

REC Security Camera Annual Surveillance Report 2024

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required.

Change In Authorized Use Cases ▼



1.1 In the last year, did your department have use cases which differed from your “approved use cases” in your BOS-approved policy?

No

Change in Authorized Job Titles ▼



2.1 Does the list of “authorized job titles” in your BOS-approved policy need to change? (i.e. Do you need additional job titles to be authorized to access the data, or do you need to remove any current job titles?)

Yes

2.2 Please provide an updated list of authorized job titles.

1704 Communications Dispatcher, 8208 Park Ranger, 8210 Head Park Ranger, 1820 Administrative Analyst series, 1050 IS Business Analyst series, 1090 IT Operations Support series, 0900 Manager series

2.3 Why have the job titles changed?

The department added the 1704 classification to allow dispatchers to support the department's use of this technology. The department added the 0900 series to allow individuals who were promoted from other, previously authorized classifications, to continue using the technology and accessing data.

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology ▼



Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

No



Addition of New Technology

5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?

No

🔖 Ceased Operation of Technology

6.1 Is any technology listed in the policy no longer in use?

No

🔖 Services or Equipment Sources

7.1 List any and all entities, companies or individuals which provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology (list "N/A" if not applicable): *

Microbiz, Exacqvision, Samsung, Hanwa, Arecont, Vivotek

Surveillance Technology Goals ▾



8.1 Has the surveillance technology been effective at achieving its identified purpose?

Yes

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective

This technology has been effective in helping the department maintain healthy, clean, and safe parks and facilities and in keeping the public and department staff safe. It does so by enabling staff to view multiple properties and multiple areas within a property simultaneously, with a relatively small number of staff. Cost savings result from staffing efficiencies and harm prevention. In fiscal year 2024 there were a total of 2042 Police Department Incident Reports recorded for intersections adjacent to the properties where the department deploys this technology. A by-location breakdown is provided in the following table:

Property Reported Incidents

- Alice Chalmers 13
- Betty Ann Ong 9
- Boeddeker Park 767
- Garfield Center and Pool 92
- Geneva Powerhouse 64
- GGP Alvord Lake 104
- GGP Conservatory of Flowers 28
- GGP Corporation Yard / Nursery 35
- GGP Goldman Tennis Center 65
- GGP Golf Clubhouse 31
- Glen Park Recreation Center 16
- Herz Park & Clubhouse 17
- Margret Hayward Complex 155
- Mission Dolores Park 304
- Mission Recreation Center 72
- Portsmouth Square 103
- Rossi Pool 33
- SF Marina Yacht Harbor 24
- Victoria Manalo Draves Park 71
- Willie Woo Woo Wong 39

Data Sharing



9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?

Yes

9.2 Was the data shared with city and county departments or other entities associated with city and county government?

Yes

9.3 List which departments received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

The following departments received surveillance technology data from San Francisco Recreation and Parks: San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco Sherriff's Office, San Francisco Public Defender, and the San Francisco City Attorney's Office.

Each department received video data.

The legal standards under which the information was disclosed were subpoena, requests for active cases in progress, and Sunshine Requests.

The justifications are active cases in progress, evidence, and legal claims.

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?

Yes

9.5 List which non-city entities received surveillance technology data from your department, what type of data was disclosed, under what legal standard the information was disclosed, and a justification for the disclosure.

Video data was disclosed to persons who requested data via public records requests. We disclosed the requested data in response to valid Sunshine Requests, pursuant to the California Brown Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance.

Accidental Receipt of Face Recognition Data



10.1 Did your department inadvertently or unintentionally receive, retain, access or use any information obtained from Face Recognition Technology?

No

Complaints



11.1 Has your department received any complaints and/or concerns from community members about this surveillance technology?

Yes

11.2 How many complaints or concerns has your department received from community members about the surveillance technology?

The department received 2 complaints and 1 concern.

11.3 Please summarize the complaints or concerns which your department received about the surveillance technology.

Two complaints regarded the placement of cameras at Alamo Square. One concern requested specific information as to locations, data capture and use, use of facial recognition technology, and inquiring about decision-making authority for camera deployment.

Violations ▾



12.1 Were there any violations of the Surveillance Technology Policy or Surveillance Impact Report, reported through community members, non-privileged internal audits, or through other means in the last year?

No

12.4 Has your department conducted any internal audits of the technology?

No

Statistics and Information about Public Records Act Requests ▾



13.1 Has your department received any public records act requests for this surveillance technology?

Yes

13.2 How many public records requests have been made regarding this surveillance technology?

4

13.3 Please summarize what has been requested via public records requests, including the general type of information requested and disclosed, as well as the number or requests for each general type of information.

The department received four requests for security camera video.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology ▾



14.1 List the number of FTE (new & existing).

6

14.2 Are there one-time costs for Fiscal Year 2024-2025?

Yes

14.3 Are there one-time Salary and Fringe costs?

No

14.5 Are there one-time Software costs?

No

14.7 Are there one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2024-2025.

\$679,670.00

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.10 List total one-time Professional Services costs for FY 2024-2025:

\$77,000.00

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

Yes

14.12 List total one-time Training costs for FY 2024-2025:

\$2,000

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

14.15 Are there annual costs for Fiscal Year 2024-2025:

No

14.28 What source of funding will fund the Surveillance Technology for FY 2024-2025?

General Fund

14.29 Have there been any changes to the one-time costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

Yes

14.30 Why have the one-time costs changed?

One-time costs vary on a year-to-year basis based upon the number of installations and repairs.

14.31 Have there been any changes to the annual costs from your department's approved Surveillance Impact Report?

No