



San Leandro Police Department • Proud to Serve

Chief's Advisory Board Meeting Notes Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Community Crime Cameras –Discussion:

1. Purpose and Scope
 2. General Principals
 3. Procedures
 4. Responsibilities
 5. Training/Oversight
 6. Retention/Extraction and Storage Procedure
 7. Audits
 8. Complaint Process
 9. Annual Review of the Public Safety Camera System
- Concerns/Feedback
 - Free Standing Surveillance Systems throughout City (i.e. City Hall, Senior Center, Police Department)
 - IT Budgeted \$240K to Replace Cameras in City Hall & Police Department
 - Community Camera Costs are Approximately \$10-20K Per Camera
 - Reviewed Actual Scenarios where Technology Helped to Apprehend Suspects
 - Disciplinary Actions for Violating Policy
 - Discussion on Policy Violations
 - Concern about Data Storage – iCloud - Reducing Retention and Losing Frames (Data)
 - Access – Protected Room and Not Having Video Footage Monitored Unless Needed to Assist in Solving a Crime
 - Video Footage will be in a Locked Area
 - Access will be Given to Management (Chief, Captains, and Lieutenants)
 - Access will be Tracked/ Strict Monitoring – Audits in Place – As With Department of Justice and CLETS
 - All Extracted Video Footage will be Logged
 - Training – Require Signing Policy Annually & Yearly Training on Procedures
 - Definitions of “Law Enforcement” and “System Operator”
 - Providing Public Notification Before Community Cameras are Installed – 30 Days
 - Discussion on Number of Community Cameras and Locations
 - Concern that Cameras will Not Reduce Crime.
 - Goals are: Prevention of Crime & Provide Safety to Community
 - Performance Measures – Results/Measure Success/ Impact on Crime
 - Discussed Newly Implemented Crime Suppression Unit
 - Feedback from Police Department/Community
 - Impacting Crime/ Targeting Hotspots
 - 2 Months Steady Decline in Crime Since Implementation
 - Importance of Crime Intel/Debriefing Criminals/Collecting & Information Sharing
 - Request to Speak to District Attorney Regarding Discovery Process

- Chief's Advisory Board Vote – Implementation of Community Cameras
 - 81% - Yes, In Favor of Installing Cameras
 - 13% – Not in Favor of Installing Cameras
 - 6% Undecided – Need Additional Information
- Emphasis that Video Footage Cannot be Accessed by City Staff/Regulation by Law
 - Data Housed at SLPD/Cameras Not Linked to Outside Access
 - Existing Auditing Procedure in Place
- Discussion on Government Code – Retention Policy 1 Year
- A Follow Up Meeting will be Scheduled to Continue Discussion
 - Meeting Scheduled Monday, August 12, 2013 at 4:00 p.m.

Public Safety Initiative “United For Safety” Outcomes

- Event Well Attended – Approx. 1,000 Attendees - Positive Feedback From Community
- Donations for Beverages, Food, and Raffle Prizes
- KTSF Came to Event and Interviewed Community Members
- San Leandro Police Department Debriefed Event – Collected Feedback for Next Year
- CalChief's Article

Feedback on Oral Board – Lieutenant Exam

- Process has Been Re-Designed to Include Community Members and Outside Agencies on Panel Interviews
- An Independent Contractor Facilitates the Testing Process
- Chief's Advisory Board Members Peggy McCormick & Michael Fitzgerald Participated
 - Quality Candidates Interviewed for Lieutenant from SLPD
 - Testing Phase Included Mock/Community Interviews
 - Common Interest of All Candidates – Relationships with Public/Community is Important
 - Combination of Community Panel and External Law Enforcement is Essential for the Selection Process or Department Promotions

Animal Ordinance Update

- Plan Meeting with Community Members to Gather Feedback to Finalize Ordinance
- Develop Comprehensive Ordinance to Include Novice Beekeepers and Chicken Coops

K9 Competition

- The San Leandro Police Department and Alameda Police Department are hosting the First Annual Police K-9 Competition - Search, Agility, Obedience, and Protection.
 - Saturday, August 3, 2013 9:00 a.m. - 1101 West Red Line Avenue, Alameda,

Adjournment 7:05 p.m.

