

ADM 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?)

No

Change in Number and/or Type of Technology ▾



Replacement of Old Technology

4.1 Has any technology listed in the policy been replaced?

Yes

4.2 Why has the technology been replaced?

Equipment failure

4.3 Please list technology which was replaced (include manufacturer and model information).

Pelco Spectra 3 and Pelco Spectra 4

4.4 Please list technology which replaced the original technology (include manufacturer and model information).

Avigilon H4A

4.5 Please list how many units have been replaced.

4

 Addition of New Technology**5.1 Has any technology been added which is not listed in the policy?**

Yes

5.2 Why has the technology been added?

Additional cameras to augment existing facility coverage

5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.


Avigilon H4A Fisheye

5.4 Please list how many units have been added.

1

 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): ***

There are only two divisions within our department with surveillance cameras, including Treasure Island Development Authority(TIDA) and Real Estate Division (RED). For TIDA, the Department of Technology(DT) helps maintain their cameras and servers. For RED, Paganini Corp. replaces old coax cable pulls new camera cables, also Microbiz Corp replaces old coax cable, pulls new replacement cameras, mounts replacement cameras.

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

Technology has been effective for both RED and TIDA to assist staff to efficiently view and assess remote locations. For RED, the technology has helped security response to incidents, and has aided law enforcement in the prevention and prosecution of criminal acts against City facilities, City personnel, City residents and visitors. Please see below for more on-site details:

SF City Hall : Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility and in Civic Center plaza. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFSD, SFPD, SFMTA, SFFD, Public Defender, City Attorney, District Attorney and building tenant departments where security or operational related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

1 South Van Ness Ave. : Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, SFMTA, Public Defender, and building tenant departments where security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

49 South Van Ness Ave. : Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, City Attorney, Public Defender, and building tenant departments where security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

25 Van Ness Ave . : Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, SFMTA, Public Defender, and building tenant departments where security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

1650 Mission St: Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, and building tenant departments where security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

450 Toland St. / 555 Selby St. (Central Shops): Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of Vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division and building tenant when security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

1419 Bryant St. (Animal Care and Control): Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of Vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. After legal counsel review of request for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, and building tenant when security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

1 Newhall St. (Office of the Medical Examiner) : Protection against, and documentation of, incidents of vandalism against the facility. Safety and protection of staff and public around, and in, the facility. Assist law enforcement investigate criminal incidents, captured by perimeter cameras, around the facility. After legal counsel review of request

for footage, footage has been provided to Real Estate Division, SFPD, and building tenant when security related incidents, requiring investigation, have occurred.

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.

TIDA did not share their surveillance technology data with other departments

The following departments received surveillance technology data from RED:

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) received video footage from surveillance cameras to support ongoing criminal investigations .

San Francisco Sheriff's Department (SFSD) received video footage from surveillance cameras to support ongoing criminal investigations and exigent operational circumstances.

Units within Real Estate Division received video footage from surveillance cameras to review incident and assess property damage.

Animal Care and Control (ACC) received video footage from surveillance cameras to assess property damage.

San Francisco Office of the City Attorney received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with ongoing litigation.

California Highway Patrol (CHP) received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with ongoing criminal investigations.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) received video footage from surveillance cameras to review incident and assess property damage.

San Francisco Fire Department received video footage from surveillance cameras video footage to assess property damage.

Office of the Chief Medical Examiner received video footage from surveillance cameras to review incident.

San Francisco Public Defender's Office received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with ongoing criminal investigations.

Department of Human Resources (DHR) received video footage from surveillance cameras to review incident.

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.

TIDA did not share their surveillance technology data with non-city entities.

The non-city entities received surveillance technology data from RED:

California Highway Patrol, (CHP) received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with ongoing criminal investigations such as traffic incident and assault that occurred adjacent to City Facility, that CHP responded to.

Law enforcement investigation with assigned case number received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with ongoing criminal investigations .

Legal counsel in criminal cases received video footage from surveillance cameras to assist with their litigation cases.



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?

No

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?

1

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.

TIDA did not receive public records request regarding their surveillance technology. RED received one public record request for video footage from the interior and exterior cameras at a City facility documenting interactions with City employees.

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology ▼

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

RED: 1) 0922 Media Security Systems and Facilities Manager (1) 1781 Media Security Systems Manager (4) 1777 Media Security Systems Specialist. * NOTE: all FTE but have multiple daily responsibilities not related to security systems. ** NOTE: (2 additional) 1777 as needed positions with multiple daily responsibilities not related to security systems/security tasks. TIDA: Two Principal Administrative Analysts (1824), also with multiple daily responsibilities not related to security systems/security tasks

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?

No

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

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

\$80,000

14.11 Are there one-time Training costs?

No

14.13 Are there one-time "Other" costs?

No

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

Yes

14.16 Are there annual Salary and Fringe costs?

Yes

14.17 List total annual Salary and Fringe costs for FY 2024-2025:

\$361,464 (RED: \$112,968 + TIDA: \$22,559, calculated by estimating the % of work time each FTE dedicated to surveillance camera related work)

14.18 Are there annual Software costs?

Yes

14.19 List total annual Software costs for FY 2024-2025:

RED: Individual camera software license costs \$(23,000) for 2-4 year term. Video management software Support Agreement (2 year term) \$24,000 for 2 year term.

14.20 Are there annual Hardware/ Equipment costs?

Yes

14.21 List total annual Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2024-2025:

RED: \$15,000

14.22 Are there annual Professional Services costs?

Yes

14.23 List total annual Professional Services costs for FY 2024-2025:

RED: \$80,000. TIDA: \$4,200 for DT services

14.24 Are there annual Training costs?

No

14.26 Are there annual "Other" costs?

No

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

TIDA and RED budgets

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

No

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

Yes

14.32 Why have the annual costs changed?

TIDA partnership with DT for ongoing system maintenance