

Amadeo S. St.
City Attorney

As Amended By City Council on June 2, 2015

OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION NO. 85638 C.M.S.

Introduced by Councilmember _____

RESOLUTION (1) ESTABLISHING THE CITY OF OAKLAND’S POLICY FOR PRIVACY AND DATA RETENTION FOR THE PORT DOMAIN AWARENESS CENTER (DAC) AND (2) CONSIDERATION FOR FUTURE ACTION OF AN ORDINANCE IMPOSING ENFORCEMENT PENALTIES INCLUDING CREATING A PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION TO SEEK A WRIT OF MANDATE, INJUNCTIVE AND/OR DECLARATORY RELIEF

I. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

WHEREAS, the Port Domain Awareness Center (interchangeably referred to in this document as the “Port Domain Awareness Center,” “Domain Awareness Center,” or “DAC”) was first proposed to the City Council’s Public Safety Committee on June 18, 2009, in an informational report regarding the City of Oakland partnering with the Port of Oakland to apply for Port Security Grant funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; and

WHEREAS, under this grant program, funding was available for Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) projects relative to “maritime” or “waterside” uses. The Port and City were encouraged to consider the development of a joint City-Port Domain Awareness Center. The joint DAC could create a center that would bring together the technology, systems, and processes that would provide for an effective understanding of anything associated with the City of Oakland boundaries as well as the Oakland maritime operations that could impact the security, safety, economy, or environment. However, the City Council action on March 4th, 2014 limited the scope of the DAC to the Port. Any effort to expand the DAC beyond the Port would require a public hearing and action by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, “Port Domain Awareness” is defined as the effective understanding of anything associated with all areas and things of, on, under, relating to, adjacent to, or bordering the e sea, ocean, or other navigable waterways, including all first responder and maritime related activities, infrastructure, people, cargo, and vessels and other conveyances that could impact the security, safety, economy, or environment; and

WHEREAS, the DAC would be used as a tool or system to accomplish this effective understanding as it relates to the security, safety, economy, or environment of the Port of Oakland; and

WHEREAS, the DAC is a joint project between the Port and the City of Oakland. The DAC is physically located within the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and it can collect and monitor live streams of video, audio, and/or data, watching for time-critical events that require an immediate response. Additionally, the DAC is the part of the EOC that stays alert between emergencies and refers Port-adjacent incidents to the EOC staff for the EOC activation decision. While the rest of the EOC activates, the DAC can share relevant information to incident participants until the EOC infrastructure takes over. Notwithstanding any other provision to the contrary, this Policy applies only to the City-Port DAC systems operated by the City of Oakland's Emergency Operations Center in Oakland, California which are under the City's control, and does not apply to Port of Oakland monitoring and security systems operated by the Port and which are outside the City's jurisdiction or control; and

WHEREAS, the mission of the DAC is to have situational awareness needed for time-critical decision making in order to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies and crime at the Port; and

WHEREAS, this policy's purpose is to protect the Right to Privacy, civil liberties, and freedom of speech of the general public as protected by the California and Federal Constitutions, and erect safeguards around any data captured and retained by the DAC, and to protect against its improper use, distribution, and/or breach and in how it is used for law enforcement investigations. This policy shall be referred to as the DAC Privacy and Data Retention Policy ("Policy"). More specifically, the principal intent of this Policy is to ensure the DAC adheres to constitutionality, especially the 1st and 4th amendments of the U.S. Constitution and the California Constitution. Also, this Policy is designed to see that the DAC processes are transparent, presume people's innocence, and protect all people's privacy and civil liberties; and

WHEREAS, privacy includes our right to keep a domain around us, which includes all those things that are part of us, such as our body, home, property, thoughts, feelings, associations, secrets, and identity. The right to privacy gives us the ability to choose which parts in this domain can be accessed by others, and to control the extent, manner, and timing of the use of those parts we choose to disclose. The importance of privacy can be illustrated by dividing privacy into three equally significant parts: 1) Secrecy - our ability to keep our opinions known only to those we intend to receive them, without secrecy, people may not discuss affairs with whom they choose, excluding those with whom they do not wish to converse. 2) Anonymity - Secrecy about who is sending and receiving an opinion or message, and 3) Autonomy - Ability to make our own life decisions free from any force that has violated our secrecy or anonymity; and

