

**DEPARTMENTS THAT CURRENTLY  
RECORD A MAJORITY OF CUSTODIAL INTERROGATIONS<sup>1</sup>**

*Those named are police departments unless otherwise indicated.  
CS refers to county sheriff departments, DPS for Department of Public Safety,  
and FD for Fire Department.*

<b>Alabama</b>	Tempe	San Bernardino CS
Baldwin CS	Tucson	San Diego
Daphne	Yavapai CS	San Francisco
Mobile	Yuma	San Joaquin CS
Mobile CS	Yuma CS	San Jose
Prichard	<b>Arkansas</b>	San Leandro
<b>Alaska</b>	All departments – Supreme	San Luis
All departments – Supreme	Court rule <sup>3</sup>	Santa Clara
Court ruling <sup>2</sup>	<b>California</b>	Santa Clara CS
<b>Arizona</b>	Statute – Juvenile	Santa Cruz
Apache Junction	homicides <sup>4</sup>	Stockton
Casa Grande	Alameda CS	Sunnyvale DPS
Chandler	Arcadia	Union City
Coconino CS	Auburn	Vallejo
El Mirage	Bishop	Ventura CS
Flagstaff	Butte CS	West Sacramento
Gila CS	Carlsbad	Woodland
Gilbert	Contra Costa CS	Yolo CS
Glendale	El Cajon	<b>Colorado</b>
Marana	El Dorado CS	Arvada
Maricopa CS	Escondido	Aurora
Mesa	Folsom	Boulder
Oro Valley	Grass Valley	Brighton
Payson	Hayward	Broomfield
Peoria	La Mesa	Colorado Springs
Phoenix	Livermore	Commerce City
Pima CS	Milpitas	Cortez
Pinal CS	Oceanside	Denver
Prescott	Orange CO Fire Authority	El Paso CS
San Luis	Orange CS	Ft. Collins
Scottsdale	Placer CS	Lakewood
Sierra Vista	Pleasanton	Larimer CS
Somerton	Rocklin	Logan CS
South Tucson	Roseville	Loveland
State Dept of Corrections	Sacramento	
Surprise	Sacramento CS	

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)*

Montezuma CS  
South Ute Gaming Div.  
Sterling  
Thornton  
**Connecticut**  
All departments as of  
Jan. 1, 2014 – statute<sup>5</sup>  
**Delaware**  
New Castle City  
New Castle County  
State Police Dept  
**District of Columbia**  
All departments – statute<sup>6</sup>  
**Florida**  
Bradford CS  
Broward CS  
Cape Coral  
Carrabelle  
Clay CS  
Clearwater  
Collier CS  
Coral Springs  
Davie  
Daytona Beach  
Delray Beach  
Escambia CS  
FL Attorney General,  
Tallahassee Div.  
FL Highway Patrol  
FL Inspector General (Dept  
of Financial Services)  
Ft. Lauderdale  
Ft. Myers  
Gainesville  
Hallandale Beach  
Hialeah  
Hollywood  
Key West  
Kissimmee  
Lake Wales  
Lee CS  
Leon CS  
Manatee CS  
Margate  
Miami  
Miami-Dade County

Midway  
Miramar  
Monroe CS  
Monticello  
Mount Dora  
Naples  
Okaloosa CS  
Orange CS  
Orlando  
Osceola CS  
Palatka  
Palm Beach  
Palm Beach CS  
Pembroke Pines  
Pensacola  
Pinellas CS  
Port Orange  
St. Lucie CS  
St. Petersburg  
Sanibel  
Seminole CS  
Sunrise  
Tallahassee  
Valparaiso  
Walton CS  
West Palm Beach  
**Georgia**  
Atlanta  
Centerville  
Cobb County  
DeKalb County  
Fulton County  
Gwinnett County  
Houston CS  
Macon  
Perry  
Savannah-Chatham  
Warner Robins  
**Hawaii**  
Hawaii County  
Honolulu  
**Idaho**  
Ada CS  
Blaine CS  
Boise City  
Boise CS