San Leandro Police Chief Advisory Board Camera Policy Assignment 7-2013

Comments With Some Questions	
1.	I believe that putting surveillance cameras in residential areas will help keep San Leandro safer but I will agree with what xxxx mentioned about "Big Brother" happening. That's something I don't agree with. I also asked some of my peers about it as well and they all agreed that your idea will help San Leandro become Safer.
2.	I was wondering where will the cameras be located at? The light post? Because anybody can be able to vandalize it if it was at lower ground levels.
3.	Must educate the public that the cameras will help prevent crime as in other cities. The police dept must be completely transparent with the use and it should be noted that they will be put in public locations only.
4.	I think the police team should conduct a series of public educational lessons on the advantages of camera and showcase statistical data to residents on how cameras fight crime. A Committee or the CAB should have some oversight and governing power to guide Police decisions.
5.	Is the Department contracting Lexipol? If yes, what are their policy recommendations?
6.	Are more resources available to us? A report or presentation on public surveillance systems? It would be helpful for us to have good overview and better understanding? Any laws and legislation we need to know about? Are there evaluations from other cities (lessons they learned?)
7.	Budget and cost analysis would be helpful. Equipment, installation, implementation, use (active staff monitoring or passively monitored), ongoing maintenance, storage. Should also factor in potential future upgrades and/or expansions.
8.	Transparency is key and very important. Community outreach, public meetings. Input from businesses and interest groups (are there any groups we should be aware of?)
9.	Any changes must be brought to public forums for discussion and for the public to allow or disallow, including usage policies of current surveillance, sharing of data, changes in data retention, access, releases to any other organizations, and all uses of the data by our own organizations or those the data is shared with.
10.	That outside independent entities without conflict of interest be selected by the civil government of San Leandro to guide the decision making process based on the data available.
11.	The policy requires a three (3) pronged oversight committee. The committee should include judicial oversight, citizen review, as well as a strong law enforcement component. The program, policy and committee should be impartial and transparent providing regular and open reports to the City Council. The policy should contain serious commonsense rules that are easily applied to meet the requirements of police, judiciary and citizens.
12.	There should be strict limits on surveillance to protect citizen privacy, limits on targeting individuals, time limits on storage and a clear understanding of where data is being stored and with whom it is being shared, what their time limits are and with whom they share information.

San Leandro Police Chief Advisory Board Camera Policy Assignment 7-2013

13.	Any surveillance program should take advantage of the technical innovations available to us in San Leandro. The initial goal should be aimed at being the best possible system, with the ability to easily improve and upgrade. As well, the program should include a funding source from beginning development, taking into account the need for regular upgrades.
14.	Need a definite retention time period for normal (non criminal) recordings and destruction and detail of destruction process, records and personnel responsible. 2. A definitive process and who/whom will determine the placement of the cameras. Note, according to the California Government Code Section 34090.6 regarding electronic recordings, I do not see that this or any other section of the California Government Code will apply as long as our cameras do not record sounds (conversations) and the policy and SOP are approved by the City Council. It appears that we are flexible to write a our own policy without State restrictions.

Below I have included additional information for the Board from one of the Board Members. I wanted to respect the Board Members time and effort to educate the Board, so I have included it as additional reading if you choose.

The following feedback is on the larger issues and the sample law.

Surveillance technology has an extremely poor record when it comes to authorities abusing the technology in illegal, immoral, and damaging ways. These actions not only compromise the rights of the residents and individuals, but undermine the trust of those within the purview of those departments. There is little evidence to support their effectiveness when one takes into account larger views of the geographic region. In fact, some municipalities have removed them once in place due to the ill effects and lack of effectiveness and reducing crime.

The sample law provided leaves me with several concerns, but none of them so much as the fact that the law is written in such a way as to allow virtually any use of the information gathered and stored as nearly any "use" qualifies.