WHEREAS, this Policy is designed to promote a "presumption of privacy" which simply means that individuals do not relinquish their right to privacy when they leave private spaces and that as a general rule people do not expect or desire for law enforcement to monitor, record, and/or aggregate their activities without cause or as a consequence of participating in modern society; and

WHEREAS, in adopting this Policy, it is not the intent of the City Council to supersede or suspend the functions, duties, and authority of the City to manage and oversee the affairs of the

City and to protect public safety. This Policy is intended to affirm the rights of privacy and freedom of expression, in conformance with and consistent with federal and state law. Nothing in this Policy shall be interpreted as relieving the City's responsibility to comply with any and all labor and union agreements, and to comply with all other City Council applicable policies; and

WHEREAS, for any policy provision that imposes a criminal penalty and/or creates a private right of action to be enforceable, Council must first pass an ordinance providing for such remedies; and prior to Council adopting such an ordinance, the City must meet and confer with the affected employee unions; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That any updates to the policy and to DAC will be subject to the following:

II. DAC POLICY DEVELOPMENTS AND UPDATES

A. The City Council shall establish a citywide Permanent Privacy Policy Advisory Committee for the DAC Privacy Policy Advisory Committee. The Permanent Privacy Policy Advisory Committee shall have jurisdiction as determined by the City Council, including but not limited to reviewing and advising on any proposed changes to this Policy or to the DAC. Further, this Policy must be reviewed by the Permanent Privacy Policy Advisory Committee at least once a year.

B. No changes to this Policy shall occur without City Council approval. This Policy is developed as a working document, and will be periodically updated to ensure the relevance of the Policy with the ever changing field of technology. All changes proposed to the Policy or to the DAC must be submitted to and reviewed and evaluated by the permanent Privacy Policy Advisory Committee for recommendation for submission to the City Council, and include an opportunity for public meetings, a public comment period of no fewer than 30 days, and written agency response to these comments. City Council approval shall not occur until after the 30 day public comment period and written agency response period has completed.

C. For any proposed changes for the Policy that occur prior to the City Council establishing the permanent Privacy Policy Advisory Committee, such changes shall be in the purview of the City Council.

D. The requirements and limitations for the DAC required by City Council Resolution 84869 of March 4, 2014, are incorporated herein by reference, as follows:

1. That the Domain Awareness Center will only be implemented in a Port-only approach and shall hereafter be referred to as the "Port Domain Awareness Center (DAC);
2. That the following items will be removed from the DAC Phase I integration: (a) Shot Spotter in immediate areas outside of the Port Area, and (b) 40 City Traffic Cameras identified on pages 9 and 10 of the City Administrator's Supplemental Agenda Report, dated February 27, 2014;

3. That the following items will be removed from DAC Phase II integration: (a) Police and Fire Records Management Systems (RMS), and (b) any news feeds and alerts except those expressly listed in the City Administrator's Supplemental Agenda Report, dated February 27, 2014,
4. That staff shall: (1) develop a clear definition of the Police and Fire Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) that will be integrated into the DAC, and (2) develop a protocol for the use of such CAD data by the DAC,
5. That operation of any DAC program beyond the Port area may only move forward upon explicit approval of the Council,
6. That City, as opposed to Port, Shot Spotter is specifically excluded from the Port-only Domain Awareness Center program and may only be included in the future upon approval by the Council,
7. That there will be no data or information sharing with any local, state, or federal agency/entity without a written Memorandum of Understanding that has been approved by Council; and be it
8. That no new system capabilities can be added to the DAC without express City Council approval, including, but not limited to technological functionalities such as facial recognition, other forms of analytics (like "gait analysis", in which someone can be identified based on the way they walk) or other capabilities that haven't yet been invented but are soon to come; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the following definitions apply to this policy:

III. DEFINITIONS

"Allowable Use" means the list of uses allowable for the DAC as specified below in this policy;

