

## **Attendance**

Shankar Narayan, Joe Woolley, Rich Stolz, Negin Daya (phone), Asha Mohamed

City Staff: Kate Garman, Jim Loter, Greg Doss, Asha Mohamed, Jennifer Lee, Mary Dory, Matt Miller, Amy Tsai, Sarah Carrier, Megumi Sumitani, Seferiana Day, Omari Stringer

Public: Cynthia Spiess

## **Meeting called to order at 12:08 PM**

### **Delivery Timing for SIR's to the group**

Group 1 and 2 technologies are in groupings from lowest risk to potentially higher risk

1<sup>st</sup> group:

Emergency Scene Cameras, Hazardous Materials, CCTV, Sensor link,

2<sup>nd</sup> group:

License Plate readers – three technologies that raise a higher level of civil liberties risk

Revisit timeline, figure out a plan to space out technologies

JW: Which are you concerned about not having sufficient time to get to?

SN: 3 and 4. I feel fairly optimistic about groups 1 and 2, but what concerns me with 3 and 4 is that we don't know what we don't know. These will require a lot more research. Facial recognition, for example.

AM: Council timing is also an issue

SN: We want Council to take our recommendations seriously, and we need enough time for them to review our input.

GA: Technologies are ready to go when you want them, given the ultimate deadline of 3/28/2020. With the current timeline there needs to be some overlap. Perhaps you have subgroups to review them.

SN: My fear on that is that this is a massive amount of work. Making sure the feedback is what we want it to be, getting it to Council is going to be quite the under-taking. If we do split things up, we want to make sure each group is staffed to do the work.

SC: When we met last week, there were still five technologies from Group 1 that haven't been organized.

SN: Any other thoughts for how to make it more manageable?

JW: Is doing them in tandem inevitable?

SN: Not necessarily. The main thing is giving the technology the time it deserves.

JW: I think the technologies should be split into groups, and

AM: I'm in agreement. I think the amount of information, trying to frame it in a sense to get feedback from community is overwhelming. Especially given some of the issues within community. Balancing trying to get input from community and not frightening community is becoming a full-time job. It's become one of major concern. This is new information and to be fully present, to do justice to the work, it feels really rushed. I would like to discuss as a group what that looks like. Are we going to make all the decisions and then go back to community, or do we simultaneously educate the community and bring folks along.

SN: The reason we are here is to serve as a conduit to the community.

JW: My interpretation was that our mandate is not to go out and conduct community outreach, but to act as a check on it in our analysis.

KG: The timeline is set that the City is doing engagement. The six-weeks is framed so that you take the city's engagement and review it. If the City can do better outreach, please let us know.

AM: We were charged with something different – people need to have the conversation about what we are looking at. Small organizations, it's a lot of work for us.

SN: ACLU has already commented on all of these 14 Group 1 and 2 technologies.

JW: I'm for putting dates on and just starting. I think we cripple ourselves if we slow ourselves down with doing more outreach. Unless we see a huge gap in the City's outreach.

SN: How about we get APLR and City Light technologies next?

GA: If you agree today, we will send you these 3 today – ALPR, LPR, Parking Enforcement – right away

RS: The first three are the ones we will be receiving now? And on 4/15, which ones? – Binoculars, Ampfork, Check-meter Device

ND: Sounds like we do just need to scope out the plan and get started. With regards to the existing documents. They seemed very thorough, and my question is because of the amount of research needed to produce this – it's a question of how much time do we want to review the work the ACLU has already done in so much detail.

SN: For every technology the group looks at, the ACLU will have already produced a public comment. There's no reason to reinvent the wheel, unless the group has changes from what the ACLU has written. The discussion could focus on What's missing? Do we want to throw our weight behind a regulation, policy piece...

Did folks get to review ACLU's comments on ALPR? This is the document that has the ACLU logo on it.

Basically, if you look at our comments, we don't really understand why this data is sitting around. We don't agree with dragnet use of license plate reader technology, without adequate protections.

RS: I echo those concerns. I'm curious- what would be the justification for doing ALPR's in neighborhoods that may have 2 or 5 hour limits or permits. I'm curious what the rationale is? Where does the data go? What do people get charged? Who gets impacted?

GA: The first 50 pages or so of the SIR, will give you the background on why and how the technology is used

RS: There are some outstanding questions.

