

Agenda	Time	Starting Time
Introductions and Housekeeping	10	12.00 PM
City auditor Joe Michelle Negumi		
Staffing update	10	12.10 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seferiana, will there be a replacement? TBD (Eleonor for now)• Kate Garmin leaving as of 12.13 interim Julie Klein (policy advisor for MO stepping in)• As we have change in council, we will be seeing changes with committee member with staffing but all TBD (• Vinh (new council will be able to speak to this better, in prior years seek to do this by first Monday in Jan but likely first three weeks) Chair od Tech• Shankar wants to meet with new members, work of group and setup for good working relationship.		

Master list update	10	12.20 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memo from Mark Baird (COO for SPD)		
3 technologies that SPD would like to remove masterlist		
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. booking comparison photo) they don't use it anymore. Limited use for a time, but no longer using. Facial recognition by passing pic around. Isn't used, facial recognition not as important and so removing it (decom and not using anymore) letter from Mark Baird.2. Shankar: I understand licensees are not current, but does the system still exist in SPD or has it been entirely removed? Directive not to make use in any operations for PD. Specific language, what it doesn't address is whether tech has been uninstalled?3. Reclass of technologies: WS patrol – aircraft.4. Drones – documenting crash sites		

Since then we don't use it, don't get info and don't own it. So it's a technology that we don't actually request or use. Reason for reclassing, not used by SPD or owned.

Shankar: what changed between initial assessment and reclassification? We don't direct to fly drones or aircraft, but we will accept data?

Ginger: (referred to letter) what is and isn't actually surveillance technology
So, we've had a longer time to look more closely at what we use and what we control, and these are 3 we aren't using or own or direct.

Shankar – what's the status of the memo and who would it go to?

Ginger – filing with the clerk, but is a draft and due diligence

Shankar- would like to go back to ordinance and see whether we agree with the removal of the tech from the list.

ACLU Question – can we provide our assessment about how this was filed, who are we filing the memo with?

Ginger – it is filed with the city clerk

Shankar – is there a timeline? When is this filed? Is there opportunity to provide feedback or assessment? Would like time to give input. (based off the word direct, but can it be a beneficiary of control)

ACLU - Language of the ordinance is being used (the intent was that agency not able to do end run around acquisition) and they would simply continue to collect but not own

Transmitted to city clerk, no timeline or vote – decision for policy makers.

Actionable – take to Kate or whoever is sitting in her place.

- Memo to file with the clerk

File without public input – if the public appeals to the council, the council can pull anything into review.

Ordinance serves to aid council in making their own decision.

(look at ordinance) Acquire is a broader term in the ordinance – look for more clarity (ACLU) would like to review language. The purpose of this group is to have an outside eye and accountability – does anyone want to comment?

REQUEST – time to review assessment and provide feedback before memo is filed

How much time? End of next week (falls to Julie) We've been asking about facial recognition for months so we want to review before it's submitted. In two meetings with Chief there wasn't clarity and my impression was that there was no rush to get facial recognition off the list.

Black bag – has been added. IS that correct?

Is that an additional tech or in the category (ACLU) how many technologies fall in that category?

Ginger to respond re the above.

Julie – even if it were filed there are checks and balances so we can always pull it back, whether its filed first or whether its pulled back. It needs to happen by the EOY so I think what's likely is that we might wait a week for ACLU to see whether there is an objection and then file, and if we need to revisit then we will.

Vinh – we are trying to be timely.

Appendix A - revisit

Placeholder on the next meeting, do we want to review and what do we want to convey back?

When do we want to have this meeting? Shall we shift to get away from holidays, and if we disagree, what should we do? Can the city wait to file?

Goes with extension

Ginger update – extension for deadline for SIRS (looking for 6 month extension) lost well over a year in trying to get SIRS completed –

New due date: end of Sept 2020

We've all been in somewhat agreement that the extra time would be beneficial, allows us to determine how everything will roll out. We started the discussion to see what we would be doing EOY with events, realized that not much attention to this particular issue was occurring. Based on new council etc.

SIRS that are due now, we are waiting on those as well to restart in Jan.

Shankar – what is the current status? An extension is great, but more importantly we need a clear timeline for working group and City to do their jobs.