Bonneville CS  
Caldwell  
Canyon CS  
Cassia CS  
Coeur d' Alene  
Dept of Corrections  
Dept of Fish & Games  
Garden City  
Gooding  
Gooding CS  
Hailey  
ID Falls  
Jerome  
Jerome CS  
Ketchum  
Lincoln CS  
Meridian  
Nampa  
Pocatello  
Post Falls  
State Police  
Twin Falls  
**Illinois**  
All departments – statute<sup>7</sup>  
**Indiana**  
All departments – Supreme  
Court rule<sup>8</sup>  
**Iowa**<sup>9</sup>  
Altoona  
Ames  
Ankeny  
Arnolds Park  
Benton CS  
Bettendorf  
Burlington  
Cedar Rapids  
Clarion  
Clay CS  
Colfax  
Council Bluffs  
Davenport  
Des Moines  
Des Moines CS  
Fayette CS  
Hancock CS  
Iowa City

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)*

Iowa DPS	Topeka	Northeastern Univ.
Johnson CS	Wichita	Oak Bluffs
Kossuth CS	<b>Kentucky</b>	Orleans
Linn CS	Elizabethtown	Pittsfield
Marion	Hardin CS	Quinsigamond College
Marshalltown	Jeffersontown	Revere FD
Mason City	Louisville Metro	Sheffield
Merrill	Louisville	Somerset
Missouri Valley	Oldham CS	Somerville
Muscatine	St. Matthews	State Police
Nevada	<b>Louisiana</b>	Tewksbury
Orange City	Lafayette City	Truro
Parkersburg	Lake Charles	West Brookfield
Polk CS	Oak Grove	West Tisbury
Pottawattamie CS	Plaquemines Parish CS	Westfield
Rock Valley	St. Tammany Parish CS	Yarmouth
Sioux City	<b>Maine</b>	<b>Michigan</b>
Storm Lake	All departments – statute <sup>10</sup>	All departments - statute <sup>13</sup>
Vinton	<b>Maryland</b>	<b>Minnesota</b>
Washington CS	All departments – statute <sup>11</sup>	All departments – Supreme
Waterloo	<b>Massachusetts</b> <sup>12</sup>	Court ruling <sup>14</sup>
Waverly	Amherst	<b>Mississippi</b>
West Burlington	Assumption College	Biloxi
Woodbury CS	Campus	Cleveland
<b>Kansas</b>	Auburn	Gulfport
Attorney General –	Ayer	Harrison CS
Medicaid Fraud	Barnstable	Jackson CS
Derby	Boston	<b>Missouri</b>
Junction City	Bourne	All departments – statute <sup>15</sup>
Kansas Bureau of Invtn.	Brewster	<b>Montana</b>
Great Bend	Cambridge	All departments – statute <sup>16</sup>
Overland Park	Chatham	<b>Nebraska</b>
Pittsburg	Dalton	All departments – statute <sup>17</sup>
Topeka	Dartmouth	<b>Nevada</b>
Wichita	Dennis	Boulder City
Kansas Dept. of Corr.	Easton	Carlin
Kansas Univ.	Edgartown	Douglas CS
Liberal	Fall River	Elko
Newton	Great Barrington	Elko CS
Olathe	Holyoke	Henderson
Ottawa	Hudson	Lander CS
Riley County	Lenox	Las Vegas Metro
Saline CS	Longmeadow	Nevada DPS
Sedgwick	Nantucket	North Las Vegas
Sedgwick CS	North Central Correctional	Reno
Shawnee CS	Inst.	Sparks

Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)

