AIR Electronic Toll Reader 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?

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?

Yes

6.2 Why is the technology no longer used?

1) The cost to upgrade the hardware was prohibitive from an ROI perspective. 2) The Time to review disputes was onerous. There have been no complaints since it has been deprecated.

6.3 Please list how many units have ceased operation.

All units have ceased operation.

🔖 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): *
FasTrak, New South Parking and Scheidt & Bachmann all provide services or equipment to the department which are essential to the functioning or effectiveness of the Surveillance Technology.

Surveillance Technology Goals ⌄

🔖

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

8.2 In 3-5 sentences, please explain how the technology has or has not been effective
The technology was not that popular with users of the parking facilities at SFO. As a result, the decision was made to shut down its use due to the following factors:

1) The Cost to upgrade the hardware was prohibitive from an ROI perspective.
2) The Time to review disputes was onerous.

There have been no complaints since the system has been deprecated in August of 2023.

Data Sharing ⌄

🔖

9.1 Has data acquired through the surveillance technology been shared with entities outside of the department?
No

9.4 Was the data shared with entities outside of city and county government?
No

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 surveil-lance 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?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology ⌄

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

5

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

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?

N/A - system has been deprecated.

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?

No