



PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

3:00 PM

Remote Meeting

The Public Safety Committee will meet to discuss various items related to the Surveillance Technology Ordinance, including CMA 2021 #41 regarding data on Shotspotter, BRIC and COPLINK

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Quinton Zondervan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marc C. McGovern	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE - JUNE 22, 2021

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Clerk: And you have a quorum.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I will call the Meeting to order. I call the Meeting of the Public Safety Committee to order. Call of the Meeting is to discuss various items related to the Surveillance Technology Ordinance, including CNA 2021 No. 41 regarding data on ShotSpotter, Brick, and COPLINK. Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 adopted by Massachusetts General Assembly and approved by the Governor, the City is authorized to use remote participation at Meetings with the Cambridge City Council and its committees. In addition to having members of the Council participate remotely, we've also set up Zoom teleconference for Public Comment. Please be aware that Zoom is primarily being used for Public Comment. In order to watch the Meeting, please tune into Channel 22 or visit the Open Meeting Portal on the City's website. If you would like to provide Public Comment, please visit the City Council section of the City's webpage. Instructions for how to sign up to speak are posted there. Once you've completed the sign-up procedure, you will receive a link to the Zoom meeting. We will not allow any additional Public Comment sign up after 2:30 p.m. Mr. Clerk, if you would take a roll of the members present.

Mr. Clerk: Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Vice Mayor Mallon.

Alanna Mallon: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: Present. Councillor Zondervan.

Quinton Zondervan: Present and audible.

Mr. Clerk: There are five members present.

Quinton Zondervan: Emiliano Falcon-Morano And uh, Mr. Clerk we're also joined by uh, Mr. Emiliano Falcon-Morano from the ACLU. If you could be promoted to a uh, Panel seat.

Mr. Clerk: He's been promoted.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. So, um, we'll start with the um, Data Report and I know the Commissioner did, did you want to talk through the, the Data Report on, on ShotSpotter.

Branville Bard: Sure. I'm, I'm unable to uh, turn uh, my camera on now. Uh, I mean I don't have the capabilities here to- if they give me permission then I'll do that.

Quinton Zondervan: Okay. Mr. Clerk will you provide uh, Commissioner Bard the permission? {Inaudible}

Branville Bard: All right. So, just a quick overview of, of the report. Over a six-year period from 2015 to 2020 inclusive, there were 326 calls for gunshots in the City. Sixty-eight of them were confirmed gunshot incidents. That amounts to about 21%. Um, 185 of the 326 calls were in the ShotSpotter area. That amounts to about 57%. Suring that same time uh, time period ShotSpotter activated 105 times with uh, 35 being confirmed incidents or about 34%. Um, 105 of the 185 calls, um, or a- about 57% were in the coverage area and, um, 105 out of the 326 calls in the City amounts to about 32%. Uh, the ShotSpotter coverage area, just for point of reference, is about 1.1 square miles, and of 6.4 square miles, So, that's about 17% of the City. So, eight of the 18 victims were in the coverage area or 44% of uh, the victims. So, you get 17% of the City is responsible for 44% of the shooting victims or conversely the rest of the City, about 83%, responsible for uh, only 56% of the shooting victims. Um, when it comes to response times, our analysis indicates that on average a ShotSpotter activation equates to Police arriving on scene 51 seconds faster. Um, just for point of reference, when it comes to 51 seconds, it is an eternity, especially in the context of somebody suffering from a deep penetrating wound when every fraction of a second could mean, you know, the difference between life and death. Um, in, in my 28 years in this business, I can't tell you how many times I've heard an ER doctor tell me that if I or we, you know, had gotten a victim there even a second later, they might not- they probably wouldn't survive. So, um, as it pertains to ShotSpotter, our analysis shows that it's a valuable tool. Um, it's that ever-vigilant listening ear that helps us respond to crucial situations, uh, quickly and more effi- uh, efficiently. And it would make more sense to cover the rest of the City with ShotSpotter, in my opinion, than it would to discontinue, uh, for it's it's use for some improbable scenarios. Um, you want me to stop there or you want me to go over the Brick in the COPLINK part as well?

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Commissioner. Yeah, if you could, um, review the Brick in COPLINK as well. Okay.

Branville Bard: The key points with the, the Brick that the, you know, the major dashboard is separate and distinct. Uh, it's a product supplied by the Brick. No confidential information is inputted. Uh, the information and policies are in compliance with Boston's Trust Act which forbids BPD from assisting uh, immigration and customs or enforcement and any civil deportation. So, that's really the key pointers there in the Brick park. And the, as it pertains to COPLINK um, you know, it's critical to point out that Homeland Security, the Enforcement Removal Operations Section doesn't have access to any of the data. Um, and also no intelligence information in stored it it . Um, only Homeland Security investigations which focuses on stuff like human trafficking and other crimes

against persons have access to that information. And one of the other key points is the, the- that should be pointed out or uh, made known is that no- a- a- any third party who requests uh, data would be directed by the Brick to the individual agency where they requested uh, where, you know, whose data they asked for. So, um, the Brick wouldn't release any information. They would send them right to Cambridge who um, would obviously um, act in accordance with our values and rules and policies.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you Commissioner. So, at, at this point, I'll open it up to any clarifying questions from Committee members. And then um, we'll, we'll have Public Comment and then we can have further discussion. Um, and also I'll note that the, the Mayor is unable to attend but, but has a representation through her staff at this Meeting. So, any questions from my colleagues and please raise your hand in the Zoom or wave me down in the video. Okay, so, I'm not seeing any. So, I'll um, oh Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Sorry. Um, uh, thank you, through you Mr. Chair. So, Commissioner uh, in terms of the Shot Spotter um, I know one of the things that has come up before, and I know we've talked about this before but maybe you can mention it again, um, is just the uh, what it actually picks up and when it doesn't pick up. I know some folks have... and I get- if you covered this, I- I'm sorry, I stepped away for like four seconds and then to get my door. And so, maybe you covered it. But I know there were concerns that people had raised before about it picking up conversations and it's picking up, you know, other things that could be uh, intrusive to people's privacy. So, what's- what does it get- what does it pick up and what does it not pick up?