Washoe CS	Oneida	Dublin
Wells	Ontario	Dept of Natural Resources
Yerington	Orange	Franklin
<b>New Hampshire</b> <sup>18</sup>	Otsego	Garfield Heights
Carroll CS	NY State – Ithaca	Grandview Heights
Concord	NY State – Oneonta	Grove City
Conway	NY State – Sidney	Hartford
Enfield	Rensselaer	Hudson
Keene	Rochester	Miami CS
Laconia	Rotterdam	Millersburg
Lebanon	Schenectady	OH Pharmacy Board
Nashua	Sullivan	Ontario
Plymouth	Tioga	Reynoldsburg
Portsmouth	Tompkins CS	Springboro
State Police	Troy	State Highway Patrol
Swanzy	Ulster	State Univ.
<b>New Jersey</b>	Vestal	Troy
All departments – Supreme	Washington	Upper Arlington
Court rule <sup>19</sup>	Wyoming	Wapakoneta
<b>New Mexico</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	Warren CS
All departments – statute <sup>20</sup>	All departments –	Westerville
<b>New York</b>	homicides – statute <sup>21</sup>	Westlake
Binghamton	<b>North Dakota</b> <sup>22</sup>	Worthington
Brockport	Bismarck	<b>Oklahoma</b>
Broome CS	Burleigh CS	Moore
Cayuga Heights	Cass CS	Norman
Chautauqua	Devils Lake	Oklahoma CS
Chenango	Dickinson	Tecumseh
Clinton	Fargo	<b>Oregon</b>
Columbia	Grand Forks	All departments – statute <sup>24</sup>
Deposit	Grand Forks CS	<b>Pennsylvania</b>
Dryden	Hazen	Bethlehem
Dutchess	Jamestown	Bradford Township
Endicott	Minot PD	Phildelphia
Franklin	ND Bureau of C. I.	Tredyffrin Township
Fulton	ND Highway Patrol	Whitehall
Genesee	Richland CS	<b>Rhode Island</b> <sup>25</sup>
Glenville	Valley City	New Shoreham
Greece	Ward CS	RI Dept of Public Safety
Greene	West Fargo	(capital offenses)
Herkimer	<b>Ohio</b> <sup>23</sup>	Warwick
Irondequoit	Akron	Woonsocket
Jefferson	Bratenahl	<b>South Carolina</b>
Madison	Cincinnati	Aiken CS
Monroe CS	Columbus	Aiken DPS
Niagara	Darke CS	City of Charleston

Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)

Florence CS  
N. Augusta DPS  
N. Charleston  
Savannah River  
Site Law Enf.  
**South Dakota**  
Aberdeen  
Belle Fourche  
Brandon  
Brookings  
Brown CS  
Clay CS  
Lincoln CS  
Minnehaha CS  
Mitchell  
Pierre  
Rapid City  
Sioux Falls  
State Div. of Criminal  
Investigations  
State Univ.  
Vermillion  
Yankton

**Tennessee**  
Bell Meade  
Benton CS  
Blount CS  
Bradley CS  
Brentwood  
Bristol  
Chattanooga  
Cleveland  
Franklin  
Gallatin  
Goodlettsville  
Hamilton CS  
Hendersonville  
Highway Patrol  
Knox CS  
Knoxville  
Loudon CS  
Montgomery CS  
Murfreesboro  
Nashville  
Shelby CS  
White CS

**Texas**<sup>26</sup>  
Abilene  
Alamo Heights  
Andrews  
Arlington  
Austin  
Burluson  
Cedar Hill  
Cedar Park  
Cleburne  
Collin CS  
Corpus Christi  
Dallas  
Dallas CS  
Duncanville  
Florence  
Fort Worth  
Frisco  
George West  
Georgetown  
Granger  
Harris CS  
Houston  
Hutto  
Irving  
Jim Wells  
Johnson CS  
Killeen  
Leander  
Midland  
Murphy  
Parker CS  
Plano  
Randall CS  
Richardson  
Round Rock  
San Antonio FD  
San Antonio  
San Jacinto CS  
Southlake DPS  
Sugar Land  
Taylor  
Thrall  
Travis CS  
Univ. of Texas  
Webster

Williamson CS  
**Utah**<sup>27</sup>  
American Fork  
Atty General Invtgn. Div.  
Beaver CS  
Box Elder CS  
Brian Head  
Brigham City  
Cedar City  
Centerville  
Clearfield City  
Cottonwood Heights  
Davis CS  
Draper City  
Duchesne CS  
East Carbon  
Emery CS  
Enoch City  
Farmington  
Garfield CS  
Garland  
Grand CS  
Granite School District  
Grantsville  
Harrisville  
Heber City  
Helper City  
Hurricane City  
Iron CS  
Ivins PS  
Kanab City  
Kane CS  
Kaysville  
Layton City  
Lehi City  
Lindon City  
Logan City  
Lone Peak  
Mapleton  
Millard CS  
Morgan CS  
Mount Pleasant  
Murray  
Naples  
Nephi  
North Park

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)*

North Ogden  
North Salt Lake  
Orem DPS  
Park City  
Parowan  
Pleasant Grove  
Pleasant View  
Price City  
Provo City  
Rich CS  
Riverdale  
Roosevelt  
Roy City  
Saint George  
Salt Lake City  
Salt Lake City Airport  
Salt Lake CS  
San Juan CS  
Sandy  
Saratoga Springs  
Sevier CS  
South Jordan  
South Ogden  
South Salt Lake  
Southern Utah Univ. DPS  
Spanish Fork  
Springville  
Summit CS  
Syracuse  
Tooele City  
Tooele CS  
Tremonton City  
Uintah CS  
Utah CS  
Univ. of Utah DPS  
Utah DPS Highway Patrol  
Utah Transit Authority DPS  
Vernal City  
Washington CS  
Washington DPS  
Wayne CS  
Weber State Univ.  
West Bountiful City  
West Jordan  
West Valley City  
Woods Cross

