



# Committee on Information Technology

## Office of the City Administrator

### Minutes

#### Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board Meeting City and County of San Francisco

Friday, August 28, 2020  
9:00 am – 11:00 am

To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link below:

<https://ccsf.webex.com/ccsf/onstage/g.php?MTID=ed5a8dc98337ef5bd35e413a7d6538c92>

If you wish to offer public comment, call in using the number +1-408-418-9388 and access code 146 596 4809

A toll-free number is +1 415 655-0001

[Coit.staff@sfgov.org](mailto:Coit.staff@sfgov.org) can be used as an email address when joining the WebEx event

---

### Members

Taraneh Moayed – Chair, Assistant Director, Office of Contract Administration  
Mark de la Rosa – Acting Chief Auditor Executive, City Service Auditor, Controller’s Office  
Jason Lally – Data Services Manager, DataSF  
Brian Roberts – Policy Analyst, Department of Technology  
Todd Rydstrom – Deputy Controller, Controller’s Office  
Matthias Jaime – Director, Committee on Information Technology  
Nnena Ukuku – Public Member

### 1. Call to Order by Chair

Ms. Taraneh Moayed called the meeting to order at 9:08am.

### 2. Roll call

Jason Lally  
Brian Roberts  
Matthias Jaime  
Nnena Ukuku  
Mark de la Rosa  
Taraneh Moayed

### COIT Staff

Emma Fernandez  
Luke O’Neill

### Department Representatives

Christine Nath

Marcus Garcia  
Asja Steeves  
Lt. Derrick Lew  
Commander Raj Vaswani

**Members of the Public**

Sam Klepper (ShotSpotter)  
Paul Ames (ShotSpotter)  
David Pilpel

**3. Approval of Minutes from August 14, 2020 (Action Item)**

Mr. Pilpel provided comment on the August 14, 2020 agenda item on Automated License Plate Readers, which he was unable to provide at the time. He requested several clarifications regarding the Surveillance Technology Policy and the Surveillance Impact Report.

In addition, Mr. David Pilpel provided corrections to the August 14, 2020 minutes. PSAB members reviewed the minutes and approved the minutes with the following amended changes:

- Under Item 3, change to July 24
- Identification of David Pilpel's name as a Member of the Public
- Add page numbers, dates, and status to all Surveillance Technology Policies

**4. Review of Revised Surveillance Technology Policy: Automated License Plate Reader (Discussion Item)**

*Recreation and Parks (REC)*

Ms. Christine Nath provided an overview of REC use of ALPR. REC authorized use cases include:

- supporting local, state, federal, and regional law enforcement agencies in the identification of vehicles associated with criminal investigations;
- protecting the public and REC staff at events from misconduct and/or violent confrontations; and
- Protecting critical infrastructure sites from vandalism, theft, or damage.

Ms. Christine Nath explained that REC has one stationary ALPR unit, which is mounted on a wall at the Palace of Fine Arts. This ALPR unit was set up to monitor the Park-managed facility for car break-ins.

Ms. Nath continued to explain some of the technical protections such as REC saves all ALPR data in local storage only. Specifically, ALPR captures the license plate image, identifying features of the vehicle, geolocation of the capture, and the time and date associated with the capture. REC does not continuously monitor ALPR-captured footage.

Upon request, REC may share ALPR data with San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), the District Attorney's office, or the San Francisco Public Defender's office.

PSAB members provided a variety of feedback, and REC will update their Impact Report and Technology Policy to address the following issues:

- REC to make more robust the civil liberties section and add to Impact Report
- REC to investigate whether data is needed to be retained indefinitely.
  - o A data diagram would include request from law enforcement agencies, transfer of information, verification, deletion of data from REC storage.
  - o If data is transferred to another department, how long will that record be retained?
- REC to add more specificity in the Policy to the nature of the request for data sharing that the department would be responding to

*Public Comment*

Mr. David Pilpel requested several clarifications regarding the Surveillance Technology Policy and Surveillance Impact Report.

**5. Review of Revised Surveillance Technology Policy: Audio Recorder (Discussion Item)**

*San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)*

Ms. Asja Steeves provided an overview of SFPD’s use of ShotSpotter. ShotSpotter captures short audio snippets of gunshots, identifies the speed and direction of travel, and locates where the gunfire originated.

ShotSpotter provides officers with information that enhances their situational awareness. Authorized use cases include providing officers with alerts and allowing officers to render aid faster. The other use case is to provide information to help with post-incident investigating e.g., finding gun casings.

Mr. Sam Klepper and Mr. Paul Ames, representatives from ShotSpotter, provided more details regarding the technology. Mr. Paul Ames drilled down into ShotSpotter technical details and data collected. Typically, around 20 sensors are installed per square mile. They are installed on top of buildings but may be installed on streetlamps. ShotSpotter sensors communicate with ShotSpotter cloud via private networks – the data is encrypted. The intent of putting the data in the cloud is to be able to run machine classification and human classification through the data to identify what the source is.

ShotSpotter provides snippets of acoustic data. No more than one second of ambient sound prior to the acoustic event and no more than one second of ambient sound after the acoustic event is kept in the snippet of acoustic data.

PSAB members provided a variety of feedback, and SFPD will update their Impact Report and Technology Policy to address the following issues:

- SFPD to include the data diagram from their presentation in the Impact Report
- SFPD to explain in the Policy who has access to the ShotSpotter data
- SFPD should consider assembling a tabular accounting of “events.” This would entail all events SFPD responded to based on a ShotSpotter alert, a 911 call, etc.
- SFPD to detail the process of expanding ShotSpotter service/deployment, should this be considered by the department. This would include an analysis the department would do to determine where the technology is deployed.

*Public Comment*

Mr. David Pilpel requested several clarifications regarding the Surveillance Technology Policy and the Surveillance Impact Report.

## **6. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 am.