Branville Bard: So, I'm, I'm glad the ACLU is here because they could chime in on this as well. But so, here, here's the thing. That, that- it's a, a proprietary algorithm that they use that um, picks up and, and reports gunshot activity. Um, in the past, it has also after it's been initiated uh, because of a gunshot, picked up conversations related to that incident through screams, yells, you know. Um, and to me the test there is to ask yourself is it unreasonable uh, for it to pick up other uh, sounds while it's also picking up gunshots. And to me the answer to that question is a clear none. Um, there's a compelling societal and governmental interest in um, having that uh, ever vigilant reporting ear for gunshots because, you know, while that's not the case in Cambridge um, as much. Some neighborhoods have become numb to the sounds of gunshots and won't even pick up their phones to uh, report gunfire. Um, so, um, could it pick up conversation? Has ShotSpotter uh, microphones picked up conversations um, or yelling or screaming in conjunction with gunfire or other sounds in conjunction with gunfire? Yes. Is it unreasonable that it would do that? No. Also, I should point out that we don't get the ShotSpotter information and, and audio footage. All we get is after the, the information or the incident is reviewed or confirmed in ShotSpotter headquarters in California, or at a location in California, the snippet of the gunfire sound, the incident uh, is sent to us through uh, automated notification through a, a, a web-based platform. So, it's not like we could ever listen to any microphones anyway.

Marc McGovern: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Councillor. Um, Mr. Falcon-Morano you have a question about a ShotSpotter?

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Yes, sure. Thank you. Thank you. Um, through the Chair. Um, my, my question here is, uh, I haven't seen that there was were a total of, uh, 326 calls for gunshots, but I don't see how many times was the ShotSpotter activated in the same, oh, in the same period, 105 times, with 35 being uh, confirmed shooting incidents. So, I was wondering if, if the company that owns this algorithm uh, provided any explanation and as to why, um, this accuracy is kind of uh, bad. Um, it picks up more things than, than gunshots, right, according to these numbers.

Quinton Zondervan: Th- um, sorry, if- just for the record, um, Mr. Falcon-Morano, rather, if you could just briefly introduce yourself and uh...

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Oh, yeah, sorry. Sorry, yeah, sorry, sorry, hello. Hi all. My name is Emiliano Falcon-Morano. I'm the Policy Council for the Technology for Liberty Program at the ACLU of Massachusetts. Uh, thank you.

Branville Bard: Um, th- that, that question was directed to me uh, through the Chair. Yeah. So, sometimes the algorithm picks up uh, gunshot-like incidents as far as fireworks, cars backfiring. Um, uh, sometimes immediately when I hear the, the sound over the web-based application, I can tell it was a nail gun at a nearby construction site or a car driving over one of the metal plates uh, right away. But sometimes those- the algorithm does uh, confuse those incidents for gunshots as well. And when you look at it, the analysis, you- you'll see that the algorithm is far more accurate than the human ear which um, has accurately uh, depicted the sound of gunshots about 20% of the time where the algorithm here in this City um, is almost double that accuracy.

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Okay, through the uh, Chair, thank you, uh, uh, Chief.

Quinton Zondervan: Uh, Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Um, Commissioner, you mentioned that this technology enables our Police to help a victim um, 51 seconds faster. W- what is the normal? What is that compared to? Are we talking about a three-minute uh, Police arrival versus uh, almost four minutes?

Branville Bard: So, uh, through the Chair uh, Councillor Carlone and it depends on which year that we look- we looked at it over a six-year period. So, in 2015 {Inaudible} seconds faster. Fast forward to 2020, on average, we responded 85 seconds faster. So, when any one second can mean the difference between life and death when you're suffering from uh, uh, a deep penetrating wound like a gunshot wound, it, it, you know, one second is too much. A one-second delay could literally mean the difference between an individual surviving a gunshot wound and not making it.

Dennis J. Carlone: Yeah, I- I- I thank you. And I could see that, but my uh, but my question is, what is the average time? Is it a four minute cycle where we save 80 odd seconds? I- I have no sense of- I know we're fast because I've experienced fast uh, Police action one time. But what is a normal one for such-for ShotSpotter incidents?

Branville Bard: Uh, through the- through the Chair. Uh, Councillor I'm not sure if I understand your question. If you are asking me what our average response time is it's varied from um, as quick as 137 seconds to as long as 200 seconds, 205 seconds.

Dennis J. Carlone: Okay thank you. That's helpful. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Councillor. Thank you, Councillor. So, um, if I can follow up on, on that um, are we measuring response time for the Police to get there or for the ambulance to get there? Because if, if we're talking about providing medical care, then there's a difference between those two as well, right?

Branville Bard: Through you Chair and to you. Uh, yeah, we're talking about Police response, but um, most of the time the Police response is going to be faster than any other response.

Quinton Zondervan: So, do you have the ability um, through the Police response to begin treating the victim?

Branville Bard: We, we do. We, we apply um, tourniquets. We begin life-saving measures like CPR. Um, you know, we, we had a shooting incident um, a uh, couple of years ago at one of our festivals. And if not for the grace of God that an officer was standing over the victim, and that that officer also happened to be an RN and knew how to go inside of a woman and cut off the femoral artery, we would have lost that individual right then and there. Um, and so, like I- I can't reiterate or stress enough how that every second literally, you know, can be the difference between life and death. And we're talking about deep penetrating wounds, but you can, um, I don't have the analysis of ambulance response time, but we- we're, you know, aware that our response time um, is typically the fastest between all of the public safety apparatus.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. So, I mean, in, in some ways, I want to agree with you that- why aren't we deploying the City-wide? I mean, if I look at victims treated, you know, 2015 we had three victims treated City-wide versus one in the ShotSpotter area. 2016, seven City-wide versus three in ShotSpotter. 2017, seven City-wide, zero in ShotSpotter. 2018 is a- an outlier. We had five City-wide, four in the ShotSpotter. And then 2019 one versus zero in 2020, zero and zero. So, that, that does argue if, if this is truly a life-saving technology then, then why single out the Port and not have it available City-wide to save- to save lives anywhere there's a gunshot victim.

