06/26/2024 CSWG Agenda

1	**Introductions**	2 mins.
2	**Approval of minutes and agenda**	2 mins.
3	**Working Group Review & Discussion** • Closed-Circuit Television Camera Systems (CCTV) SIR	25 mins.
4	**Working Group Review & Discussion** • Real-Time Crime Center (RTCC) SIR	25 mins.
5	**Scheduling additional meetings**	
6	**Public comment**	

Community Surveillance Working Group

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday June 26, 2024

Working Group Members Present:	Rene Peters, Kayleigh McNiel, John Chen, Alex Maestretti, Wendy Novotne, Carolyn Riley-Payne
City Staff:	Vinh Tang, Nick Zajchowski, Sarah Carrier, Eleonor Bounds, Sarah Carrier, Toby Baden
In Attendance:	Teerth, Randal, BJ Last, Cynthia, Julia, Matt, observer, public meeting observer, unknown name (ph number)

Surveillance Working Group meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion

---

Agenda:

Quorum

Introductions

Approve minutes from last meeting & agenda

Run through notes

Set up next meeting

Minutes:

Rene overview of minutes from 6.13 meeting. Carolyn move to approve, Kayleigh second. All aye. Motion passed.

Working group review sessions on RTCC & CCTV, work through mid July for submission.

Agenda approved: Carolyn moved, Kayleigh second. All aye.

Item 3: working group reviews and discussions,

Rene: target date to read through the materials was 6.24. Hopefully everyone was able to get thoughts out and read. Would like to get started.

Vinh: would stay consistent with template (PCLIA)

Rene: focusing on CCTV first.

Discuss Executive Summary: hear/read

Kayleigh: major concerns around lack of specifics around actual technology being used. Its hard to evaluate impacts without knowing the exact technology (particularly with RTCC). With CCTV, after reviewing, there is some ambiguity in terms of how this will actually be operated. Is this live feed monitored 24/7 or how will these instances for follow up be flagged? Is someone actually looking for crimes that are happening in real time?

Nick: 1. challenge to write SIRS when we cant discuss a specific vendor, its informed by multiple vendors. 2. In terms of monitoring, staffing plans are still being developed. Not all of these feeds would be monitored 24/7. Will likely be mix of call for service, depends on if there are many active calls. If the RTCC is of use, then active monitoring occurs.

Kayleigh: so it that just a decision that will be made after the technology? Concerns around acquiring without more information how it will be monitored. In terms of OIG auditing, is there any indication around when and how often those audits would occur and whether they could be conducted monthly/quarterly?

Nick: can't speak on behalf of OIG.

Rene: this was a question I had as well, a year sounds really slim. Having them be scheduled may be problematic too. Something like an ongoing ability to audit may be more reasonable. Also had question, since a lot is vendor agnostic. What's the process of once the technology is installed, whats the process of software. How do we know about the technology that is part of updating the technology.

Nick: depends on deployment of the model. Updates might be pushed out monthly or quarterly, usually given a list of upcoming updates. If an app installed on machine then there is more control over when that is pushed out. If concerns are significant then may ask not to push out. Usually most things are turned off and then would have to be turned on by administrator in the department itself. Unsure of whether Toby has something to add. (no)

In terms of, if it was something related to additional functionality, then would need to go through the material change SIR process and would not utilize that until it goes through the process.

Rene: one more question, another thing striking through the technologies is the use of AI through the streams. How could other identifiable characteristics be used for other info streams. This can be a slippery slope as it relates to the analysis done on video streams in terms of where the line in the sand is drawn.

Wendy: big picture question. Looking at public comments and materials in terms of research. What research was relied upon to determine that RTCC and CCTV are effective? IT looks like there is research to the contrary; would like more background on what research was considered.

Nick: in terms of research out there, this was identified individually by folks doing RET and in SPD. With social science there are often mixed results. We looked at what was out there versus what was relevant.

Vinh: I think looking at page 2o it will help (for CCTV) and RTCC is page 21 as it relates to the research.

Wendy: I was just thinking there was more than what was listed here. Particularly with the scope and how that was balanced.

Rene: was looking at the Chicago study and how results didn't really account for unique differences, seems like a little bit of muddy water. Was wanting to understand the clear metrics.

