

POWERFUL TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS
FOR THE CITY AND PUBLIC WE SERVE

2018 Surveillance Impact Report

EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS

SEATTLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

CONTENTS

SURVEILLANCE IMPACT REPORT OVERVIEW	7
HOW THIS DOCUMENT IS COMPLETED	7
PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	8
PURPOSE	8
WHEN IS A PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED?.....	8
1.0 ABSTRACT	8
1.1 PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION (ONE PARAGRAPH) OF THE PURPOSE AND PROPOSED USE OF THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY.....	8
1.2 EXPLAIN THE REASON THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY IS BEING CREATED OR UPDATED AND WHY THE PIA IS REQUIRED.	9
2.0 PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW.....	9
2.1 DESCRIBE THE BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY.....	9
2.2 PROVIDE ANY DATA OR RESEARCH DEMONSTRATING ANTICIPATED BENEFITS.	9
2.3 DESCRIBE THE TECHNOLOGY INVOLVED.	10
2.4 DESCRIBE HOW THE PROJECT OR USE OF TECHNOLOGY RELATES TO THE DEPARTMENT'S MISSION.....	10
2.5 WHO WILL BE INVOLVED WITH THE DEPLOYMENT AND USE OF THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY?	10
3.0 USE GOVERNANCE	10
3.1 DESCRIBE THE PROCESSES THAT ARE REQUIRED PRIOR TO EACH USE, OR ACCESS TO/ OF THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY, SUCH AS A NOTIFICATION, OR CHECK-IN, CHECK-OUT OF EQUIPMENT.	10
3.2 LIST THE LEGAL STANDARDS OR CONDITIONS, IF ANY, THAT MUST BE MET BEFORE THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY IS USED.....	11
3.3 DESCRIBE THE POLICIES AND TRAINING REQUIRED OF ALL PERSONNEL OPERATING THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY, AND WHO HAS ACCESS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH USE AND MANAGEMENT POLICIES.	11
4.0 DATA COLLECTION AND USE	12
4.1 PROVIDE DETAILS ABOUT WHAT INFORMATION IS BEING COLLECTED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN AN INDIVIDUAL, INCLUDING OTHER IT SYSTEMS, SYSTEMS OF RECORD,	

COMMERCIAL DATA AGGREGATORS, PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA AND/OR OTHER CITY DEPARTMENTS.	12
4.2 WHAT MEASURES ARE IN PLACE TO MINIMIZE INADVERTENT OR IMPROPER COLLECTION OF DATA?	12
4.3 HOW AND WHEN WILL THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY BE DEPLOYED OR USED? BY WHOM? WHO WILL DETERMINE WHEN THE PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY IS DEPLOYED AND USED?	12
4.4 HOW OFTEN WILL THE TECHNOLOGY BE IN OPERATION?	12
4.5 WHAT IS THE PERMANENCE OF THE INSTALLATION? IS IT INSTALLED PERMANENTLY, OR TEMPORARILY?	12
4.6 IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT COLLECTING DATA OR IMAGES VISIBLE TO THE PUBLIC? WHAT ARE THE MARKINGS TO INDICATE THAT IT IS IN USE? WHAT SIGNAGE IS USED TO DETERMINE DEPARTMENT OWNERSHIP AND CONTACT INFORMATION?.....	12
4.7 HOW WILL DATA THAT IS COLLECTED BE ACCESSED AND BY WHOM?	13
4.8 IF OPERATED OR USED BY ANOTHER ENTITY ON BEHALF OF THE CITY, PROVIDE DETAILS ABOUT ACCESS, AND APPLICABLE PROTOCOLS. PLEASE LINK MEMORANDUMS OF AGREEMENT, CONTRACTS, ETC. THAT ARE APPLICABLE.....	13
4.9 WHAT ARE ACCEPTABLE REASONS FOR ACCESS TO THE EQUIPMENT AND/OR DATA COLLECTED?	13
4.10 WHAT SAFEGUARDS ARE IN PLACE, FOR PROTECTING DATA FROM UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS (ENCRYPTION, ACCESS CONTROL MECHANISMS, ETC.) AND TO PROVIDE AN AUDIT TRAIL (VIEWER LOGGING, MODIFICATION LOGGING, ETC.)?.....	13
5.0 DATA STORAGE, RETENTION AND DELETION	14
5.1 HOW WILL DATA BE SECURELY STORED?	14
5.2 HOW WILL THE OWNER ALLOW FOR DEPARTMENTAL AND OTHER ENTITIES, TO AUDIT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH LEGAL DELETION REQUIREMENTS?	14
5.3 WHAT MEASURES WILL BE USED TO DESTROY IMPROPERLY COLLECTED DATA?	14
5.4 WHICH SPECIFIC DEPARTMENTAL UNIT OR INDIVIDUAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING COMPLIANCE WITH DATA RETENTION REQUIREMENTS?	14
6.0 DATA SHARING AND ACCURACY	15
6.1 WHICH ENTITY OR ENTITIES INSIDE AND EXTERNAL TO THE CITY WILL BE DATA SHARING PARTNERS?	15
6.2 WHY IS DATA SHARING NECESSARY?.....	15
6.3 ARE THERE ANY RESTRICTIONS ON NON-CITY DATA USE?.....	15
6.4 HOW DOES THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY REVIEW AND APPROVE INFORMATION SHARING AGREEMENTS, MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING, NEW USES OF THE INFORMATION,	

NEW ACCESS TO THE SYSTEM BY ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN CITY OF SEATTLE AND OUTSIDE AGENCIES? 16

6.5 EXPLAIN HOW THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY CHECKS THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTED. IF ACCURACY IS NOT CHECKED, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY. 16

6.6 DESCRIBE ANY PROCEDURES THAT ALLOW INDIVIDUALS TO ACCESS THEIR INFORMATION AND CORRECT INACCURATE OR ERRONEOUS INFORMATION..... 16

7.0 LEGAL OBLIGATIONS, RISKS AND COMPLIANCE..... 16

7.1 WHAT SPECIFIC LEGAL AUTHORITIES AND/OR AGREEMENTS PERMIT AND DEFINE THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION BY THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY? 16

7.2 DESCRIBE WHAT PRIVACY TRAINING IS PROVIDED TO USERS EITHER GENERALLY OR SPECIFICALLY RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY. 16

7.3 GIVEN THE SPECIFIC DATA ELEMENTS COLLECTED, DESCRIBE THE PRIVACY RISKS IDENTIFIED AND FOR EACH RISK, EXPLAIN HOW IT WAS MITIGATED. SPECIFIC RISKS MAY BE INHERENT IN THE SOURCES OR METHODS OF COLLECTION, OR THE QUALITY OR QUANTITY OF INFORMATION INCLUDED..... 16

7.4 IS THERE ANY ASPECT OF THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY THAT MIGHT CAUSE CONCERN BY GIVING THE APPEARANCE TO THE PUBLIC OF PRIVACY INTRUSION OR MISUSE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION?..... 17

8.0 MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT..... 17

8.1 DESCRIBE HOW THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY MAINTAINS A RECORD OF ANY DISCLOSURES OUTSIDE OF THE DEPARTMENT. 17

8.2 WHAT AUDITING MEASURES ARE IN PLACE TO SAFEGUARD THE INFORMATION, AND POLICIES THAT PERTAIN TO THEM, AS WELL AS WHO HAS ACCESS TO THE AUDIT DATA? EXPLAIN WHETHER THE PROJECT/TECHNOLOGY CONDUCTS SELF-AUDITS, THIRD PARTY AUDITS OR REVIEWS. 17

FINANCIAL INFORMATION..... 18

PURPOSE 18

1.0 FISCAL IMPACT 18

1.1 CURRENT OR POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDING: INITIAL ACQUISITION COSTS..... 18

1.2 CURRENT OR POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDING: ON-GOING OPERATING COSTS, INCLUDING MAINTENANCE, LICENSING, PERSONNEL, LEGAL/COMPLIANCE USE AUDITING, DATA RETENTION AND SECURITY COSTS. 18

1.3 COST SAVINGS POTENTIAL THROUGH USE OF THE TECHNOLOGY..... 19

1.4 CURRENT OR POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDING INCLUDING SUBSIDIES OR FREE PRODUCTS OFFERED BY VENDORS OR GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES..... 19

EXPERTISE AND REFERENCES 20

PURPOSE 20

1.0 OTHER GOVERNMENT REFERENCES 20

2.0 ACADEMICS, CONSULTANTS, AND OTHER EXPERTS 20

3.0 WHITE PAPERS OR OTHER DOCUMENTS 21

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT AND ENGAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT WORKSHEET 22

PURPOSE 22

ADAPTION OF THE RET FOR SURVEILLANCE IMPACT REPORTS..... 22

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT OVERVIEW 22

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT: TO ASSESS POLICIES, INITIATIVES, PROGRAMS, AND BUDGET ISSUES 22

1.0 SET OUTCOMES 23

1.1. SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL HAS DEFINED THE FOLLOWING INCLUSION CRITERIA IN THE SURVEILLANCE ORDINANCE, AND THEY SERVE AS IMPORTANT TOUCHSTONES FOR THE RISKS DEPARTMENTS ARE BEING ASKED TO RESOLVE AND/OR MITIGATE. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING INCLUSION CRITERIA APPLY TO THIS TECHNOLOGY? 23

1.2 WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON CIVIL LIBERTIES THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS TECHNOLOGY? 23

1.3 WHAT DOES YOUR DEPARTMENT DEFINE AS THE MOST IMPORTANT RACIALLY EQUITABLE COMMUNITY OUTCOMES RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS TECHNOLOGY? 23

1.4 WHAT RACIAL EQUITY OPPORTUNITY AREA(S) WILL BE AFFECTED BY THE APPLICATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY?..... 23

1.5 ARE THERE IMPACTS ON: 23

2.0 INVOLVE STAKEHOLDERS, ANALYZE DATA 24

2.1 DEPARTMENTAL CONCLUSIONS ABOUT POTENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY. ARE THE IMPACTS ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS?..... 24

2.2 WHAT ARE THE RACIAL DEMOGRAPHICS OF THOSE LIVING IN THE AREA OR IMPACTED BY THE ISSUE? 24

2.3 HAVE YOU COMPLETED THE FOLLOWING STEPS TO ENGAGE THE PUBLIC?..... 24

2.4 WHAT DOES DATA AND CONVERSATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS TELL YOU ABOUT EXISTING RACIAL INEQUITIES THAT INFLUENCE PEOPLE’S LIVES AND SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN APPLYING/IMPLEMENTING/USING THE TECHNOLOGY?	26
2.5 WHAT ARE THE ROOT CAUSES OR FACTORS CREATING THESE RACIAL INEQUITIES?	26
3.0 DETERMINE BENEFIT AND/OR BURDEN	27
3.1 HOW WILL THE TECHNOLOGY, OR USE OF THE TECHNOLOGY INCREASE OR DECREASE RACIAL EQUITY?	27
3.2 WHAT BENEFITS TO THE IMPACTED COMMUNITY/DEMOGRAPHIC MAY RESULT?	27
3.3 WHAT ARE POTENTIAL UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES (BOTH NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE POTENTIAL IMPACT)?	27
3.4 ARE THE IMPACTS ALIGNED WITH YOUR DEPARTMENT’S COMMUNITY OUTCOMES THAT WERE DEFINED IN STEP 1.0?	27
4.0 ADVANCE OPPORTUNITY OR MINIMIZE HARM	28
4.1 HOW WILL YOU ADDRESS THE IMPACTS (INCLUDING UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES) ON RACIAL EQUITY?	28
5.0 EVALUATE, RAISE RACIAL AWARENESS, BE ACCOUNTABLE	28
5.1 WHICH NEIGHBORHOODS WERE IMPACTED/TARGETED BY THE TECHNOLOGY OVER THE PAST YEAR AND HOW MANY PEOPLE IN EACH NEIGHBORHOOD WERE IMPACTED?	28
5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF PEOPLE IMPACTED/TARGETED BY THE TECHNOLOGY OVER THE PAST YEAR.	29
5.3 WHICH OF THE MITIGATION STRATEGIES THAT YOU IDENTIFIED IN STEP 4 WERE IMPLEMENTED IN THE PAST YEAR?	29
5.4 HOW HAVE YOU INVOLVED STAKEHOLDERS SINCE THE IMPLEMENTATION/APPLICATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY BEGAN?	30
5.5 WHAT IS UNRESOLVED?	30
6.0 REPORT BACK.....	30
PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSESSMENT	31
PURPOSE	31
WORKING GROUP PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSESSMENT.....	31
SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT RESPONSE	42
APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY	44

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC COMMENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND ANALYSIS 46

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS 46

COMMENTS SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSING EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS... 46

GENERAL SURVEILLANCE COMMENT THEMES 48

DEMOGRAPHICS FOR GROUP ONE COMMENTS..... 49

APPENDIX C: PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE(S)..... 50

APPENDIX D: MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET(S) 58

APPENDIX E: INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS RECEIVED 65

ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED ON EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS..... 65

ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED ON GENERAL SURVEILLANCE 67

APPENDIX F: LETTERS FROM ORGANIZATIONS 105

APPENDIX G: EMAILS & LETTERS FROM THE PUBLIC 117

**APPENDIX H: PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY
123**

OVERVIEW 123

BACKGROUND ON METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK..... 123

METHODOLOGY..... 123

STEP ONE: PREPARE DATA 123

STEP TWO: CONDUCT QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS USING FRAMEWORK METHODOLOGY 124

STEP THREE: CONDUCT QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS 124

STEP FOUR: SUMMARIZATION 124

APPENDIX I: POLICIES AND OPERATING GUIDELINES (POG) 125

APPENDIX J: CTO NOTICE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY 127

SURVEILLANCE IMPACT REPORT OVERVIEW

The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance [125376](#), also referred to as the “Surveillance Ordinance”, on September 1, 2017. This Ordinance has implications for the acquisition of new technologies by the City, and technologies that are already in use that may fall under the new, broader definition of surveillance.

SMC 14.18.020.B.1 charges the City’s Executive with developing a process to identify surveillance technologies subject to the Ordinance. Seattle IT, on behalf of the Executive, developed and implemented a process through which a privacy and surveillance review is completed prior to the acquisition of new technologies. This requirement, and the criteria used in the review process, are documented in [Seattle IT Policy PR-02](#), the “Surveillance Policy”.

HOW THIS DOCUMENT IS COMPLETED

As Seattle IT and department staff complete the document, they should keep the following in mind.

- Responses to questions should be in the text or check boxes only; all other information (questions, descriptions, etc.) should **NOT** be edited by the department staff completing this document.
- All content in this report will be available externally to the public. With this in mind, avoid using acronyms, slang, or other terms which may not be well-known to external audiences. Additionally, responses should be written using principally non-technical language to ensure they are accessible to audiences unfamiliar with the topic.

PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PURPOSE

A Privacy Impact Assessment (“PIA”) is a method for collecting and documenting detailed information collected in order to conduct an in-depth privacy review of a program or project. A PIA asks questions about the collection, use, sharing, security and access controls for data that is gathered using a technology or program. It also requests information about policies, training and documentation that govern use of the technology. The PIA responses are used to determine privacy risks associated with a project and mitigations that may reduce some or all of those risks. In the interests of transparency about data collection and management, the City of Seattle has committed to publishing all PIAs on an outward facing website for public access.

WHEN IS A PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED?

A PIA may be required in two circumstances.

- 1) When a project, technology, or other review has been flagged as having a high privacy risk.
- 2) When a technology is required to complete the Surveillance Impact Report process. This is one deliverable that comprises the report.

1.0 ABSTRACT

1.1 Please provide a brief description (one paragraph) of the purpose and proposed use of the project/technology.

Certain Seattle Fire Department (SFD) response vehicles maintain a digital camera for use during emergency operations. These cameras may be utilized by Department personnel for several reasons:

- Providing emergency medical doctors with pictures of the mechanism of injury for trauma patients.
- Pictures of fire scenes for Fire Investigation Unit (FIU) investigations.
- Safety investigations following collisions involving Department response vehicles.

First responders take the cameras from the vehicles, use the images for one of the purposes above and then delete the images in accordance with Seattle Fire Department’s Policies and Operating Guidelines (“POG”).

1.2 Explain the reason the project/technology is being created or updated and why the PIA is required.

According to the Surveillance Ordinance, a technology has surveillance capability if it can be used “to collect, capture, transmit, or record data that could be used to surveil, regardless of whether the data is obscured, de-identified, or anonymized before or after collection and regardless of whether technology might be used to obscure or prevent the capturing of certain views or types of information.”

Digital cameras are a ubiquitous part of modern life, and their use by first responders are no exception. However, cameras used to capture images without the knowledge or consent of the subjects or property owners are also an example of a technology that meets the most basic definition of surveillance.

First responders are often required to enter incident scenes at private residences or businesses, gaining access to potentially sensitive locations or encountering victims requiring emergency medical services (EMS). In specific cases, SFD personnel use digital cameras to take pictures of patients and incident scenes, and could potentially capture images of identifiable individuals or their residences during emergency responses.

2.0 PROJECT / TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW

Provide an overview of the project or technology. The overview gives the context and background necessary to understand the purpose, mission and justification for the project / technology proposed

2.1 Describe the benefits of the project/technology.

In emergency settings, time is of the essence. A camera is a useful tool for first responders for information sharing purposes because images convey a significant amount of information in a short amount of time.

Providing medical professionals with immediate access to information during emergency responses can reduce potential for further injury or loss of life for patients. Photos of incident scenes can also provide valuable information for fire investigators to examine and share their findings with other Fire Investigation Unit (FIU) staff and the Seattle Police Department’s Arson and Bomb Squad (ABS).

Chiefs may use the cameras to take photos of incident scenes for research or for use in training. Pictures are also taken during safety investigations involving Fire Department personnel, such as vehicle collisions.

2.2 Provide any data or research demonstrating anticipated benefits.

The National Fire Protection Association provides guidelines on situational responses, including best practices and operating procedures. [NFPA 904 the Incident Follow-up Report Guide](#) recommends collecting photographs as a data point to reduce risk over long term when reviewing incidents.

2.3 Describe the technology involved.

The make and model of emergency scene cameras differ slightly according to the unit or response vehicle. In all cases though, the cameras are used to take photographs via a basic “point and click” method.

Chiefs and Medic Units use the [Nikon Coolpix L24](#) or the [Panasonic Lumex TS30](#). The Fire Investigation Unit’s [Nikon D7200](#) has more functionality, including the ability to take high quality videos. It is only used to take pictures for fire investigations.

2.4 Describe how the project or use of technology relates to the department’s mission.

The SFD’s mission is to save lives and protect property through emergency medical service, fire and rescue response and fire prevention. Effective communication and information sharing are essential components required to achieve our mission.

2.5 Who will be involved with the deployment and use of the project / technology?

The following are involved with the deployment and use of the emergency scene cameras:

- SFD Operations Staff (SFD HQ)
- Seattle Medic One (Battalion 3 at Harborview Medical Center)
- Safety Office (SFD HQ)
- Support Services (SFD HQ)
- SFD Client Services Director

3.0 USE GOVERNANCE

Provide an outline of any rules that will govern the use of the project / technology. Please note: non-City entities are bound by restrictions specified in the Surveillance Ordinance and Privacy Principles and must provide written procedures for how the entity will comply with any restrictions identified.

3.1 Describe the processes that are required prior to each use, or access to/ of the project / technology, such as a notification, or check-in, check-out of equipment.

For Medic One units, cameras are located in a locked safe with the controlled drugs on each response vehicle, which require a special PIN to access. The accountability system for the controlled drugs also allows for an audit trail of all personnel who access the safe. Daily inventories are conducted for every medic unit, and a quarterly inventory is done by the Medical Services Officer (“MSO”).

For FIU photo records, only investigators and one administrative specialist have access to the Nikon D7200 camera and photographs. The cameras are physically located in an office secured behind two locked doors, which can only be accessed by FIU staff.

3.2 List the legal standards or conditions, if any, that must be met before the project / technology is used.

[The Uniform Health Care Information Act \(RCW 70.02\)](#) governs the use, retention and disclosure of confidential medical information, which includes photos of traumatic injuries sustained by patients. For covered entities, the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) also provides useful standards regarding data security and privacy. For FIU records, investigation photos are retained in a database that is compliant with current Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) standards.

3.3 Describe the policies and training required of all personnel operating the project / technology, and who has access to ensure compliance with use and management policies.