**Vermont**<sup>28</sup>  
Bennington  
Norwich  
Rutland CS  
Rutland  
**Virginia**  
Alexandria  
Chesterfield County  
Clarke CS  
Fairfax County  
Loudoun CS  
Norfolk  
Radford City  
Richmond  
South Boston  
Stafford CS  
Virginia Beach  
**Washington**  
Adams CS  
Arlington  
Bellevue  
Bellingham  
Bothell  
Buckley  
Clark CS  
Columbia CS  
Cowlitz CS  
Ellensburg  
Everett  
Federal Way  
Ferndale  
Grandview PD  
Kennewick  
Kent City  
King CS  
Kirkland  
Kittitas CS  
Klickitat CS  
Lewis CS  
Lynden  
Mercer Island  
Mount Vernon  
Pierce CS  
Prosser  
Quincy

Snohomish CS  
State Patrol  
Sunnyside  
Thurston CS  
Univ. WA  
Walla Walla  
Washougal  
Whatcom CS  
Yakima  
Yakima CS  
**West Virginia**  
Charles Town  
Monongalia CS  
Morgantown  
Morgantown CS  
Wheeling  
**Wisconsin**  
All departments – statute<sup>29</sup>  
**Wyoming**  
Campbell CS  
Casper  
Cheyenne  
Cody  
Gillette City  
Laramie  
Laramie CS  
Lovell  
Park CS  
**Federal**<sup>30</sup>  
Air Force Office of  
Special Investigations<sup>31</sup>  
Department of Defense<sup>32</sup>  
Naval Criminal  
Investigative Service<sup>33</sup>

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)*

---

<sup>1</sup> In July 2010, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws approved a comprehensive model state statute on electronic recording of custodial interrogations. <http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/archives/ulc/erci/2010final.htm>

<sup>2</sup> *Stephan v. State*, 711 P.2d 1156, 1162 (Alaska 1985).

<sup>3</sup> On June 22, 2012, the Court adopted rule 4.7, providing, “Whenever practical, a custodial interrogation at a jail, police station, or other similar place, should be electronically recorded,” and that in determining admissibility of a custodial statement, the court may consider, among other relevant evidence, “whether an electronic recording was made; if not, why not; and whether any recording is substantially accurate and not intentionally altered.”

<sup>4</sup> CAL. PENAL CODE § 859.5 and CAL. WELFARE & INSTS. Code § 626.8.

<sup>5</sup> Conn. Gen. Stat. §54-1o. The statute, effective January 1, 2014, requires audiovisual recording of custodial interrogations of arrested suspects of capital and Class A and B felonies, with a rebuttable presumption of inadmissibility if statements that should have been but were not recorded are offered into evidence. The presumption “may be overcome by a preponderance of the evidence that the statement was voluntary given and is reliable, based on the totality of the circumstances.”

<sup>6</sup> D.C. CODE §§ 5-116.01-03.

<sup>7</sup> 705 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. § 405/5-401.5 and 725 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. § 5/103-2.1.

<sup>8</sup> In September 2009, the Indiana Supreme Court entered an order stating, “this Court finds that the interests of justice and sound judicial administration will be served by the adoption of a new Rule of Evidence to require electronic audio-video recordings of customary custodial interrogation of suspects in felony cases as a prerequisite for the admission of evidence of any statements made during such interrogation.” Under the Court’s “inherent authority to supervise the administration of all courts of this state,” the Court added Rule 617, which requires custodial interrogations of felony suspects to be recorded, beginning January 1, 2011. Indiana Rule of Evidence 617 - Unrecorded Statements During Custodial Interrogation.

