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**Attendees**:

* Nico Diaz
* Joe Cecile
* Patrick Blood
* Mark King
* Martha Grabowski
* Sharon Owens
* Ocesa Keaton
* Jen Tifft
* Ken Stewart
* Derek Werthmuller

**Agenda**:

* Where we are
* Review
* New Technology Requests
* Status Update: Public Comment Review
* Community Asset Tracker
* Technology Audit
* Next Steps
* Questions

**Notes**:

* Review
	+ New Definitions
		- Need Patrick Blood’s review on new definitions to add to ongoing list of key definitions.
		- Patrick is comfortable with the drafted definitions
			* There have been developments with regards to the Fourth Amendment which may trigger a re-review of these definitions – **would like to follow up on this at the next meeting**.
		- There are two additional definitions that need to be drafted
* New Technology Requests
	+ Wrapped up Fotokite and Vacant Lot Monitoring comment period
		- Moving to last portion of SLA, where submission is finalized and reviewed by departments
	+ DocuSign – exempt
* Status Update: Public Comment Review
	+ Fotokite:
		- 86 responses total
			* 26 Positive
			* 7 Negative
	+ Vacant Lot Monitoring
		- 36 responses total
			* 22 Positive
			* 14 Negative
	+ Questions:
		- Q: Are we going to respond to questions submitted through the public comment period? Should we release answers to these questions somewhere if we’re not going to respond to people’s questions directly?
			* A: Yes, communicating answers to these questions broadly will help communicate to the general public the purpose and efficacy of this working group.
				+ Deputy Chief Cecile will put his answers to the questions about Fotokite in writing
				+ Rebecca Klossner could detail out any answers to these questions (she is still involved with sensor projects) but Codes ultimately will be the owners of the vacant lot monitoring data
		- Q: For the vacant lot monitoring, are all of the lots City-owned, Lank-Bank owned, or a combination?
		- Q: The Fire Dept. is already using Fotokite. If there’s a vote to use the technology but with caveats, is that grandfathered in? How do we balance the need for continuity/consistency with understanding that the technology has been used a certain way in the Fire Department for some time in ways potentially different than are described in the proposal for this technology.
			* The Fire Department is using this technology similarly but not in contradiction to what this working group has stipulated.
		- The police cameras being considered through this group are already in use and located on poles in the city – how is that handled? Similarly to the Fotokite example with the Fire Department?
	+ Next Steps:
		- Once the working group collects responses to all questions about these technologies from relevant departments, this group will vote whether to recommend moving forward or not, or move forward but with caveats.
* Community Asset Tracker
	+ Dave and Derek provided an overview of the new technology, use cases, and general next steps for implementation.
	+ Overview
		- Equip vehicles in the city with the ability for the city to record streets. Could use for planning, code enforcement, etc.
		- Can customize and make the technology ‘smart’ by allowing it to spot specific things like illegal setouts, counting assets like stop signs, etc.
	+ Roadmap
		- Received funding from SUNY Albany – in the proof of concept stage now.
		- Have all equipment – haven't trialed it yet.
		- Dave is going to demo device in a box. Going to put it in his car and drive around parking lot . Still have to train these to do tall grass. Need to provide some feedback to the funding agency so we can make more widgets and get more trucks. This is likely going to happen within the next 3-6 months.
	+ Technology Description/Use Cases
		- Helping a couple of regional cities fight urban blight and recognize changes in the community over time.
		- Technology is mounted in a vehicle and records, similar to a street view on Google Maps but more up-to-date.
			* There are city vehicles out in the city now that we could be leveraging.
			* Recorded on raspberry pi on trucks. Transferred using a secure connection.
		- License plates and faces are blurred out if there are cars or people in any of the recordings.
		- Would give someone at the City credentials to access data.
	+ Questions:
		- Q: At what point does information get diffused in the process? When are the images diffused?
			* A: The device itself stores the data, uploads to private server for processing, at which point it’s processed and tagged. Then uploaded to the application. This “middle ground” is where analysis happens, then uploaded to the server where people who have login credentials are able to access the data.
			* A (Cont’d): There is a private connection to internal server, which is behind a firewall. Monitored by university network operations center. All data transfer is over secure connection. Data is not encrypted.
		- Q: From the description of how the faces and license plates are blurred, is it possible that as the that these features could be re-accessed?
			* A: No. The intermediary server that looks for the features overwrites the recording and deletes the original which no longer exists.
		- Q: How is this different from traffic light technology the City has been approached about before?
			* A: The purpose is very different. The purpose of the traffic light technology is to capture illegal activities on a traffic light whereas this technology is focused on improving city operations. In terms of functionality, the traffic light cameras also keep all data and the data owner needs to decide what to do with it.
		- Q: Will this be used for code enforcement?
			* A: Can be used in a variety of different ways, whether DPW or Codes uses it.
		- Q: Where is data stored?
			* A: On Amazon Web Services (AWS)
		- Q: Do you anticipate a policy or management system to ensure the safety of the data?
		- Q: Is this built with a SUNY Albany algorithm?
			* A: Yes. S3 for images.
		- Q: Is there a concern about scalability?
			* A: Yes
		- Q: With regard to data destruction, are there any policies in place for how long the data will be stored?
		- Q: How has this been modeled for a city such as the size of Syracuse?
			* A: No answer
		- Q: Is this group already contracted to do this work?
	+ Concerns:
		- There are a couple bottlenecks with the upload and download links. Currently the sensor is very low power. Image processing is low.
		- It sounds as though we have already committed to this to some degree. Do we have input on whether or not implementation moves forward?
		- What they’re proposing today is so different from the commercial product they’re going to roll out which is what this group needs to be looking at.
		- Enabling research organizations to test/research things:
			* UAlbany applied for grant funding, was looking for a city to test this in. In some ways the university could partner with a private sector company like UPS and deploy on their trucks. And we wouldn’t necessarily try to regulate it. Decision between procurement and R&D for the actual city application.
			* People in the community already feel “guinea pigged: all the time.
		- The working group has a written explanation that we couldn’t get our heads around so we brought in the team to explain it. Today’s presentation still doesn’t provide any clarity. How are we going to explain this to the public for their input in a cohesive manner?
* Announcements
	+ If interested in Fotokite, going to demonstrate out at the airport on Thursday (Ken)
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