The Seattle Fire Department's internal Policies and Operating Guidelines ("POG") establishes rules around the use and retention of digital photographs during emergency medical responses:

- Section 5001-13: "All Medic Units and Medic 44 carry a digital camera in the controlled drug safe. These cameras may be utilized by Department personnel to record the mechanism of injury for trauma patients. These photographs will only be shown to appropriate hospital emergency department staff to clearly explain the severity of injury and then will be promptly deleted from the camera's internal memory."
- Section 5001-2.6: "Digital photographs of mechanism of injury for trauma patients taken with the digital camera carried in Medic Unit(s) and/or M44 shall be deleted after being shown to appropriate hospital emergency department staff."
- Section 3004-7: "in accordance with OG 5001.2 Aid and Medic Responses, Digital Cameras, on-duty firefighter/paramedics may use digital cameras provided by the Department to record the mechanism of injury to trauma patients. After showing the photographs to appropriate hospital emergency department staff the photos will be deleted."

All SFD uniformed personnel are trained extensively on all POG sections during recruit school and their one-year probationary period following the hire date. Battalion 3 (Medic One) paramedics receive additional training on the use of cameras for documenting traumatic injuries during paramedic training school.

For the Fire Investigation Unit (FIU), the Captain is responsible for ensuring investigation photos are maintained in a secure, CJIS compliant database. <https://www.seattle.gov/police-manual/title-12---department-information-systems/12050---criminal-justice-information-systems>

In general, commanding officers, such as the acting Lieutenant and/or Captain, are responsible for ensuring compliance of uniformed personnel in their unit. While the Department has strict policies around the use of personal devices, such as cameras and cell phones, at this time there are no sections of the POG specifically addressing the use of department-issued digital cameras and photo retention. The Department is working to develop a policy update regarding the use of department-issued digital cameras in general, as well as their use and retention in vehicle collision investigations by the Safety office and fire investigations by the FIU.

4.0 DATA COLLECTION AND USE

Provide information about the policies and practices around the collection and use of the data collected.

4.1 Provide details about what information is being collected from sources other than an individual, including other IT systems, systems of record, commercial data aggregators, publicly available data and/or other city departments.

No information from other sources is collected by this technology.

4.2 What measures are in place to minimize inadvertent or improper collection of data?

The Department is working to develop a policy for the all staff regarding the acceptable use of this technology during emergency responses, as well as the subsequent storage of photos and sharing with law enforcement agencies. However, there are strict policies regarding the use and deletion of photos if they include victims requiring emergency medical service (POG section 3004-7).

4.3 How and when will the project / technology be deployed or used? By whom? Who will determine when the project / technology is deployed and used?

Digital cameras are currently in use by three divisions of the Seattle Fire Department:

- Medic One (Battalion 3) paramedic units
- Battalion Chiefs in Safety 1 and Safety 2 units
- Fire Investigation Unit (FIU) investigators and the FIU Captain

4.4 How often will the technology be in operation?

Digital cameras are currently used in three divisions of the Department. They are used as necessary by first responders.

4.5 What is the permanence of the installation? Is it installed permanently, or temporarily?

The cameras are included in the apparatus inventory for the respective Department units, but can be removed for use as needed during an emergency response or investigation.

4.6 Is a physical object collecting data or images visible to the public? What are the markings to indicate that it is in use? What signage is used to determine department ownership and contact information?

All digital cameras used by Department personnel are visibly recognizable as such. No signs or other markings indicate that a digital camera is in use.

4.7 How will data that is collected be accessed and by whom?

The Medic Unit cameras can only be accessed Battalion 3 paramedics. First responders take the pictures and display them to the Medic One doctor at Harborview Medical Center. Per Department policy, the data is not retained following transfer of patient care.

Fire Investigation Unit (FIU) photos are stored in a CJIS-compliant database physically located in a secured room of the Fire Prevention Division. The records are accessible only to fire investigators, the FIU Captain and one civilian administrative specialist.

Safety chiefs take pictures for collision investigations, which are stored on the Department's internally shared computer or "O" drive and accessible only to the safety office. A total of four battalion-level chiefs have access to the stored records.

4.8 If operated or used by another entity on behalf of the city, provide details about access, and applicable protocols. Please link memorandums of agreement, contracts, etc. That are applicable.

There are no applicable MoA's, contracts or protocols associated with the use of digital camera technology by SFD personnel, with the one exception of trauma patient photos taken during EMS responses (POG Section 3004-7).

4.9 What are acceptable reasons for access to the equipment and/or data collected?

For medic units, cameras are only to be used during emergency medical responses where showing the mechanism of injury to hospital staff is required to maintain high-level continuity of care. The FIU camera may only be used for fire investigations. The Safety Office cameras can only be used by chiefs during safety investigations, such as vehicle collisions.

The Department is working develop a 2018 policy update to document the access and other protocols for digital cameras, photo retention and data-sharing.

4.10 What safeguards are in place, for protecting data from unauthorized access (encryption, access control mechanisms, etc.) And to provide an audit trail (viewer logging, modification logging, etc.)?

CAD may be used to identify personnel associated with a specific unit or incident, as all on-shift SFD members are required to sign-in to CAD. Daily inventory and equipment use that can be traced to the personnel on duty.

5.0 DATA STORAGE, RETENTION AND DELETION

5.1 How will data be securely stored?

Strict policies regarding the use and deletion of photos for trauma patients are outlined in the Department's Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG) section 3004-7 following the completion of a patient's transfer of care to hospital staff.

Fire Investigation Unit photos are stored on a CJIS-client database. Safety office photos are stored on a secured city server within the Department's "O" drive.

The Department is also adopting Multi Factor Authentication in late 2021, which will further increase the security of any images stored on City drives.

5.2 How will the owner allow for departmental and other entities, to audit for compliance with legal deletion requirements?

Any oversight agency may schedule an appointment with the appropriate officer listed in 5.4.

5.3 What measures will be used to destroy improperly collected data?

Strict policies regarding the use and deletion of photos for trauma patients are outlined in the Department's Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG) section 3004-7 following the completion of a patient's transfer of care to hospital staff.

FIU photos are retained according to the same retention schedule as the Seattle Police Department's Arson and Bomb Squad and DEMS requirements.

5.4 Which specific departmental unit or individual is responsible for ensuring compliance with data retention requirements?

Medic One/Battalion 3 - Four Medical Safety Officers (MSO), one for each shift, and the Medic One Deputy Chief.

Fire Investigation Unit – FIU Captain

Safety Office – Four Battalion Chiefs, one for each shift.

6.0 DATA SHARING AND ACCURACY

6.1 Which entity or entities inside and external to the city will be data sharing partners?

Photos of trauma patients are only shared in person with emergency room staff for the purposes of providing patient care. The pictures themselves are never transferred from the camera in any format.

Photos taken by Safety Chiefs for vehicle collision investigations may be shared with the Risk Management Division of Finance and Administrative Services (FAS) for the purposes of processing claims for damages against the City.

FIU photos are shared with the Seattle Police Department using a shared CJIS-compliant database known as Digital Evidence Management Software (DEMS).

6.2 Why is data sharing necessary?

The mechanism of injury (MOI) for trauma patients can be shared much more quickly and accurately with emergency medical staff with a picture than by written or verbal communication. Time and accuracy are critical in these scenarios, so sharing photos is an invaluable tool for first responders during medical emergencies.

The Seattle Fire Department's Fire Investigation Unit works closely with the Seattle Police Department's Arson and Bomb Squad (ABS). The sharing of information and records is necessary for adequate law enforcement.

In addition, all Department records, including photos, are subject to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). FIU records are exempt from disclosure during an ongoing law enforcement investigation (RCW 42.56.240). Once an investigation is closed, all photos are then subject to disclosure, except for those showing a victim (RCW 70.02). The sharing of FIU photos with the SPD ABS only occurs within a CJIS-compliant framework, as the two offices share a secure database.

6.3 Are there any restrictions on non-city data use?

Yes No

6.3.1 If you answered Yes, provide a copy of the department's procedures and policies for ensuring compliance with these restrictions.

Photos of victims are considered confidential medical records protected by the UHCIA (RCW 70.02). Department policies, outlined above in section 3.3, prohibit the retention of photos showing injuries sustained by trauma patients.

The Department is working to develop a policy update for incorporation into the POG specifically regarding the use of Department-issued cameras. However, those policy changes will have to be included in the next round of collective bargaining before they are officially adopted as Department policy.

6.4 How does the project/technology review and approve information sharing agreements, memorandums of understanding, new uses of the information, new access to the system by organizations within City of Seattle and outside agencies?

At this time, no such information sharing agreements exist regarding the use of SFD’s digital cameras and sharing of pictures.

6.5 Explain how the project/technology checks the accuracy of the information collected. If accuracy is not checked, please explain why.

In all cases, the technology simply produces an image. Any “corrections” to the photographs would actually reduce the accuracy of the information collected.

6.6 Describe any procedures that allow individuals to access their information and correct inaccurate or erroneous information.

No corrections to pictures or photos are necessary for this technology, nor would it be appropriate.

7.0 LEGAL OBLIGATIONS, RISKS AND COMPLIANCE

7.1 What specific legal authorities and/or agreements permit and define the collection of information by the project/technology?

Photos of trauma patients are considered confidential medical records according to RCW 70.02, otherwise known as the Uniform Health-Care Information Act (UHCIA).

Fire Investigation photos are maintained in a CJIS-compliant database known as Digital Evidence Management Software (DEMS). Policies set forth by CJIS include:

- A limit of 5 unsuccessful login attempts by a user accessing CJIS
- Event logging various login activities, including password changes
- Weekly audit reviews
- Active account management moderation
- Session lock after 30 minutes of inactivity
- Access restriction based on physical location, job assignment, time of day, and network address

7.2 Describe what privacy training is provided to users either generally or specifically relevant to the project/technology.

The only privacy training provided is the City-wide privacy and security training. For the Medic Units, all paramedics undergo training on the use of cameras for recording the mechanism of injury for trauma patients during EMS responses. POG section 3004-7 governs the use of cameras during such incidents.

7.3 Given the specific data elements collected, describe the privacy risks identified and for each risk, explain how it was mitigated. Specific risks may be inherent in the sources or methods of collection, or the quality or quantity of information included.

Please work with the Privacy Team to identify the specific risks and mitigations applicable to this project / technology.

Private occupancies or sensitive areas may be accessed by SFD personnel during an emergency response. Other records of the response, such as Computer-Aided Dispatch reports, could be then used in conjunction with this technology to identify individuals at an incident scene.

7.4 Is there any aspect of the project/technology that might cause concern by giving the appearance to the public of privacy intrusion or misuse of personal information?

Examples might include a push of information out to individuals that is unexpected and appears to be intrusive, or an engagement with a third party to use information derived from the data collected, that is not explained in the initial notification.

Sharing of incident records with law enforcement is likely the greatest cause for concern. Another would be protection of records associated with emergency medical services, which are protected by RCW 70.02.

8.0 MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

8.1 Describe how the project/technology maintains a record of any disclosures outside of the department.

Disclosures are only authorized if processed by the Department’s Public Disclosure Officer. The PDO ensures compliance with the POG, UHCIA and the City’s Privacy Principles.

All disclosures are tracked in a log, which is regularly updated and retained on a secure server accessible only to select employees, as well as the Public Records Request Center (AKA GovQA).

8.2 What auditing measures are in place to safeguard the information, and policies that pertain to them, as well as who has access to the audit data? Explain whether the project/technology conducts self-audits, third party audits or reviews.

Medic One cameras are stored in a secure safe on each medic rig, which provides an audit trail of all individuals who access the safe. The FDA conducts regular audits of the controlled drug safe to ensure compliance with federal regulations.

At this time, there are no specific auditing measures in place for this technology. The Department will develop a policy on disclosure, tracking and retention of Unit 77 records and incorporate it into the Seattle Fire Departments Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG) following negotiations with labor partners.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

PURPOSE

This section provides a description of the fiscal impact of the surveillance technology, as required by the Surveillance Ordinance.

1.0 FISCAL IMPACT

Provide a description of the fiscal impact of the project/technology by answering the questions below.

1.1 Current or potential sources of funding: initial acquisition costs

Current Potential

Date of Initial Acquisition	Date of Go Live	Direct Initial Acquisition Cost	Professional Services for Acquisition	Other Acquisition Costs	Initial Acquisition Funding Source
FIU Camera: 11/23/16 Medic One & Safety Office Cameras: 5/6/15	All currently live	FIU: \$1,349.99 per camera Medic One & Safety Office: \$211.11 per camera	N/A	None	Seattle Fire Department General Fund – Submitted as a Form 22

1.2 Current or potential sources of funding: on-going operating costs, including maintenance, licensing, personnel, legal/compliance use auditing, data retention and security costs.

Current Potential

Annual Maintenance and Licensing	Legal/compliance, audit, data retention and other security costs	Department Overhead	IT Overhead	Annual Funding Source
\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Department general fund, if replacement is needed.

1.3 Cost savings potential through use of the technology

In an emergency setting, good communication is always critical. Pictures allow first responders to convey large amounts of information to hospital staff in a quick, efficient and accurate manner.

Early and accurate sharing of information with medical professionals can prevent further injury or loss of life of patients.

Safety chiefs take pictures of collision involving Department apparatus to preserve information that could be later used for risk management, including documentation used in processing claims for damage, as well as improvements to emergency vehicle incident prevention (EVIP) training

1.4 Current or potential sources of funding including subsidies or free products offered by vendors or governmental entities

None.

EXPERTISE AND REFERENCES

PURPOSE

The following information is provided to ensure that Council has a group of experts to reference while reviewing the completed Surveillance Impact Report (“SIR”). Any individuals or agencies referenced must be made aware ahead of publication that their information has been included. All materials must be available for Council to access or review, without requiring additional purchase or contract.

1.0 OTHER GOVERNMENT REFERENCES

Please list any other government bodies that have implemented this technology and can speak to the implementation of this technology.

Agency, Municipality, etc.	Primary Contact	Description of Current Use
Bellevue Fire Department	(425) 452-6892	Use during emergency responses.
South King Fire & Rescue	(253) 839-6234	Use during emergency responses.

2.0 ACADEMICS, CONSULTANTS, AND OTHER EXPERTS

Please list any experts in the technology under consideration, or in the technical completion of the service or function the technology is responsible for.

Agency, Municipality, etc.	Primary Contact	Description of Current Use
National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)	NFPA Secretary of Standards Council: Address – 1 Batterymarch Park P.O. Box 9101 Quincy, MA 02269-9101; Email - stds_admin@nfpa.org	Provides standards for usage and adoption of by local fire departments across the country.

3.0 WHITE PAPERS OR OTHER DOCUMENTS

Please list any authoritative publication, report or guide that is relevant to the use of this technology or this type of technology.

Title	Publication	Link
Mechanism of Injury in Prehospital Trauma Triage	EMS 1	https://www.ems1.com/ems-products/education/articles/597356-Mechanism-of-Injury-in-Prehospital-Trauma-Triage/ o
Photography in Arson Investigations	Journal of Criminal law and Criminology	https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=4433&context=iclc
Arriving at the Fire and/or Arson Scene: Documenting the Scene	National Institute of Justice	https://www.nij.gov/topics/law-enforcement/investigations/crime-scene/guides/fire-arson/pages/document.aspx

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT AND ENGAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT WORKSHEET

PURPOSE

Departments submitting a SIR are required to complete an adapted version of the Racial Equity Toolkit (“RET”).

1. To provide a framework for the mindful completion of the Surveillance Impact Reports in a way that is sensitive to the historic exclusion of vulnerable and historically underrepresented communities. Particularly, to inform the public engagement efforts Departments will complete as part of the Surveillance Impact Report.
2. To highlight and mitigate any impacts on racial equity from the adoption and the use of the technology.
3. To highlight and mitigate any disparate impacts on individuals or vulnerable communities.
4. To fulfill the public engagement requirements of the Surveillance Impact Report.

ADAPTION OF THE RET FOR SURVEILLANCE IMPACT REPORTS

The RET was adapted for the specific use by the Seattle Information Technology Departments’ (“Seattle IT”) Privacy Team, the Office of Civil Rights (“OCR”), and Change Team members from Seattle IT, Seattle City Light, Seattle Fire Department, Seattle Police Department, and Seattle Department of Transportation.

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT OVERVIEW

RACIAL EQUITY TOOLKIT: TO ASSESS POLICIES, INITIATIVES, PROGRAMS, AND BUDGET ISSUES

The vision of the Seattle Race and Social Justice Initiative is to eliminate racial inequity in the community. To do this requires ending individual racism, institutional racism and structural racism. The Racial Equity Toolkit lays out a process and a set of questions to guide the development, implementation and evaluation of policies, initiatives, programs, and budget issues to address the impacts on racial equity.

WHEN DO I USE THIS TOOLKIT?

Early. Apply the toolkit early for alignment with departmental racial equity goals and desired outcomes.

HOW DO I USE THIS TOOLKIT?

With inclusion. The analysis should be completed by people with different racial perspectives.

Step by step. The Racial Equity Analysis is made up of six steps from beginning to completion:

Please refer to the following resources available on the Office of Civil Rights’ website [here](#): Creating effective community outcomes; Identifying stakeholders & listening to communities of color; Data resources

1.0 SET OUTCOMES

1.1. Seattle City Council has defined the following inclusion criteria in the surveillance ordinance, and they serve as important touchstones for the risks departments are being asked to resolve and/or mitigate. Which of the following inclusion criteria apply to this technology?

- The technology disparately impacts disadvantaged groups.
- There is a high likelihood that personally identifiable information will be shared with non-City entities that will use the data for a purpose other than providing the City with a contractually agreed-upon service.
- The technology collects data that is personally identifiable even if obscured, de-identified, or anonymized after collection.
- The technology raises reasonable concerns about impacts to civil liberty, freedom of speech or association, racial equity, or social justice.

1.2 What are the potential impacts on civil liberties through the implementation of this technology?

Some personally identifiable information (PII) gathered during emergency responses could be used to identify individuals, such as their name, home address or contact information. Medical privacy is particularly relevant in the case of pictures taken during medical emergencies. Victims of criminal activity may also be identified during incident responses, whose identities should be protected in accordance with [RCW 42.56.240](#) and [RCW 70.02](#).

1.3 What does your department define as the most important racially equitable community outcomes related to the implementation of this technology?

The Seattle Fire Department is committed to equitable service delivery regardless of race, sexual orientation, income, immigration or refugee status. All individuals, including non-residents and visitors to the City will be treated with compassion, professionalism and respect by SFD personnel.

1.4 What racial equity opportunity area(s) will be affected by the application of the technology?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Jobs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |

1.5 Are there impacts on:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contracting Equity | <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Workforce Equity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Immigrant and Refugee Access to Services | |

2.0 INVOLVE STAKEHOLDERS, ANALYZE DATA

2.1 Departmental conclusions about potential neighborhood impacts of the technology. Are the impacts on geographic areas?

Yes No

Check all neighborhoods that apply (see map of neighborhood boundaries in Appendix A: Glossary, under “Seattle Neighborhoods”):

All Seattle neighborhoods

Ballard

North

Northeast

Central

Lake Union

Southwest

Southeast

Delridge

Greater Duwamish

East District

King County (outside Seattle)

Outside King County. Please describe:

[Respond here, if applicable.]

2.2 What are the racial demographics of those living in the area or impacted by the issue?

(see Stakeholder and Data Resources [here](#).)

City of Seattle demographics: White - 69.5%; Black or African American - 7.9%; Amer. Indian & Alaska Native - 0.8%; Asian - 13.8%; Native Hawaiian & Other Pac. Islander - 0.4%; Other race - 2.4%; Two or more races - 5.1%; Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (of any race): 6.6%; Persons of color: 33.7%.

King County demographics: White – 70.1%; Black or African American – 6.7%; American Indian & Alaskan Native – 1.1%; Asian, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander – 17.2%; Hispanic or Latino (of any race) – 9.4%

STOP: Department should complete RET questions 2.3 – 6 and Appendices B-I AFTER completing their public comment and engagement requirements.

2.3 Have you completed the following steps to engage the public?

If you have not completed these steps, pause here until public outreach and engagement has been completed. (See OCR’s RET worksheet [here](#) for more information about engaging the public at this point in the process to ensure their concerns and expertise are part of analysis.)

Create a public outreach plan. Residents, community leaders, and the public were informed of the public meeting and feedback options via:

Email

Mailings

- Fliers
- Phone calls
- Social media
- Other

The following community leaders were identified and invited to the public meeting(s):

- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
- CARE
- Northwest Immigrant Rights
- OneAmerica
- JACL
- For Seattle Police Department only, Community Police Commissions
- Other:

Engagement for Public Comment #1

Date of meeting:

Location of meeting:

Summary of discussion:

Small group discussion regarding the importance of cameras in emergency settings. See Appendix B for an overview of comments received, and demographics on attendees. See Appendix E for the transcript of all comments received for this technology.

Engagement for Public Comment #2

Date of meeting:

Location of meeting:

Summary of discussion:

Concerns regarding medical privacy and audit of persons with access to cameras. See Appendix B for an overview of comments received, and demographics on attendees. See Appendix E for the transcript of all comments received for this technology.

