

# Community Surveillance Working Group

## Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 10th, 2024

---

### Working Group Members Present: City

John Chen, Rene Peters, Alex Maestretti, Wendy Novotne,

### Staff:

Vinh Tang, Sarah Carrier, Eleonor Bounds, Nich Zajchowski,

Toby Baden

### In Attendance:

Member of the Public: P Jensen, Matt, Cynthia, BJ, Sasha Anderson, Donovan, fw, Tee Shannon, Roz

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

---

### Agenda

#### Introductions

2 Approval of minutes and agenda 10 mins. 2 mins.

3 Working Group Review & Discussion Closed-Circuit Television Camera Systems (CCTV) SIR 20 mins.

4 Working Group Review & Discussion Real-Time Crime Center (RTCC) SIR 20 mins.

5 Public comment 10 mins.

1. Intros
2. Approval of minutes: motioned, seconded, approved. Agenda approval. Two week conversation about extension to add to agenda. All Ayes.

3. Rene: reviewing purpose and review, looking at 6 week timeline.

Two Week Extension agenda item: Allowed a two week extension in writing.

Who is recipient of written request? Sarah Nelson, Joy Hollingsworth, Bob Kettle. Could use the extra time to collate the thoughts. Two weeks would put us to the 30<sup>th</sup> of July. Any discussion, questions etc? Motion to approve. All approved. Will write formal request and send to Vinh, will assume that working with extension and moving toward July 30<sup>th</sup> date. If WG fails to submit assessment then council etc may move forward with voting. Any other questions?

Next agenda item: WG discussion on CCTV and RTCC SIRS

Rene share screen document. Summarising broad positions and dive into details of some questions all have hit on and see whether there is anything thematically large missing.

Table review: general temp of measures, for, against or in between. Rene and Kayleigh (against)

Starting with **Wendy** (unstated) : similar to Carolyn. There are several things that everyone is asking about, in terms of getting responses with safeguards and controls in place. Since at the proposal stage there are some unknowns.

**John** (unstated) : similar to Wendy, similar. General trend in terms of retention, monitoring and tech. Leaning against or modified. Common point is that there is no common policy for all tech.

**Carolyn** (unstated with broad concern around both programs)

**Alex** (rtcc for but cctv for with reservations) given the broader context, the tech will be iterative. Would prefer more highly scoped pilot, understand chicken and egg issue. RTCC has existing SIRS tied together. Would not be in favour of CCTV but City should have room to experiment and then be able to address any negative concerns.

#### **Pulled some bullet points**

- Public engagement, key step. More public input around: areas of coverage, comms around surveillance presence, inclusion of community resources

#### **Constitutional concerns regarding civil liberties (Kayleigh)**

- 4<sup>th</sup> amendment right
- Baltimore pilot program. Kayleigh has expressed a concern around the constitutional component.
- John- saw a suggestion, only accessing data when there was a crime (as opposed to monitoring) - captured
- Wendy – centers around expectation of privacy. When and where there is an expectation of privacy. Combining them, not just govt but private companies could be tracking and combining data.

Widespread concern around this. Not something as much on peoples radar. All to say, in terms of expectation of privacy. **Consider mitigating factors:**

- Unsure about people receiving notice
  - What, if any, proper notice can be given and what consent?
- Rene: language access etc.

### **Omnibus Surveillance Policy**

- What is the timing of this, how is the community inputting etc and should that be completed prior to approval
- Alex: hard to make a call for controls without more information. Given short duration of pilot could adjust post or, another option is to say hey this is too risky prior to roll out.
- Rene- Carolyn pointed out vendor consideration. Who are the vendors and who have they served before, third party camera and how consistency would be monitored or accounted for.

### **Lack of clear evaluation criteria**

#### **Scope**

- Definition of crimes for justification for use, is there a list of individual crimes or is this a broad application?
- How to get to specific definitions of these crimes
- Reasons for why tech suited to crimes, is there opportunity for a smaller rollout? Could one zone be rolled out instead? Timeframes, metrics, goals and hurdles at each checkpoint. What does uninstall look like, recommendation from Kayleigh around clear end point to discourage scope creep. Any additions re scope?
  - Alex: focus on vendor, would focus more on the technology capabilities. Detail that comes later.

#### **Oversight**

- OIG, lack of clear definition around OIG on running basis. Clear audit and initiating audits on off times for natural data points where tech is used. Build out some questions in the report.
- Sasha (member of the public – public comment) would be really helpful if we could start with quick summary, purpose and power. Who does the document go to etc.
- Rene responds to Sasha questions/concerns

#### **CCTV:**

- Lack of data/research linking to deterrence in crime. Questions around crime. Seeking more information around evidence and metrics. Does anyone want to speak to improvement around response and investigation?

#### **Sourcing and Vendors**

**Privacy Concerns-** live monitoring = pandoras box. AI and CCTV data – risk to flag. Could videos be scraped for other data? Uninvolved public: minors. Is there an exempt by default approach. Could we eliminate faces?

- Wendy: this is difficult bc when you use any video recording, this can incorporate other applications of technology. For instance, object recognition. Children in cart example. Would like to know more about how redactions work etc.
- How are the feeds made public? (WSDOT)

**RTCC-** lack of clarity around what, exactly, RTCC is comprised of. IE individual data streams? If CCTV is not approved, how does this impact **RTCC**. What technically has changed since rollout in 2015

- Alex: GDPR has laid out good standard for how privacy can be applied and has been tested over the last few years.

### **Public Comment**

**Cynthia:** expansion of CCTV, would that be treated as a material update after pilot? Surveillance ordinance does not require the WG to support the deployment. WG can state harms outweighs benefits. At min tech should be limited to felony crimes.

**BJ:** share Cynthias concerns and group should not support tech. Don't think concerns can be mitigated by controls. Minors concern as well. RTCC – AI features would come out. Bare min, controls need to be in place and any features need to go through full SIR process. Thank you for your work

**Sasha:** thank you, know it's a lot of work. Agree with Cynthia, know coming late to the game. Take the time to reformat report to be strong and definitive stance against this technology. Seattle has stated they will be a sanctuary city but this technology runs counter to being able to uphold that commitment. Seattle should not be extending the police state. Really hope this board will rethink risk, you can provide a report that outlines harm and gives a firm no. Urge you to do this.

**Roz:** also strongly against this. Due to political climate in country, how will this play into this. For example supreme court ruling that makes being homeless unprotected.

**Fw:** agree with all the public comments. Recommend against all of it. 2015 – ibase on premise, no need thru cloud base. This could endanger residents.

**Matt:** Thank you for doing this work. Agree with the sentiment that this committee should communicate clearly and strongly in opposition to these technologies.

**Donovan:** Agree on being in opposition. Thank you for your work.