JW: My problem is that I don't feel comfortable just stamping ACLU's work.

We get the SIR, public comment, I read everything, come prepared. This is what we have been charged to do.

GA: The initial SIR's have been posted, but beyond

SN: Just to clarify – the public comment SIR for ALPR group is available now?

GA/SC: Yes. Group 2 is close, as of 4/15. We will send it at 8am tomorrow.

GA: Our departments are working on answering the questions. We want to make sure we are getting consistent questions, as we are getting questions from multiple sources that may be worded differently.

ALPR – ASAP, City Light: hold until next meeting in April.

SN:

### **Civil Liberties Impact Assessment**

Draft document

1. Purpose should be clearly defined
2. Data retention limited to the time needed
3. Limited data sharing with third parties
4. Clear policies should govern operation, all camera operators should be trained in those policies

We could deliver the comments to Council as they are or ask for more time from Council to get the policies and public comment.

What do people think about submitting or waiting until we see policies?

RS: It'd be important to relay to Council that the process is not yet complete, and to ask for more time to review. But if things get delayed, it makes work pile up toward the end.

SN: Ask the City to get us those policies, with hope that we can get

RS: Can we ask for MOU's, contracts between the City and the private companies that are providing the technology. Is that within our purview?

SN: I don't see why it wouldn't be possible.

RS: It might be important to advise Council approach contracts differently in the future.

SN: What do people think?

JW:

GD: Since you've asked for the City, I represent the LEG branch. Relevant to the suggestions and observations made in the draft impact assessment, It's certainly in the purview to transmit anything to the Council. I don't think the two weeks is a big deal on the Council's end. The suggestion that these get sent without further discussion, you have a couple things going on

- Observations are around use and retention. Identity holes and potential places to improve data use, security, etc. – Page 2 – the first 5 bullets are great recommendations.
- I have concern about the last one- that Council adopts an ordinance – this falls outside of the framework of the Surveillance Ordinance and the process that is articulated by the ordinance. It's more a function of the Executive branch, rather than the legislative.

SN: An opportunity to set a bar for all camera technologies and all data collected by them. To make them standard. We can table that discussion til next time around.

JW: If it's not going to foul up any other process, I recommend we ask for the 2 weeks, convey we have a comprehensive draft and are waiting on the documents from the city.

SN: I move to request a 2-week extension from the City Council for a civil liberties assessment on the ESC, Hazmat, CCTV.

RS: Second.

SN: All in favor? Motion passes with all in favor.

SN: I did want to flag Acyclica. Jen will give a short overview of each technology.

JL: Acyclica: SDOT uses this technology – road trend, gather WiFi addresses which can be in tired, cell phones, etc. to track location. They use this for the unclear purpose of “traffic management”.

CopLogic: used by SPD – community members and retailers can submit police reports without calling 911. – Retail theft program, etc.

SN: The company that manufactured Acyclica has been acquired. The current sensors may contain more privacy concerns because they have more capabilities. We may want to obtain the contract for this one. Look at the current diversion technology piece. Figure out where we want to go with that.

Anything on the Group 2 comments that we should raise?

Our next agenda item is that we have a member transitioning.

ND: I'm moving to the University of Toronto, so I am leaving UW and the Working Group.

SN: Negin is a Mayoral appointee, so the Executive will need to make the appointment decision. We should post the initial announcement. The Latinx and Indigenous communities are not represented. It'd be good to have them represented. If you have specific people you'd like to

JW: Was there a desire to have an academic?

ND: Yes, I do believe that I was brought on in my academic capacity.

JW: Negin, if you have recommendations, I'd love to hear them.

KG will work with working group and Mayor to determine new appointee.

JW: Recap the next meeting – what needs to be done in the meantime.

SN: We are getting the first three technologies – ALPR, LPR, Parking enforcement – these SIR's will formally be delivered to us tomorrow. The charge for the next meeting will be to review those, including the public comments – send to staff our outstanding questions based on those SIR's.

Should we draft up a preliminary comment memo? It would be pretty easy to come up with one based on the ACLU's comments. In addition we are asking for more time.

GD: I don't know how or whether there will be a formal granting of 2-weeks. I need to work with Gary Smith to determine whether that is necessary. The 6 weeks was intended to be a guideline for what the group is doing. I'll look into the process.

Meeting adjourned at 1:31 pm.