Carolyn: one of the things I was wondering and maybe I missed it, don't really see check and balances along the way. So IT WILL BE a whole year before there is A check in? THE concern is that the communities will be over surveilled. Not too much back up or feedback from the community on how this is working FOR them Because no one FEEDBACK is on a regular basis.

Nick: in terms of timing, dedicated to pulling up metrics as listed in 6.5 and some other sections, there wasn't a specific timeline for the check in. Important to give it time to collect the data and analyse it. It needs time to have a large enough time period as we got approval and actually procured the technology.

Alex: building on Carolyns comments and going back to the comment around the research is unclear. Would like to know more about metrics are, what success looks like, how long do we need to bake this, would love more detail around success and would like to understand the omnibus policy.

Nick: Im not the best person to speak to the specifics around evaluation and metrics. Did talk about outcomes looking at reduction in 911 calls, response times. Specific questions about how the metrics will be analysed would be out of my expertise and could be handled by research team.

Alex: would like to see the documentation or if they want to attend, would like to ensure that this is well governed.

Nick: its sometimes difficult to develop specifics and metrics when we haven't yet procured it. How much work do we do now, versus how much post approval. The policy isn't finalized in part because we need to figure out the eventual product. The specifics on that policy will be finalized once we move forward.

Carolyn: if that is the case, you can understand the concerns that the communities at large will have around this tech and how it will be used if we cant narrow down some of the quantitative ways etc that will allay the concerns to some degree. Some may not trust the tech

Nick: one of the things I know im looking for is the input on those areas. For example the beginnings of a plan, would love to hear that feedback as well as policies that youre concerned about. We would like to hear that from you as well so we can incorporate that as well. Was hoping to get your input since this is a rough sketch of it so we can take it back and incorporate.

Rene: could you help me understand more about the process, particularly as you were determining coverage zones? What was the interaction like when creating the maps? Did you consider areas to exclude?

Nick: coverage areas were driven by heatmaps of criminal activity. Some of the community feedback, haven't heard the specific concern about the health area. As we nail down the specific cam locations, we would invite feedback around considering areas of sensitivity so as to redact/mask etc.

Rene: Accessibility of signs for low/no vision for members of the public who may not realise they are walking through these areas. Whats the level of detail around that communication. It would be good to outline that

Kayleigh: to piggyback, seems like a lot of leeway in the SIR to change location of cameras. Cameras being moved during the pilot period, focusing on gun violence, persistent crimes – some of the language seems like a catchall so maybe have more clarity in policy around who makes determination for movement to different location, what would constitute broadening the cameras by moving, who is making the decision around crimes warranting this level of surveillance

Nick: to clarify, if they were to be moved this would trigger a mat change, ergo SIR process again.

Rene: new locations, but also privately owned cameras which essentially allows people to opt in. How do we know that people who opt in are held to a standard.

Nick: intent with private camera feeds would be that those only within the zones are allowed. The question about designs of the system, any business that would opt in, SPD would only accept public facing cameras with signage. In terms of storage, we would store the same way as city cameras. Would be same retention that the city would be on. Generally we would just be getting the feed and using to tap in live if needed and storing for 30 days and aligning with City retention policies.

Carolyn: the vagueness, if there is a need someplace else, the cameras will be moved. What will be done with the original area?

Nick: I think its hard to answer that with any specificity, if the activity went away, there would be an assessment made and would not have cameras there. All of that would go through the material change process.

John: In SIR CCTV section 9, theres a lack of data retention policy. The 911 calls are retained for 90 days – do you have a suggested policy? Whats the retention policy?

Nick : we put in 30 days for the CCTV. Idea is that we will be able to go in and use for investigative purposes. Often it's something a detective comes back to as they look at a case. Typically retention periods vary; partly it's driven by tech. For constant feeds this is a lot of storage.

Agenda item: Next meeting

Rene: July 9th – 11th Tues – Thursday

Meeting 4: 16th or 17th

Can we use same process as used for this meeting?

Cynthia – still want clarity around equity focused. Will completion of pilot require new SIR or will it be a material update? The ordinance requires comment on impacts on communities, wouldn't it be smart or invite a civil rights expert to help with writing assessment.

Julia: blue leaks which happened in 2020. Breach of 5 different RTCC, uploaded information showing integration with large number of social media platforms. These sets of data were altogether. The companies themselves were not following data retention practices. Real concerns about the expansive nature that these companies provide.

Randal: unable to unmute

Formally adjourn