Branville Bard: Councillor, I- I can only speculate uh, through you, uh, Chair and to you. I can only speculate as to why it was initially was um, only put in the

area where it was. And that's because of the need um, as opposed to City-wide. Um, I believe that, you know, a few factor- things factor into that, like the zeitgeist, um, whether there's a particular widespread attitude, a um, acceptance of it uh, across the City. I believe that it, it should be deployed across the entire City.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. Um, Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up for Public Comment?

Mr. Clerk: We have three people signed up for Public Comment.

Quinton Zondervan: All right. So, let's hear from them. {Inaudible background conversation}

Mr. Clerk: So, the only- so, the uh, we have three people signed up the only person uh, that is signed up uh, that uh, excuse me we have- James Williamson is not currently in the Zoom. So, we cannot go to him. Emiliano Falcon is a panelist and the third person is Saul Tenenbaum who is uh, in the Zoom. So, Saul, you can go ahead.

Saul Tenenbaum: Um, hi uh, Commissioner Bard, Chair Zondervan, members of the Committee. Um, I'd like to actually offer comments on two surveillance systems, Focus Deterrence, and again ShotSpotter. Um, Focus Deterrence according to the CPD report uses an algorithm to detect people quote "who have recently caused or been the subject of the greatest social harm and could currently benefit from social services and a case manager." CPD goes on to say that this is quote "a strategy that aims to deter specific criminal behavior through fear of specific sanctions." CPD claims that this isn't predictive policing but deterrence is literally about the future and preventing acts that might otherwise occur. It's the use of the algorithm that should raise a warning flag. The Council should, at the very least, insist that the algorithm be independently audited for bias. It's through these sort of small cracks that bias can creep into even the best intentions of organizations. And now as is my tradition, I'm going to talk about ShotSpotter and how useless it is. Um, I respect Commissioner Bard's comment that every minute, um, every second matters. Um, but you can be sure if it actually did matter in any circumstance, um, they would be talking about how ShotSpotter saved a life um, or solves a crime. CPD never says that to their credit because it hasn't. Um, before you even begin to talk about expanding ShotSpotter City-wide, keep in mind that ShotSpotter is intended for communities with large volumes of gun violence and large volumes of gunshots. We are thankfully not that. Um, and I can say no other thing that the thought of expanding ShotSpotters City-wide is insane. If the City ever spends a dollar on that um, it's just a sign that we have too much money. Um, um, I'll point out that the CPD data analysis isn't really a statistical analysis. They're just offering numbers without any sense of statistical significance. And again, there's nothing about actual outcomes. Um, the Commissioner talks about listening to ShotSpotter um, reports that um, um, turn out to be a metal plate or firecrackers. ShotSpotter clearly drives Police response and it is deployed in a particular neighborhood with particular demographics. Since ShotSpotter does suffer from these false alarms, that's the disparate impact um, that the Surveillance Ordinance speaks about. Um, if the City wishes to be true to his commitments to

racial justice, civilian oversight of surveillance and the reinvention of policing, you should really reconsider using ShotSpotter at all and not expanding it. Thank you.

Mr. Clerk: There are no further uh, Public Commenters.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you Mr. Clerk. Um, so, any, any follow-up questions or comments from Committee members on ShotSpotter? So, I'm not seeing anyone raise their hand. I'll ask um, the Commissioner about what we, what we just heard in Public Comment in terms of outcomes and, and saving lives. Do we have any situations where we think ShotSpotter activation saved someone's life?

Branville Bard: Through the Chair and to the Chair. So, anytime that we go to a gunshot victim and begin life-saving uh, you know, activities and, and scoop that individual and transport them to the hospital and, you know, they don't die and you can count that as a- as a save. Um, so, you know, I don't- I don't know how else to, to prove it than that. But it gets us there faster and we're able to begin life-saving efforts faster and we're able to in some instances scoop that individual and get them to the hospital or stabilize them until um, you know, more qualified medical individuals are- arrive on scene.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you and, and what about the, the concern about disparate impacts that I mean, you said the human ear's maybe 20% accurate ShotSpotters, maybe double that. So, that still puts us at 40%. So, does that mean that 60% of the time we're responding to a ShotSpotter alert that- that's not actually a gunshot?

Branville Bard: Through the Chair and to the Chair. I- I- I understand the argument that was made and but I don't know that that's necessarily the case here in, in the City. Oftentimes the, the incidents that are false positives, y- you know, if it's firecrackers, you'll have an officer who was already present in the area saying I heard and see firecrackers and no, no further responses is, is, you know, occurs because of that. So, oftentimes the, the, the false positives don't garner any additional response.

Quinton Zondervan: Okay. And what about the perception question, right? If, if we are only deploying and I understand that, you know. This wasn't your decision because it predates your arrival, but we've only deployed this technology to a particular neighborhood in the City, uh, which does overlap with our historically Black neighborhood. And if, if we maintain that going forward, then we are creating a perception that that's the high crime area of the City. That's where all the gunshots are happening, which itself perpetuates that situation. So, what, what are we to make of that? um, reality as policymakers trying to decide, you know, how to regulate this technology.

Branville Bard: Councillor. Um, I- I- I've- through you and to you. I've already stated that I believe that the, the most appropriate remedy for that would be to blanket the entire City with uh, uh, the ShotSpotter technology. I would hate to be- I would have to think that if I was unlucky enough to be shot, that I would

have to be lucky enough to be in a ShotSpotter coverage area for- to get the fastest possible response that I could get. So, I would like to think that I was- if I was unlucky enough to be shot anywhere in the City that help will be on this way as fast po- as, as humanly possible and that if technology existed to increase the response time that it would be employed, where where I was unlucky at.

Quinton Zondervan: Okay, and, and in terms of cost, what, what would that look like if we were to put this technology City-wide?

Branville Bard: I'm- I'm- through you Chair and to you Chair. I'm unsure of what the City-wide cost would be. I think at some point I had that number. I know right now the technology costs about \$50,000, but it's not a budgetary impact for the City because the urban area security initiative pays for it.

