



MEMORANDUM

TO: LeRonne Armstrong,
Chief of Police

FROM: Drennon Lindsey, Deputy Chief
OPD, Bureau of Investigations

SUBJECT: Mobile Identification Devices
– 2020 Annual Report

DATE: March 19, 2021

Background

Oakland Municipal Code (OMC) 9.64.040: Surveillance Technology “Oversight following City Council approval” requires that for each approved surveillance technology item, city staff must present a written annual surveillance report for Privacy Advisory Commission (PAC). After review by the PAC, city staff shall submit the annual surveillance report to the City Council. The PAC shall recommend to the City Council that:

- The benefits to the community of the surveillance technology outweigh the costs and that civil liberties and civil rights are safeguarded.
- That use of the surveillance technology cease; or
- Propose modifications to the corresponding surveillance use policy that will resolve the concerns.

The City Council approved the Oakland Police Department (OPD) Department General Order (DGO) I-21: Mobile Identification Devices (MID) via Resolution 88095 C.M.S. on April 7, 2020; DGO I-21 requires that OPD provide an annual report to the Chief of Police, the Privacy Advisory Commission (PAC), and the City Council. The information provided below is compliant with OMC 9.64 and the annual report policy requirements.

The Surveillance Impact Report that accompanied the DGO I-21, reviewed by the PAC, explained that the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office (ACSO) will provide MID devices to OPD and will accept all costs to furnish OPD with MID devices. As of the date of this report, OPD has received the MIDs but has not yet implemented program use due to numerous other priorities, especially since the beginning of the global Coronavirus Pandemic. OPD plans to implement the technology later in 2021.

OPD is still in the process of determining the most appropriate MID Technology Program Coordinator.

2020 Annual Report Details

- A. A description of how the surveillance technology was used, including the type and quantity of data gathered or analyzed by the technology:

Mobile ID was not used by OPD in 2020.

- B. Whether and how often data acquired through the use of the surveillance technology was shared with outside entities, the name of any recipient entity, the type(s) of data disclosed, under what legal standard(s) the information was disclosed, and the justification for the disclosure(s):

There was no Mobile ID technology data generated as the technology was not used in 2020.

- C. Where applicable, a breakdown of what physical objects the surveillance technology hardware was installed upon; using general descriptive terms so as not to reveal the specific location of such hardware; for surveillance technology software, a breakdown of what data sources the surveillance technology was applied to:

n/a

- D. Where applicable, a breakdown of where the surveillance technology was deployed geographically, by each police area in the relevant year:

The technology was not deployed in Oakland in 2020.

- E. A summary of community complaints or concerns about the surveillance technology, and an analysis of the technology's adopted use policy and whether it is adequate in protecting civil rights and civil liberties:

There were no community complaints in 2020.

- F. The results of any internal audits, any information about violations or potential violations of the Surveillance Use Policy, and any actions taken in response unless the release of such information is prohibited by law, including but not limited to confidential personnel file information:

There were no audits as the technology has not been deployed. There were no policy violations.

- G. Information about any data breaches or other unauthorized access to the data collected by the surveillance technology, including information about the scope of the breach and the actions taken in response:

There were no MID technology data breaches.

- H. Information, including crime statistics, that helps the community assess whether the surveillance technology has been effective at achieving its identified purposes:

There is no crime statistics relevant to MID due to zero usage.

- I. Statistics and information about public records act requests regarding the relevant subject surveillance technology, including response rates:

There were no PRRs related to MID in 2020.

- J. Total annual costs for the surveillance technology, including personnel and other ongoing costs, and what source of funding will fund the technology in the coming year:

Zero cost; ALCO provides the MIDs to OPD and covers maintenance costs.

- K. Any requested modifications to the Surveillance Use Policy and a detailed basis for the request:

No requests for changes at this time.

OPD is committed to providing the best services to our community while being transparent and instilling procedural justice through daily police activity. This report is compliance with these OPD commitments as well as the reporting requirements of OMC 9.64.040. OPD hopes that this report helps to strengthen our trust within the Oakland community.

Respectfully submitted,

Drennon Lindsey, Deputy Chief,
OPD, Bureau of Investigations

Reviewed by,
Angelica Mendoza, Deputy Chief,
OPD, Bureau of Risk Management

Joseph Turner, Acting Lieutenant
OPD, Research and Planning Unit

Prepared by:
Bruce Stoffmacher, Legislation and Privacy Manager
OPD, Research and Planning Unit

David Pullen, Officer
OPD, Information Technology Unit