"Analytics" means the discovery and understanding of meaningful patterns and trends in data for well-informed decisions. Especially valuable in areas rich with recorded information, analytics relies on the simultaneous application of statistics, computer programming, and operations research to quantify performance;

"Bookmark" means a feature of the Physical Security Information Management (PSIM) system that allows staff to mark and annotate data for later review; the time stamped record is the bookmark;

"ITD" means the City of Oakland's Information Technology Department;

"DAC Application" means the VIDSYS Software;

"DAC Data" means any data or information fed into, stored, collected, or captured by the DAC System, or derived therefrom;

"DAC Staff" refers to the specific City of Oakland employees who as part of their regular duties are responsible for using the DAC System, including supervisors, and ~~that~~ have completed appropriate training prior to interaction with the DAC;

"DAC System" means access and use of the following combined feeds and systems in one application: Port Security Cameras (Phase 1), Port Intrusion Detection System (IDS) (Phase 1), Port Geographic Information System (GIS) (Phase 2), Port Vessel Tracking (Phase 2), Port Truck Management (Phase 2), Police and Fire CAD (Phase 2), WebEOC Notifications (Phase 2), Tsunami Alerts (Phase 2), Police and Fire Automatic Vehicle Location (Phase 2), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Weather Alerts (Phase 2), United States Geological Survey (USGS) Earthquake Information (Phase 2), City of Oakland Shot Spotter Audio Sensor System (only those sensors that provide coverage to Port areas), and the physical security information system, server, attached storage, and mobile devices. "DAC System" does not refer to the use of any of these systems or feeds outside the DAC Application;

"DAC Vendors" means the various vendors who support and maintain the DAC computer and network equipment;

"EOC" means Oakland's Emergency Operations Center, a facility and service of the Oakland Fire Department's Emergency Management Services Division (EMSD). The EMSD ensures "that the City of Oakland and community are at the highest level of readiness and able to prevent, mitigate against, prepare for, respond to and recover from the effects of natural and human-caused emergencies that threaten lives, property and the environment." "EMSD also supports the coordination of the response efforts of Oakland's Police, Fire and other first responders in the City's state-of-the-art Emergency Operations Center to ensure maximum results for responders, the ability to provide up-to-date public information and the ability to provide the best resource management during a crisis. Additionally, EMSD coordinates with the Operational Area and other partner agencies to guarantee the seamless integration of federal, state and private resources into local response and recovery operations. The EOC is a secure facility with access limited to City employees with a need for access, contractors, and security-cleared members of partner organizations. The EOC facility hosts the joint City-Port DAC systems, data, and staff."

"Major Emergency" means the existence of conditions of disaster or extreme peril to the safety of persons and property within the territorial limits of the Port of Oakland or having a significant adverse impact within the territorial limits of the Port of Oakland, caused by such conditions as air pollution, fire, flood, storm, epidemic, drought, sudden and severe energy shortage, plant or animal infestation or disease, the state Governor's warning of an earthquake or volcanic prediction, an earthquake, or other conditions, which are likely to be beyond the control

of the services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of the City of Oakland and require the combined forces of other political subdivisions to combat, or with respect to regulated energy utilities, a sudden and severe energy shortage requiring extraordinary measures beyond the authority vested in the California Public Utilities Commission.

“Need To Know” means even if one has all the necessary official approvals (such as a security clearance) to access the DAC System, one shall not be given access to the system or DAC Data unless one has a specific need to access the system or data in order to conduct one's official duties in connection with one of the Allowable Uses in Section VIII A. of this Policy. Furthermore, the “need” shall be established prior to access being granted by the designated City official or their designee and shall be recorded in accordance with Internal Recordkeeping requirements under Section IX.

“Personally Identifiable Information” (“PII”) means any data or information that alone or together with other information can be tied to an individual with reasonable certainty. This includes, but is not limited to one’s name, social security number, physical description, home address, telephone number, other telephone identifiers, education, financial matters, medical history, employment history, photographs of faces, whereabouts, distinguishing marks, license plates, cellphone meta-data, and internet connection meta-data.