Engagement for Public Comment #3 (if applicable)

Date of meeting:

Location of meeting:

Summary of discussion:

N/A

Collect public feedback via mail and email

Number of feedback submissions received:

Summary of feedback:

Open comment period:

Community Technology Advisory Board (CTAB) Presentation

Date of presentation:

Summary of comments:

2.4 What does data and conversations with stakeholders tell you about existing racial inequities that influence people’s lives and should be taken into consideration when applying/implementing/using the technology?

(See OCR’s RET worksheet [here](#) for more information; King County Opportunity Maps are a good resource for information based on geography, race, and income.)

With regard to emergency scene cameras, there is a concern regarding the sharing of pictures with law enforcement. These cameras are used across the City, including underprivileged communities that may have greater worry about being unfairly targeted. For example, if vulnerable populations such as refugees do not trust first responders, they are less likely to call 911.

2.5 What are the root causes or factors creating these racial inequities?

Mitigation strategies will be addressed in 4.1 and 5.3. *Examples: bias in process; lack of access or barriers; lack of racially inclusive engagement.*

A key factor is mistrust of government, particularly calling 911. Communities that are more vulnerable to fires, such as immigrants and refugees, may be less willing to contact first responders in an emergency.

3.0 DETERMINE BENEFIT AND/OR BURDEN

Provide a description of any potential disparate impact of surveillance on civil rights and liberties on communities of color and other marginalized communities. Given what you have learned from data and from stakeholder involvement...

3.1 How will the technology, or use of the technology increase or decrease racial equity?

What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits may result? Are the impacts aligned with your department's community outcomes that were defined in 1.0?

Emergency scene cameras are only used in specific scenarios by Fire Department personnel. With the exception of fire investigations, the photos are never shared with law enforcement or the general public. There is no discernable effect on racial equity with regard to emergency scene cameras.

3.2 What benefits to the impacted community/demographic may result?

Potentially exposing individuals or their homes to strangers during very difficult times. While the images are not shared with law enforcement or the public, it can still be embarrassing to have first responders entering a residence during an emergency.

3.3 What are potential unintended consequences (both negative and positive potential impact)?

A potential positive impact is reducing the likelihood of further loss of life or property during an emergency. Cameras are a useful tool for first responders, and anything that makes them more effective can result in lives being saved. There is also the potential misuse of cameras by first responders when they have access to sensitive areas and people experiencing medical emergencies. Strict policies and controlled access to cameras help prevent improper use.

3.4 Are the impacts aligned with your department's community outcomes that were defined in step 1.0?

The mission of the Seattle Fire Department is ultimately to protect lives and property. This technology helps with that mission by assisting first responders with better communication and coordination during very dangerous moments. While there is a valid concern that the cameras could be used to identify individuals, they are not used for that purpose or shared with law enforcement in any case.

4.0 ADVANCE OPPORTUNITY OR MINIMIZE HARM

Provide a mitigation plan for the impacts described in step 3.

4.1 How will you address the impacts (including unintended consequences) on racial equity?

What strategies address immediate impacts? What strategies address root causes of inequity listed in 2.5? How will you partner with stakeholders for long-term positive change? If impacts are not aligned with desired community outcomes for surveillance technology (see 1a), how will you re-align your work?

Program/Partnership Strategies:

The Community Fire Safety Advocates (CFSA Program) are a great resource for communicating with communities across the City, including those who speak languages other than English. These advocates can be used to translate fire prevention messages and educate SFD personnel on appropriate ways to interact with their communities.

Policy Strategies:

While the Department already has some policies in place, new and stricter policies regarding the use of digital cameras are currently being considered for adoption. These rules will clarify when, where and how digital cameras are to be used. The policy has been drafted and is currently waiting approval for adoption in the POG following the next round of collective bargaining with labor partners.

5.0 EVALUATE, RAISE RACIAL AWARENESS, BE ACCOUNTABLE

The following information must be provided to the CTO, via the Privacy Office, on an annual basis for the purposes of an annual report to the City Council on the equitable use of surveillance technology. For Seattle Police Department, the equity impact assessments may be prepared by the Inspector General for Public Safety.

The following information does not need to be completed in the SIR submitted to Council, unless this is a retroactive review.

5.1 Which neighborhoods were impacted/targeted by the technology over the past year and how many people in each neighborhood were impacted?

- All Seattle neighborhoods
- Ballard
- North
- NE
- Central
- Lake Union
- Southwest
- Southeast
- Greater Duwamish

- East District
- King County (outside Seattle)
- Outside King County. Please describe:

Not applicable.

5.2 Demographic information of people impacted/targeted by the technology over the past year.

To the best of the department’s ability, provide demographic information of the persons surveilled by this technology. If any of the neighborhoods above were included, compare the surveilled demographics to the neighborhood averages and City averages.

City of Seattle demographics: White - 69.5%; Black or African American - 7.9%; Amer. Indian & Alaska Native - 0.8%; Asian - 13.8%; Native Hawaiian & Other Pac. Islander - 0.4; Other race - 2.4%; Two or more races - 5.1%; Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (of any race): 6.6%; Persons of color: 33.7%.

King County demographics: White – 70.1%; Black or African American – 6.7%; American Indian & Alaskan Native – 1.1%; Asian, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander – 17.2%; Hispanic or Latino (of any race) – 9.4%

5.3 Which of the mitigation strategies that you identified in step 4 were implemented in the past year?

Specifically, what adjustments to laws and policies should be made to remedy any disproportionate impacts so as to achieve a more equitable outcome in the future.

Type of Strategy (program, policy, partnership)	Description of Strategy	Percent complete of implementation	Describe successes and challenges with strategy implementation
Policy	Implementation of a more strict policy regarding the use of cameras by SFD personnel. Will be incorporated in the Department’s Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG).	90%	There are many stakeholders that have to review and approve the policy, including Department leadership and multiple unions. The policies can only be put in the POG twice a year (June and December).
Program/Partnership	The Community Fire Safety Advocate (CFSA) program was developed to effectively meet the specific fire safety	100%	Over 24,000 immigrant/refugee community members have received safety messages, including carbon monoxide

	<p>needs of Seattle’s immigrant and refugee communities. Initiated after a tragic fire in 2010, this program has expanded to provide fire prevention services to multiple language and cultural groups. SFD practices are also communicated to vulnerable populations via these advocates.</p>		<p>poisoning, home fire evacuation planning and cooking, and heating fire safety since the program began.</p>
--	--	--	---

5.4 How have you involved stakeholders since the implementation/application of the technology began?

- Public Meeting(s)
- CTAB Presentation
- Postings to Privacy webpage seattle.gov/privacy
- Other external communications
- Stakeholders have not been involved since the implementation/application

5.5 What is unresolved?

What resources/partnerships do you still need to make changes?

None

6.0 REPORT BACK

Responses to Step 5 will be compiled and analyzed as part of the CTO’s Annual Report on Equitable Use of Surveillance Technology.

Departments will be responsible for sharing their own evaluations with department leadership, Change Team Leads, and community leaders identified in the public outreach plan (Step 2c).

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSESSMENT

PURPOSE

This section shall be completed after public engagement has concluded and the department has completed the Racial Equity Toolkit section above. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Assessment is completed by the Community Surveillance Working Group (“Working Group”), per the Surveillance Ordinance which states that the Working Group shall:

“[p]rovide to the Executive and the City Council a privacy and civil liberties impact assessment for each SIR that must be included with any departmental request for surveillance technology acquisition or in-use approval. The impact assessment shall include a description of the potential impact of the surveillance technology on civil rights and liberties and potential disparate impacts on communities of color and other marginalized communities. The CTO shall share with the Working Group a copy of the SIR that shall also be posted during the period of public engagement. At the conclusion of the public engagement period, the CTO shall share the final proposed SIR with the Working Group at least six weeks prior to submittal of the SIR to Council for approval. The Working Group shall provide its impact assessment in writing to the Executive and the City Council for inclusion in the SIR within six weeks of receiving the final proposed SIR. If the Working Group does not provide the impact assessment before such time, the Working Group must ask for a two-week extension of time to City Council in writing. If the Working Group fails to submit an impact statement within eight weeks of receiving the SIR, the department and City Council may proceed with ordinance approval without the impact statement.”

WORKING GROUP PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSESSMENT

From: Seattle Community Surveillance Working Group (CSWG)

To: Seattle City Council

Date: April 23, 2019

Re: Privacy and Civil Liberties Impact Assessment for Emergency Scene Cameras, Hazardous Materials Cameras, CCTVs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

On February 27th, CSWG received the Surveillance Impact Reports, or SIRs, for the above-mentioned technologies included in Group 1 of the Seattle Surveillance Ordinance technology review process. This document is CSWG’s Privacy and Civil Liberties Impact Assessment for those technologies as set forth in SMC 14.18.080(B)(1), which we provide for inclusion in the final SIRs submitted to the City Councils.

Our assessment of these surveillance technologies focuses on three key issues:

- (1) The use of these systems and the data collected by them for purposes other than those intended;
- (2) Over-collection and over-retention of data;
- (3) Sharing of that data with third parties (such as federal law enforcement agencies).

While the stated purposes of the cameras may be relatively innocuous, it is important to remember that images taken by such cameras, for example at emergency scenes, can compromise the privacy of individuals at vulnerable moments, and can be misused to target and profile communities based on their religious, ethnic, or associational makeup. In addition, with the widespread and inexpensive availability of facial recognition (or face surveillance) technology, which can be applied after the fact to any image showing a face, it is even more important that protections limiting the use of these tools to their intended purpose be enacted.

For all of these systems, the Council should adopt, via ordinance, clear and enforceable rules that ensure, at a minimum, the following:

1. The purposes of camera use should be clearly defined, and its operation and data collected should be explicitly restricted to those purposes only.
2. Data retention should be limited to the time needed to effectuate the purpose defined.
3. Data sharing with third parties should be limited to those held to the same restrictions.
4. Clear policies should govern operation, and all operators of the cameras should be trained in those policies.

We recommend creating these rules in a single, blanket ordinance that will govern not only these, but other, similar camera technologies operated by or at the behest of the City, and would be happy to work with the City to create such an ordinance.

EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS (ESCS) (SEATTLE FIRE DEPARTMENT)

The initial (October 2018) Surveillance Impact Report (SIR) for this technology stated that no explicit internal policy exists at SFD that governs the use of ESCs (with one limited exception for mechanism-of-injury recordings). The updated January 2019 SIR added a letter (dated February 28, 2018) from Fire Chief Harold D. Scoggins in Appendix I, stating that SFD would update its policy with specified language regarding the use of Department-issued digital cameras. However, the CSWG was notified on April 5, 2019 that the specified policy language in the February 2018 letter was never actually adopted by

SFD. (See Appendix 1 for that communication.) It is unclear why the February 2018 letter was added to the January 2019 SIR if there was no intent to adopt any of the specified policy language. This also renders language currently in the updated SIR inaccurate.¹

Existing general policies provided with the April 5 email leave a number of outstanding concerns. For

Emergency Scene Cameras, the Council's approval of this technology should ensure use is limited to the specific emergency, investigative, or training purposes set forth, that the data is deleted immediately upon completion of those purposes, that data sharing with third parties is prohibited unless explicitly specified for those same uses, and only instances where the third party is held to the same use and retention standards. More specific recommendations for the Council's approval of this technology are below.

Specifically, the existing policy:

- Does not clearly define the term "Department-issued digital camera," making it unclear if the intended scope is to cover both ESCs and Hazmat Cameras.
 - *Recommendation: SFD should adopt a policy that explicitly states that it applies to both ESCs and Hazmat Cameras.*
- Does not include use rules for the cameras.
 - *Recommendation: SFD's adopted policy should include clear statements of what can and cannot be photographed depending on the situation, including specific protections for the privacy of individuals and homes.*
- Does not create clear guidelines on what data is retained, and how it is stored and for how long (with the exception of photos that include photos of victims requiring emergency medical services).
 - *Recommendation: SFD's adopted policy should include clear data retention policies, including where and how the data is stored, with all photos immediately deleted once their intended purpose is fulfilled. The policy should explicitly define under what specific*

¹ The SIR states the following in Section 4.0:

"While the Department already has some policies in place, new and stricter policies regarding the use of digital cameras are currently being considered for adoption. These rules will clarify when, where and how digital cameras are to be used. The policy has been drafted and is currently waiting approval by Department leadership and relevant stakeholders for adoption during the next POG update anticipated in December 2018."

And further in Section 4.2:

“The Department is working to develop a policy for the all staff regarding the acceptable use of this technology during emergency responses, as well as the subsequent storage of photos and sharing with law enforcement agencies. However, there are strict policies regarding the use and deletion of photos if they include victims requiring emergency medical service (POG section 3004-7).”

circumstances photos are permitted to be transferred off the cameras (e.g., via a SD card, USB cable, or WiFi).

- Does not make clear whether any legal standard is being applied in use or retention.
 - *Recommendation: In instances where a legal standard such as reasonable suspicion is applied, it should be clear what the standard is, who applies it, and how that application is documented.*
- Does not restrict data sharing with third parties, including law enforcement agencies.
 - *Recommendation: The policy should explicitly ban sharing of camera data with third parties except for specified instances necessary to fulfill the purpose of the cameras, and only in instances where the third party is held to the same use and retention standards.*
- Does not ensure all operators of the cameras are trained in the foregoing policies.
 - *Recommendation: This requirement should be part of any new policy.*

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (HAZMAT) CAMERAS (SFD)

The initial October 2018 SIR for Hazmat cameras indicated that no policy governing the use of this technology currently exists, with one limited exception for mechanism-of-injury recordings (see SIR Section 3.3). The updated January 2019 SIR included the same letter from Fire Chief Harold D. Scoggins, and again, the specified policy language was never actually adopted by SFD. This once again renders the language of the January 2019 SIR inaccurate.²

Given the lack of adequate existing policy, we recommend that SFD adopt a policy for Hazmat Cameras that includes all the elements set forth above for ESCs, and that the Council’s approval of this technology incorporate that policy. The use policy would limit use of these cameras to hazardous materials documentation and enforcement.

In addition, Section 6.4 of the January 2019 Hazmat SIR states:

“The Department is working to develop a 2018 policy that addresses the use of this technology, photo retention, and sharing of records with law enforcement. With this policy the Department will develop Memorandum of Agreements with the Seattle branch of the FBI and Seattle Police Department.”

² As with the ESC SIR, because the January 2019 Hazmat SIR states intent to update current policies, the language in the letter and the SIR is misleading. For example, Sections 4.2 and 4.8 of the Hazmat SIR both state:

“The Department is working to develop a policy for the Hazmat unit regarding the acceptable use of this technology during emergency responses, as well as the subsequent storage of photos and sharing with law enforcement agencies. However, there are strict policies regarding the use and deletion of photos if they include victims requiring emergency medical service (POG section 3004-7).”

It is unclear whether these MoAs have been developed and what they cover. But both the MoAs and SFD’s policy should limit such data sharing to the purpose of criminal hazmat enforcement, and only where the third party is held to the same use and retention standards as SFD. The Council’s approval of this technology should incorporate this requirement.

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION “TRAFFIC CAMERAS” (CCTVS)(SDOT)

As with ESCs and Hazmat Cameras, concern around these traffic cameras relates to limiting their use to specific purposes, ensuring protections against invasion of privacy and general data collection, and limiting data sharing with third parties. It is important for these limits to be set forth in clear, enforceable policies. The updated January 2019 SIR states that SDOT “has developed” policies on use of the cameras, but it is not clear where all of these policies are set forth and whether they are currently in effect (see Section 3.3). We have reviewed the Camera Control Protocol document that sets forth existing policies.

For CCTVs, the Council’s approval of this technology should ensure use is limited to traffic operations, that no data is collected except for clearly specified exceptions (and that data must be deleted immediately upon completion of those purposes), and that data sharing with third parties is prohibited. More specific recommendations for the Council’s approval of this technology are below.

The existing policy:

- Does not set forth clear use, collection, and retention rules.
 - *Recommendation: SDOT’s adopted policy should make clear that no data may be recorded or retained except for specifically defined purposes. Currently, the SDOT Camera Control Protocol states that recording is allowed for “compelling SDOT traffic operations and traffic planning needs”—but that term is undefined. The retention of data for “engineering studies” must also be clearly defined. No personally-identifiable information should ever be recorded. For any data recording that is allowed, it must be deleted within 10 days (which is stated in the SIR and protocol) and not shared with third parties. The policy should also make clear that traffic camera data (beyond what is made available to the general public) may not be used for law enforcement purposes, and that no associated surveillance technologies such as facial recognition or license plate readers may be incorporated into the cameras.*
- Does not ensure all operators of the cameras are trained in the foregoing policies.
 - *Recommendation: This requirement should be part of any new policy.*
- Does not state include technical controls.
 - *Recommendation: Technical controls ensure logging how cameras are moved from their preset locations, when camera streams to the public are stopped or restarted, and whether there are access controls determining who, when, where, and why users can access the camera management software. Without these technical controls, it would be difficult to detect if users are abusing their access to cameras (e.g., by cutting camera feeds to the public, moving a camera to zoom and view into the window of a home). These technical controls (logging when cameras are moved, stopped, or restarted; and mandating access controls for cameras) should be included in SDOT’s adopted policy.*

APPENDIX 1: APRIL 5, 2019 EMAIL FROM MEGAN ERB, SEATTLE IT (INCLUDING ATTACHMENTS)

From: Erb, Megan <Megan.Erb@seattle.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2019 3:45 PM
To: Shankar Narayan <snarayan@aclu-wa.org>; Negin Dahya <ndahya@uw.edu>; mmerrriweather@urbanleague.org; mfouladi@cair.com; asha@youthclub.org; joseph.r.woolley@gmail.com; Stolz, Rich <rich@weareoneamerica.org>
Cc: Day, Seferiana <Seferiana.Day2@seattle.gov>; Loter, Jim <Jim.Loter@seattle.gov>; Armbruster, Ginger <Ginger.Armbruster@seattle.gov>; Stringer, Omari <Omari.Stringer@seattle.gov>
Subject: Surveillance Advisory Working Group updates re: recent SIR questions and requests

Hello Working Group members,

We wanted to provide you with several updates regarding your recent SIR questions and requests for information:

1. The linked and/or embedded documents in the SDOT LPR and CCTV SIRs have been updated and are available on the Working Group SharePoint page and the publicly accessible Seattle.gov website

- a. <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Tech/2018-12-10%20DRAFT%20SIR%20-%20CCTV%20Traffic%20Cameras%20-%20For%20Working%20Group%20Review.pdf>
 - b. <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Tech/2018-12-10%20DRAFT%20SIR%20%20License%20Plate%20Readers%20-%20For%20Working%20Group%20Review.pdf>
2. Regarding policies from SFD on Emergency Scene Cameras and HazMat Cameras, please see the attached documentation related to their implemented policies in response to your questions posed. Additionally:
- a. The Seattle Fire Department policies on image recording devices in general (Section 3004-6) and digital cameras specifically (5001-13) are attached. These policies are currently in our Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG) and are being enforced.
 - b. As for the 2/28/18 letter from Chief Scoggins, that was actually just a draft dispatch that I wrote on his behalf. The specifics of that dispatch were never actually adopted into the POG. We felt that the broad language contained in sections 3004-6 and 5001-13 already addressed the issue with regard to all image recording devices and that the additional specifics were not necessary.
3. Regarding policies from SDOT and their CCTV cameras, some are located in the Camera Control Protocol that was embedded in the SIR (that has been updated to be accessible).

Additionally, we would like to remind you that Seattle IT has created an externally accessible SharePoint Online page where you can access the Surveillance Impact Reports and related materials that are currently ready for your review. **Please let me know which email address is used for your Microsoft account, so that we can set up appropriate site permissions relative to that email address.**

Thank you and have a great weekend,

Megan

Megan Erb

Communications Manager

SEATTLE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

megan.erb@seattle.gov o: (206)233-

8736 m:(206)375-3895

TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS FOR THE CITY AND PUBLIC WE SERVE

For one year after leaving City employment, a former member of the Seattle Fire Department may not communicate, on behalf of any person on a matter involving the City, with an employee of the agency of the City with which he or she was previously employed (see SMC 4.16.075.C).

Examples of violations of this instruction include:

- Communicating on behalf of any person or entity with the Fire Department about a Code compliance matter.
- Communicating on behalf of any person or entity in an attempt to sell goods or services to the Fire Department.

The prohibitions of the preceding two instructions do not apply to former employees acting as employees or agents of a governmental agency unless that governmental agency's interest in the matter is adverse to the interest of the City (see SMC 4.16.075.F).

For one year after leaving City employment, a former member of the Seattle Fire Department may not participate as a competitor in any competitive selection process for a City contract in which he or she assisted the City in determining the project or work to be done or the process to be used in selecting a contractor (see SMC 4.16.075.D).

