

# Community Surveillance Working Group

## Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2024

---

### Working Group Members

Kayleigh McNeil, John Chen, Rene Peters, Wendy Novotne,  
Carolyn Reilly Payne

### Present: City Staff:

Vinh Tang, Eleonor Bounds, Sarah Carrier, Toby Baden.

Member of the Public:

### In Attendance:

BJ Last, Drew Batchler, Randall, Matt, C, Commander Fred  
Waterford, Winston Smith

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

---

### Agenda

# Community Surveillance Working Group

## Meeting Agenda

July 16, 2024, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

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

## Minutes:

Rene: Goal is to have another working session for this meeting. Rene has typed in a draft of Executive Summary. Want to verify that two week extension is approved? Vinh confirmed yes. July 30<sup>th</sup> is new target date. Exec summary is basic overview of process. Rene will duplicate and then change out tech for RTCC. PCLIA overview. Feedback from WG on exec summary.

Kayleigh concerns/questions: CCTV and RTCC integration. Have concerns and don't have enough information from SIR about what the difference is between current RTCC and new RTCC. How does this change the access to CCTV. Hard to evaluate potential impacts. Potential 4<sup>th</sup> amendment violations, unsure of impacts. Don't see any reference about whether there was follow up re intent of whether CCTV would be live monitored. Community member pointed out that it was stated that feed would not be live monitored.

Rene: both concerns were called out. Did discuss the live monitoring but if you have additional questions please let us know.

Kayleigh- did we get any clarity on that. Since there is no policy outlining the use of this tech, looks like this is well addressed in assessment.

Rene: tried to give color to 4<sup>th</sup> amendment piece. Could you speak to this more?

Kayleigh: concerns around CCTV, particularly if it's monitored, concerned that combination of technology would enable SPD to track peoples movements across the City. Could be 4<sup>th</sup> amendment violation re Baltimores use of aerial surveillance systems, court of appeals relied on supreme court ruling that ppl have expectation of privacy on while of their movements. Enough similarities in the use of the tech that under current 4<sup>th</sup> amendment case law it could be a violation. Unsure about whether this is applicable as SIR doesn't give enough information so should outline these concerns.

Commander Waterford shared : <https://www.pss-1.com/> <https://radiolab.org/podcast/update-eye-sky>  
<https://www.wired.com/story/cities-curb-surveillance-baltimore-police-took-air/>

Carolyn: one thing that surfaced from NAACP and with council, concerned about how this will be used and who has access to this tech. This does not seem tight enough and this will be used in a way that is not intended. Needs to be tighter for members of the community. They don't feel that there is enough control/review over when and how its all done. Surveillance and use of it and shared.

Rene: those concerns are captured in the Data Privacy section. A lot of lack of clarity between sworn officers and citizen data etc. and access/use/authentication and so forth. Data retention. Timelog. Broader concern of slippery slope of analysis. Considerations of minors and so forth – how would this work? Would there be a practice of exempting the public until there is a court order or warrant? Questions around facial recognition, but there will be object recognition, does that add up to PII of people moving thru space.

John: how do we clarify some of these areas. For example, data retention. Does this committee create one or ask for these points of clarity?

Rene: in my view, there are areas different members know about but can think about what can be considered as it relates to artificial intelligence. To our ability we throw the darts on the board – is it an open question.

John: I think there is conflicting information around whether CCTV deters crime or not

Rene: think that it was murky conclusions, moderate clearance increase. ROI wasn't notable. Etc. No clear trend that is suggestive of direct correlation/causation.

John: if CCTV shows that there is a small to moderate impact, would enable us to recommend a path of action. What about third party cameras

Rene: we had further questions around third party CCTV footage. High level of concern.

Kayleigh: to go back to recommendations, this group can make them and supplement them with parameters that would limit potential impact on civil liberties and marginalized groups in the city. For the retention should be limited to 14 days.

Rene: there is a certain point that we can say we recommend not to do something.

Wendy: would err towards industry standard, while this isn't a typical industry standard, there does have to be some standard across the board. It isn't our job to find that out. I don't think we have to get specific or guess at what seems reasonable.