Quinton Zondervan: Got it. Okay. Um, unless there's more questions, I see Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler has raised his hand.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you, um, to the Police Commissioner, I just had, um, one, uh, follow-up question, um, on ShotSpotter and it was, um, uh, I think, uh, not I believe he said at this Meeting, but it was a previous Meeting if I'm remembering correctly, and we were sort of talking about the same question about ShotSpotter in one neighborhood versus City-wide. Um, and I think you had said at that point that one of the reasons this wasn't deployed City-wide, um, was that other neighborhoods might not want it um, in their neighborhood. Um, and, you know, apologize if I'm- if I'm mischaracterizing that, but I was just interested if we did have any data on, you know, folks in the Port wanting the system there and folks in other neighborhoods not wanting it or if it was a little more, more anecdotal, you know, if there was any sort of survey, I would be interested and helpful, I think, for the Council to see that.

Branville Bard: Through, through the Chair and to you, Councillor. Yeah, I think what you just said was, um, much more anecdotal or than the point that I try- to tried to express. Um, I only can speculate, um, that maybe there wasn't a widespread, uh, appetite for the technology. I don't know why other than the need was, was most prevalent there. That's where the most incidents- gunshot incidences- of gunfire were. Um, why it wasn't employed over the entire City, I- I can only speculate. Um, but maybe it was um, n- need based.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Okay, thank you. That's helpful. Um, I yeild back.

Quinton Zondervan: Uh, Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Um, Councillor thanks. Um, just sort of on that- on that track a little bit. I mean, have we uh, have we spoken to- what has been the input from folks in, in the community about this? I could just say anecdotally, anecdotally, dotily(sic)? Um, I have, you know, I've been talking with folks in Newtown Court and Washington Elms and I'm not, I'm not- my- I've had five or six families say to me, can you help get me moved to another um, CHA building because I'm scared of all the gunfire that's happening here. So, you know, I know that there's a lot of talk of, you know, we obviously don't want to over Police. We obviously don't

want to stigmatize. We don't want to, um, you know, infringe on people's privacy. But in, in some of my conversations with folks who live in, in that area, they have raising concerns that they're scared about the gun activity there. So, are we talking to folks? Do they find this valuable? Do they find this intrusive? I mean, do we know what the community actually thinks about this? If we're- if we're concerned about putting it in another neighborhood because they may not want it, we should probably talk to this community that has it and see if they want it or don't want it. Um, and I- I just know just, you know, I've just recently in the last few weeks I've had just a lot of people say to me that they're scared. And so, are we talking to these folks? Do we know what they want? Do we know what they think?

Branville Bard: Luddite Uh, through the- through the Chair and to you Councillor. Um, so, um, obviously we haven't done any s- s -s- study that will rise to a statistical study. Anecdotaly, I can tell you that um, the most people who I encounter want um, increased technological a uh, measures in the City, increased cameras, um, ShotSpotter. They, they welcome it. They want increased presence. Um, the voices who tend to be the loudest tend to be the uh, uh, voices on the fringe who want to, um, you know, decrease technology. Um, I want to say Luddites but, um, uh, eliminate um, the, the technology or bar the City from using technology. Um, so, the, the voices who I hear, um, the most from, uh, tend to be the, the not the loudest voices. They, they, they tend to, you know, quietly tell you, I don't know what they're, you know, what they're talking about. I want more of technology that's- but um... ((cross-talk))

Marc McGovern: Well, it might be- through you, sorry, through you, Mr. Chairman, that may be something we want to, you know, think about. I mean, if people feel like, look, this is, you know, this is intrusive to our lives. We should hear that and, and take that into consideration. If people feel like it's actually helpful and it makes them feel safer, we should take that into consideration too. But um, you know, we shouldn't make any of these decisions in a vacuum. Uh, so, thank you, Mr. Chair.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Councillor. Um, Mr. Falcon-Morano.

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Yes, thank you. I- I just wanted to make a question uh, through the Chair. Um, so, in the surveillance reports, you mentioned that, uh, the evidence that it's derived from this technology is, is being used in criminal prosecutions. How is that- how does that discovery uh, that, that disclosure happens? Like if the algorithm is proprietary, uh, w- what is it that you disclose? Like there's like a time timestamp or something?

Branville Bard: So, uh, through, through the Chair and uh, to, to uh, Mr. Falcon-Emiliano, I'm sorry. I don't remember your last name, but um, I've- I've neglected to say that I'm here with attorney Mulcahy and I'll uh, let him answer that question in regards to uh, prosecutions.

James Mulcahy: Sure. So, under uh, Rule 14 of the Mass Rules of Criminal Procedure, whatever we have in our possession uh, at the time of prosecution would be considered uh, mandatory discovery and we would turn that over uh,

automatically to the prosecution team. Uh, that would include any uh, recordings of uh, the alleged gunfire uh, that was recorded. Additionally, a lot of these get handled by discovery motions. Uh, oftentimes a defense attorney may file uh, a Motion for specific information uh, from ShotSpotter and that will be litigated back and forth between the uh, District Attorney's Office uh, and the um, uh, defense counsel. Um, and at that point it's up to the individual judge uh, to decide the Motion as to what might be turned over that's not immediately within uh, our possession. Uh, so, it does tend to vary uh, case by case. What we have in our possession, we are required to turn over uh, and then typically on a case by case basis, uh, the judge is going to order uh, what other information needs to be turned over.

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Through the Chair, thank you.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. Um, Commissioner, I- I wonder if you could also address the um, issue that was raised in Public Comment about the Focus Deterrence and the, the algorithm that's used here.