<sup>9</sup> Following the ruling of the Iowa Supreme Court in *State v. Hajtic*, 724 N.W.2d 449 (Iowa 2006), the Attorney General wrote in the State Police Association’s publication: “Although the court stated that it is ‘encouraging’ the practice of electronic recording, the attorney general’s office believes that the *Hajtic* decision should be interpreted as essentially requiring this practice.” Tom Miller, *Cautions Regarding Custodial Issues*, IOWA POLICE J., vol. 39, no. 1, at 15 (2007). In 2009, the Department of Public Safety issued guidelines for interviews providing, “Officers will audio or video record interrogations as defined in DOM 23-02.5 ... Custodial interrogations will be audio or video taped, including documentation of the *Miranda* warnings and waiver of rights consistent with DOM 23-02.15” DOS guidelines, IV C2g and E4C.

<sup>10</sup> ME REV. STAT. ANN. Title 25, § 2803-B(1)(K).

<sup>11</sup> MD. ANN. CODE, CRIM. PROC. § 2-402. The statute requires that “A law enforcement unit that regularly utilizes one or more interrogation rooms capable of creating audiovisual recordings of custodial interrogations shall make reasonable efforts to create an audiovisual recording of a custodial interrogation of a criminal suspect in connection with a case involving” named felonies, “whenever possible.” Other law enforcement units “shall make reasonable efforts to create an audio recording of a custodial interrogation of a criminal suspect in connection with” cases involving the named felonies, “whenever possible.”

<sup>12</sup> *Commonwealth v. DiGiambattista*, 813 N.E.2d 516, 533-34 (Mass. 2004). Following this ruling, the Attorney General, the Chiefs of Police and District Attorneys Associations, and the State Police, endorsed the policy of videorecording all custodial interrogations of suspects in serious felony investigations unless strong countervailing considerations make recording impractical or the suspect refuses to be recorded.

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654*  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)

---

<sup>13</sup> Michigan Public Act No. 479, effective March 28, 2013. The statute requires that audiovisual recordings be made of the entire interrogations of persons in custodial detention regarding involvement in the commission of a major felony. The requirement takes effect in each law enforcement agency within either 60 or 120 days after the agency obtains appropriate audiovisual recording equipment or funds. Failure to record as required “does not prevent any law enforcement official present during the taking of the statement from testifying in court as to the circumstances and content of the individual’s statement if the court determines that the statement is otherwise admissible,” but “the jury shall be instructed that if is the law of this state to record statements of an individual in custodial detention who is under interrogation for a major felony and that the jury may consider the absence of a recording in evaluating the evidence relating to the individual’s statement.”

<sup>14</sup> *State v. Scales*, 518 N.W.2d 587, 591 (Minn. 1994).

<sup>15</sup> MO. REV. STAT. ch. 590, §701. The statute requires recording of custodial interviews of suspects of specified felonies if recording equipment is available and recording is feasible. A law enforcement agency’s failure to comply with the statute shall have no impact other than that “the governor may withhold any state funds appropriated to the noncompliant law enforcement agency if the governor finds the agency did not act in good faith in attempting to comply with” the statute. Nothing in the statute “shall be construed as a ground to exclude evidence.” A violation of the statute “shall not be admitted as evidence, argued, referenced, considered or questioned during a criminal trial.”

<sup>16</sup> MONT. CODE ANN. tit. 46, ch. 4, §§406-11. The Montana statute requires recording of custodial interviews of felony suspects.

<sup>17</sup> NEB. REV. STAT. ANN. §29-4501-4508 (West 2009).

<sup>18</sup> In *State v. Barnett*, 789 A.2d 629, 632-33 (N.H. 2001), the Supreme Court held that if an electronically recorded statement is offered into evidence, the recording is admissible only if the entire post-*Miranda* interrogation interview was recorded. The ruling does not require that custodial interviews be recorded either in whole or in part. If a partially recorded statement is excluded from evidence because the entire interview was not recorded, testimonial evidence is nevertheless admissible as to what occurred before, during and after the custodial interview, including the portion that was recorded.

<sup>19</sup> N.J. CT. R. 3.17 (2005).

<sup>20</sup> N.M. STAT. ANN. §29-1-16.

<sup>21</sup> N.C. GEN. STAT. ANN. §15A-211, relating to major felonies.

<sup>22</sup> In April 2011, the Governor enacted a law providing that “the legislative management shall consider studying the feasibility and desirability of adopting the Uniform Electronic Recording of Custodial Interrogations Act. The legislative management shall report its findings and recommendations, together with any legislation necessary to implement the recommendations, to the sixty-third [2012] legislative assembly.” No recording bill has been approved by the legislature.