Ginger: 14 review, 2 passed, 12 remaining. Need to make sure everything is up to date and need due diligence in order to redline. Have had discussions with group 3 and now we are in draft stage and need to get public engagement and need 12 SIRS to be drafted and presented to council. Recommendation is to get these done asap – we have 3 ready, need public engagement : video recording, situational awareness, king county helicopter one (loathe to do more before we clear the backlog) need to be correct.

ACLU – If you take out drones and aircrafts, when would these be released to the public since they're already done?

Ginger – we need a lot to be done before we present to public (as things are changing we want to make sure that things are up to date) We have a lot of form and format to land on. We need a new committee to help

Shankar – are you talking about going back to SIRS that the group has already commented on and revise

Ginger – we just want to make sure that we have the correct versions

Shankar – we appreciate that, but it wouldn't mean we are re reviewing to put in another set of public comments?

Ginger – we hope not, but we need to make sure we have cleared the past and format. We need to be clear on our approach.

Shankar – that would be a great discussion to have, but it seems to me that even with a 6 month extension that it is a large amount of Tech with seeing any SIRS. We are mandated to help with public outreach, and I don't want to see that go out the window. Can we use part of the next meeting to work through a timeline (would prefer to collaborate)

Draft is review and can submit on Dec 9th , last council meeting is on the 16th.

Shankar – how does that play into working with the group re timeline?

Ginger – this is asking for that now without and this is the delivery timeline. Can be separate. We want to make sure that we ask now so we know we are working along a timeline. So suggest to ask now, then create timeline.

When SIRS are ready to are ready to talk about. We haven't seen SIRS and are asked to endorse an extension we haven't seen any SIRS.

City – is there a particular objection you have

Shankar – we want to collaborate with the city so we don't have clarity as to which SIRS we can see. Concern is that council would actually have to amend ordinance to
A lot of the concerning tech is in group 3 and 4 and we want the clarity to plan around that – it can be in the timeline but we want that clarity. Need a plan that allows it to be feasible to the group to review

City – id we pass the thirs Monday in dec, then the extension wouldn't reasonable happen with a new council. They would have to take this up when theyre organized and can actually consider it. If the intent is not to have the extension go now, then the extension wont go forward until next year (longer than Sept?)

The decision to wait past that 3rd Monday is likely a decision to wait until Feb at the earliest

Shankar – if there is a game plan we agree on, then that's an easy sell then there is likely room to come to some type of working agreement so we can be as colaboratve as possibke moving forward.

Julie – is there then an objection to the extension on 12.9?

Shankar – yes, need clear timeline.

Julie – in order for you to agree to extionsion you want a timeline first?

Shankar – yes, this group came early this year but constituted late. This group performed a lot of work but it was very difficult and just based on that experience it'll be less possible to review towards the end of the window.

ACLU – can we push this there?

Julie – pragmatically speaking, it looks like this will then push out the extension.

Ginger – since our slot is on the 9th, I don't know can we do this in late Dec?

Vinh – 16th is final vote. But we are trying to stick with the wording in the original bill, ie it doesn't need the feedback of the council. Case to extend makes more sesnse, and I think this meeting is more of housekeeping for us to get all of this done

ACLU – can we use this to create momentum around other things we’d like to see accomplished? Can we get it on a vote on Dec 16th? Can we meet before? We don’t want to push this and then ask for an extension at the last minute

Ginger – the difficulty is getting the group together, but if we need a timeline we can do that.

Council – is there a difficulty to have an anticipated timeline, and the Shankar express support for extension?

Shankar – we will need to discuss the timeline

Joe – sounds like simply – we need the extension 2. City doesn’t technically need the approval of working group so suggest city should just ask for the extension and then collaborate.

Michelle – nothing to add. Best path forward is move and keep the work going.

Shankar – proposed timeline to discuss, have a meeting with working group. Aim to meet on the 3rd or 10th,

Vinh to bring to council and see whether we can be added Tuesday the 3rd at noon to substitute. Aim to propose timeline

Invite – to come out today.

Public outreach **10** **12:50 PM**

Shankar – we wanted to make the meetings accessible in community spaces with outreach that is accessible for people to actually attend

We want to figure out how we can use the learnings to help us build the big picture work for the entire project

Creation of community toolkits and workshops around understanding impact of Surveillance and decision making and Ai and there may be learnings from those workshops that come from that as well. There is a lot to put in there and hope to come together early in the year –

30 days is pushing it, 6 – 8 weeks is a good timeline for event

Joe – Negumi anything to add?

Deadline extension request **30** **13.00 PM**

Adjourn **13:30 PM**