Branville Bard: Through the Chair and to the Chair. Yeah. So, um, when I- when I arrived here in 2017 and I saw the Focus Deterrence, I think the first thing I said to my to myself and to Attorney Mulkcahy was no, um, I'm not in favor of using it. I don't- I don't really- I don't support predictive policing. Um, and uh, you know, it explained to me to hear that it's not done that way that it's based on social harm. So, it basically calls um, the our records management system and it's based on a couple of factors. The biggest thing being a soldier harm. So, if you've been the victim or the perpetrator of harm or and the recency of those incidents or something that happened 10 years ago, um, that doesn't, you know, really, you know, it doesn't impact and it's not weighted to something that happened ten days ago. But the biggest thing is that we reach out to individuals and offer them the chance to voluntarily enter the Focus Deterrence program not this isn't something that we impose on. We we say, listen, you know, we notice that, you know, You've been a victim here. You've been a perfect whatever but we offer it services to the individual and they are fully free to decline. One of the things that I want to point out is the fact that you know, we were very we're selective and using we haven't used uh, or the program in two years. We haven't used the Focus Deterrence uh, our we, you know, we're very selective and how we use it.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you Commissioner. Um, so, I think I'm going to close out the, the discussion on ShotSpotter and, you know, I'll just say that, you know, I think it's, it's a technology it's a tool and like every technology it has it has pros and cons and um, it sounds like um, you know, we're using it in the best way. But I think there are some, some questions in, in our minds and in, in people in the community as to um, you know, whether, whether this is the right way to use this particular technology. So, um, I think it clearly warrants further discussion um, and, and we're also, as you know, because you've led some of this conversation. We're having conversations about alternative public safety response and I think that factors in here as well because it's not just about the technology. It's also about the response to a gunshot. And, you know, how, how do we respond

to that? Right? If we're only responding in a- in a punitive way, that's one thing. If we're responding um, in, in a way that that tries to prevent further harm, that's another. So, um, I think we're, we're going to have further conversation as we reconsider our approach to public safety, how this technology fits in uh, to that- to that over all picture. Um, but thank you for providing the data that, that we requested and, and for uh, discussion that {Inaudible}. We appreciate that. Um, so, I'll turn it over now to Mr. um, Falcon-Morano from the ACLU to discuss uh, the overall Surveillance Policy uh, for the City.

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Through the Chair. Thank you, Councillor Zon- Zondervan. Uh, well, good afternoon, everyone. I- I might have to turn off the camera because of connectivity issues. Uh, my name is, you know, as I said, I introduced myself before. Uh, my name is Falcon-Morano. I'm the Policy Council for the Technology for Liberty Program at the State of Massachusetts. And today I'm here because I want to give uh, three main considerations. Uh, the first one is a consideration of uh, about the Metro Boston Homeland Security region and uh, Cambridge relationship with the City of Boston. The second one, uh, I have a couple of considerations about the break. The Boston Regional Intelligence Center. And finally, I will address, uh, the Surveillance Policy, which we think needs a lot of work. So, let's get started. First, I want to call the attention to the situation that happened a couple of weeks ago when the City of Boston Office of Emergency Management tried to put forward a contract, uh, that would upgrade the system to link all cameras, uh, in the cities and towns in the Met- Metro Boston homeless security region. We are generally concerned about how the City of Boston manages uh, this, this surveillance and the security. Uh, the money it receives uh, from the federal government and also its relationship with cities and towns, uh, uh, governments in eastern Massachusetts, including, of course, Cambridge. So, we are particularly concerned uh, with the inability of town and City governments to perform sufficient oversight and accountability of the Metro Boston Homeland Security region related activities when those activities are themselves shrouded in secrecy. To date, we know that decisions about how to spend uh, the Metro Boston Homeland Security region funds which are the UAC funds had effectively been made only by a group of unelected Police officers representing the cities and towns in the Metro Boston uh, meetings. In this case we know uh, as the chief today mentioned that the money for the ShotSpotter comes from the uac and we know this because well the City of Cambridge is very open and there is the Surveillance Ordinance here but that is not the case in, in other- in other cities and towns. Uh, so, so, today is a good opportunity to remember uh, how smart and how useful and how uh, thoughtful was for the City of Cambridge to the City of Cambridge decision uh, to keep the DHS the homeless security cameras turned off back in 2009. Second, we are generally concerned with how the Brick operates because we have documented the break attacks and undermines protected first amendment rights. Puts immigrants and immigrant youth in ice- Isis crosshair, collects shares and uses information derived from racially biased surveillance like the gang database. It adopts and deploys surveillance technology in secret without any democratic oversight or accountability like the social media buying software back in uh, 2015. And it also

shares information with big corporations through a Brick shield, while at the same time refuses the public's right to know by taking the uh, longest time in the public records request. I filed a lot of public records requests with uh, the Brick. And they always take a long time to to to answer. So, so, uh, I really want to raise this, this issues in this- in this Committee because because we think that the break is, is really bad at the intelligence that it that it does is used not for our safety surveillance isn't safety. Uh, so, I just wanted to raise this. And finally, I now want to readdress the Surveillance Policy. Back in November 2020, we sent a detailed analysis of what we think ought to be changing in this Policy. So, so, we can send you that again. Uh, so, basically the, the Surveillance Policy should provide for a privacy protective framework that promotes and respects Cambridge residents privacy and civil rights, uh, and civil liberties. In this vein, it should provide for strong safeguards that prevent the abuse and misuse of surveillance technologies as well as data protection. Overall, we see- we think the Surveillance Policy needs a lot of work because as it's currently written, the Policy does not protect the civil rights or civil liberties interests of Cambridge residents and worse, sometimes it undermines the purpose of the Ordinance. So, so, I have a couple of comments. I don't know. I have a lot of comments. I will make a couple of them uh, and then I can- I can forward you all the analysis that we made. So, first of all, uh, we have Section 2 and this permissible purposes and authorized use of surveillance technologies in department other than the Police departments. We think that this section should be amendment- amended to reflect that the permissible, permissible purposes of surveillance technologies related to each approved surveillance technology. So, each time the City Council approves of surveillance technology that approval is for the use of technology for a specific permissible purpose. The Policy should not serve as a blanket approval for all these purposes at once. Each surveillance technology has to be approved with their own permissive purposes. We have some formal following language that I will forward to you, uh, if you want, because we also work with this in other cities like uh, Somerville. So, so, we already have been dealing with these issues. Also, we believe that the purposes of law outlined in Section 2 are overbroad. For example, in Section 2, uh, the intent is to prevent vandalism in public parking lots, there was evidence to show that video surveillance does not prevent uh, threats to persons on property. So, it is ordered to say the least to have a proven false assailant in a government Policy. So, so, we believe it seems to be a broader, inaccurate catch all to allow for a broad range of uses. So, we want that uh, to be more precise. We would think that should be more precise. Also, Section 2 should be modified to include explicit prohibitions. At a minimum prohibitions of using surveillance acknowledges surveillance data to monitor people engaged in First Amendment activity. Unless there was a specific article of suspicion of community active criminal activity linked to the specific person using surveillance acknowledges the reasons data to monitor people based on project class such as race and ethnicity. So, so, we believe that there should be explicit prohibitions. When it comes to Section 3, which is the permissible purposes and uses, uh, for surveillance technology in the Police Department. Uh, it is not clear why there is a need for Section 3- section uh, for this section because uh, it merely