OFF-DUTY EMPLOYMENT

Officers and employees of the Seattle Fire Department may engage in off-duty employment so long as it does not interfere with their ability to carry out their duties for the City, and provided it does not result in a conflict of interest or otherwise violate these instructions.

Officers and employees of the Seattle Fire Department are specifically prohibited from conducting or engaging in the following types of off-duty employment:

- Selling and/or installing fire protection equipment or systems within the City of Seattle.
- Process serving, repossessing, bill collecting, or other employment in which your position with the City might tend to be used to collect money, merchandise, etc., for a private purpose of a civil nature.
- Employment that might require you to have access to Fire Department files, records, or services as a condition of the off-duty employment.

IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES

PERSONAL IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES

The use of personal devices to take still or digital photographs, or video or audio recordings, by Operations personnel at emergency scenes for personal use or Department training purposes is not authorized.

**DEPARTMENT
AUTHORIZED DIGI-
TAL CAMERAS**

Members responding to an incident may not use helmet mounted cameras, video cameras, personal cell phones, cameras, or any other recording device while on an emergency response.

In accordance with OC 5001.2 *Aid and Medic Responses, Digital Cameras*, on-duty firefighter/paramedics may use digital cameras provided by the Department to record the mechanism of injury to trauma patients. After showing the photographs to appropriate hospital emergency department staff the photos will be deleted.

EQUIPMENT

All Aid and Medic Units should be inventoried at the beginning of every shift. If units leave equipment with a patient transported by a Medic Unit, the Medic Unit will be contacted promptly to ensure the equipment is returned or replaced as soon as possible. However, Aid Unit personnel should be aware that the Medic One Office does not replace items left on a Medic Unit. Equipment that is not immediately returned should be noted in the Watch Desk Journal and the Form 9. The notation should include the items missing, the incident number, and the Medic Unit involved.

Each Company, Aid, and Medic Unit has been issued backboards assigned as part of their inventory. Replacement boards will come from the on-scene Aid or Medic Unit, if possible. If none are available, replacement boards can be obtained from hospital emergency rooms, or requisitioned from Medic One.

DOUBLE-WIDE BACKBOARDS

A double-wide backboard is located in each fire station housing a ladder company. The backboards are 32" X 72" and resemble the wood backboards currently in service throughout the Department. Company Captains are responsible for the proper storage of the backboard within their respective stations. When the need for a double-wide backboard arises, on-scene personnel must prompt FAC to dispatch an Operations company with one of the backboards. Each board has an approximate weight limit of 700 pounds. The eleven backboards comprise the Department's current inventory, and arrangements must be made to recover them, as soon as possible, after each use.

DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED DIGITAL CAMERAS

All Medic Units and Medic 44 carry a digital camera in the controlled drug safe. These cameras may be utilized by Department personnel to record the mechanism of injury for trauma patients.

These photographs will only be shown to appropriate hospital emergency department staff to clearly explain the severity of injury and then will be promptly deleted from the camera's internal memory.

The utilization of the digital camera will not infringe on the quality of patient care provided on an emergency response.

OTHER IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES

In accordance with OC 3004.7 *Image Recording Devices* section, members responding to an incident may not use helmet mounted cameras, video cameras, personal cell phones, personal cameras, or any other recording device while on an emergency response.


The use of personal devices to take still or digital photographs, video or audio recordings by Operations personnel at emergency scenes for personal use or Department training purposes is not authorized.

LP 500 DOWNLOAD INSTRUCTIONS

Instructions for downloading patient summaries from the LifePac 500 are posted near the station computer. The instruction sheet is entitled "Instructions for Downloading LP500 Resuscitations". In the event that the sheet is lost, the information is also available on the "O" drive at O:\Dept\LP500.

Additional assistance can be obtained by contacting the EMS Coordinator or the on-duty MSO.

SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT RESPONSE



Memo

Date: 11/27/2018
To: City Council
From: Seattle Fire Department
Subject: Surveillance Impact Report Cover Memo – Emergency Scene Cameras

Description

Seattle Fire Department first responders use Digital Cameras in certain emergency situations, allowing personnel to quickly and efficiently transmit information required to provide seamless handoff to medical personnel. They are also used by investigators to document significant fire incidents and collisions involving Department vehicles.

Purpose

Collecting photos at response incidents is a best practice guideline from the National Fire Protection Association. These photos help provide medical professionals information during emergency responses, which can reduce potential for loss of life for patients and direct emergency medical treatment options. Photos of incident scenes also provide valuable information for SFD's Fire Investigation Unit and Safety Office.

Benefits to the Public

The tactical use of cameras by first responders allows them to better do their jobs, which helps protect lives and property from further harm. Getting critical information to hospital staff before and after a patient arrives can drastically improve the likelihood of a positive outcome. In addition, investigators can use pictures to better understand what happened following a fire or collision and use that knowledge to potentially prevent another loss of life or property in Seattle.

Privacy and Civil Liberties Considerations

As with any use of camera technology, there may be concerns about inappropriate image collection or use outside of the purpose originally identified. To reduce these risks, the Seattle Fire Department adheres to internal policies and operating guidelines, as well as relevant laws governing the use, retention and disclosure of photos taken by Department personnel. The use of digital cameras is strictly limited to Fire Investigators, Safety Chiefs and paramedic units during severe medical emergencies or SFD vehicle collision investigations.

Summary

When time is of the essence, such as during an emergency response, communicating as much information as possible becomes vital to prevent further loss of life or property. For example, paramedics can provide emergency room doctors with pictures of trauma patients before they arrive at the hospital, which allows them to provide more accurate information to first responders and better prepare for the patient's arrival. Following fires, investigators use cameras to better understand the conditions on the ground and document their findings for later analysis. Digital cameras are an invaluable tool for firefighters to meet their mission of protecting lives and property.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Q: Does SFD ask permission to take photos?

A: No, in the few scenarios where Department personnel use cameras, permission is generally not sought. During ALS responses to capture the mechanism of injury, the patient's consent is implied as part of their treatment by certified medical providers.

Q: You mention that you do data sharing with SPD, do you have agreements or contracts around sharing this data?

A: The Seattle Fire Department does not have a specific data-sharing agreements with SPD, but we are in compliance with law enforcement data management policies (CJIS) for fire investigation photos, as well as medical privacy laws (HIPAA & RCW 70.02) when used during advanced life support responses.

Q: Are patient photos not covered under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)?

A: Photos of patients are protected under the Uniform Health Care Information Act (RCW 70.02) and the Department is in full compliance with HIPAA's Privacy and Security Rules.

Q: Is there an audit trail for people not taking photos off the camera (i.e. when an audit is preformed, are they just checking that the camera is in the secure box, or are they checking that not photos are on the camera)?

A: Not to that specificity, but all uses of cameras can be traced back to the assigned personnel on a particular unit, which allows for tracking non-compliance by Department personnel.

Q: Are there any policies governing fire using personal phones for taking photos of people?

A: Yes, this is prohibited according to the Department's Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG).

Q: Are emergency responders provided data management training?

A: All City of Seattle employees, including all Seattle Fire Department personnel, undergo a yearly privacy and security training. The Department's Policies and Operating Guidelines (POG) are also taught during recruit school and regularly reinforced throughout day-to-day operations.

Q: Does the Department use audio/video from vehicle-mounted or body cameras?

A: SFD does not use cameras on vehicles or body cameras.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

Accountable: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Responsive to the needs and concerns of those most impacted by the issues you are working on, particularly to communities of color and those historically underrepresented in the civic process.

Community Outcomes: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) The specific result you are seeking to achieve that advances racial equity.

Contracting Equity: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Efforts to achieve equitable racial outcomes in the way the City spends resources, including goods and services, consultants and contracting.

DON: “Department of Neighborhoods.”

Immigrant and Refugee Access to Services: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Government services and resources are easily available and understandable to all Seattle residents, including non-native English speakers. Full and active participation of immigrant and refugee communities exists in Seattle’s civic, economic and cultural life.

Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Processes inclusive of people of diverse races, cultures, gender identities, sexual orientations and socio-economic status. Access to information, resources and civic processes so community members can effectively engage in the design and delivery of public services.

Individual Racism: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Pre-judgment, bias, stereotypes about an individual or group based on race. The impacts of racism on individuals including white people internalizing privilege, and people of color internalizing oppression.

Institutional Racism: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Organizational programs, policies or procedures that work to the benefit of white people and to the detriment of people of color, usually unintentionally or inadvertently.

MSO: “Medical Services Officer”

OCR: “Office of Arts and Culture.”

Opportunity Areas: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) One of seven issue areas the City of Seattle is working on in partnership with the community to eliminate racial disparities and create racial equity. They include: Education, Health, Community Development, Criminal Justice, Jobs, Housing, and the Environment.

POG: “Seattle Fire Department’s Policies and Operating Guidelines”

Racial Equity: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) When social, economic and political opportunities are not predicted based upon a person’s race.

Racial Inequity: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.)
When a person’s race can predict their social, economic, and political opportunities and outcomes.

RET: “Racial Equity Toolkit”

Seattle Neighborhoods: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit Neighborhood.) Boundaries defined for the purpose of understanding geographic areas in Seattle.

Stakeholders: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Those impacted by proposed policy, program, or budget issue who have potential concerns or issue expertise. Examples might include: specific racial/ethnic groups, other institutions like Seattle Housing Authority, schools, community-based organizations, Change Teams, City employees, unions, etc.

Structural Racism: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) The interplay of policies, practices and programs of multiple institutions which leads to adverse outcomes and conditions for communities of color compared to white communities that occurs within the context of racialized historical and cultural conditions.

Surveillance Ordinance: Seattle City Council passed Ordinance [125376](#), also referred to as the “Surveillance Ordinance.”

SIR: “Surveillance Impact Report”, a document which captures the fulfillment of the Council-defined Surveillance technology review process, as required by Ordinance [125376](#).

Workforce Equity: (Taken from the Racial Equity Toolkit.) Ensure the City's workforce diversity reflects the diversity of Seattle.



APPENDIX B: PUBLIC COMMENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND ANALYSIS

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS


Analysis of public comments was completed using a combination of thematic analysis and qualitative coding. Comments were gathered from many sources, from public engagement meetings, an online survey form, letters, emails, and focus group discussions. All comments may be reviewed in the Surveillance Impact Report, Appendix E.

After assigning a theme and code for the content, City staff conducted an analysis using R. A high-level summary of the results of this analysis are shown below. A detailed description of the methodology is available in the Surveillance Impact Report, Appendix H.

Below is a summary of the responses by question, prepared by Privacy Office staff. This data includes comments from all submission methods (e.g. letter, email, public meeting, etc.). The total number of responses to this question is in the top right. The percentage of responses to that question, following the identified theme is shown in dark blue. The dark gray shows the percent of comments for this technology that did not answer that specific question. The light gray shows the percent of responses to that question that fall into other themes, (General, Data Management, Policy, Enforcement, and Oversight, etc.).

A word cloud of each qualitative sub-code identified appears at the bottom of each question to provide more context of the question response themes. If an appropriate quote could be identified to capture the overall tone of the majority of comments it was included.

COMMENTS SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSING EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS



Question 2

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

2

Value Other value

Reponses to this question

Efficiency and City finance: increase City capacity and results in cost savings, revenue generation, innovation, or better service.



Public safety: All applications of public safety from traffic and transit, to emergency response, and law enforcement.



Valuable: The public sees great value for City use of the technology, including to reduce bias through technological subjectivity.



“this technology seems the most straightforward in its clear help for the City and potential help in saving lives.”

Common Themes

emergency response public service public safetyresponse public

Question 3

What worries you about how this is used?

2

Worry Other worry

Reponses to this question

Government Overreach and Civil Liberties: Government unnecessarily or oversurveillance in a way that could impact individual rights and civil liberties.



Unconcerned: expressed a lack of concern around technology use or interest in expansion of use



Question 4

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

2


Yes No

Reponses to this question

Increase policy, enforcement, and oversight: recommendations related to department and city policy, oversight, accountability, transparency, audit and policy enforcement.



Improve data management: Recommendation to improve approach to data lifecycle management, including third party use storage and retention.



“An ETA/deadline needs to be supplied for getting the SFD POG updated, overall.”

Question 5

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

1

Alternative solution Did not respond to question

Reponses to this question

None: The respondent has no alternative solutions to recommend.



Question 6

Do you have any other comments?

2

Comment Other comment

Reponses to this question

Improve SIR Process: Change the surveillance impact report process, suggestions include adding a cost benefit analysis, increasing information clarity, etc.



Public safety: All applications of public safety from traffic and transit, to emergency response, and law enforcement.




Common Themes

public safety improvement information information clarity sir.process improvement

GENERAL SURVEILLANCE COMMENT THEMES

Many comments were submitted as part of the public comment period that were not specific to a technology, but to either the concept of surveillance in general, or to technologies which are not on the Master List.




DEMOGRAPHICS FOR GROUP ONE COMMENTS

The number of reported demographics does not correspond to the number of comments received for the following reasons.

1. The demographic information includes all responses, regardless of which technology was commented on to protect the privacy of those who provided a response.
2. Some individuals offered more than one comment.
3. Some individuals did not provide any demographic information.


Method Submitted By	Gender
Focus Group 1	9
Focus Group 2	5
Meeting 1	15
Meeting 2	7
Meeting 3	10
Meeting 4	14
Meeting 5	5
Survey Monkey	64
Grand Total	129



Age



Ethnicity



Neighborhoods



King County (outside Seattle)	8
Outside of King County	1
Prefer not to identify	10

APPENDIX C: PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE(S)

Notice of Public Meetings Surveillance Technology Public Comment

This is the first round of public comment on previously acquired surveillance technologies. For more information on these technologies or Surveillance Ordinance visit seattle.gov/privacy.

	Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Meeting 4	Meeting 5
Depts. Presenting	Police Dept.	Transportation, Fire Dept.	Police Dept.	Police Dept.	Transportation, Fire Dept.
Date & Time	October 22, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	October 25, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	October 29, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	October 30, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	November 5, 2018 4:30-5:30 p.m.
Location	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

Technologies discussed at the meetings include:

Transportation (Meetings 2 & 5)	Fire Dept. (Meetings 2 & 5)	Police Dept. (Meetings 1, 3, & 4)
Traffic Cameras & License Plate Readers	Emergency Scene Cameras & Hazmat Cameras	Parking Enforcement Systems & Automated License Plate Readers

Here's how you can provide comments:

The open comment period for these technologies is **October 8 - November 5, 2018**. There are three ways to comment:

- Attend the meeting. See the table above for locations and times.
- Submit comment online at seattle.gov/privacy.
- Send mail to Attn: Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

Comments submitted will be included in the final Surveillance Impact Report submitted to City Council and available to the public. To comment after this period has closed, contact City Council staff at seattle.gov/Council.

Please note, this meeting will:

Be video recorded.

Ask for a sign-in record of attendees.

Collect public comments.

For meeting accommodations: Please let us know **two weeks in advance of the meeting date** if language translation, or other services are needed by emailing Surveillance@seattle.gov.



Aviso de audiencias públicas

Comentarios del público sobre tecnologías de vigilancia

Esta es la primera ronda de audiencias públicas sobre tecnologías de vigilancia adquiridas previamente. Para obtener más información sobre estas tecnologías o sobre la [Surveillance Ordinance](#) (Ordenanza sobre Vigilancia), visite seattle.gov/privacy.

	Audiencia 1	Audiencia 2	Audiencia 3	Audiencia 4	Audiencia 5
Departamentos a cargo	Depto. de Policía	Depto. de Transporte y de Bomberos	Depto. de Policía	Depto. de Policía	Depto. de Transporte y de Bomberos
Fecha y hora	22 de octubre de 2018 5:00 a 6:30 p. m.	25 de octubre de 2018 5:00 a 6:30 p. m.	29 de octubre de 2018 5:00 a 6:30 p. m.	30 de octubre de 2018 5:00 a 6:30 p. m.	5 de noviembre de 2018 4:30 a 5:30 p. m.
Lugar	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

En las audiencias se hablará de las siguientes tecnologías:

Transporte (audiencias 2 y 5)	Depto. de Bomberos (audiencias 2 y 5)	Depto. de Policía (audiencias 1, 3 y 4)
Cámaras de tránsito y lectores de placas de automóviles	Cámaras para escenas de emergencia y cámaras para Hazmat (hazardous materials, materiales peligrosos)	Sistemas de control de áreas de estacionamiento y lectores automáticos de placas de automóviles

Cómo puede enviar sus comentarios:

El período abierto para recibir comentarios sobre estas tecnologías es desde el **8 de octubre hasta el 5 de noviembre de 2018**. Existen tres formas de aportar comentarios:

1. Asista a la audiencia. Consulte la tabla anterior para conocer los horarios y los lugares.
2. Deje sus comentarios en línea en seattle.gov/privacy.
3. Envíe comentarios por correo postal a la siguiente dirección: [Surveillance & Privacy Program](#), Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

Los comentarios enviados se incluirán en la versión final del [Surveillance Impact Report](#) (Informe del efecto de la vigilancia) que se presentará ante el Consejo de la Ciudad y estará disponible al público en general. Para aportar comentarios luego de este período, comuníquese con el personal del Consejo de la Ciudad desde la página web seattle.gov/Council.


Tenga en cuenta que esta audiencia tendrá las siguientes características:

Se grabará en video.

Se llevará un registro de asistencia.

Se recolectarán comentarios del público.

Adaptaciones para las audiencias: Si necesita servicios de traducción u otros servicios, envíenos un correo electrónico a Surveillance@seattle.gov dos semanas antes de la audiencia.



Ogaysiiska Kulanada Dadwaynaha
Fikradaha Dadwaynaha ee ku aadan Qalabka
Muraaqabaynta Casriga ah

Kani waa wareegi koowaad ee lagu aruurinaayo fikradaha dadwaynuhu kaqabaan qalabka muraaqabaynta casriga ah noociisii hore. Wixii macluumaad dheeraad ah oo kusaabsan qalabkaan ama Surveillance Ordinance (Qaabka Muraaqabaynta) booqo seattle.gov/privacy.

	Kulanka 1	Kulanka 2	Kulanka 3	Kulanka 4	Kulanka 5
Waaxaha. Soojeedinta	Waaxda Booliiska.	Gaadiidka, Waaxda Dab Damiska.	Waaxda Booliiska.	Waaxda Booliiska.	Gaadiidka, Waaxda Dab Damiska.
Tariikhda iyo waqtiga	Oktoobar 22, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktoobar 25, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktoobar 29, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktoobar 30, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Nofeembar 5, 2018 4:30-5:30 p.m.
Goobta	Laanta Maktabada ee Magaalada Columbia 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Laanta Maktabada Green Lake 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Laanta Maktabada Green Lake 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

Tignoolojiyadaha looga dooday kulanada waxaa kamid ah:

Gaadiidka (kulanada 2 iyo 5)	Waaxda Dab damiska. (Kulanada 2 iyo 5)	Waaxda Booliiska. (Kulanada 1, 3, iyo 4)
Kaamirooyinka taraafikada iyo Qalabka Akhriya Aqoonsiga Shatiyada	Kaamirooyinka Dhacdooyinka Degdega ah iyo kaamirooyinka Hamzat	Nidaamyada Xakamaynta Baakinka iyo Qalabka Akhriya Aqoonsiga Shatiyada

Halkaan kabaro sida aad fikrado kudhiiban karto:

Mudada ay furantahay fikrad kadhiibashada qalabkaan casriga ah waa **Oktoobar 8 - Nofeembar 5, 2018.** Waxaa jira saddex qaab oo fikir lagu dhiiban karo:

1. Inaad kulanka kaqaybgasho. Fiiri shaxda kore oo ay kuqoran yihiin goobaha iyo xiliyada laqabanaayo kulanada.
2. Fikirkaaga kudir si oonleen ah seattle.gov/privacy.
3. Boosto udir: Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

Fikrado kasta oo lasoo gudbiyo waxaa lagu darayaa War bixinta ugu danbaysa Surveillance Impact Report (Saamaraynta Qalabka Muraaqabada) ee loogudbiyo Dawlada hoose dadwaynuhuna ay akhri sankaraan. Si aad fikirkaaga udhiibato kadib marka mudadaan dhammaato, laxiriir Shaqaalaha Dawlada Hoose oo ciwaankoodu yahay seattle.gov/Council.


Fadlan ogsoonow, kulankaan waa:

Laduubayaa si muqaal ahaan ah.

Dalbo Diirwanka Galitaanka dadka Kaqaybgalaaya ay saxiixayaan.

Aruuri Fikradaha Dadwaynaha.

Wixii laxiriira adeegyada kulanada intay socdaan labixinaayo: Fadlan noosoosheeg labo asbuuc kahor taariikhda kulanku dhacayo haddii adeegyada turjumida luuqada, ama adeegyo kale loobaahdo adoo email noogusoo diraya Surveillance@seattle.gov.



