

APPROVED ON JULY 18, 2024

**SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

June 20, 2024

**City Council Chamber
555 Santa Clara Street
Vallejo, CA 94590**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Sorce, Board members Lee, Moreno, and Reddell

Absent: None

Staff present: Secretary Ashraf

4. COMMUNITY FORUM – Mike Katz-Lacabe from Oakland Privacy

5. CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Action: *Moved by Board member Reddell, seconded by Board member Lee, and carried unanimously to approve the Agenda and the Consent Calendar.*

A. Approval of Minutes – April 18, 2024

Actions: *Approved minutes.*

6. REPORT OF THE BOARD SECRETARY

- Introduced City Manager Murray to the board.
- Informed about 2 applications for SAB.
- Captain Ramsey's retirement.
- Lt Jeff Tai as new SAB Liaison.

7. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT – None

8. REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL LIAISON – None

9. REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

- Chair Sorce stressed again that her request to operate monthly meetings and filling

Surveillance Advisory Board Regular Meeting Minutes

April 18, 2024

Page | 1

the vacancies.

10. ACTION ITEM

- A. Receive staff presentation and adopt a resolution providing a recommendation, as requested by the City Council, concerning the use of new replacement FLOCK cameras and FLOCK Automated License Plate Reader Cameras (ALPRs).

Action: *Detailed discussion by staff, Captain Ramsey on all the questions chairs submitted. The written response to the questions submitted by Chair Sorce is attached to this document. Board helped formulate a resolution 001-2024 (signed copy attached) approving the use of ALPR technology and moving the contract forward for 3 additional years with few stipulations. The stipulations are detailed in the attached SAB Reso 001-2024.*

1. We'd like to discuss the deployment plan for Flock devices (ALPR, Condors, and Raven), and specifically how the locations of devices are selected, and how the optimal number of devices is determined.

FALCON/CONDORS – were decided upon by best practices and a Vallejo PD working group made up of a officers from a variety of assignments. We took great care to place cameras in positions that would allow us to capture ingress and egress, first to the City by placing cameras in areas to capture vehicles at on and off ramps from major freeway/highways. Then to areas identified through crime analysis for higher crime rates. Some could be based on crimes of violence while others such as Commercial property areas could be based on property crime data or combination. CONDORS were specifically identified to be placed in areas where there was a lot of non-vehicle criminal activity in addition to the normal ALPR needs.

RAVEN – Gun Shot detection was determined through Crime Analysis data of Calls for service regarding shots being fired. Once we determined an approximate area, Flock's Engineer's determined the specific locations based on terrain, building density, and other obstructions on where to specifically locate the devices. All but 11 of the devices were determined to be placed on City Property and FLOCK went through the permitting process for those devices. The 11 private property devices have not been installed but 10 of the eleven have been approved by the property owner the last one has yet to respond.

2. Please share information on the Condor cameras which are being renewed as part of this contract (the SAB hasn't previously discussed this particular technology).

Condors and their technology have been discussed as technology the City and Police Department utilizes. These "Flock" devices were previously called "Owls". Simply put they are PTZ cameras similar to those utilized at many City buildings including the Police Department, City Parking garage, etc. the difference with these is that if zoomed in and focused they could capture LP Data as similar to FLOCK Safety's Falcon (ALPR)

3. How does VPD measure effectiveness of this technology? Flock does not have independent evaluation, which is needed to be able to judge it against other companies' ALPRs, and determine cost-effectiveness. If we don't have a good measure now, we'd like to brainstorm ways we can use the data we have to measure effectiveness going forward.

VPD Crime Analysis unit created monthly statistics reports for our LPR system. In our most recent report, LPR data has assisted in over 141 cases, used to recover more than 20 stolen vehicles, led to more than 48 arrests. Frankly, these numbers are lower than the actual effectiveness. Much of the above data is based on the officers' crime reports where they are asked to indicate the use of ALPR from a drop down menu on the face page of the report. ALPR Data has been used to help solve Homicides, robberies, Assault with Deadly weapons, kidnapping and many other types of serious crimes.

4. What data do we have on false positives of this technology? How often do the hits flagged by Flock end up not being stolen/wanted vehicles?

I am uncertain how or if false positives can be pulled. I can say that with all LPR technology the devices are reading the visible portions of a plate. If there is no obstruction, there can be a false hit. A common misread is a "T" getting misread as an "I" in the case where a the license plate frame obstructs the full view of the plate. Remember the Flock System provides an "Alert" not what we refer to as a "Hit" as in from our Law Enforcement databases. Their training process, adopted by us and placed into our Policy Manual is that the Officer must make a visual confirmation of the plate and confirm the actual want prior to enforcement action is taken.

5. How does the price Flock is charging in this renewal compare to the previous pricing? If the price went up, what is the justification from Flock?

Our Flock pricing per camera has not risen. We are priced at \$2500 per Falcon and \$3000 per Condor (Previously called Owls).

6. How often does VPD use ALPRs retroactively for investigation (as opposed to the hot list alerts), and what is the success rate of that?

In the last 31 days, 2,111 Searches were conducted by members of our Organization. That's an average of about 68 searches a day. Several searches were made for serious crimes to include murder, rape, and other violent crimes. This tool has proven invaluable for many investigations. As I stated before, the issue is capturing that success, which comes down to human factor/error. Though we can try to figure out a better method to capture that information, this is just one tool/step in an investigation.

7. How does VPD guard against officer abuse of this technology? (i.e. someone using the system to track an individual or vehicle for personal motivations)

Currently the Professional Standards Division Lieutenant, thought this likely will move to our compliance Division, conducts an Audit at least yearly, in that Audit 6 users are randomly selected for a deeper audit of their use. Violations of use can lead to suspension of use of the system to major discipline through our Internal Affairs/Discipline System.