<sup>23</sup> OHIO REV. CODE ANN. §2933.81. Recorded statements made during custodial interviews are presumed voluntary. Failure to record is not a basis to exclude the statement.

<sup>24</sup> The Oregon statute requires recording of custodial interviews of suspects of aggravated homicides and crimes with mandatory minimum sentences. OR. REV. STAT. §165.540.

<sup>25</sup> R.I. Gen. Laws §12-7-22, June 2011. The General Assembly established a Task Force to develop policies for electronically recording custodial interrogations in their entirety. In February 2012, the Task Force filed its Final Report which contained recommendations that by July 1, 2013, “every Rhode Island law enforcement agency adopt uniform written policies and procedures requiring the electronic recording of custodial interrogations.” The December 2013 edition of the RI Police Accreditation Commission (RIPAC), which contains mandatory standards for accreditation of police departments, requires adoption of a model policy of recording custodial interrogations of persons suspected of having committed a capital offense crime, punishable by up to life in prison, from the *Miranda* warnings to the end. All 43 state police departments have agreed to adopt the RIPAC model policy.

*Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)*

---

<sup>26</sup> The Texas Code of Criminal Procedure provides that a defendant's unrecorded oral statement is inadmissible unless the statement "contains assertions of facts or circumstances that are found to be true and which conduce to establish the guilt of the accused." TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 38.22; *see Moore v. State*, 999 S.W.2d 385, 400 (Tex. App. 1999). The statute does not require recording of custodial interviews preceding recorded statements, nor exclusion of suspects' unrecorded written statements. *See Rae v. State*, No. 01-98-00283-CR, 2001 WL 125977, at 3 (Tex. App. 2001); *Franks v. State*, 712 S.W.2d 858, 860 (Tex. App. 1986).

<sup>27</sup> The Utah Attorney General has adopted a Best Practices Statement, endorsed by all state law enforcement associations, recommending that custodial interrogations in a fixed place of detention of persons suspected of committing a statutorily defined violent felony, should be electronically recorded from the *Miranda* warnings to the end in their entirety. Various exceptions to the requirement are included. Office of the Utah Attorney General, *Best Practices Statement for Law Enforcement: Recommendations for Recording of Custodial Interviews* (Oct. 2008).

<sup>28</sup> Act of June 3, 2010, §238d. Pursuant to this statute, a Working Group of the Vermont Law Enforcement Advisory Board adopted a Best Practices Statement, recommending that custodial interviews of felony suspects be electronically recorded by audio and visual whenever practicable.

<sup>29</sup> Wis. Stat. Ann. §§968.073, 972.115.

<sup>30</sup> In October, 2009, the Commission on Military Justice (the "Cox Commission") released a report containing recommendations "to advance principles of justice, equity, and fairness in American military justice," including: "Require military law enforcement agencies to videotape the entirety of custodial interrogations of crime suspects at law enforcement offices, detention centers, or other places where suspects are held for questioning, or, where videotaping is not practicable, to audiotape the entirety of such custodial interrogations."

<sup>31</sup> AFOSI Manual, General Investigative Methods (AFOSIMAN 71-124), effective Oct. 2009, Ch. 4, Sec. 4E4.18, requires DVD recording of all subject interviews, with limited exceptions, and the optional recording of witness and victim interviews. Judge Advocate General's Corp. Online News Service, Vol. IX, Issue 34, 26 Aug. 09, par. 10.

<sup>32</sup> Section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 requires that "each strategic intelligence interrogation of any person who is in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense or under detention in a [DOD] facility is videotaped or otherwise electronically recorded." The "term 'strategic intelligence interrogation' means an interrogation of a person . . . conducted at a theater-level detention facility." On May 10, 2010, the DOD Judge Advocate General issued detailed guidelines. Directive-Type Memorandum 09-031.

<sup>33</sup> U.S. Naval Criminal Investigative Services Manual, General Order 00-0012, "Policy Change Regarding Recording of Interrogations," Sept. 4, 2008. Require audio or video recording of interrogations of suspects involving crimes of violence which take place within an NCIS facility. The Special Agent-in-Charge or supervisory designee may make a decision not to record when recording would be counterproductive or impede the interrogation.

Thomas P. Sullivan, 353 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60654  
312-923-2928; 312-840-7328 (fax); [tsullivan@jenner.com](mailto:tsullivan@jenner.com)