公開會議通知

監視技術公開意見徵集會

這是第一輪會議，徵集公眾對之前取得的監控技術的建議。要獲取有關這些技術或 Surveillance Ordinance (監控條例) 的更多資訊，請瀏覽 seattle.gov/privacy。

	會議 1	會議 2	會議 3	會議 4	會議 5
出席部門	警察署	交通、消防署	警察署	警察署	交通、消防署
日期及時間	2018 年 10 月 22 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 25 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 29 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 30 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 11 月 5 日 下午 4:30-5:30
地點	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

會上討論的技術包括：

交通署 (會議 2 和會議 5) 交通攝像頭和車輛牌照識別器	消防署 (會議 2 和會議 5) 緊急現場攝像頭與危險品攝像頭	警察署 (會議 1、3 和 4) 停車執行系統與車輛牌照自動識別器
--	---	---

您提交意見的方式：

針對這些技術的公眾意見徵集時間是 **2018 年 10 月 8 日至 11 月 5 日**。有三種方式可提交意見：

1. 出席會議。
和時間見上表。

2. 透過 seattle.gov/privacy
網上提交意見。

3. 寄郵件至：Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle II, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124。

提交的所有意見都將收錄於最終的 Surveillance Impact Report (監控影響報告)，遞交至市議會並向大眾開放。如果要在這期間結束後提交意見，請瀏覽 seattle.gov/Council，聯繫市議會的工作人員。


請注意，此會議將：

進行錄影。

要求參會者簽到。

收集公眾意見。

會議輔助服務：如果需要語言翻譯或其他服務，請參照會議日期提前兩週發送電子郵件至 Surveillance@seattle.gov 告知我們。



公开会议通知

坎地比士公共空间征询会

这是第一轮会议，征集公众对之前取得的监控技术的意见。要获得有关这些技术或 Surveillance Ordinance (监控条例) 的更多信息，请访问 seattle.gov/privacy。

	第 1 次会议	第 2 次会议	第 3 次会议	第 4 次会议	第 5 次会议
出席部门	警察局	交通、消防局	警察局	警察局	交通、消防局
日期与时间	2018 年 10 月 22 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 25 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 29 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 10 月 30 日 下午 5-6:30	2018 年 11 月 5 日 下午 4:30-5:30
地点	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

会上讨论的技术包括：

交通局 (第 2 和第 5 次会议)	消防局 (第 2 和第 5 次会议)	警察局 (第 1、3、4 次会议)
交通摄像头和车辆牌照识别器	紧急现场摄像头与危险品摄像头	停车执行系统与车辆牌照自动识别器

您提交意见的方式：

针对这些技术的公众意见征集时间是 **2018 年 10 月 8 日至 11 月 5 日**。提交意见的三种途径：

1. 出席会议。
地点和时间见上表。
2. 通过网站
seattle.gov/privacy
在线提交意见。
3. 寄送邮件至：Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle II, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124。

提交的所有意见都将收录于最终的 Surveillance Impact Report (监控影响报告)，递交至市议会并向大众开放。如果要在此期间结束后提交意见，请浏览 seattle.gov/Council，联系市议会的工作人员。

请注意，此会议将：


进行录像。

要求参会者签到。

收集公众意见。

会议辅助服务：如果需要语言翻译或其他服务，请参照会议

日期提前两周发送电子邮件至 Surveillance@seattle.gov



Thông Báo Về Các Cuộc Họp Công Chúng Ý Kiến Của Công Chúng Về Công Nghệ Giám Sát

Đây là vòng thu thập ý kiến của công chúng đầu tiên về các công nghệ giám sát đã được ứng dụng trước đây. Để có thêm thông tin về các công nghệ này hoặc Surveillance Ordinance (Sắc Lệnh Giám Sát), hãy truy cập seattle.gov/privacy.

	Cuộc họp 1	Cuộc họp 2	Cuộc họp 3	Cuộc họp 4	Cuộc họp 5
Các Sở Tổ Chức Cuộc Họp	Sở Cảnh Sát	Sở Giao Thông Vận Tải, Sở Cứu Hỏa	Sở Cảnh Sát	Sở Cảnh Sát	Sở Giao Thông Vận Tải, Sở Cứu Hỏa
Ngày & Giờ	Ngày 22 tháng 10 năm 2018 5 giờ - 6 giờ 30 phút chiều	Ngày 25 tháng 10 năm 2018 5 giờ - 6 giờ 30 phút chiều	Ngày 29 tháng 10 năm 2018 5 giờ - 6 giờ 30 phút chiều	Ngày 30 tháng 10 năm 2018 5 giờ - 6 giờ 30 phút chiều	Ngày 5 tháng 11 năm 2018 4 giờ 30 - 5 giờ 30 phút chiều
Địa điểm	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

Các công nghệ được thảo luận tại các cuộc họp bao gồm:

Giao thông vận tải (Cuộc họp 2 & 5)	Sở Cứu Hỏa (Cuộc họp 2 & 5)	Sở Cảnh Sát (Cuộc họp 1, 3 & 4)
Các Máy Quay Giao Thông & Các Thiết Bị Đọc Biển Số Xe	Máy Quay Trường Hợp Khẩn Cấp & Máy Quay Hazmat	Hệ Thống Thực Thi Việc Đậu Xe & Các Thiết Bị Đọc Biển Số Xe Tự Động

Đây là cách quý vị có thể đưa ra ý kiến của mình:

Thời gian lấy ý kiến cho các công nghệ trên là **Ngày 8 tháng 10 – Ngày 5 tháng 11 năm 2018**. Có ba cách đưa ra ý kiến:

- 1.** Tham dự cuộc họp. Xem bảng bên trên để biết thời gian và địa điểm.
- 2.** Nộp ý kiến trực tuyến tại seattle.gov/privacy.
- 3.** Gửi thư đến Attn: Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

Các ý kiến được nộp sẽ được đưa vào bản Surveillance Impact Report (Báo Cáo Tác Động Giám Sát) cuối cùng nộp cho Hội Đồng Thành Phố và có sẵn dành cho công chúng. Để đưa ra ý kiến sau khi giai đoạn thu thập ý kiến đã kết thúc, hãy liên hệ với nhân viên của Hội Đồng Thành Phố tại seattle.gov/Council.


Vui lòng lưu ý, cuộc họp này sẽ:

Được ghi hình.

Yêu cầu lưu tên trong danh sách đăng ký tham dự.

Thu thập các ý kiến của công chúng.

Để đáp ứng các yêu cầu điều chỉnh: Vui lòng thông báo cho chúng tôi biết **hai tuần trước ngày diễn ra cuộc họp** nếu quý vị cần dịch vụ thông dịch ngôn ngữ hoặc các dịch vụ khác, bằng cách gửi email đến Surveillance@seattle.gov.



Paunawa sa Mga Pampublikong Pagpupulong Komento ng Publiko sa Teknolohiya sa Pagmamanman

Ito ang unang round para sa pagkomento ng publiko tungkol sa mga dating nakuhang teknolohiya sa pagmamanman. Para sa higit pang impormasyon tungkol sa mga teknolohiyang ito o sa Surveillance Ordinance (Ordinansa sa Pagmamanman), bumisita sa seattle.gov/privacy.

	Pagpupulong 1	Pagpupulong 2	Pagpupulong 3	Pagpupulong 4	Pagpupulong 5
Mga departamentong Naglalahad	Departamento ng Pulisya	Departamento ng Transportasyon, Bumbero	Departamento ng Pulisya	Departamento ng Pulisya	Departamento ng Transportasyon, Bumbero
Petsa at Oras	Oktubre 22, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktubre 25, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktubre 29, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Oktubre 30, 2018 5-6:30 p.m.	Nobembre 5, 2018 4:30-5:30 p.m.
Lokasyon	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St. Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1 st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

Kabilang sa mga teknolohiyang tatalakayin sa mga pagpupulong ang:

Transportasyon (Pagpupulong 2 at 5)	Departamento ng Bumbero (Pagpupulong 2 at 5)	Departamento ng Pulisya (Pagpupulong 1, 3, at 4)
Mga Camera sa Trapiko at License Plate Readers (Mga Tagabasa ng Lisensyadong Plaka)	Mga Camera sa Pinangyarihan ng Emergency at Mga Camera ng Hazmat	Mga Sistema sa Pagpapatupad ng Tamang Pagpaparada at Mga Automated License Plate Reader (Mga Awtomatikong Tagabasa ng Lisensyadong Plaka)

Narito ang mga paraan kung paano ka makapagbibigay ng mga komento:

Ang panahon ng bukas na pagkomento para sa mga teknolohiyang ito ay mula **Oktubre 8 - Nobyembre 5, 2018**. May tatlong paraan upang makapagkomento:

1. Dumalo sa pulong. Tingnan ang talahanayan sa itaas para sa mga lokasyon at oras.
2. Magsumite ng komento online sa seattle.gov/privacy.
3. Magpadala ng liham sa Attn: Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

Isasama ang anumang isinuniteng komento sa huling Surveillance Impact Report (Ulat sa Epekto ng Pagmamanman) na isusumite sa Konseho ng Lungsod at isasapubliko. Upang makapagbigay ng komento pagkalipas ng panahong ito, makipag-ugnayan sa mga kawani ng Konseho ng Lungsod sa seattle.gov/Council.


Mangyaring tandaan, ang pulong na ito ay:

Ire-record sa video.

Hihingi ng tala ng pag-sign in ng mga dadalo.

Mangongolekta ng mga komento ng publiko:

Para sa mga pangangailangan sa pagpupulong: Mangyaring ipaalam sa amin kung kailangan mo ng mga serbisyo sa pagsasalitang wika o iba pang serbisyo dalawang linggo bago ang petsa ng pagpupulong sa pamamagitan ng pagpapadala ng email sa Surveillance@seattle.gov.



공개 회의 통지 감시 기술 여론 수렴

본 회의는 과거 획득된 감시 기술에 대한 제1차 여론 수렴 회의입니다. 본 기술 또는 Surveillance Ordinance(감시 조례 관련) 자세한 정보는 seattle.gov/privacy를 참조해 주시기 바랍니다.

	회의1	회의2	회의3	회의4	회의5
발표 부처	경찰국	교통국, 소방국	경찰국	경찰국	교통국, 소방국
날짜 및 시간	2018년 10월 22일 5-6:30 p.m.	2018년 10월 25일 5-6:30 p.m.	2018년 10월 29일 5-6:30 p.m.	2018년 10월 30일 5-6:30 p.m.	2018년 11월 5일 4:30-5:30 p.m.
장소	Columbia City Branch Library 4721 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	American Legion Hall: West Seattle 3618 SW Alaska St, Seattle, WA 98126	Bertha Knight Landes Room 1st Floor City Hall - 600 4th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104 (5th Ave door)	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115	Green Lake Branch Library 7364 East Green Lake Dr. N, Seattle, WA 98115

회의에서 논의되는 기술 항목:

교통국(회의 2 & 5)	소방국(회의 2 & 5)	경찰국(회의 1, 3, & 4)
교통 카메라 및 번호판 판독기	응급 현장 카메라 및 Hazmat 카메라	주차 단속 시스템 및 자동 번호판 판독기

의견 전달 방법:

상기 기술에 대한 공개 의견 기간은 **2018년 10월 8일~11월 5일**입니다. 의견 전달 방법은 다음 세 가지입니다.


1. 회의에 참석합니다. 장소 및 시간은 상기 표를 참조해 주십시오.
2. 의견은 온라인 seattle.gov/privacy로 제출해 주십시오.
3. 우편 발송지: Surveillance & Privacy Program, Seattle IT, PO Box 94709, Seattle, WA 98124.

제출된 의견은 시의회에 전달되는 최종 Surveillance Impact Report(감시 영향 보고서)에 수록되며 일반에게도 공개됩니다. 본 의견 수렴 기간 종료 후 의견을 제출하시려면, 시의회 담당 직원에게 seattle.gov/Council로 문의해 주시기 바랍니다.

회의 시 참고 사항은 다음과 같습니다.

비디오가 녹화됩니다. 참가 기록을 요청합니다. 대중 의견을 수집합니다.

회의 편의 제공: 언어 번역 또는 기타 서비스가 필요한 경우 회의 개최일 2주 전에 Surveillance@seattle.gov로 이메일을 보내 당국에 알려 주시기 바랍니다.



APPENDIX D: MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET(S)

Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		




Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		





Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		
				
Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender

<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		
				

Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Female
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



Neighborhood		Race/Ethnicity	Age	Gender
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ballard	<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Union	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> Central	<input type="checkbox"/> North	<input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 18-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Male
<input type="checkbox"/> Delridge	<input type="checkbox"/> Northeast	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaska Native	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-64	<input type="checkbox"/> Transgender
<input type="checkbox"/> East District	<input type="checkbox"/> Southeast	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian	<input type="checkbox"/> 65 +	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify
<input type="checkbox"/> Greater Duwamish	<input type="checkbox"/> Southwest	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify	
<input type="checkbox"/> King County (outside Seattle)		<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to identify		



APPENDIX E: INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED ON EMERGENCY SCENE CAMERAS

ID: 10333698252

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/7/2018 5:12:21 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

SFD: Emergency Scene Cameras

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

1) Lack of ability to detect (and I believe, if I recall correctly, also a lack of formal policy governing/preventing) photos of patients on the SFD devices being transferred off device, such as via SD card, USB cable, NFC/wifi, etc. 2) Lack of certainty and formal policy requiring that the trauma photos be deleted after being shown in the ER; and that when the controlled substances box is checked for its contents, that it's also checked to ensure there are no photos accidentally still remaining on the device (not just a check that the camera exists in the box). 3) Overall need for timely improvements to the SFD POG (encompassing the prior 2 comments and as noted by SFD itself in multiple places in the draft SIR).

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Out of all 6 technologies currently up for review, this technology seems the most straightforward in its clear help for the City and potential help in saving lives. My concerns/worries noted are not at all meant to diminish its value, and instead are hopeful areas to further bolster the patient protections in place, as we maintain this technology in use.

What worries you about how this is used?

1) I was surprised to learn that photos of trauma patients taken using these SFD devices aren't covered under HIPAA. I mean, Seattle can't change HIPAA of course, this is just something I didn't realize wasn't covered; and does indeed make me uneasy (though it did sound like at the meeting that SFD personnel do generally treat the photos with caution). 2) (Not with SFD, to the best of my knowledge but) There have been some incidents known online of nurses/doctors taking photos/videos of patients in compromising/derogatory ways, such as mocking a patient that was dying (though they did end up surviving). These incidents don't seem common (thankfully) and they make the news due to the violation of patient trust and generally unethical behavior displayed. One would hope that SFD would never be found doing such, but you asked for worries about this technology, and this is an honest answer.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

1) I do believe that most SFD personnel use the cameras in a responsible manner, but people are human and can be forgetful (especially if its a busy day for responding to incidents back-to-back), so it'd be a reasonable (but hopefully rare) accident for photos to not get deleted at times, so it'd be great if the formal procedure for auditing the controlled substances box included ensuring the camera has no lingering photos on it. 2) An ETA/deadline needs to be supplied for getting the SFD POG updated, overall.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

I appreciated SFD's honesty at the community meeting, but I do think it would be helpful in any future SIR (across departments/technologies), if when a citizen would be reasonably likely to believe that HIPAA was in scope, that the draft/formal SIR explicitly said either "this technology is in scope for HIPAA" or "this technology is not in scope for HIPAA", so there would never been any ambiguity about it.

ID: 10312336531

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/29/2018 10:01:24 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

SFD: Emergency Scene Cameras

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I wish we had more cameras around West Seattle. I visit London and NYC often and feel safer knowing the cameras are on!

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Huge value to citizens and visitors for feeling safe in our city.

What worries you about how this is used?

None. Other than stupid people saying it infringes on their liberties and having certain city council persons use it as a way to rally her radicals.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Have a citizen oversight committee to ensure legitimate security and privacy concerns are addressed.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

No I can not. Let's be grown ups for once.

Do you have any other comments?

Maybe cameras could have figured out two unsolved murders on Alki.

ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED ON GENERAL SURVEILLANCE

ID: 66

Submitted Through: Focus Group 1

Date: 11/8/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

no. Glad some surveillance is being used.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 65

Submitted Through: Focus Group 1

Date: 11/8/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Technologies discussed are less dangerous than some other technologies in our personal lives

ID: 63

Submitted Through: Focus Group 1

Date: 11/8/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

not a lot of privacy anymore: google earth, maps, streetview

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

Google home is always listening. There is always someone listening to your conversations.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Some of the images you can find online appear to be voyeurism

ID: 61

Submitted Through: Focus Group 1

Date: 11/8/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Street sweepers coming in the middle of the night are ineffective, cars are parked and blocking areas

ID: 60

Submitted Through: Focus Group 1

Date: 11/8/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Sometimes too much surveillance

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Curious about how much construction has to pay when blocking off half a block for parking.

ID: 56

Submitted Through: Mail

Date: 10/23/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Surveillance. I don't want it. Any of it. Just stop.

ID: 28

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Can you please do a better job telling the public about these meetings? Targeted Ads? KUOW - helped, Blogs, Newspaper - Poor turnout

ID: 27

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Most too technical and need to communicate better with public

ID: 26

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Concerned about aggregation of technology and data collected

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

More transparent; less defnesive is how you gain trust

ID: 25

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

KC Parcel viewer information is too much. State listings of addresses of voters is a problem. Too much info has impact on DV victims - keeping them from voting

ID: 24

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Work and Human Rights Activist- Process too complicated. Can be benign but SPD doesn't make dark usage more clear. Info is too complex/data need better education for public on technologies.

ID: 23

Submitted Through: Meeting 2

Date: 10/25/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No concerns as a professor. Traffic is getting worse - how do we make improvements. How do we use data in other ways to improve our lives?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Impressed by how City handles data - Check it and Chuck it

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Spent time on dark web and stunned by what they can do

ID: 53

Submitted Through: Meeting 4

Date: 10/30/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

People lose track of "public service" being performed. Misuse of data

ID: 52

Submitted Through: Meeting 4

Date: 10/30/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Hate to go "China route" tied to credit

ID: 51

Submitted Through: Meeting 4

Date: 10/30/2018

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

Restricted use: will it generate income? Mission creep. Report back to community

ID: 10334071978

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/7/2018 9:41:13 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Yes

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Minimal

What worries you about how this is used?

Very concerned about how red light enforcement cameras are racially unjust and frequently cause tickets to be issued to people of color.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Remove red light cameras, if a particular intersection requires policing then assign officers to be posted there to create a presence that can be seen.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Use officers in cars.

Do you have any other comments?

Red light cameras create an unjust, racially imbalanced burden on blacks, latinos and other marginalized groups. They should be eliminated from the city.

ID: 10328244312

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/5/2018 8:41:00 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

We, the Critical Platform Studies Group, are a collective of researchers at the University of Washington Information School conducting a third-party ethnographic research study of the Seattle Surveillance Ordinance. In our ongoing research, we are conducting interviews with stakeholders on the processes leading to the revised Seattle Surveillance Ordinance. We have also compared the law to similar U.S. initiatives, and analyzed the functionality of each technology covered by Seattle's ordinance. Despite the salience of algorithmic processes in surveillance technologies, we are finding that the ordinance does not describe or address machine learning, artificial intelligence (AI), or algorithmic bias. We conclude that there is a pressing need for attention to algorithmic bias within disclosed surveillance technologies, for which we suggest additional elements be added to Seattle Surveillance Impact Reports, or by expanded stakeholder engagement in the RFP stage of the procurement process. Our preliminary findings that lead to these recommendations are as follows: ***Expanded use of technologies triggers new surveillance review***: The Seattle ordinance models a strong process for submitting a given to technology to further review in the event its functionality or uses are expanded. ***Law motivated by concern for marginalized groups***: The motivation for the Seattle Surveillance Ordinance was to protect groups that have historically been targeted by surveillance programs. Given that the implicit biases that have been demonstrated to exist in algorithmic systems invariably affect marginalized groups, it is critical to consider the algorithmic aspects and potential algorithmic biases in disclosed surveillance technologies. ***Gap between perception and reality of current machine learning use***: Three municipal employees familiar with the Surveillance program stated that machine learning technologies are not used in technologies on the Master List. Contrary to these statements we found that at least two technologies on the Master List rely on machine algorithms---Automated License Plate Recognition

(ALPR) and Booking Photo Comparison Software (BPCS). We found that at least two other technologies on the Master List rely on AI technology that could also be used long term in a way that implicates protected groups---i2 iBase and Maltego. The reliance on machine learning technologies likely introduces algorithmic bias, such as through "false positive" identifications. *Absence of algorithmic considerations in other surveillance ordinances*: None of the six municipal surveillance ordinances we surveyed included language for wrestling with algorithmic bias. *Opportunity to strengthen existing processes*: The Seattle Surveillance Impact Reports could include questions or prompts that would target and stimulate investigation into machine learning / AI facets or into algorithmic bias in disclosed surveillance technologies.

