



**Privacy Advisory Commission**  
**October 3, 2019 5:00 PM**  
**Oakland City Hall**  
**Hearing Room 1**  
**1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 1st Floor**  
***Regular Meeting Minutes***

---

**Commission Members:** *District 1 Representative: Reem Suleiman, District 2 Representative: Chloe Brown, District 3 Representative: Brian M. Hofer, District 4 Representative: Lou Katz, District 5 Representative: Raymundo Jacquez III, District 6 Representative: Gina Tomlinson, District 7 Representative: Robert Oliver, Council At-Large Representative: Henry Gage III, Mayoral Representative: Heather Patterson*

---

*Each person wishing to speak on items must fill out a speaker's card. Persons addressing the Privacy Advisory Commission shall state their names and the organization they are representing, if any.*

1. Call to Order, determination of quorum

*Members present: Suleiman, Brown, Hofer, Katz, Tomlinson, Oliver, Gage, Patterson.*

2. Open Forum/Public Comment

*There were no open forum speakers.*

3. Review and approval of the draft September 5 meeting minutes

*The September Minutes were approved unanimously.*

4. Surveillance Equipment Ordinance – OPD – ShotSpotter Impact Report and proposed Use Policy – review and take possible action

*The Chair called for Public Speakers at the beginning of the item and there was one speaker: J.P. Masser spoke about two concerns he has with the Shotspotter Technology, neither of which are privacy-related. The first was a concern about the company itself and litigation it is involved in from New York State. He questioned whether the City of Oakland should be doing business with Shotspotter. The second was a desire to see a cost-benefit analysis to determine if the cost is worth it. He raised concern that there is not enough data to show the real benefits of the technology.*

*Chairperson Hofer opened up Commission discussion and had several edits to share with the staff present. One was involving efficacy and reporting requirements for officers. Lt. Shavies discussed the reporting process and the fact that officers treat every Shotspotter activation as a priority one call and Deputy Chief Holmgren added that the Computer Automated Dispatch System (CAD) is being upgraded in a manner that will allow easier tracking when Shotspotter is part of the disposition report when responding to an incident by ensuring it is part of a drop-down menu in the system.*

*Member Oliver asked for details about the response and Lt. Shavies noted that officers go to the area, search for evidence, canvass homes and businesses in the vicinity, and even leave behind door hangers if people don't answer the door in case they wish to report information later from the privacy of their home.*

*Member Gage proposed that language be included in the policy "that it is the policy of OPD to treat all Shotspotter activations as priority one calls." OPD agreed to this addition.*

*There was additional conversation about the need to track the efficacy of the technology and both Member Brown and Tomlinson acknowledged that capturing efficacy falls to the department's internal process improvements (as opposed to changes in the actual technology).*

*Member Katz raised the issue of the litigation in New York and Chairperson Hofer noted that the problem had more to do with the Rochester Police Department's actions than those of Shotspotter, also since it is pending litigation, he noted that asking Shotspotter to comment on it was not appropriate.*

*With a strong emphasis that the department make every effort to show the usefulness of the technology when they return with an Annual Report, the group unanimously approved the Use Policy to be forwarded to the Oakland City Council.*

## 5. Adjournment

*The meeting adjourned at 6:30.*