

Community Surveillance Working Group

Meeting Minutes

November 19, 2024, 12:00 – 1:05 pm

Working Group Members Present:	Present: Kayleigh McNeil, John Chen, Rene Peters, Carolyn Riley-Payne, Alex Maestretti Not present: Wendy Novotne
City Staff:	Vinh Tang, Sarah Carrier
In Attendance:	Public: Cynthia, Chris, 206-852-3403

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

Agenda:

		Minutes
1	Introductions	
2	Approval of minutes and agenda	<p>Rene: last official meeting was on July 26, 2024 Kayleigh: move to approve John: second All members: approve</p> <p>Rene: Summarize/discuss the last cycle for CCTV, RTCC. Feedback on the process, things that went well, things that could be better, how we can improve in 2025 if the WG receives new SIRs from the City of Seattle.</p> <p>Rene: Provided summary of today’s agenda. John: Moved to approve agenda. Kayleigh: seconded All members: approve</p>
3	CCTV & RTCC Results Summary, Feedback, and Follow-Up	<p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarized the timing in September/October of the Council Bills for CCTV and RTCC. Media did reach out to Rene and Rene responded. Couple of amendments that Council moved forward, amendment to expand Aurora zone, data privacy and storage, data request of SPD. Feedback from members on the previous process

		<p>John:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any actions taken by the Council?• Any items coming up in the pipeline related to the WG's report.• Opportunity at City Council in the future as it relates to WG's report. <p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Getting notifications of the tangible votes from the Council committee.• Opportunity for the WG to participate at committee during the SIR process.• Rene was interviewed at the one of the City Council meetings and in a couple of articles (Urbanist).• How was the document used by the city? <p>Kayleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disappointed in the decision by Council. Thought and consideration we put into the report. All the prior reports were already in use. How the city will respond in implementing this pilot. Take into consideration the public concerns. Answer questions from the Council at the public safety committee meetings. Feel like we sent it out, saw the articles. What benefit the report provided? Product to the council for consideration. I am interested what happens in the future. Hope that you have the support that is needed. Only a handful of cities that actually have a surveillance working group. Going through this process, even if it didn't necessary take into consideration the concerns or follow the recommendations, I just want to state that this is important and it matters.• Would like to get feedback from council about the report (was the report long, too much info., etc.). <p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As other cities start to adopt, we can share our framework (as an example).• Primary concern how do we improve communication with Council after the SIR is transmitted. <p>Alex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It comes down to role of the group, advisory in nature. How to influence decision makers. Tailor messaging to be effective. Curious to learn more about. Document went into the staffing review process document, then the Council read.• Amendment that went into sharing data was a small victory. <p>Carolyn:</p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because first time, it took some time to get a handle on all the info. Appreciate the working group to get it done. I too was disappointed if our recommendations were considered. Is there an opportunity in the future to go back and look at the report with council? <p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press council on the documentation process as it goes through committee.
<p>4</p>	<p>General Board Membership Discussion</p>	<p>Vinh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position #6 is a city council appointee. The executive has communicated a potential appointee for this council appointment. • Position #2 is a mayor appointee and Kayleigh’s second term will end on 12/31/24. • The Executive plans to fill position #2 in January 2025. <p>Kayleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominate Alex M. as co-chair. <p>Alex M:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honored to serve if there is a second. <p>Carolyn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second the nomination of Alex M. as the co-chair. <p>Kayleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved to nominate Alex M. as the co-chair <p>Carolyn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seconded <p>All members: approved</p> <p>Upon Kayleigh’s transition at the end of the year, Alex will assume the second co-chair role.</p> <p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any WG members interested in taking notes/minutes for these WG meetings in the future?
<p>5</p>	<p>Master Technology List Question</p>	<p>Vinh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized the September 2024 Revised Master List document <p>Rene:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In September, the City filed a revised master list.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who in Seattle IT is going through the exclusion criteria? • Request an opportunity for the WG to be involved when a reclassification is made.
6	Public Comment	Cynthia: commented about the Revised Master List
	Adding public comment per Rene:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alarm that the large number of removals wasn't discussed with CSWG / weren't notified. • Lack of clarity on the reasoning behind the removals (deprecation, change in definition of classification, etc). • Worry that removal from list means that these technologies won't be subject to certain audits/reviews / Annual Surveillance Usage Review or will be moved out of City Council purview.