ID: 10326819811

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/5/2018 9:14:43 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Adaptive signal technology does not seem ready for a multimodal city where bikes/pedestrians need priority.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

It can potentially improve mobility and that has certainly been demonstrated for cars at least.

What worries you about how this is used?

It doesn't account for bikes or pedestrians or requires some sort of additional effort (like installing an app) to work for those groups.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Are these technologies helping or hurting the vision zero goals?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

I would question whether cars being in gridlock is a problem that can be solved or simply a consequence of the culture that we are encouraging in a dense city.

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10326707921

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/5/2018 8:38:49 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

As our population grows this is the only way to enforce laws as we don't have enough police to do it

What worries you about how this is used?

None. If you're abiding by the law you have nothing to fear

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Allow police to use it to their advantage to do their job to keep us all safe, but don't use it against them!

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Create an environment that would make police want to stay in Seattle and do the job they were hired to do.

Do you have any other comments?

See above

ID: 10324587536

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/4/2018 3:55:12 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

License plate cameras in general, I'm supportive of, if they can be used at greater frequency to crack down on illegal parking and driving.

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Full steam ahead! Bus lane camera on every bus, so that operators can push a button to send video of an illegal bus lane violator or other moving/parking violations when they see one, to get folks to drive better.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Literally no.

Do you have any other comments?

I have no worries about these technologies. Get bus cameras online ASAP.

ID: 10322210731

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 11/2/2018 9:47:34 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

This is government overreach and Big Brother at it's finest. Surveillance technologies do not belong in a free society and are solely implemented to farm money from taxpayers for minor infractions, at "best".

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

None; outside of the ticket-issuing racket.

What worries you about how this is used?

Law Enforcement will abuse this technology. As a prior victim of stalking at the hands of a Law Enforcement Officer, we don't need to give Police more surveillance tools which make it easier to harass citizens.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Do not turn Seattle into Singapore, China, or the United Kingdom. America is The Land of the Free. We don't want to be under the Watchful Eye of Big Brother.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Use your eyes and have officers enforce the law as needed.

Do you have any other comments?

Robots are not Sworn Officers of the Law. SPD should be writing tickets, not computers. This technology will likely be abused, it will violate privacy laws, and I don't trust the Government to keep secure such a Mass Surveillance system. The costs of securing and maintaining such a system will require massive amounts of artificial "ticketing". At best, this is a Perpetual Revenue Generator for City Hall; at worst, it's a Gross Violation of Our Civil Rights.

ID: 10315099454

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/30/2018 7:57:58 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Hi it brings proof. It impacts crime before it occurs.

What worries you about how this is used?

Mone

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Where you see lots of camera you see less crime.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10314183202

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/30/2018 12:34:32 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

The location of the cameras/where the police vans circulate can be racially discriminatory. The city should make sure that these are distributed equitably.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

If the city is already going to be placing these cameras, they should also use these cameras to enforce speeding violations. Cars are always driving dangerously fast in this city, and these cameras should also make people follow the law.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10312185174

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/29/2018 7:45:04 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Yes

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

Over-policing. Waste of tax money. City government probably isn't sufficiently organized or skilled to process and analyze the data collected. It will ultimately lead to more overly bureaucratic, under-skilled, departments hopelessly trying to learn how to use the equipment and manage a massive records collection. The City should think twice before tying their shoes together on this one. It won't turn out well. I suggest you save yourselves the headache and bad PR by abandoning any surveillance plans now.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Fire whoever is responsible for trying to waste tax money on invasive surveillance equipment. Also, whoever wrote question #6 should take a course on writing unbiased survey questions because the question assumes that the proposed surveillance equipment in fact solves a problem but that is not an established truth.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

This is a loaded question. It does not solve a problem. It creates an IT nightmare, costs way too much to store the data, invasive surveillance, and bad PR. Eventually, someone involved will likely lose a future election as a result.

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10312163737

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/29/2018 7:35:08 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Yes, I don't agree on public surveillance. This is America not China!

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I think it strips me from my right as a citizen and make me feel like the whole country is big huge jail

What worries you about how this is used?

How it's interpret and what people of color will have to go through to not been punished for small and trivial crimes.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

We're not ready, this is not London. Don't do it!

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

I don't think it's solving a problem as much as it's creating one.

Do you have any other comments?

Don't do it!

ID: 10310577035

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/29/2018 8:13:55 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Yes, the police are not honest about how and when they use this technology which means they are violating the 4th amendment rights which is a federal offense. Are they held accountable? No, almost never.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

The percentage of crimes solved with these technologies is a very small amount. And violating 4th amendment rights is a normal act by police in many of those instances.

What worries you about how this is used?

I support the pursuit of justice to make our city safer but but lawful citizens and criminals all have rights which the police disregard because there is no price to pay. If you could cheat and got caught doing so but there was no consequences, why wouldn't you? Its examples like this in our leaders, public officials and public servants that have eroded society and the trust people in each other.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Until we have good honest leaders at the top who oversee the ones who use these technologies and who have no bias about who is held accountable for violations of ANY kind, they should be sidelined.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Good morals and the respect for your fellow humans. It starts with the people on top to set good examples. We as a society have gotten more numb to violence, dishonesty and corruption at the highest

levels ,it has now sown itself into our way of life. If we see this kind of behavior from the people that are "roll models" or "leaders" then we adopt them as our own values.

Do you have any other comments?

Unfortunately, corruption is widespread in government agencies and public enterprises. Our political system promotes nepotism and wasting money. This has undermined our legal system and confidence in the functioning of the state. Communism is the corruption of a dream of justice.

ID: 10307049643

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/26/2018 7:08:32 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I need the red light cameras NOT to have flash equipment on them. These lights are too bright, and they flash without warning, blinding people on the sidewalks at intersections.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Damn all. It may be that drivers get citations--but this does not compensate for the blinding of pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.

What worries you about how this is used?

I have several times been so bedazzled and startled that I might easily have stumbled into traffic, if I'd chanced to be closer to the curb.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Get cameras that don't need so much light, if you INSIST on having such cameras.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Since I don't think it solves anything, no.

Do you have any other comments?

Other cameras are intrusive and invasive--but they're not so immediately dangerous, generally.

ID: 10307028243

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/26/2018 6:42:15 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

None of these technologies are novel, particularly compared to other parts of the world (Europe, Asia). However, the use of the automated parking enforcement technology specifically for the purpose of booting cars is of highly questionable value.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Hopefully some efficiencies in reducing human effort required to perform basic data-gathering and enforcement. If the parking enforcement buggies can cover many more blocks in a day, or a police officer yanks someone out of a car that's actually stolen, great!

What worries you about how this is used?

Abuse of data access, lax enforcement of retention and removal-of-access policies, above SECURITY BREACH OF DATA that may be useful in some level of identification (car with plate X was seen at location Y at time Z). Be wary of social justice impacts, particularly of the auto-boot technology. Those who are the most vulnerable may be in more frequently trouble with the law (and absolutely unable to rectify fines) and would thus unable to reach services. It would be absolutely unacceptable if a vulnerable member of the population who may be living in a vehicle is booted and unable to access basic human services, or worse.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Data security is of paramount importance -- if data cannot be handled safely by the right people at the right time with prompt removal processes for data and access, then none of this matters and the public trust is gone. If there are any questions about this whatsoever, do not proceed with adoption. After that is transparency. Be specific about what is gathered, down to individual data elements: publicly post the data schemas (but obviously not the data). E.g., when your license plate is recorded, it also gathers: date, time, location, and so on. Finally, policies about use must be clearly understood by the public and the civil servants the tech is entrusted too. "SPD may use tech [when] for [reason] in order to perform duty [elaborate]." "SDOT uses these cameras to perform analysis of [condition]". People care about access and retention policies in this day and age -- post them and perform routine audits no less than quarterly but ideally more often than that (again, posting results publicly).

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Drone-mounted cameras can be used to gather movement data for travel time analysis; this doesn't require the use or exposure of any identifying marks whatsoever. They may also be helpful for SFD response scenes to perform rapid large area surveys.

Do you have any other comments?

Addressing these topics with serious care and thoughtfulness raises chances of success. Be intentional about uses of these technologies and do not allow for hidden uses.

ID: 10307002973

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/26/2018 6:13:10 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Not particularly

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

CCTV makes this city safer, particularly since we are so short of police officers.

What worries you about how this is used?

Nothing

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Beat policemen are better.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Policemen/women who walk or ride bikes in the same neighborhood on a daily basis. We've all read English novels. Doesn't the bobby on his beat seem like the best way to protect a neighborhood, and make a neighborhood feel safe?

Do you have any other comments?

I've lived in Ballard for 35 years. In the last five years I've put grates on my windows, bought a wrought-iron screen door, locked the gate to the backyard. This is after the theft of my bicycle from my shed, shoes from my porch, etc. Opioids. The government is cracking down on doctors who overprescribe.

How about cracking down on street drug dealers as well? If a bath tub is overflowing from two spigots going full blast, turning off only one of those spigots doesn't work. Gotta turn off both.

ID: 10306958976

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/26/2018 5:25:35 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I do have concerns. However, if there is public oversight of the surveillance technology used, both by elected officials and through releases of content recorded to the general public, then these concerns will be sufficiently addressed.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I think this has the ability to automate many of the services currently done by the city. Further, it can provide hard evidence of events that occurred which human testimony cannot do.

What worries you about how this is used?

I am worried that these systems could be used by its operators to spy on people they know or to blackmail individuals both known and unknown to the operators. The accountability to elected officials and through releases to the public would prevent these things from happening.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Make sure there is actual transparency and accountability to the general public and the press, and make sure this technology is about automation and providing evidence, not to keep tabs on people.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

no

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10303980026

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/25/2018 12:46:20 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I have concerns about the validity of Seattle's privacy program after listening to Seattle's Chief Privacy Officer on KUOW today. Per Ordinance 125376, greykey (the ability for the Seattle Govt to unlock iPhones without having the password) should have been reviewed by the Privacy Officer Armbruster, but it wasn't and she provided no explanation why. She offered no apology. This lacks transparency and accountability.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10300614662

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/24/2018 9:04:59 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

yes

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

On a world level, at the federal government level, and at the city level we move closer towards fascism and other forms of authoritarianism, expanded surveillance will give expanded power to authoritarian regimes such as ours.

What worries you about how this is used?

The list of technologies for surveillance should include all other 'law' enforcement agencies at work in our city such as ICE.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

As I sat down on the Seattle Trolley on Jackson Street a drone flew up and held stationary and then tilted slightly up. The blue lens of a camera flashed and the drone banked off. I'd like to know what other technologies are at use in our city, by ICE for instance as well as other 'law' agencies.

ID: 10299219171

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/23/2018 7:14:36 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

in general I'm concerned about the collection, retention, aggregation, sharing, and mining of information collected thru surveillance technologies, particularly with regard to the risk for abuse by agencies like ICE or other yet-to-be created Federal agencies that do not represent the views of the Seattle area population.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Emergency Scene cameras give medical professional an opportunity to prepare for treating emergencies and protect first responders from frivolous lawsuits. Hazmat cams gather information while allowing humans to remain at a safe distance. The rest of them essentially allow the city to more effectively collect revenue, except for ALPR, which scans licenses in search of stolen cars or vehicles sought for other reasons.

What worries you about how this is used?

ALPR is essentially a surveillance dragnet. Data is retained for 90 days even on vehicles that have nothing to do with anything.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Do not retain any ALPR data except that which pertains to tagged vehicles. In general, always err on the side of not collecting data, not storing it, and not sharing it. Please. I work for Google.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Fund transportation infrastructure so we don't have so many cars on the road running traffic lights and hitting pedestrians and cyclists and being driven by drunks.

Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

ID: 10298281561

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/23/2018 11:18:38 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

It seems like all of these technologies are primarily focused on the movement of vehicles through Seattle instead of pedestrians and their own needs

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Giving the illusion of gathering useful, but inactionable, data.

What worries you about how this is used?

general privacy concerns about collecting so much data. There's no such thing as perfect security, to say the least.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Use it to benefit the most vulnerable road users: pedestrians, including cyclists and other small transport methods/vehicles.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Does it solve things? It's a bit early to say that.

Do you have any other comments?

Stop focusing on car throughput, and instead focus on people.

ID: 10298170617

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/23/2018 10:37:29 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Can you quantify the # of crime investigations, stolen cars recovered and \$ amount of traffic violations recovered by using the ALPR/LPR technology.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I am concerned that we are trading our privacy for a "sense" of security. How have surveillance technologies incrementally affected our security in Seattle.

What worries you about how this is used?

slippery slope -- see "The Last Enemy" film

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

I'd like to see more police body cams; less surveillance;

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

I have not been convinced except in the case of the Fire Department technology that we are actually better off -- I need to see numbers.

Do you have any other comments?

I would like to see year over year numbers comparing "before technology - after technology"

ID: 10296707285

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 9:13:04 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

The public ought to be made aware of all surveillance technologies being used. In the case of permanent fixed surveillance devices such as cameras, the public should be readily able to find information about where all such devices are installed.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

The provided examples of traffic monitoring seem useful. However, a full-blown security system similar to the widespread CCTV coverage in London seems overly pervasive.

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Minimize the number of surveillance devices implemented, and make their locations available for online viewing by the public at any time. No surveillance devices should be installed without informing the public.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Security cameras should be limited to guarding private property or specific locations of concern, and not used to generally monitor all public areas at all times.

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10296428154

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 5:35:21 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10295649414

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 11:24:46 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

What worries you about how this is used?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

Do you have any other comments?

I don't want any surveillance. Any of it. Let us live privately and in peace. Just stop.

ID: 10295424650

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 10:02:24 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

SPD has proved over decades that it should BE constantly monitored, rather than be further enabled to abuse - the inseparable seduction of its under-controlled power.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Surveillance tech further dehumanizes and commoditizes residents. A better SPD investment would be in outside beat walking and mingling with citizens.

What worries you about how this is used?

SPD is under Federal oversight due to its documented abuses. Its modus operandi are Trumpist (i.e. thrive only in the dark). We have witness where that tends.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

No Councilperson can adequately oversee or hold accountable her portfolio, let alone the Mishmash and Safe Communities octopus. Until proven effective governance by elected officials obtains, no greater powers should be distributed to SPD.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

The morality police in Iran and Saudi Arabia and the like in China demonstrate that everyday citizens are readily induced to spy and report on their neighbors. Although beyond the pale, a progressive version of neighborly support and assistance should be the direction Seattle pioneers to deal with the pressing problems of Mass Humanity.

Do you have any other comments?

One cannot "tech" to a humanitarian city, least of all through an insidiously equipped praetorian armed force. SPD elevates the interests of its minuscule membership above those of a citizenry whose dwarf it in all regards. City Council year-in/year-out approves the contracts cementing this folly. Seattle needs a formal goal of reducing its separate-but-armed constituency into the service element it should be, not the formidable power-center it is.

ID: 10295330166

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 9:29:06 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

Yes. We have crimes and shootings that occur in public areas where there is no reasonable expectation of privacy but we lack the info to respond effectively.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

By placing cameras in certain areas with frequent criminal activity we could both deter and aid in the arrest and prosecution of those responsible. The city is undergoing an epidemic of property crime and dumping of garbage in many areas. Cameras could help deter, aid in the arrest/fines and prosecution of those responsible.

What worries you about how this is used?

Very little. If used in public spaces there is no reasonable expectation of privacy. If there is concern about privacy or tracking, the data could be encrypted by default and then made available to police after an incident with a court order or approval of some oversight body.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Hurry up and put cameras in place where it makes sense. If there are privacy concerns, implement some kind of a check on access but get moving.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Not cost effectively.

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10295152382

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/22/2018 8:30:01 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

A person could be set up, I suppose. I just read that the journalist who was murdered in the embassy....well his ambushers had a double for him. Now whether this is true or not it could happen. Of course facial recognition might put a stop to imposters posing as someone else.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Safety in public spaces is increased...although, it is sadly 'after the fact' that it is usually the most effective. I think that just the knowledge that you might be watched could deter criminal behavior or, for that matter, abuse by law enforcement. It works both ways. Also, if you had more speed detectors you could generate a lot of revenue with speeding tickets. I can't tell you the number of times I've had cars speed by me in neighborhoods where speed limits are 25 mph. I know police can't be everywhere...but cameras can be. People are much less respectful nowadays. I drive to neighborhoods all over Seattle 5 days a week as a caregiver and have people honking at me because I'm driving too slow for them. I wish I could take the Mayor along with me on some of my trips so she could see first hand how rude people can be.

What worries you about how this is used?

It will alleviate my worries about road rage....maybe make people feel safer walking about outside...especially those most vulnerable who stay cooped up in their homes too afraid to go outside.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Please...more sir. I would love to see children outside playing...who aren't afraid of being outside playing...in quiet neighborhoods or parks. We need these cameras etc. if only to act as a babysitter in some respects.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Change human nature....which is nearly impossible.

Do you have any other comments?

I'm sure there would be people who could try to use surveillance to watch women etc.....when I was younger I've had police pull me over I'm sure just to check me out...stupid weirdos....BUT there is a lot of good to be had with watching over the public for the public good

ID: 10291758143

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/19/2018 2:19:06 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No, I support surveillance cameras, even as I understand this is a tradeoff to privacy. But, CC TVs are widely accepted and extraordinarily helpful for law enforcement in other countries such as the UK.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

The ability to safeguard spaces and revisit victimizations.

What worries you about how this is used?

How long the data is kept. We should have a period of time that the data is kept after which it is destroyed.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Adopt this widely.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

NO.

Do you have any other comments?

As a UW professor who studies law, I fully support better surveillance of our population--this includes police, citizens, and so on.

ID: 10287347565

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/17/2018 9:55:10 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No. Technology is ubiquitous; surveillance is everywhere. Technology plays a pivotal role in keeping our communities safe. The paranoia of some should be easily address by strong policies and auditing of use.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Technology is critical to solving crime, deterring crime, and bringing criminals to justice, and providing closure to victims.

What worries you about how this is used?

I worry that it is not used enough. I live in the South End, yes, in a black community (I am black) and we have been pleading with the city (you, Councilmember Harrell) for cameras for years. The ACLU, and supposed "community activists", do not speak for the average among us who go to work, take our kids to school, and just want to live in a safe community.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Lead. Do what you're paid to do. Protect the communities you serve, and allow - perhaps even enable - the police to keep our communities safe.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

A ridiculous question. If the city's not going to invest in a technological solution, why would the city invest in a lesser solution?

Do you have any other comments?

Please, do not hamstring our first responders anymore. Property crime is rampant. Auto theft is rampant. Our kids are being robbed on the street. And you want to TAKE AWAY tools to solve crime?? We want cameras - like we were promised, Councilmember Harrell. We want crimes solved, and deterred. Do not let absurdity rule the day.

ID: 10281389699

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/15/2018 4:13:31 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Possible reduction in open street crimes

What worries you about how this is used?

May be considered not useful to detect crimes in low income communities.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Use the technologies to cut down the kidnapers/rapist-- violent sex predators working and living in southend housing.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Police patrols more often and seizure--not just showing up and leaving the scene.

Do you have any other comments?

The city seems to be over-run by kidnapers raping, I am getting sick to my stomach. Violent Sex Predators seem to be running the city via what I know.

ID: 10281279313

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/15/2018 3:10:22 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10273624842

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/11/2018 1:35:22 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

What worries you about how this is used?

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10271359916

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/10/2018 6:19:02 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I think we need more. Especially at every bus stop.

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Hopefully catching criminals

What worries you about how this is used?

Nothing

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

More cameras.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

No

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10270768915

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/10/2018 1:10:42 PM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

No

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I think it has great value in areas of high use, especially in areas where crime is historically reported. Both deterrent to crime and tool that helps law enforcement in the event crime has occurred.

What worries you about how this is used?

totally ok with it, as long as it's targeted in areas of heavy use, congested areas, high volume of people, areas with historically issues with crime, etc.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Make sure law enforcement has real time access. Limit access to law enforcement type groups, don't get sidetracked as to possible other uses of the data.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

more police officers

Do you have any other comments?

Believe this is a cost effective way to help keep people safe.

ID: 10270556248

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/10/2018 11:50:08 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

I do not want increased surveillance. License Plate Readers,

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

None.

What worries you about how this is used?

Privacy and tracking concerns are rampant in an age where social media [LinkedIn] is almost required for a profession, a cell phone is required for jobs, and cars are required for jobs. StingRay [cell phone interceptor] has already been shown to be used unlawfully. I can only imagine a database version would be subject to equal lack of scrutiny.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Vote no.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Mountains out of molehills. Patrol HOV lanes.

Do you have any other comments?

