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**Position nominations**

Working group head:

The intention is that they will represent the group when dealing with other stakeholders. They will not be responsible for the day-to-day running of the group but is an important role.

Nominees include:

* No one mentioned

Secretary:

The intention is that they will keep the needed documentation for the working group as they meet on a regular basis.

Nominees include:

* No one mentioned

**Definition review**

Surveillance Tech - Martha mentioned that we would include capabilities in the definition.

**Process discussion**

* When can a department expect us to review their initial form?
	+ SPD has had pilots that ran for 3 months or more, like the body cam pilot program. That ran for over a year and a half.
	+ One option could be to just let them be and stick to the letter of the law and go through the review once the City has begun procurement OR we can add to the initial requirements that would require a trial run first.
		- SPD would want to know before the pilot that the tech would be approved by the team due to the expense of resources.
		- Certain components of the pilot could fall under the Surveillance group’s purview but we don’t want to hinder a department’s ability to try the product first.
		- SFD would also want to know before they pilot if the group would approve.
	+ Can we require approval from this group before the department pilots the product?
		- We want to be careful that we don’t start a shot clock that could hinder an opportunity for a department.
		- Perhaps we could cap the pilot timeline to address this. A risk would be that once you start the process it cost time and money.
			* Basically set a shot clock for the trial period and then if a department goes over they would no longer be considered.
		- If you have a short-term proposal or an offer that will expire then you would be eligible for an expedited review process. Could establish a number of conditions that you would have to meet.
			* Question on the form: is there a timeline for this? Can we ask this differently?
	+ Once a dept submits the form what should the group commit to doing and what would be reasonable for the department?
		- From the department’s point of view ASAP would be best to learn about any red flags that might be raised so that they can pivot as needed to address those challenges.
		- It would help to know beforehand what those red flags are for SPD as they often engage the public and provide insight into the tech they want to use. This could have a negative impact on public perception.
		- We should have a window in order to address complexity. 2 to 6 weeks was suggested.
			* This sounds reasonable (seconded)
	+ How do we determine exceptions? (Options provided by Nico)
		- The dept determines this
		- We take a vote offline (Marth supported)
		- We give the power to the working group head to decide on their own
		- We use time in the working group as a group to determine this (Ocesa supported)
			* The purpose of form this group was to establish that a governing body would have the ability to assess as provide recommendations. A department should NOT be able to make this call on its own.
			* They would need to meet at least every 2 weeks, but the duration could be much shorter depending on what they need to review and the depth.
		- Perhaps we need legal purview on these requests. Any federal precedents set?
			* Certain stages of this should be done with the Department and Law before they submit.
			* Patrick Blood did suggest that any additional titles that be named in the group could include Council if that will be his intended role within the group. He mentioned that he has not been reviewing the applications through the lens of a lawyer as he was unaware that that would be his role in the group.

**Fotokite discussion**

* Fotokite is a surveillance tool that does just what it says. It is a kite that goes up to 150 feet and takes recordings and images and can stay in place for an indefinite amount of time.
* The SPD would use for a missing or endangered person, crime scene or car accident scene reconstruction, situational awareness, and any large event happenings. It does not have facial recognition capabilities.
* Other departments can utilize the technology.
* It’s very helpful in creating 3D images of the scene.
* Also has thermal imaging capabilities.
* SPD is looking to purchase this as part of a larger grant that the Council has approved already.
* Nico asked what timeline SPD is working on with this.
	+ They have to get the grant first, but they have considered using seizure funds that would allow them to procure immediately.
* They will follow the current drone policy with a few minor changes.
* They might operate the tech with another municipality so they might share that data, but otherwise, unless it was relative to an investigation or case that would need the data collected they will not be sharing.

Summary:

Working Group Head: No current nominees

Working Group Executive Secretary: No current nominees

\*\*\*Please reach out if you are interested in either of these positions.

Process Discussion:

* When can a department expect us to review their initial form?
* How do we approach pilots? Often these can run as short as 14 days and as long as a few years.
	+ Departments could go through the review once the City has begun procurement
	+ We can add to the initial requirements that would require a trial run first.
	+ Departments could be required to go through the process before starting a pilot.
	+ Portions of the pilot could be required to go through the process while other segments wouldn’t have to.
	+ Requiring pilots to go through this process could limit departments capabilities to move forward on an opportunity.
	+ There could potentially be timeline parameters instated for pilots overall.
	+ Potentially could have an option to expedite for pilots or opportunities that require short turnaround.
* Once a dept submits the form what should the group commit to doing and what would be reasonable for the department?
	+ Are there specific red flags we can include in a publicly available list so departments and the public have insight into the characteristics we’re using to determine exemptions?
	+ 2 - 6 week window for initial review
* How do we determine exceptions? (Options provided by Nico)
	+ The dept determines this
	+ We take a vote offline (Marth supported)
	+ We give the power to the working group head to decide on their own
	+ We use time in the working group as a group to determine this (Ocesa supported)
		- Could meet more often (every two weeks) but for a shorter duration
	+ Perhaps we need legal purview on these requests. Any federal precedents set?
		- Certain stages of this should be done with the Department and Law before they submit.
		- Potential additional role for Council: Patrick Blood

**Fotokite discussion**

* Fotokite is a surveillance tool that does just what it says. It is a kite that goes up to 150 feet and takes recordings and images and can stay in place for an indefinite amount of time.
* The SPD would use for a missing or endangered person, crime scene or car accident scene reconstruction, situational awareness, and any large event happenings. It does not have facial recognition capabilities.
* Other departments can utilize the technology.
* It’s very helpful in creating 3D images of the scene.
* Also has thermal imaging capabilities.
* SPD is looking to purchase this as part of a larger grant that the Council has approved already.
* Nico asked what timeline SPD is working on with this.
	+ They have to get the grant first, but they have considered using seizure funds that would allow them to procure immediately.
* They will follow the current drone policy with a few minor changes.
* They might operate the tech with another municipality so they might share that data, but otherwise, unless it was relative to an investigation or case that would need the data collected they will not be sharing.
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