Community Surveillance Working Group

Meeting Minutes
Friday, July 26, 2024

Working Group Members Present:	John Chen, René Peters, Alex Maestretti, Wendy Novotne, Kayleigh McNiel, Carolyn Reilly-Payne
City Staff:	Vinh Tang, Eleonor Bounds, Toby Baden
In Attendance:	Members of the Public: none

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

Community Surveillance Working Group

Meeting Agenda

July 26, 2024, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

1	Introductions	10 mins.
2	Approval of minutes and agenda	2 mins.
3	Privacy and Civil Liberties Impact Assessment Document -Closed-Circuit Television Camera Systems (CCTV) SIR -Real-Time Crime Center (RTCC) SIR Discussion and possible vote on recommendations	40 mins.
4	Public comment	10 mins.

Minutes:

René: Agenda Approved (all in favour)

René: one assessment can be sent for both technologies.

Collaboration on document

René: aimed to get everything into category areas, what is the take away for consumers of this report.

René reads overview from document. Want to ensure we are all on the same page about the way in which sentiment is represented.

Alex: only a few comments of support, its important to reflect. Don't want to lose the voices of those who are in support as some are from the community. Would like to know how public comment is performed. It seems that there are views that are not being well represented. Should be able to reflect some nuance around this.

René: wanted to represent the groups who provided comment.

Kayleigh: important to note that from an evidentiary standpoint that having the data is valuable in solving the crime, so while we are focused on the negative sentiment it is important to represent that this in some ways helpful.

Alex: important to think about how to represent everyone.

René: People should be able to cross reference and find information within the document. Noticed you added another section for first amendment, what do we mean by certain phrasings?

Kayleigh: want to make sure that as we look at civil rights impacts, we can look at the public comment concerns on impacts on first amendment rights that relate to peaceful protest if theyre fearful that they'll be surveilled by the City. Might discourage members of the public from the right to peacefully protest and assemble. Noted in the OCR letter provided.

Wendy: for a synonym – maybe deter may be more appropriate. Clarification question: youre saying this maps to the bullet points, maybe we can do numbering in order to help with guiding through the document. A lot of use of video surveillance is video + AI, surveillance identification and impact on minority communities. IS the research reflected in the bullet points? When I look at the major issue list, I think this could use some succinct statements about this.

René: did mini analysis. Got census data from dashboard, able to segment by demographics. Grabbed screenshots and aligned the areas to the proposed area.

Kayleigh: disparate impacts should be called out

René: adjusting sections in the document in real time

Wendy: can add, not just the placement, but the use of the technologies can impact communities. Its not about the places they're placed, but rather that the use of the technologies in the first place creates an issue.

Kayleigh: unsure of how in depth we want to go when it comes to statistics.

René: list of summary of big areas:

inaccuracy with tech (misidentification)

increase of implicit bias

More specifically the placement of the technology (add context)

CCTV section: maybe add a connection point, which "reflect general privacy and security points", we are very into the details. But I want to know, right off the bat- are there privacy concerns.

Formatting for numbers and then ensure Alex's name

Kayleigh: any other concerns or comments

Alex: curious about prior City council and how these were received and impact of the report. Our strongest points relate to lack of information and clarity, that's where I would be pressing. Our remit needs to be around disparate impacts.

Kayleigh: the executive summary may be all they read, try to keep it to the point. But those all reflected technologies in use.

Vinh: this will be going to Public Safety Committee, they may extend an invitation to the CSWG to understand approach

Explanation of how council disseminates information (ie via central/council staff)

Kayleigh: I see an issue around lack of clarity in the SIR and that's correlated to the 4th amendment case law. Feel that it's important to highlight, who knows what will happen if US v Carpenter is expanded. Not sure if this is a constitutional issue, so just want to highlight this. I don't know enough about how this technology has been deployed in other cities.

René: we just don't know certain things, and that's indicated in our assessment. From a civil liberties standpoint, I think it's a fair callout.

Alex: do we read the SIR as constrained or open? How do we read it? The slippery slope call out is important. It's the balance that im trying to figure out. My issue is that policy doesn't exist. Would like to adjust language around Pilot.

René: questions around omnibus policy that's pointed to frequently, with the lack of this. How much of an analysis can we do?

John: the thing I was thinking about was to turn recommendation to against.

René: one of the questions is that within the success metrics and measurement timelines, there isn't really a mechanism for a hard stop. What happens if this is or is not successful, what are the mechanisms that exist to peel back (for example if unsuccessful)

Alex: I heard this was a two-year maximum for the pilot (verified)

René: have adjusted some key focuses, pulled out bullet points, vetted language re privacy concerns. Have some notes on stylistic adjustments (navigation). Pending these adjustments, would like to get vote on the document. Open the floor for vote

Kayleigh: would like to add, is there any dissenting comments or concerns. Are everyone's concerns highlighted? Made some adjustments to final paragraph. In terms of recommendations, as we have a section for this, not sure if we should all include recommendations or whether.

René: used notes that were dropped in. Opened floor for motion to approve Civil Liberties Assessment content for submission through Vinh pending addition of a number system for easier navigation.

Motion made, and seconded.
All ayes, non nays/abstentions.