parrots the Ordinance and bring confusions when it comes to interpreting the Ordinance vis-a-vis the Policy. So, we think that it might be entirely it- it- it's uh, advisable for it to be entirely removed. Uh, also it pirates the language and for example Section 3A does not conform with Section 2 1- 128030 before of the Ordinance and the Police Department cannot enter into an agreement with a non-city entity to acquire share otherwise use awareness technology without City Council approval. Section 3B imposes less reporting requirements than what the Ordinance requires. Uh, the Policy should not be used to water down the Ordinance. This section should refer to the process laid out uh, in Section 2128030 for all of the Ordinance and nothing less. Finally, Section 3C adopts the false narrative that the information required to be reported by the Ordinance can undermine public safety. And this is not true. And the City of Cambridge cannot allow, uh, the Policy to grow such an unfounded conclusion. Uh, the Surveillance Ordinance does not undermine public safety. It's just know what technologies are being used. Uh, the Surveillance Ordinance doesn't require to, to disclose the use of surveillance technologies in particular cases. Uh, just as us, the title says permissible purposes. Third uh, Section 4 oversight. Uh, the department heads and the combined officers should also ensure compliance with the Ordinance. Uh, not only with the Policy and this should be cited directly in this section. So, what we notice in the Policy is that it's sometimes, uh, kind kind of like tries to replace the ordinance. It this should not be this way. The Policy should always conform with the ordinance. Uh, when it comes forth, Section 4A about data collection, this section should mention that City agencies will do everything they can to keep surveillance data accurate and up to date, especially if they use the data to make decisions about individuals. Uh, this presents certain obligations um, that they are being created by the Policy. This is not correct. For example, the second paragraph should specifically side this section of, of the Ordinance. And finally, this section should differentiate between the purpose limitation and data minimization. There are two data principles that are different. Purpose limitation means that the information has to be collected for- for specific, explicit and legitimate purpose and not further processed in an incompatible manner with those purposes. Whereas data minimization concerns the amount of information collected. So, it has to be adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary in relation to the purposes for which the data are processed. So, while these two data principles are, uh, related, they're different at that. We believe that should be noted in the Policy. Five- uh, Section 5C about data access. Uh, this section has to be strengthened, strengthened to include a requirement done. That were technically feasible. The City uses technology that creates an automated record of each time a person in City government accesses surveillance data, uh, including time and data, and if possible, the reason for the access. This presents certain obligations that are being created by the Policy. Again, this is not correct. The Ordinance so decided the Policy cannot be used to water down the Ordinance. Uh, when it comes to Section 6D data retention under the Ordinance, the second paragraph's uh, exception have to be provided in advance to the City Council for approval. Here they are merely noting that they might invoke exceptions without any City Council approval. This is another example of how the Policy undermines uh, the

Ordinance uh, 7. Section 5 when it comes to public and uh, third party access. The term information in the second paragraph is vague, uh, because it looks like it means the surveillance, surveillance data itself. And if that is so, the widespread release of surveillance data is not advisable, both because of its negative impacts on privacy and because it could uh, end up in the wrong hands like ICE and abusive spouse, etcetera. And finally, lastly, sorry, there should be mechanisms to ensure that only those persons whose information is being collected can access information. If third parties need to access it for a legitimate reason, their privacy should be protected, uh, reductions or whatever method or any other method. Number 8, uh, Section 7 when it comes when deals with relationships to other policies and required reports. Uh, again, we believe that this section is- the Policy is being used to water down the Ordinance. Uh, and a good Policy should be written to effectuate the Ordinance, not to be creative in creating an exceptions to the Ordinance and taking power from the City Council, uh, you know, literally. And finally, when it comes to the appendixes, each City agency must be very detailed when it comes to answering uh, filling these appendixes. Uh, generic answers are not enough. If possible, agencies should give quantitative data about the use of surveillance technology, technologies against the- this doesn't mean that they would have to disclose on a specific instance where the technology was investigated. Just, just, uh, provide some more information, or data to the Council that's going to ultimately decide whether, uh, proper this technology. Uh, and we believe that there is a mistake in Appendix D because of technology specific Surveillance Use Policy has to be used for any technology not approved by the City Council, under the required practices not covered by the Surveillance Policy. So, we believe there might be a little misunderstanding. So, the Surveillance Policies and Policy that applies to all the technologies. So, if the Police Department or any other agency wants to use another surveillance technology, then- and that and the use of that technology is not covered by the original Surveillance Policy, then they, at that point, they will have to, uh, also submit uh, when they request for approval, this technology specific surveillance is Policy that deals with those specific issues that are not covered by the general Policy. Uh, so, please uh, don't hesitate to contact us if you want to have a meeting or, or something to talk about this on. I will send you there. The analysis after the Meeting. Thank you very much.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. Um, Mr, Morano, uh, Falcon-Morano and what you just uh, shared with us is the same analysis from November 2020. Is that correct?

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Yeah, I send this in November 2020. Um, should I send it again? Or do you, you want to forward that? Um, okay...

Quinton Zondervan: Yeah, they know how to again to((cross-talk)).