“Protected Activity” means all rights including without limitation: speech, associations, conduct, and privacy rights including but not limited to expression, advocacy, association, or participation in expressive conduct to further any political or social opinion or religious belief as protected by the United States Constitution and/or the California Constitution and/or applicable statutes and regulations. The First Amendment does not permit government “to forbid or proscribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.” *White v. Lee* (9th Cir. 2000) 227 F.3d 1214, 1227; *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969) 395 U.S. 444, 447.

Example of speech not protected by 1st Amendment: *People v. Rubin* (1979) 96 C.A.3d 968. Defendant Rubin, a national director of the Jewish Defense League, held a press conference in California to protest a planned demonstration by the American Nazi Party to take place in Illinois in five weeks. During his remarks, Rubin stated: “We are offering five hundred dollars . . . to any member of the community . . . who kills, maims, or seriously injures a member of the American Nazi Party. . . . This is not said in jest, we are deadly serious.” Rubin was charged with solicitation for murder. The appeals court upheld the charge, reasoning that Rubin’s words were sufficiently imminent and likely to produce action on the part of those who heard him. *Id.* at 978-979.

Example of speech protected by 1st Amendment: *Watts v. U.S.* (1969) 394 U.S. 705. The defendant, Watts, stated that he would refuse induction into the armed forces and “if they ever make me carry a rifle the first man I want in my sights is L.B.J.” and was federally charged with “knowingly and willfully threatening the president.” The Court reasoned that Watts did not make a “true ‘threat’” but instead was merely engaging in a

type of political hyperbole. Id., at 708.

For purposes of determining whether sufficient grounds exist for any of the allowable DAC uses authorized under this policy under the Section “Allowable uses”, “Reasonable Suspicion” means specific and articulable facts which, taken together with rational inferences from those facts, evince more than an inchoate and unparticularized suspicion or hunch that an individual or organization is involved in a definable criminal activity or enterprise. Reasonable Suspicion shall not be based on Protected Activity. A suspect’s actual or perceived race, national origin, color, creed, age, alienage or citizenship status, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or housing status, shall not be considered as a factor that creates suspicion, and may only be used as identifying information in the description of a criminal suspect.

The “Right to Privacy” is recognized by the California Constitution as follows:

All people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy. Cal. Const. Art. 1, Section 1; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That access to the DAC system and equipment shall be as follows:

IV. ACCESS TO THE DAC SYSTEM / EQUIPMENT

A. Day to Day Operations

The DAC computer and network equipment is maintained by the DAC Staff and DAC Vendors. Only DAC Staff as defined by this policy will be authorized to monitor DAC Data in the regular course of business. ~~Employees assigned to monitor DAC Data are required to undergo security background checks at the local level as well as security clearances required at state and federal levels.~~ These employees will be required to sign binding Non-Disclosure Agreements to ensure data and information security.

B. Training

Training by the Chief Privacy Officer is required prior to interaction with the DAC System. All DAC Staff who are assigned to monitor the DAC Data will be required to participate in specific training around constitutional rights, protections, and appropriate uses of the DAC System and consequences for violating this Policy.

C. Critical incidents/emergencies/EOC activations

During an Allowable Use as defined by this policy, and notwithstanding the requirements in Access to Information and Data Section, City of Oakland officials and officers such as the City Administrator, Mayor, City Council Members, City Attorney, Department Directors and/or their designees, and outside governmental and non-governmental agencies assisting with the Allowable Use (such as the Red Cross) and who report to EOC, may have limited access to live

data from the DAC System only on a Need To Know basis and if there was a direct correlation between the Allowable Use and DAC operations. Nothing in this policy shall be construed to conflict with the duties and responsibilities of City of Oakland officers and officials under the Oakland City Charter, Articles I through V.

D. Support and Repairs

ITD staff and DAC Vendors that installed the systems will have access to the DAC System components but will only have access to DAC Data for the purpose of carrying out their job functions. Various manufacturers and vendors are hired to provide additional support services. Any system and network level access by DAC Vendors requires a background check. The system level access is maintained by ITD staff, however the Applications level access, as far as end-users are concerned, is maintained by the DAC Staff.