Questions specific to the Master Services Agreement which was posted in the City Council agenda packet:

1. In section 4.3, it states that data is anonymized. We are putting trust here in in Flock's standard - do we have examples of how Flock anonymizes the data?

From Flock Safety's website:

"Anonymized Data: We may collect, analyze, and anonymize your data to the extent such anonymization renders the data non-identifiable ("Anonymized Data"). We may use Anonymized Data to perform the Flock Services and improve or develop related systems and technologies, including the training of machine learning algorithms. Our use of Anonymized Data is not subject to this policy.

Data protection and privacy laws in your jurisdiction may impose certain responsibilities on you and your use of our products. You are responsible for ensuring that you comply with all applicable laws when you use the Flock Services or products, including, where so required, to execute a mutually agreed upon data protection agreement with Flock. Note, recording and sharing content that involves other people may affect their privacy and/or data protection rights".

2. Section 5.1 on confidentiality has a mention of "non-public data provided or collected by Flock via Flock Services" and goes on to mention geolocation info and "environmental data" collected by sensors. What is meant by environmental data?

From Flock Safety Website:

"Environmental Data from Sensors: We collect data from sensors built into some of our devices or products installed on your property. These sensors collect data such as device temperature and ambient light. By recording this information, your device can know, for instance, to turn on night vision if it's dark outside".

3. In section 5.3, does the disclosure of data by Flock include or exclude Vallejo's prohibited uses? (Immigration enforcement, targeting based on a protected class, reproductive health care, etc)

Flock Safety does not share data outside an organization. It is the Organization, such as VPD that authorizes any data sharing with other Agencies. VPD utilizes California Civil Code and Laws specific to ALPR Systems consistent with the guidelines presented by California DOJ, Division of Law Enforcement.

Please refer to Flock Safety's Privacy policy: <https://www.flocksafety.com/privacy-policy>

4. Section 10.3 mentions the deployment plan. Board members would like to discuss this plan and specifically how the number of devices and locations are chosen.

As this relates to Falcon/Condor Cameras, the number is based on what area we are trying to capture data from. A four-lane roadway would need more cameras to accurately capture data than a two-lane roadway. As stated before the areas of coverage are decided upon by Vallejo Police Crime Analysis. This would determine a general location, Flock Safety places the devices in that

general area as directed. They may move a slight distance one way or another after consultation with us based on the terrain/obstacles in the area. Vallejo PD Personel decide how many cameras to purchase based on budgetary constraints.

5. In section 11.4 there is mention of an order form, which we'd like to request.

I am not familiar with this form or have access to one.

RESOLUTION NO. 001-24

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD OF THE CITY OF VALLEJO CONCERNING THE USE OF NEW REPLACEMENT FLOCK CAMERAS AND FLOCK AUTOMATED LICENSE PLATE READER CAMERAS

WHEREAS, Vallejo Municipal Code chapter 2.27 authorizes the Surveillance Advisory Board to provide recommendations concerning the deployment and use of surveillance technology within the City of Vallejo; and

WHEREAS, the Surveillance Advisory Board has received multiple presentations concerning the deployment and use of Flock cameras and Flock automated license plate reader cameras but has never provided a recommendation on those technologies to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, at its May 28, 2024 meeting, directed staff to take the City's use and deployment of Flock camera technology and ALPR technology to the Surveillance Advisory Board for a recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council directed that the Surveillance Advisory Board consider the camera and ALPR technology at a meeting to be held on June 20, 2024 and to return an recommendation to the City Council for its June 25, 2024 meeting; and

WHEREAS, staff has provided a presentation on the City's use of Flock cameras and ALPR cameras.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Board hereby recommends that the City Council approve the acquisition and use of the Flock camera and ALPR technology subject to the following: 1) In section 5.3 of the Master Services Agreement add an amendment that Flock acknowledges and agrees to the City's Policy of not providing data relating to prohibited uses or a violation of California law and attempt to add a notice requirement in the event of a subpoena request; 2) insure that the City's policy includes as a prohibited use, any use of data for the prosecution of activities relating to reproductive rights per the SAB's previous resolution relating to the Policy (Resolution 001-2023); 3) staff to remove from the transparency portal/and data sharing agreements Houston TX, US Postal Service, US Marshalls service and any other out of state or federal agencies, and confirm with SAB whether any data has previously been shared with such agencies and insure that such agencies do not return to the shared data list; and 4) verify that the order form complies with the above provisions and the rest of the Master Services Agreement relating to privacy and provide said information to the SAB.
2. The Board further recommends that City Council direct the SAB and VPD work together to establish clear and more accurate efficacy data, including pre-and post-technology data, including relevant crime statistics and ways to track false positives.

- B. Discussion of relevant training available to board members.
 - a. Training available from city staff.
 - b. Training available from VPD.
 - c. Budget for training.

Action: *Little discussion took place on this item and the consensus was to continue this item in September and create a comprehensive plan to train the new board members on various surveillance technologies in place by Vallejo PD.*

11. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. Technology usage reports: Drones, Cell Site Simulator, RAVEN Gunshot Beta Project, and Flock ALPR Cameras

Board received updates on drone usage, ALPR usage, and cell site simulator usage.

B. Flock Raven Gunshot Detection Beta Project Ad-hoc Subcommittee Report

Captain Ramsey gave an update on the current installation of the Raven and informed that by next meeting the installation in the city should be complete. No progress on the ad-hoc committee.

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Andrea Sorce

D9BDA772C42A4E4

ANDREA SORCE, CHAIR

ATTEST:

DocuSigned by:

Naveed Ashraf

ECF7C940B4D0454

NAVEED ASHRAF

CHIEF INNOVATION OFFICER/IT DIRECTOR