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Yes, I will- I will, yeah, I will send it again. Yes. I will send again. Thank you, Councillor.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, um, I just forwarded it to the Clerk as well from, from November, uh just now. Um, Coucillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Thank you. Um, so, you know, having been involved in putting together the original and writing the original Surveillance Ordinance that we worked really closely with the ACLU on writing that it was a lot of people around the table. So, are these concerns- I mean, is this a sort of change in view of the Pol- of the Surveillance Policy that was written or I've just helped me understand because the ACLU was very involved in, in writing it. Um, and now we're hearing a list of concerns. So, I'm- I'm just trying to figure out...

Quinton Zondervan: Right. So, just for clarification, thank you, uh, Councillor for the question. The Ordinance requires the City to have a Surveillance Use Policy. So, what um, Mr. Falcon-Morano just uh, delivered was some critiques of the Surveillance Use Policy that the City has- the City Administration has put forward in compliance with the Ordinance. So, so, we're not um, we're talking about changing the Ordinance. We're talking about the Surveillance Policy that's required by the Ordinance to be provided to the Council. Um, and as was mentioned that Surveillance Use Policy I believe was actually uh, provided to the Council in December 2019. Um, and we I don't think we formally adopted it. We we place it on file which is what we normally have to do with these documents. Um, but we haven't really ever discussed it and of course um, not long after that we were hit by the pandemic. So, you know, this does feel a little bit disjointed because it's coming to us suddenly but but actually this conversation has been trying to be had for uh, over, over a year and a half but but has been interrupted by the pandemic. But um, these critiques are not new and they just haven't been processed yet um, by, by the administration in terms of updating the Surveillance Use Policy based on on this.

Marc McGovern: Um, through you, Mr. Chair, I mean, one, one thing I would, would offer and suggest is that, um, you know, these Meetings are kind of hard to do this. I mean, it was very helpful to get everybody around a table where, you know, you could hear all the different sides and all the different concerns. And then we came forward with, you know, at that point, an Ordinance that, um, you know, had sort of had addressed everybody's sort of concerns and there were, you know, people gave a little bit on on each side. So, um, you know, that may be a better way to go in terms of moving this forward rather than us as a, you know, as a Committee saying, okay, we're going to file all these amendments to the Policy based on, you know, there's no dialogue back and forth. I would recommend and I'd be happy to be part of it because I was part of the original piece, but I don't necessarily have to be. Um, You know get everybody together to say let's go through these things. Because we just we just got a list but it's hard to digest all of that and to go through each one of these things individually with the Police Commissioner, with the City, with everybody to say all right, you know, is this something that makes sense or not makes sense and then we come forward with something um, you know that's ready to be discussed and and voted on. So, that would be my recommendation. That was really helpful the last time we did that it worked really well. So.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Councillor. I couldn't agree more. Um, I think the, uh, you know, as I said, this, this feedback has, has been delivered to the

administration, but it just hasn't been processed yet. um, so, I just wanted to make sure that that we were aware of of this, um, critique from the ACLU. But but it's not something that we would vote on as, as a Committee or the Council. So, um, certainly appreciate your offer and and uh, I will reach out to the administration as well and ,and see if we can have some dialogue around making changes to, to the Surveillance Use Policy. But that's ultimately up to the administration to do um, and then to present it back to us to the Council if if any amendments are made. Um, any other questions from my colleagues about the Surveillance Use Policy? Um, Councillor Carlone. {Inaudible}

Dennis J. Carlone: I- I thought you preferred that. No, I'm kidding. I take it that when the Clerk receives the comments from the ACLU that you will distribute it to the Committee as well.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Councillor. Yes, it was sent to the Council a-again back in November. 2020 but that's of course eons ago. So, yes, it will be attached to the Committee Report.

Dennis J. Carlone: Great thank you and thanks to the ACLU for the work on this.

Quinton Zondervan: Okay. So, seeing no further questions are there any questions about the Annual Surveillance Technology Report? So, that's another um, aspect of our duties under the Ordinance is to receive uh, from the administration every year an Annual Surveillance um, Report that that details all the surveillance technologies in use in, in the City by different departments. And I did not request for all the departments to be present today because I anticipate that for most of these There are no, no real questions but um, if there are any for departments that are present or if there are questions that for departments that are not present we can certainly forward those to them as well. So, seeing none, I will um, ask a question to the Commissioner. We did hear some concerns from the ACLU about um, surveillance cameras in use by the Department of Homeland Security in the Boston Metro area. And based on his comments, I'm understanding that those cameras are not in use in the City of Cambridge. Could you uh, address or confirm that?

Branville Bard: Through the Chair to the Chair. Um, yeah um, as, as you correctly uh, indicated we have no active cameras. I think we have a total of three cameras but they're not in use and haven't been active in more than a decade.

Quinton Zondervan: Great thank you. Okay, So, I'm not seeing any other questions from um, my colleagues So, um, we can entertain a Motion to um, send the Annual Surveillance Report back to the City Council um, where I guess we we will vote to, to accept it.

Dennis J. Carlone: So, moved.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Mr. Clerk: On that Motion. Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Vice Mayor Mallon?

Alanna Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Zondervan.

Quinton Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion Passes. Five in favor, zero against.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. And then the um, Data Report uh, on ShotSpotter, COPLINK and Omega Dashboard, um, Mr. Clerk, I guess do we need to refer that back to the Council or or do we place it on file? I'm not sure what the procedure is with that.

Mr. Clerk: Give me give me one second. Let me check and I'll respond back to you.

Quinton Zondervan: Great. And then the, the last piece while you do that um, is, is the Surveillance Use Policy itself. And as Councillor McGovern indicated, I think that some, some dialogue is warranted between the administration and the ACLU, which I'm happy to facilitate and, and perhaps with Councillor McGovern's help. So, I think we'll just keep that in committee uh, until we have a chance to have that dialogue.

Emiliano Falcon-Morano: Sorry, through the Chair. Thank you, yes. We will be happy to be part of that.

Quinton Zondervan: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Clerk: Councillor Zondervan.

Quinton Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: On the um, on the on Motion will be- refer those back to the uh, City Council to be placed on file. Surveillance- the (stirs) the

Quinton Zondervan: Okay, and the, the data as well? report

Mr. Clerk: Yes, that's correct.