- There is no review over the selection of locations beyond that of the Chief of Police, nor any criteria as to why locations will be selected.
- Recordings can be kept longer than one year for "official reasons" - This is undefined, but mentioned uses includes use of the information for civil cases, monitoring pedestrian and vehicle traffic, to "maintain public order", "provide effective services," and "improve the general environment". Given this, any and all information could be deemed to be kept for "official reasons" forever.
- Why is the information not available to the general public?
- This information can be made available to "other than police personnel" as designated by the Chief of Police with no limitations or requirement of notice.

San Leandro Police Chief Advisory Board Camera Policy Assignment 7-2013

Some references regarding the points made above:

Do security cameras deter crime?

Homeland Security News Wire, Feb 2011

<http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/do-security-cameras-deter-crime>

"Even in the studies that show cameras help, the question arises: compared to what? Any **funds spent on this gadgetry cannot be spent on beat cops**, probation officers, laboratory gear or jail cells," he writes.

"The challenge for enthusiasts is to show the technology outperforms other options."

Study Questions Whether Cameras Cut Crime

NYTimes, March 2009

<http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/03/03/study-questions-whether-cameras-cut-crime/>

...the other three studies, which ranged from 1978 to 2002 and focused on lower-crime situations, found that the cameras' impact on reducing crime was **statistically inconclusive**. And the researchers raise the **question whether the trade-offs in cost and loss of privacy are worth it**.

San Francisco Surveillance Cameras Don't Reduce Violent Crime, Study Finds

ACLU of N. CA, April 2009

https://www.aclunc.org/issues/technology/blog/san_francisco_surveillance_cameras_dont_reduce_violent_crime_study_finds.shtml

In line with similar studies from around the world, the report found that San Francisco's **video surveillance cameras do not make people safer**. The cameras have **failed to prevent or reduce violent crime, including homicides**. The cameras have also had **no effect on drug offenses or prostitution**.

Cambridge halts activation of surveillance cameras

http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2009/02/04/cambridge_halts_activation_of_surveillance_cameras/

"The City Council is not convinced that the proposed benefits will outweigh the potential risks," said Cambridge Mayor E. Denise Simmons. The cameras were paid for with a \$4.6 million grant from the US Department of Homeland Security.

Lansing Surveillance Cameras Are Costly, Ineffective and Invasive

ACLU Report, August 2012

<http://www.aclu.org/national-security/lansing-surveillance-cameras-are-costly-ineffective-and-invasive-aclu-report-warns>

A comprehensive study conducted by the UK found that its 4.2 million cameras did not reduce crime. In Oakland, Calif., **Police Chief Joseph Samuels, Jr. concluded that "...there is no conclusive way to establish that the presence of video surveillance cameras resulted in the prevention or reduction of crime."** ...the City of Detroit approved one of the largest video

San Leandro Police Chief Advisory Board Camera Policy Assignment 7-2013

surveillance systems in the country, only to eliminate it 14 years later because the **high maintenance and personnel costs did not justify the minimal results.**

...the system of cameras **could be used to monitor peaceful protests and other constitutionally protected activities including the movements of innocent people throughout the city.** The private information collected by cameras is also **ripe for abuse**, the ACLU states, and could be used for **voyeurism, stalking, or harassment.** Furthermore, an independent study of the cameras conducted by a researcher at Oakland University concludes that **African American residents of Lansing are twice as likely to be under constant surveillance** in their neighborhoods as white Lansing residents.

Surveillance Camera Policy –

Policy number 378, the Public Safety Camera System, as submitted by Chief Spagnoli is a good starting point for the City of San Leandro as they develop their own policy; however, I believe the policy could be strengthened with following recommendations:

1. Unless limited by technological constraints, camera recordings shall be stored electronically for a period of not less than ten days. The system shall be configured to automatically purge and write over any recordings more than 10 days old. ** Note: 100 days seems way too long. Best practice seems to dictate 10 days of recording.*
2. Cameras should be clearly marked so as to be conspicuous to the general public and the location of each camera shall be made public at least 72 hours prior to installation.
3. A review board and or an independent annual audit of the camera system should be implemented to ensure adherence to policy and to ensure placement of each camera meets the objectives outlined and maximum utilization of each camera is obtained.