Enforce HOV restrictions.

ID: 10270098107

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/10/2018 9:10:36 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

ALPR/LPR: how is this technology used; if the data is being passively collected - how can the general public audit the back-end systems for sake of privacy (in the age of data breaches, this is a risk of *when* there is a breach and not *if*)

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

Studies have shown that increased surveillance does not actually lead to reduced crime. More studies have also shown that community watch organisations do more to reduce crime than passive/active remote surveillance.

What worries you about how this is used?

Unclear duration of data usage, sharing and retention, and public request process to remove targeted data.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Carefully evaluate vendors and their products to make sure the systems are hardened against breaches; evaluate whether the systems allow for public access to the data so that people can limit invasive surveillance.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

Better community education and watch programs. Try to find root causes of crimes and solve those causes. Surveillance is a short term gain with long term consequences and it doesn't address the problem of why crimes happen. Getting to the root cause may prove to be more productive (and in some cases, cost less public money)

Do you have any other comments?

ID: 10269149042

Submitted Through: Survey Monkey

Date: 10/10/2018 1:58:48 AM

Which surveillance technology that is currently open for public comment, do you wish to comment on?

General Surveillance comment

Do you have concerns about this specific technology or how it is used?

With all of these technologies, my main concern is unnecessary storage and retention. For example, what if you're storing some kind of information on people's cars, which then is acquired by ICE to prosecute undocumented individuals in spite of our city's sanctuary status?

What value do you think this technology brings to our city?

I believe there is value in the diagnostic capabilities, for example finding out what kind of traffic levels there are on a street or sidewalk, finding out how many bus lane cheaters there are, or maybe finding a pattern of frequent dangerous behavior on a street. In the same vein, I'm extremely supportive of having cameras on buses that bus operators can use to report bus lane violations because I think the level of bus lane violations we have is a serious impediment to our transportation system. I also appreciate that tech like this removes any prejudices that a police officer may have. Either you broke the law, or you didn't. I love that this tech will be used in parking enforcement. We need to enforce our traffic laws or nobody will care.

What worries you about how this is used?

Though it removes prejudice on the part of officers, I do also think this may be sub-optimal in some circumstances. Perhaps someone as speeding by only 1 mile per hour, which reasonably, we should let slide, but with cameras, we probably won't.

What recommendations would you give policy makers at the City about this technology?

Bus and bike lane camera enforcement, yes! You have no idea how many times some bus lane violators slow down a 60-person bus, or someone blocks the bike lane forcing me to make an unsafe movement. I'd also love to see box blocking or crosswalk blocking detection technology to prevent those things from happening because it seriously reduces the livability and safety of pedestrians and transit users. Don't have any facial recognition software though.

Can you imagine another way to solve the problem this technology solves?

I don't know how actionable this is, but maybe we could work with the judicial system to give the law a little bit of discretion on the prosecution of crimes, so for example if you're speeding by 1 mph, you don't get the same fine as someone speeding by 10 mph or 30 mph.

Do you have any other comments?

Please implement bus/bike lane enforcement cameras yesterday. I get there are challenges WRT privacy and whatnot, but if we're sensitive to these issues, we can make our city safer.

APPENDIX F: LETTERS FROM ORGANIZATIONS

Shankar Narayan
TECHNOLOGY AND LIBERTY
PROJECT DIRECTOR



October 24th, 2018

RE: ACLU-WA Comments Regarding Group 1 Surveillance Technologies

Dear Seattle IT:

On behalf of the ACLU of Washington, I write to offer the ACLU-WA's comments on the surveillance technologies included in Group 1 of the Seattle Surveillance Ordinance process. We are submitting these comments by mail because they do not conform to the specific format of the online comment form provided on the CTO's website, and because the technologies form groups in which some comments apply to multiple technologies.

These comments should be considered preliminary, given that the Surveillance Impact Reports for each technology leave a number of significant questions unanswered. Specific unanswered questions for each technology are noted in the comments relating to that technology, and it is our hope that those questions will be answered in the updated SIR provided to the City Council prior to its review of that technology.

The technologies in Group 1 are covered in the following order:

- I. Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Group
 1. Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR)(Patrol)(SPD)
 2. Parking Enforcement Systems (Including ALPR)(SPD)
 3. License Plate Readers (SDOT)
- II. Camera Group
 1. Emergency Scene Cameras (SFD)
 2. Hazardous Materials (Hazmat) Camera (SFD)
 3. Closed Circuit Television "Traffic Cameras" (SDOT)

I. ALPR Group

Automated License Plate Reader Systems (ALPRs) are powerful surveillance technologies that have the potential to significantly chill constitutionally protected activities by allowing the government to create a detailed picture of the movements—and therefore the lives—of a massive number of community members doing nothing more than going about their daily business. Indeed, at the first public meeting seeking comment on the SPD Patrol ALPRs, it was revealed that the ALPR system collected

AMERICAN CIVIL
LIBERTIES UNION
OF WASHINGTON
901 5TH AVENUE, STE 630
SEATTLE, WA 98164
T/206.624.2184
WWW.ACLU-WA.ORG

JEAN ROBINSON
BOARD PRESIDENT

KATHLEEN TAYLOR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

37,000 license plates in a 24 hour period—which equates to over 13.5 million scans over a full year. The overwhelming majority of these drivers are not suspected of any crime.

With this massive database of information, agencies can comprehensively track and plot the movements of individual cars over time, even when the driver has not broken any law. This enables agencies, including law enforcement, to undertake widespread, systematic surveillance on a level that was never possible before. Aggregate data stored for long periods of time becomes more invasive and revealing. Existing law in Seattle places no specific limits on the use of ALPR technology or data, meaning an agency can choose whether and how they want to retain data and track vehicle movements.

ALPR technology can be used to target drivers who visit sensitive places such as centers of religious worship, protests, union halls, immigration clinics, or health centers. Whole communities can be targeted based on their religious, ethnic, or associational makeup, and indeed, exactly that has happened elsewhere. In New York City, police officers drove unmarked vehicles equipped with license plate readers around local mosques in order to record each attendee as part of a massive program of suspicionless surveillance of the Muslim community. In the U.K., law enforcement agents installed over 200 cameras and license plate readers to target a predominantly Muslim community suburbs of Birmingham. ALPR data obtained from the Oakland Police Department showed that police there disproportionately deployed ALPR-mounted vehicles in low-income communities and communities of color. And the federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency has sought access to ALPR data in order to target immigrants for deportation. All of these concerns are magnified in light of a long history of the use of invasive surveillance technologies to target vulnerable communities (see, for example, Simone Browne’s excellent, multidisciplinary book on the subject, *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*).

The foregoing concerns suggest the Council should ensure strong protections against the misuse of this technology, regardless of which agency is deploying it and for what purpose. Specific comments follow.

1. Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR)(Patrol)(SPD)

The SIR relating to Patrol ALPRs raises a number of specific concerns around current policy and practice, and leaves open a number of significant questions. I attempt to capture these in sections below on concerns, questions, and recommendations.

a. Major Concerns

- *Inadequate Policies.* Policies cited in the SIR are vague, contradictory, and appear to impose no meaningful restrictions on the purposes for which ALPR data may be collected or used. Policy 16.170—the only apparent policy specific to ALPRs—for example, is very short, contains undefined terms, and focuses on training rather than use. Subsection 3 of the policy says that “ALPR Operation Shall be for Official Department Purposes” and that ALPR may be used “during routine patrol or any criminal investigation.” This does not meaningfully restrict

the purposes for which ALPR may be used. And another part of the policy states that ALPR data may be accessed only when it relates to a specific criminal investigation—yet it is unclear how this relates to the enforcement of civil violations mentioned in both SPD SIRs. More generally, much of the practice described in the SIR does not appear to be reflected in any written policy at all (for example, the practice of manually verifying a hit visually is not reflected in policy).

- *Dragnet Use with No Justification.* While the SIR contains contradictory information on this point, it appears that ALPR cameras are always running, offering a vast dragnet of data collection. No legal standard is stated to justify this general, dragnet use. The Seattle Intelligence Ordinance is cited, but SPD seems to assume that dragnet surveillance is consistent with this Ordinance, without any specific policy (for example, are ALPR-equipped vehicles kept away from protests?).
- *Lengthy Retention Window with No Justification.* SPD retains ALPR data for 90 days, but examples given in the SIR of crimes solved using ALPRs largely appear to involve immediate matches against a hotlist. It is unclear what justifies this long retention window.
- *Data Sharing is Not Explicitly Limited by Policy or Statute.* The sharing of ALPR data with other agencies is of great concern, and SPD states a variety of situations in which such data may be shared (see SIR Section 6.1). But the policies cited do not make clear the criteria for such sharing, nor any inter-agency agreement that governs such sharing, nor why the data must be shared in the first place (see perfunctory answer to SIR Section 6.2). This issue of data sharing was raised in the enactment of the Surveillance Ordinance itself, and has only become more urgent under the current federal administration.
- *Inadequate Auditing.* The SIR appears to contradict itself on the subject of whether and how audits of inquiries to the system can be conducted (see SIR Sections 4.10 and 8.2, for example). As with any invasive surveillance system, a clear and regular audit trail to protect against abuse is important.

b. Outstanding Questions

I'm listing questions here that I hope will be answered in an updated SIR:

- To what degree are patrol and parking enforcement ALPR systems separated, and do SPD policies on ALPR apply fully to the Parking Enforcement Systems? It appears the systems are merged at least to some extent, and in that case, the same strong protections against abuse should be applied to all systems.
- ALPR policy says there has to be a specific criminal investigation in order for ALPR data to be accessed. Does reasonable suspicion of a crime equate to a

specific criminal investigation? How is a specific criminal investigation documented?

- Under what agreements is data shared with outside agencies, and where “required by law,” what specific laws require this sharing? To which systems outside SPD is data uploaded?
- How many plate images collected by the system every day? What is the hit rate on those images? Is there systematic data reflecting how many crimes each year are actually solved using ALPR data?
- How often do misreads occur? Are they systematically tracked?

c. Recommendations

These recommendations should be considered preliminary, pending answers to the questions above. But we urge the Council to ensure binding enforceable protections in ordinance that ensure the following minimum protections:

- Dragnet use and long retention of ALPR data should be outlawed. SPD must have reasonable suspicion that a crime has occurred before examining collected license plate reader data; they must not examine license plate reader data in order to generate reasonable suspicion. SPD should retain no information at all when a passing vehicle does not match a hot list (particularly given that such data is subject to public disclosure, including to federal agencies).
- People should be able to find out if plate data of vehicles registered to them are contained in SPD’s ALPR database. They should also be able to access the data.
- There must be access controls on the ALPR databases, with only agents who have been trained in the policies governing such databases permitted access, and with every instance of access logged.
- SPD should not share any ALPR data with third parties without a written agreement ensuring that those third parties conform to the above retention and access rules, and should disclose to whom and under what circumstances the data are disclosed.
- Whenever a hit occurs, an officer, before taking any action, must confirm visually that a plate matches the number and state identified in the alert, confirm that the alert is still active by calling dispatch and, if the alert pertains to the registrant of the car and not the car itself, for example in a warrant situation, develop a reasonable belief that the vehicle’s occupant(s) match any individual(s) identified in the alert.

- ALPRs should not be used for non-criminal enforcement purposes, other than parking enforcement.
- SPD should produce detailed records of ALPR scans, hits, and crimes solved specifically attributable to those hits, as well as an accounting of how ALPR use varies by neighborhood and demographic.

2. Parking Enforcement Systems (Including ALPR)(SPD)

Particularly given the partly merged nature of the parking enforcement and patrol ALPRs, including use of the parking enforcement ALPRs to check vehicle plates against hot lists, the concerns stated above with respect to SPD Patrol ALPRs apply equally to parking enforcement systems, and Council should ensure that the same minimum rules apply to them via ordinance—the intended primary use for parking enforcement does not in itself mitigate the concerns raised. In addition, the following outstanding questions should be answered in an updated SIR:

- It is unclear from the SIR how the Parking Enforcement ALPR systems integrate with the Patrol ALPR systems—it appears that some integration occurs at least in the case of the Scofflaw enforcement vans, that store collected data in the BOSS system. An updated ALPR should clarify specifically what rules apply to that data, and how they differ from rules applied to data collected by Patrol ALPR.
- A number of software and hardware providers are mentioned in Section 2.3 of the SIR—an updated SIR should clarify whether all contract directly with SPD itself, or with each other or a third party entity, to provide ALPR and related services.
- As with Patrol ALPR, statistics on numbers of scans, hits, and revenue from the systems would be helpful.
- Section 4.1 suggests pictures of the vehicle are being taken in addition to the plate—are these pictures stored, and if so, for how long?
- Concerns set forth in the section above relating to patrol ALPR regarding data access, clear standards for data sharing with third party entities and the purpose of such sharing, as well as auditing, all apply to these systems as well—and an updated SIR should clarify those standards.

3. License Plate Readers (SDOT)

The concerns stated above with respect to patrol ALPR largely apply to this set of ALPRs as well, with the additional concern of explicit sharing with a state entity. It is heartening that the SIR suggests that no license plate data is retained, but it is not clear whether that no-retention practice is reflected in policy. It is also unclear whether an explicit agreement exists with WSDOT ensuring deletion of the data and use only for the

purpose of calculating travel times. With that in mind, the following outstanding questions should be answered in an updated SIR:

- What explicit, written policies govern what SDOT and WSDOT can do with this ALPR data? Is there a written agreement with WSDOT requiring no personal data collection and deletion of all data?
- Under what circumstances might this data be used for law enforcement purposes? Is it possible for third parties to subpoena any data retained?
- What additional third parties get access to the data?

The Council should ensure by ordinance that the data collected is used only for the purpose of calculating travel times, that no data is retained, that no third party other than SDOT and WSDOT access the data at any time, and that a written agreement holds WSDOT to these restrictions.

II. Camera Group

Overall, concerns around this group of technologies largely focus on the use of these systems and the data collected by them for purposes other than those intended, over-collection and over-retention of data, and sharing of that data with third parties (such as federal law enforcement agencies). While the stated purposes of the cameras may be relatively innocuous, it is important to remember that images taken by such cameras, for example at emergency scenes, can compromise the privacy of individuals at vulnerable moments, and can be misused for the same kinds of targeting and profiling of particular communities detailed in Section I above. In addition, with the widespread and cheap availability of facial recognition technology, which can be applied after the fact to any image showing a face, it is all the more important that protections limiting the use of these tools to their intended purpose be enacted.

For all of these systems, the Council should adopt, via ordinance, clear and enforceable rules that ensure, at a minimum, the following:

- The purpose of camera use should be clearly defined, and its operation and data collected should be explicitly restricted to that purpose only.
- Data retention should be limited to the time needed to effectuate the purpose defined.
- Data sharing with third parties should be limited to those held to the same restrictions.
- Clear policies should govern operation, and all operators of the cameras should be trained in those policies.

Specific comments follow:

1. Emergency Scene Cameras (ESCs)(SFD)

The SIR for this technology states that no explicit internal policy exists at SFD that governs the use of ESCs, so a good start would be to create such a policy and include it in an updated SIR. This process should begin with an explicit list of specific uses for the ESCs, which are currently only set forth in general terms, and with apparent contradictions between sections of the SIR (for example, Section 1.0 describes three uses for the cameras, but Section 2.1 adds several more). In addition, the updated SIR should set forth any other internal policies and Washington laws governing use, retention, and disclosure of the data; where the data is stored; and which third parties, if any, have access to it, and for what purpose. (The SIR indicates data sharing with SPD, but the purpose is not clear.)

In turn, the Council should ensure via ordinance that no use is made of the images beyond the specific emergency, investigative, or training uses set forth, and that the data is deleted immediately upon completion of those purposes. Data sharing with third parties should be prohibited unless for those specific uses, and those third parties should be held to the same use and retention standards.

2. Hazardous Materials (Hazmat) Cameras (SFD)

As with ESCs, the SIR for Hazmat cameras indicates that no policy governing the use of this technology currently exists, with one limited exception for mechanism-of-injury recordings (see SIR Section 3.3). So similarly to ESCs, with this technology, an explicit policy that lists specific uses for the cameras should be created and included in an updated SIR. In addition, answers to questions such as who stores the data and which third parties have access to it should be made explicit. In particular, the SIR describes data sharing with law enforcement, but purposes of that disclosure are not made explicit (see SIR Section 4.7). In instances where a legal standard such as reasonable suspicion is applied, it should be clear what the standard is, who applies it, and how that application is documented. Overall, use of this technology should be limited to emergency response purposes, and any law enforcement use of the data should be restricted by ordinance.

3. Closed Circuit Television “Traffic Cameras” (SDOT)

As with the other two camera technologies, the crux of concern around these traffic cameras relates to limiting their use to specific purposes, enshrining in statute protections against invasion of privacy and general data collection, and limiting data sharing. It would be helpful to see the SDOT camera control guidelines referenced in the SIR, as well as to make clear in a policy applicable specifically to these cameras, what data will be deleted when (Section 5 appears to contain several different retention policies). Additional questions that an updated SIR should answer are as follows:

- The current SIR does not reference specific camera vendors and models—these would be helpful to have.

- Are there currently explicit guidelines on when recording occurs, and what’s maintained? (See SIR Section 3.3 referencing recording for “compelling traffic operational needs”—the term is undefined.)
- Law enforcement use appears to be explicitly contemplated by the SIR, but the specific allowable uses are not defined—these should be made clear.

As with the other camera technologies, the Council should ensure clear purposes are defined in statute for these traffic cameras, that no use is made of the images for other purposes, that data is immediately deleted when the purpose is achieved, and that data sharing with third parties should be prohibited unless for those specific uses.

Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to working with you on the process of ordinance implementation. Please feel free to contact me with questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Shankar Narayan

cc: Seattle City Council and Executive



317 17TH AVENUE SOUTH, SEATTLE, WA 98144
TEL. 206.956.0779 FAX. 206.956.0780

October 29, 2018

My name is Marcos Martinez and I am the Executive Director at Casa Latina, a nonprofit organization based in Seattle that serves low income Latinx immigrant community through employment, education and community organizing.

The community that we serve at Casa Latina is particularly vulnerable to abuses by government agencies. Since the elections of 2016, our communities have been on edge due to the increased enforcement activities of agencies like ICE and Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

In addition, while government officials have pledged that the private information of individuals would be protected within agencies such as the State Department of Licensing, we have seen that those promises are not always borne out in reality. Breaches of community trust are very difficult to repair.

It is for these reasons that technologies such as the Automated License Plate Reader System cause concerns for our communities. The ACLU, in its comments on these technologies, has pointed out some major concerns regarding the policies that govern the use of the ALPR, including the lack of meaningful restrictions on the purposes for which ALPR data may be collected or used.

Limitations on data sharing are of particular concern, since this could affect immigrant community members who are subject to detention by immigration authorities but who are not the subject of any active criminal investigation by SPD. It's not clear that strong policies are in place to prohibit the sharing of data with ICE or CBP which would serve to aid those agencies in their efforts to detain immigrant community members.

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to working with you to develop policies that protect the privacy of our most vulnerable communities.

Sincerely,

Marcos Martinez

www.casa-latina.org



November 5, 2018

Dear Seattle IT:

I am writing to offer Densho's comments on the recently released Group 1 Surveillance Impact Reports (SIRs) under the Seattle Surveillance Ordinance review process. Densho is a community-based 501(c)(3) organization. For more than twenty years, we have been documenting the World War II incarceration of Japanese Americans to promote equity and social justice both in Seattle and across the country. The experiences of Japanese Americans are a somber lesson about the fragility of civil society in the face of intolerance and fear.

We have reason to cast a critical eye on infrastructure and systems created to monitor our citizenry. Some two decades before the beginning of WWII, the Japanese American community was targeted for mass surveillance in a coordinated effort involving the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), and the War Department's Military Intelligence Division, assisted by local law enforcement agencies. In the immediate aftermath of Pearl Harbor, US Census data was improperly used to develop exclusion area maps and lists of Japanese American citizens for registration. In the current political environment, we remember this history and are concerned about how a new breed of technologies may affect the rights of our friends and neighbors who belong to ethnic, religious and other vulnerable minority communities

These comments will cover the SIRs for the six Group 1 technologies in two primary sections. The first will address the Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) sub-group, including SPD Patrol, Parking Enforcement, and SDOT. The second offers comments on the camera technology SIRs for SFD Emergency Scene Cameras, SFD Hazmat Cameras, SDOT Closed Circuit "Traffic Cameras"

Section 1: Automated License Plate Reader technologies

A. General Concerns

ALPR is a powerful technology that creates almost unprecedented abilities to surveil and track the movement of individuals across our city and region. It is already being utilized in ways that impact religious, ethnic and other minority communities. In the wake of the September 11 attacks, ALPR was used to monitor Muslim communities in New York, and more recently, US Immigration and Customs Enforcement has employed ALPR data through large aggregators such as Vigilant Solutions to target Latinx populations.