Rene: Alex had mentioned this last meeting, nothing hyper specific. IE GDPR (GDPR is broad, so must look across the board)

Kayleigh: would be helpful, in drafting the SIR it would be helpful to know why the specific retention period is selected. More information would have been helpful.

Rene: or even, what has been a benefit as it relates to DOT cameras

Wendy: have question around procedure. Is it that we can give out input, would a new SIR be submitted? There are so many unknowns and questions and leaning towards not approving this? What is the effect of the recommendation?

Kayleigh: the prior tech in review has been retroactive. Wendy can you clarify your question?

Vinh: Bylaws section B. If you have questions, SPD can try address some of the questions. If you still don't feel that the questions have no been answered, then this would go in the PCLIA, then that would be answered and then go to City Council.

Rene: not showstoppers, are there any issues with the new CTO getting up to speed? Is there anything else that needs to be provided to the CTO.

Vinh: the CTO is up to speed on the process.

Rene: at this point, we have a few minutes left. Would appreciate if folks could go in and address any high points/questions to SPD and Nick and then move to finalize the report. Can we have another meeting the week before our submission date? Any final questions?

Wendy: provided that I understand our role, we have the ability to express our thoughts etc. what is your sense of where something like this would be headed? Trying to be realistic and practical.

Kayleigh: this is different from prior situation since this is a completely different set of technologies with a different impact, would hope that council would receive this report and take into account how they evaluate the technology. Can other WG members help with final review of assessment?

**Public Comment:**

Commander Fred Waterford: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/08/14/MNIPRHRPE.DTL>

CCTV 'not a crime deterrent' Wednesday, 14 August, 2002, 14:35 GMT 15:35 UK  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/2192911.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/2192911.stm)

CCTV 'fails to reduce crime' Friday, 28 June, 2002, 14:41 GMT 15:41 UK  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/2071397.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/2071397.stm)

ACLU: What Criminologists and Others Studying Cameras Have Found  
June 25, 2008 <http://www.aclu.org/technology-and-liberty/expert-findings-surveillance-cameras>  
[http://www.aclu.org/files/images/asset\\_upload\\_file708\\_35775.pdf](http://www.aclu.org/files/images/asset_upload_file708_35775.pdf)

THE SCOTTISH OFFICE CENTRAL RESEARCH UNIT CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH FINDINGS No 30  
The Effect of closed circuit television on recorded crime rates and public concern about crime in Glasgow  
<http://www.scotcrim.u-net.com/researchc2.htm>

CITRIS study on SF public cameras released <http://www.citris-uc.org/news/SFcamerastudy>

CCTV CAMERA EVALUATION The crime reduction effects of public CCTV cameras in the City of Philadelphia, PA installed during 2006, February, 2008 <http://www.temple.edu/cj/misc/PhilaCCTV.pdf>

When everyone is regarded as an eternal suspect, and knows it, only petty criminals will fail to change their behavior. Everyone else will feel a deadly chill, every minute, everywhere they turn. This is not good news for anyone who seeks to promote active citizen participation in a civil society. Or innovation, which often starts with a provocative idea. When everything is seen to pose a prospective hazard, no one will want to do anything, for fear of potential future retribution

<https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/police-chief-surveillance-cameras-dont-help-fight>

"You Are a Rogue Device: A New Apparatus Capable of Spying on You Has Been Installed Throughout Downtown Seattle. Very Few Citizens Know What It Is, and Officials Don't Want to Talk About It." <https://www.thestranger.com/features/2013/11/06/18143845/you-are-a-rogue-device>

Drew Batchelor: I have not seen any arguments from this working group in favor of this technology. It seems misrepresentative of the group's decision to present mitigation recommendations.

C: SPD existing RTCC is ibase, was approved for link analysis. New SIR doesn't mention link analysis. Seems like unwise approach. Seems that no matter who takes office next year, likely 2025 will start to usher in a time in which people will be scapegoated. This is a rare opportunity to use law and policy to prevent harms. Advise against.

BJ: thanks again for thoughtful approach, one of the big risks is that if there is any recommendations in favour that people will allow the tech. Policies can be changed. Likely going forward this will be relaxed. If these do get approved, likely these will be expanded.