Quinton Zondervan: Okay, so, so, if uh, you take the roll on that Motion. can

Mr. Clerk: And just for the record, this is on referring what had been uh, uh, just uh, termed uh, or titled A Communication transmitted from Louis A. DePasquale,

City Manager, relative to a response to a Policy Order that was adopted in December 14, 2020 as part of the Community's uh, Public Safety Committee Report on October 7, 2020 regarding data on ShotSpotter, the Omega Dashboard and COPLINK. On referring that Communication back to the full City Council. Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Vice Mayor Mallon.

Alanna Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Zondervan.

Quinton Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Five in favor, zero against.

Quinton Zondervan: Great. So, unless there's anything else that anyone would like to discuss, I will entertain a Motion to adjourn. And thank you to the Commissioner and Mr. Falcon-Morano. Thank you everyone who participated in the discussion.

Alanna Mallon: So, moved.

Quinton Zondervan: Thank you. On that Motion.

Mr. Clerk: On that Motion. Councillor Carlone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Vice Mayor Mallon.

Alanna Mallon: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor McGovern.

Marc McGovern: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler.

Jivan Sobrinho-Wheeler: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Yes. Councillor Zondervan.

Quinton Zondervan: Yes.

Mr. Clerk: Motion passes. Five in favor, zero against.

Quinton Zondervan: Thanks everyone.

Dennis J. Carlone: Thank you.

CERTIFICATION

I, Casey Kern, a transcriber for Intellectix, do hereby certify that said proceedings were listened to and transcribed by me and were prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment under my direction and supervision; and I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the proceedings is a full, true, and accurate transcript to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 4th day of October 2024.

Casey Kern

A communication transmitted from Louis A. DePasquale, City Manager, relative to a response to a Policy Order that was adopted on December 14, 2020 as part of the Public Safety Committee Report from October 7, 2020, regarding data on ShotSpotter, OMEGA Dashbord and COPLINK.

Please find attached a response to a Policy Order that was adopted on December 14, 2020 as part of the Public Safety Committee Report from October 7, 2020, regarding data on ShotSpotter, OMEGA Dashbord and COPLINK, received from Police Commissioner Branville G. Bard.

A communication transmitted from Louis A. DePasquale, City Manager, relative to the Annual Surveillance Report concerning City Departments' use of Surveillance Technology or Surveillance Data.

Pursuant to Chapter 2.128, Section 2.128.060 of the Cambridge Municipal Code, I hereby submit the City of Cambridge Departments' third Annual Surveillance Report concerning City Departments' use of Surveillance Technology or Surveillance Data.

The Annual Surveillance Report is organized alphabetically by department. Departments' reports and the Surveillance Technology referenced in those reports is as follows:

N	Department	Technology
1	Cambridge Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Monitoring - Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
2	Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Monitoring - Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
3	Department of Human Service Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IP Address Collection Platforms • Media Monitoring - Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
4	Election Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic Poll Pads
5	Emergency Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid SOS Emergency Data Integration System • Digital Evidence Management System • Landline Location Technology
6	Emergency Communications - Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trespass Tracking Database
7	Executive/City Manager - Public Information Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Monitoring-Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring-Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
8	Finance - Assessing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlas RMV Portal • MUNIS Tax Modules, MA Environmental Police Registration • LexisNexis
9	Finance - Revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlas RMV Portal • MUNIS Tax Modules

.		
1 0 .	Fire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laryngoscopes • Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
1 1 .	Information Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IP Address Collection Platforms (Multiple)
1 2 .	Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WestLaw Public Records Search function
1 3 .	Library	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AtoZDatabases • Media Monitoring - Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
1 4 .	Police - CID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Cracker
1 5 .	Police - CID Days, DV/SA & Cyber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPS tracking devices (2) • Digital Intelligence Workstation • Dell Laptop BCERT • Magnet Forensics-Axiom • Cellebrite • Getdata Forensic Explorer • Shotspotter
1 6 .	Police - Crime Analysis & CID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurint Workstation • BRIC Omega Dashboard • Coplink • QED • Incident Database • CLEAR • LexisNexis • Focused Deterrence Database • LENS
1 7 .	Police - Crime Scene Services, Booking & Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morpho Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) with camera (Massachusetts State Police (MSP) System) • Live Scan (3 devices)
1 8 .	Police - EOD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wireless Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD) robots with cameras • Tactical Electronics VF52 Fiber Scope • ATF Bomb Arson Tracking System (BATS)
1 9 .	Police - Fleet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prisoner Transport Security Cameras (Transport Wagon 236 & 240)
2 0 .	Police - PIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TweetDeck • Media Monitoring-Meltwater • Social Media Monitoring-Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
2 1 .	Police - Professional Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infraware
2	Police - SIU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covert Cameras (Keltech Covert Streetlight

2 . .		Camera, CSA Pole Camera, IVC Covert Camera) • DTC Body Wire
2 3 . .	Police - SRT	• Throwbot XT
2 4 . .	Public Health	• MAVEN (Massachusetts Virtual Epidemiologic Network)
2 5 . .	Public Schools - Information, Communications & Technology Services	• Securly for Chromebooks Web Filter • IP Address Collection Platforms
2 6 . .	Public Schools - Safety & Security, Transportation	• Bus Video Recorders • GPS Devices • Edulog Transportation System
2 7 . .	Public Works	• Social Media Monitoring - Meltwater Engage (Powered by Sprout Social)
2 8 . .	Traffic, Parking & Transportation	• Atlas RMV Portal • Traffic Signal Detection Cameras • MioVision Traffic Count Mobile Camera Units
2 9 . .	Water	• Automated Meter Reading (AMR) System • AMR Consumer Engagement Tool

I look forward to answering any questions you may have concerning the enclosed Annual Surveillance Report.

A communication transmitted from Louis A. DePasquale, City Manager, relative to the Surveillance Use Policy and related documents.

In accordance with the Surveillance Technology Ordinance, Chapter 2.128 of the Municipal Code, I am transmitting for review and discussion the Surveillance Use Policy and related documents.