While ALPR is valuable to SPD (and SDOT) in their work, and – as discussed in the SIRs – there are generally benign and beneficial uses, the creation of a large pool of highly sensitive data presents a risk for misuse.

B. SPD Patrol



1. Retention policy inconsistent with stated goals
In the SIR, the primary goal of the ALPR program is stated as, “Property Recovery” – locating stolen vehicles, while the report cites, use, “[o]n occasion,” of the stored data to assist criminal investigations, in particular, the location of Amber and Silver Alert subjects. If this is the case, this casts significant doubt on the need for a lengthy data retention period. The agency does not provide the analysis that led to the decision for the 90-day period anywhere in the SIR or, in response to questions during the public engagement meeting on October 30, 2018. This policy should be driven by careful consideration of the needs of the program, rather than
2. Third-party data sharing
As stated in the SIR, data is shared with third-parties, including law enforcement and researchers, under a number of policies and inter-agency agreements. However, the criteria for permissible sharing is vague; these policies should be articulated in a clear, consistent and explicit fashion.
3. Lack of transparency and reporting
Statistical data regarding the collection and use of the ALPR data should be made publicly available. The implementation of SPD’s new RMS should include functionality for tracking and recording when ALPR data has been used in investigations and enforcement.
4. Governing policies
Currently, the management and use of ALPR systems is guided principally by SPD Policy 16.170. SPD officials themselves admit that Policy 16.170 is inadequate and incomplete. ALPR is a novel, powerful technology that requires

C. Parking Enforcement (SPD)

1. Co-mingling of Parking Enforcement and Patrol data
The SIR describes the flow of data from the Scofflaw “boot vans” to the centralized Neology BOSS system, shared with Patrol. It is not clear whether this data is aggregated directly with the Patrol dataset. If so, this should be more explicitly stated, and the same policies and rules should apply.

D. SDOT

1. Sharing of data with WSDOT and other third parties
The SIR does not outline whether the data-sharing agreement with WSDOT includes provisions governing the sharing and use of SDOT-collected data.

Section 2: Camera technologies

The use of image and video technologies has obvious benefits in the efficiency and delivery of emergency services in crisis situations, as was articulated in the each of the SIRs covering this group. Densho’s primary concern is the possibility that the infrastructure and the data collected may be subject to uses beyond the scope of the stated purposes. While it is highly unlikely that



D E N S H Ō
The Japanese American Legacy Project

SFD and SDOT would utilize the systems in ways that directly impact privacy, unless the collection, retention and sharing of data is carefully regulated, there is potential for real harm to civil liberties in the hands of third parties. Coupled with facial recognition technology, camera data can be used in ways that SFD and SDOT may not have anticipated.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these concerns with you, and hope that this process may help to make our city a welcoming, safe and truly civil society.

Sincerely,

Geoff Froh
Deputy Director

APPENDIX G: EMAILS & LETTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

Letter submitted by individual constituent:

Surveillance.
I don't want it.
Any of it.
Just stop.

Letter submitted by individual constituent:

Kevin Orme
502 N 80th
Seattle, WA 98103
206-789-3891

November 4, 2018

Public Input Commentary – Seattle Surveillance Technology open Public Comment period – 10/22 through 11/5, 2018.

Opening Remarks:

1. Surveillance technology usage in the United States of America, regardless of use, purpose and policy, is completely and wholly within the basic tenets of the Bill of Rights, otherwise known as Amendments 1-10 to the US Constitution. There are no more fundamental laws in the United States than the Constitution and the amendments thereto.

As regards privacy, public surveillance/data capture technology and police oversight – these governing principles have to be considered in any and all policies and local procedures/laws created for our democratic society. Doing anything less is simply illegal and against our whole theory of government – it's that simple.

Specifically:

The First Amendment, including rights to freedom of speech, public assembly and the press.

The Fourth Amendment, including rights preventing unreasonable search, seizure and requiring warrants for same.

The Fifth Amendment, including rights against self-incrimination and deprivation of life, liberty and property without due process.

The Sixth Amendment, including the right to confront the accuser by the accused; defense counsel when accused of a crime and proper/complete informing of the accused concerning the nature and extent of criminal accusation if occurs.

And beyond the Bill of Rights, **the 14th Amendment, Section 1**, regarding rights of due process and federal laws also applying equally to the states (which means *cities* in those same states, of course)

2. The WA State Constitution:

In addition to the Bill of Rights and the US Constitution, the WA State Constitution is also instructive:

Article 1, Section 1 – all political power is inherent in the people, and governmentsare established to protect and maintain individual rights;

Article 1, Section 2 – the US Constitution is the supreme law of the land;

Article 1, Section 7 - Invasion of Private Affairs or Home Prohibited

Article 1, Section 32- “A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual right and the perpetuity of free government.”

3. Context for Seattle: The above means essentially:

You cannot simply 'surveil everything' in the hopes of finding a criminal (or even worse, someone you simply “don't agree with”). That is called 'guilty until proven innocent' and has been overturned time and time again in our system of laws by courts and legislators at every level. The Bill of Rights has protected the 4th Amendment concept of 'Innocent until Proven Guilty' and 24-7 surveillance of **any** sort flies in the face and openly defies this most basic law.

You cannot 'surveil' public assemblies, protests, or similar gatherings, most especially with facial recognition, phone network/bluetooth data capture or public video recordings and/or microphones without again, violating the above basic constitutional principles – otherwise known as “laws” (US and WA).

You cannot store data simply according to 'policy', or come up with what you believe adequate controls may or may not be, and then implement them without complete transparency and public input, including that of the City Attorney's office, elected officials and arguably most important, THE PUBLIC. I believe this effort you have begun to solicit feedback is a good start, but there's a long way to go and this is only the very beginning, rest assured.

Finally, you cannot pay lip service to these previous paragraphs by not actively doing them yourself, and then simply turn around and receive/use/retain the data anyway through other means – that is, you cannot obtain the data from the NSA's Fusion Center already located in downtown Seattle, or the FBI, or TSA, DHS, or increasingly rogue agencies like ICE – all of these still break the law, plain and simple.

Specific technologies being discussed in this public outreach:

1) SDOT LPR's.

Positive – the data is stated as being deleted immediately after a transit time calculation;

Positive – the data is stated as only being available to SDOT personnel after relay from WSDOT, with individual identifying license plates not part of that incoming data;

Positive – stated purpose – facilitate effective and efficient traffic management within the Seattle city limits.

SDOT LPR's - COMMENT for Submission/consideration:

a) It is unclear how long WSDOT is retaining this data for handoff to SDOT and Seattle generally – even if SDOT deletes it nearly immediately after a calculation/use, can they go back and re-retrieve it later? The answer should be NO, and simply that WSDOT is doing the same thing at minimum – deleting the data almost immediately after said calculation too (I recognize this latter is beyond SDOT's control, however, certainly as the biggest city in the state, Seattle would have major influence on these policies and procedures were you to weigh in and state clear policy positions).

b) It is also unclear what the statement 'travel time calculation' precisely means for these purposes. Is it just me driving through downtown and getting spotted if I go by any of these cameras/devices? Assuming the answer is yes, when is the 'timeout' – 1 minute if not seen by another camera? 5 minutes? When and how quickly does the 'calculation' occur (so that I know purportedly the data is then “immediately deleted” as you say?)

c) It is also unclear if anyone else working for the City of Seattle has access to this WSDOT data (and if so, for how long, in what capacity, at what level of detail, etc.) – say, the SPD, City Attorney's office, or? So maybe SDOT isn't “surveilling” anyone within the normal meaning of the term given the safeguards noted in the policy PDF, but certainly the SPD have far different reasons for using this data, and most (if not all) of them are far removed from simple data calculations, and include direct data review to carry out those tasks?

Traffic Cameras (SDOT)

Positive – similar purposes to those above – namely efficient and effective traffic mgmt in real time, using systems and human operators (either in a data center or on the scene, e.g. tow truck, etc.) to make it happen.

SDOT Traffic Cams - COMMENT for Submission/consideration:

- a) What are the 'SDOT Camera Control Protocol Guidelines' and are they public? If not, can they be and where can we review them? Have they ever been amended due to public input, potential past problems or abuses? When were they written and by whom with what expertise?
- b) What are the 'specific cases' where footage is archived and for how long?
- c) Has this data ever been subpoena'd by City personnel, or outside entities (e.g. ICE, NSA or similar)?
- d) The 'protections' paragraph says archived footage isn't shared with any other City dept – but what about data that is 'in transit' between realtime capture and potential archiving later (whether only for 10 days or not)? How/when and in what circumstances might footage be temporarily retained or shared outside normal policy, and potentially 'evade' the otherwise typical 10-day delete policy as a result?

SPD – ALPR's

Positive – as stated by SPD with any such whiz-bang tech – 'preventing crime'

SPD ALPR's: COMMENT for Submission/consideration:

- a) Why 90 days? Why not something much more reasonable, like 15? Certainly if the tech is sophisticated enough to create a 'hot list' as described here, **15 days – two working weeks in other words – is surely more than enough time for the data's intended purpose.**
- b) Can we see examples of these 'auditable records' supposedly created by SPD when logging into ALPR/contacting dispatch? If you are making them 'auditable' for the purposes of ensuring restricted and limited use of the technology generally, then surely you don't mind if we see how that works at minimum so WE can know this (and believe you) too?

c) When does something become an 'active investigation' – and how long is the data retained, where stored and accessible by who then? What if the investigation is called off or invalidated by a court or city officer/city attorney – is the data immediately deleted, and an 'auditable record' of that activity created to prove it?

d) You say nothing about sharing the data with other entities (e.g. ICE, DHS, etc.) - do you? Are you planning to? Have you done so in the past? If so on any of these, under what circumstances and did they provide any sort of a warrant of any kind?

e) You stated there are eight SPD cars equipped with ALPR systems now, and that statement implies that this is the 'only' such ALPR system deployed 1) for these purposes, 2) with this specific technology citywide. Is this true? Are there stationary systems mounted elsewhere in the city that are networked (now or can be in the future) and if so, how many are there? Are there plans (either already in motion or for say, the next few years) to implement either more cars, add in stationary systems, or both? Certainly at minimum, just like with red light cameras, we deserve and demand publicly posted notice of any such stationary systems if they exist or are being deployed.

f) I have read the online 16.170-POL governing ALPR use <http://www.seattle.gov/police-manual/title-16---patrol-operations/16170--automatic-license-plate-readers> – and it's pretty sparse with only 4 short bullet points.
– more questions:

f1) what is ACCESS certification and how can we know more that it does what it's intended to do? Where is the training, who does it, is it a private entity creating coursework, etc.?

f2) how often are these standards updated (e.g. the policy is already 6 years old, dating from 2012 – certainly the technology is not falling behind in the same way);

f3) Who is in charge of TESU and what are their qualifications? Are they elected officials or behind the scenes?

f4) does the terminology 'part of an active investigation' = 'we got a hit on a license plate of X' – and X is a known criminal, there's a warrant out, or? Need way more information here, this is far too vague and un-specific when regards data management and control. I could be the most qualified TESU guy in the department and yet it doesn't mean I should be entitled to look at *any* data – especially without a legal warrant to do so? Where are the other controlling provisions?

Emergency Scene Cameras

Positive – improve and continue to enhance emergency preparedness and response effectiveness.

Emergency Cams: COMMENT for Submission/consideration:

a) where are the 'internal policies' and 'WA laws' governing storage of said photos and materials? The PDF is pretty vague.

b) Is live footage/drone image, sound and data capture being considered or already being used? As to data captured (audio, video, photo), storage management, retention and access policies – the Details, Please.

c) what about the same (live footage/audio/video) from vehicles or bodycams/etc.? Again, Details please.

Hazmat Cameras

Positive – largely identical to that of Emergency Incident Response, save the potential for nefarious/negligent actors to be involved

Hazmat Cams: COMMENT for Submission/consideration:

- a) similar to with Emergency Cameras – essentially how long is the data stored, especially if no criminal activity is determined or the investigation concludes
- b) anything beyond tablets used or planned to be used? This mentions tablets as the primary tech, but that doesn't foreclose plans for more (or by aggressive tech vendors already talking to you)?
- c) what sort of data management training is provided to either HazMat or Emergency Responders, for that matter?

Parking Enforcement (SPD)

Positive – enforce parking and related laws, determine 'booting' situations ***SPD Parking Enforcement: COMMENT for Submission/consideration:***

- a) there is nothing seen here about general data storage or retention parameters – Details, Please.
- b) there is nothing here about whether this ALPR data is 'pooled' with ALPR data collected from the eight so-equipped SPD cars mentioned earlier – and if so, whether governed by those parameters and restrictions too/not? Details, Please.
- c) are these technologies governed by TESU as the others are? Barring possibly those controlled directly by the Seattle Municipal Court itself, separate from the SPD? Details, Please.
- d) there is also no mention of the (likely older) Red Light Traffic Cam technology that has been in use in city locations for some years now, possibly over a decade. These aren't for SDOT use, these are for people running red lights, of course. All the relevant details (Data capture, retention, storage, access, certification, etc.) - all these apply here too – Details, Please.

Submitted 11/4/2018 by

Kevin Orme
502 N 80th
Seattle, WA 98103
206-789-3891

APPENDIX H: PUBLIC COMMENT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The approach to comment analysis includes combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. A basic qualitative text analysis of the comments received, and a subsequent comparative analysis of results, were validated against quantitative results. Each comment was analyzed in the following ways, to observe trends and confirm conclusions:

1. Analyzed collectively, as a whole, with all other comments received
2. Analyzed by technology
3. Analyzed by technology and question

A summary of findings are included in Appendix B: Public Comment Demographics and Analysis. All comments received are included in Appendix E: All Individual Comments Received.

BACKGROUND ON METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

A modified Framework Methodology was used for qualitative analysis of the comments received, which *“...approaches [that] identify commonalities and differences in qualitative data, before focusing on relationships between different parts of the data, thereby seeking to draw descriptive and/or explanatory conclusions clustered around themes” (Gale, N.K., et.al, 2013)*. Framework Methodology is a coding process which includes both inductive and deductive approaches to qualitative analysis.

The goal is to classify the subject data so that it can be meaningfully compared with other elements of the data and help inform decision-making. Framework Methodology is “not designed to be representative of a wider population, but purposive to capture diversity around a phenomenon” (Gale, N.K., et.al, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

STEP ONE: PREPARE DATA

1. Compile data received.
 - a. Daily collection and maintenance of 2 primary datasets.
 - i. Master dataset: a record of all raw comments received, questions generated at public meetings, and demographic information collected from all methods of submission.
 - ii. Comment analysis dataset: the dataset used for comment analysis that contains coded data and the qualitative codebook. The codebook contains the qualitative codes used for analysis and their definitions.
2. Clean the compiled data.
 - a. Ensure data is as consistent and complete as possible. Remove special characters for machine readability and analysis.
 - b. Comments submitted through SurveyMonkey for “General Surveillance” remained in the “General Surveillance” category for the analysis, regardless of content of the

comment. Comments on surveillance generally, generated at public meetings, were categorized as such.

- c. Filter data by technology for inclusion in individual SIRs.

STEP TWO: CONDUCT QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS USING FRAMEWORK METHODOLOGY

1. Become familiar with the structure and content of the data. This occurred daily compilation and cleaning of the data in step one.
2. Individually and collaboratively code the comments received, and identify emergent themes.
 - I. Begin with deductive coding by developing pre-defined codes derived from the prescribed survey and small group facilitator questions and responses.
 - II. Use clean data, as outlined in Data Cleaning section above, to inductively code comments.
 - A. Each coder individually reviews the comments and independently codes them.
 - B. Coders compare and discuss codes, subcodes, and broad themes that emerge.
 - C. Qualitative codes are added as a new field (or series of fields) into the Comments dataset to derive greater insight into themes, and provide increased opportunity for visualizing findings.
 - III. Develop the analytical framework.
 - A. Coders discuss codes, sub-codes, and broad themes that emerge, until codes are agreed upon by all parties.
 - B. Codes are grouped into larger categories or themes.
 - C. The codes are documented and defined in the codebook.
 - IV. Apply the framework to code the remainder of the comments received.
 - V. Interpret the data by identifying differences and map relationships between codes and themes, using R and Tableau.

STEP THREE: CONDUCT QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

1. Identify frequency of qualitative codes for each technology overall, by questions, or by themes:
 - I. Analyze results for single word codes.
 - II. Analyze results for word pair codes (for context).
2. Identify the most commonly used words and word pairs (most common and least common) for all comments received.
 - I. Compare results with qualitative code frequencies and use to validate codes.
 - II. Create network graph to identify relationships and frequencies between words used in comments submitted. Use this graph to validate analysis and themes.
3. Extract CSVs of single word codes, word pair codes, and word pairs in text of the comments, as well as the corresponding frequencies for generating visualizations in Tableau.

STEP FOUR: SUMMARIZATION

1. Visualize themes and codes in Tableau. Use call out quotes to provide context and tone.
2. Included summary information and analysis in the appendices of each SIR.

APPENDIX I: POLICIES AND OPERATING GUIDELINES (POG)

The relevant Seattle Fire Department policies can be found in the Policies & Operating Guidelines document (POG). The most recent version of the POG that is currently in effect was last updated in November 2020. The complete Seattle Fire Department's Policies & Operating Guidelines (POG) is available upon request to evan.ward@seattle.gov or by Public Disclosure Request: <https://www.seattle.gov/public-records/public-records-request-center>.

SEATTLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

POLICIES AND OPERATING GUIDELINES

VOLUME I

Rev: 11/23/20

Relevant sections of the POG includes Operating Guidelines 3004 and 5001:

IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES

PERSONAL IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES The use of personal devices to take still or digital photographs, or video or audio recordings, by Operations personnel at emergency scenes for personal use or Department training purposes is not authorized.

PAGE 3004-6

REV. 11/23/20

OPERATING GUIDELINE – 3004

SEATTLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED DIGITAL CAMERAS

Members responding to an incident may not use helmet mounted cameras, video cameras, personal cell phones, cameras, or any other recording device while on an emergency response.

In accordance with OG 5001.2 *Aid and Medic Responses, Digital Cameras*, on-duty firefighter/paramedics may use digital cameras provided by the Department to record the mechanism of injury to trauma patients. After showing the photographs to appropriate hospital emergency department staff the photos will be deleted.

ETHICS

OPERATING GUIDELINE – 5001

SEATTLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED DIGITAL CAMERAS

All Medic Units and Medic 44 carry a smart phone in the controlled drug safe. These phone cameras may be utilized by M44 and Medics to record the mechanism of injury for trauma patients.

These photographs will only be shown to appropriate hospital emergency department staff to clearly explain the severity of injury and then shall be promptly deleted from the camera's internal memory.

The utilization of the phone cameras will not infringe on the quality of patient care provided on an emergency response.

OTHER IMAGE RECORDING DEVICES

In accordance with OG 3004.7 *Image Recording Devices* section, members responding to an incident may not use helmet mounted cameras, video cameras, personal cell phones, personal cameras, or any other recording device while on an emergency response.

The use of personal devices to take still or digital photographs, video or audio recordings by Operations personnel at emergency scenes for personal use or Department training purposes is not authorized.

AID AND MEDIC RESPONSES

APPENDIX J: CTO NOTICE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY

Thank you for your department's efforts to comply with the new Surveillance Ordinance, including a review of your existing technologies to determine which may be subject to the Ordinance. I recognize this was a significant investment of time by your staff; their efforts are helping to build Council and public trust in how the City collects and uses data.

As required by the Ordinance (SMC 14.18.020.D), this is formal notice that the technologies listed below will require review and approval by City Council to remain in use. This list was determined through a process outlined in the Ordinance and was submitted at the end of last year for review to the Mayor's Office and City Council.

The first technology on the list below must be submitted for review by March 31, 2018, with one additional technology submitted for review at the end of each month after that. The City's Privacy Team has been tasked with assisting you and your staff with the completion of this process and has already begun working with your designated department team members to provide direction about the Surveillance Impact Report completion process.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Michael Mattmiller
Chief Technology Officer

Technology	Description	Proposed Review Order
Emergency Scene Cameras	Photos at incidents (not retained after transmission per department policy) are collected as part of the investigation and documentation of emergency responses and may include photographs of identifiable individuals and property.	1
Hazmat Camera	This wireless system transmits pictures related to hazardous materials sites to document and identify clean up and management requirements.	2
Computer-Aided Dispatch	Computer-aided dispatch (CAD) is used to initiate public safety calls for service, dispatch, and to maintain the status of responding resources in the field. It is used by 911 dispatchers as well as by officers using mobile data terminals (MDTs) in the field. Use is opt-in, but individuals may enter personally-identifying information about third-parties without providing notice to those individuals.	3