location and angle, an officer's body parts (e.g., hands, arms, etc.) could block the recorded image. The officer may also be crouching forcing the camera to look downward.

A recording could encourage second-guessing – According to the United States Supreme Court in *Graham v. Connor*, an officer's decisions in tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving situations are not to be judged with the '20/20 vision of hindsight', but in the real-world time of a shooting or other critical event. Recordings provide an almost irresistible temptation for reviewers to second-guess an officer's actions. Under calm and comfortable conditions, reviewers can infinitely replay the action, scrutinize it for hard-to-see details, slow it down, and freeze it. The officer had to assess what he/she was experiencing while it was happening and under the stress of his/her life potentially being on the line. That disparity can lead to far different perceptions.

Recordings can never replace a thorough investigation – A camera's recording should never be regarded solely as the truth about a controversial incident. It needs to be weighed and tested against witness testimony, forensics, the involved officer's statement, and other elements of a fair, thorough, and impartial investigation that takes human factors into consideration.