E. Funding Auditing Purposes

Federal, State, or Local funding auditors may have access to only equipment, hardware, and software solely for audit purposes and must abide by the requirements of this Policy; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That access to information and data obtained through the DAC shall be as follows:

V. **ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND DATA OBTAINED THROUGH DAC**

A. **Access:** Access to DAC Data shall be limited exclusively to City and Port employees with a Need To Know. Other than DAC Staff, any sworn or non-sworn personnel without a direct role in investigating, auditing, or responding to an incident will not be permitted access to DAC Data.

B. **Data Sharing:** If the DAC Data that is being requested is from an outside feeder source, the law enforcement agency seeking such information must go to the original source of the information to request the data, video or information. In order for DAC Staff to provide DAC Data to non-City of Oakland agencies there must be a warrant based upon probable cause, court order, or a written Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Contract approved by the City Council after enactment of this Policy. Any legislation authorizing such MOU or Contract must clearly state whether the MOU or Contract will allow for DAC Data to be shared with another agency. Furthermore, any such MOU or Contract must provide in the title of such document that it authorizes the sharing of DAC Data with another agency.

C. **Retention:** The DAC shall not record any data except bookmarks of Allowable Uses as defined below ~~in Section VIII~~; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the allowable uses for the DAC data/system shall be as follows:

VI. ALLOWABLE USES

A. **Uses:** The following situations at the Port are the only ones in which the use of the DAC is allowable and may be activated in response to:

Active Shooter	Unauthorized Person in Secure Zone
Aircraft Accident or Fire	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle in Port airspace
Barricaded Subject	Vehicle Accident requiring emergency medical attention
Bomb/Explosion	Wildfire -3 Alarm or greater
Bomb Threat	
Burglary	
Cargo Train Derailment	
Chemical or Biological Incident	
Container Theft	
Earthquake	
Electrical Substation Intruder Alarm	
Fire	
Flooding-Water Main Break	
HAZMAT Incident	
Hostage Situation	
Major Emergency	
Marine Terminal Fence Line Intruder Alarm	
Mass Casualty Incident	
Major Acts of Violence (likely to cause great bodily injury)	
Medical Emergency	
Missing or Abducted Person	
Pandemic Disease	
Passenger Train Derailment	
Person Overboard	
Port Terminal/Warehouse Intruder	
Power Outage	
Radiation/Nuclear Event Detected	
Severe Storm	
Ship Accident or Fire	
Ship Intruder/Breach	
Supply Chain Disruption	
Street Racing/Side Show	
Takeover of a vehicle or vessel (transit jack)	
Telecommunications/Radio Failure	
Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) Access Control Violation	
Tsunami Warning	
Technical Rescue	

B. The DAC shall not be used to infringe, monitor, or intrude upon Protected Activity except where all of the following conditions are met:

1. There is a Reasonable Suspicion of criminal wrongdoing; and
2. DAC Staff articulates the facts and circumstances surrounding the use and basis for Reasonable Suspicion in a written statement filed with the Chief Privacy Officer no later than 8 hours after activation of the DAC System; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the following internal controls, audits and reporting metrics shall apply to the DAC data:

VII. INTERNAL CONTROLS, AUDITS AND REPORTING METRICS

A. Chief Privacy Officer

“Chief Privacy Officer” (CPO) refers to the City Administrator or a senior level employee designated by the City Administrator who is responsible for managing the risks and business impacts of privacy laws and policies. The CPO will determine that procedure manuals, checklists, and other directives used by staff are kept up-to-date and consistent with policies and procedures related to privacy for the DAC functions, City measures, or other legislative measures related to privacy issues. The CPO will also oversee any training required to maintain compliance.

B. Internal Controls

Controls should be designed to ensure appropriate access and use of the data related to DAC activities and to prevent and/or detect unauthorized access or use.

C. Compliance Officer

The Compliance Officer is an employee whose responsibilities include ensuring that the organization complies with internal policies and outside regulatory requirements. The Compliance Officer will be responsible for establishing the operational controls and procedures necessary for assessing compliance, including but not limited to the following standard operating procedures and practices.

D. Internal Recordkeeping

DAC Staff shall keep the enumerated records in this section for a period of no less than two years to support compliance with this Policy and allow for independent third party auditors to readily search and understand the DAC System and DAC Data. The records shall include, but not be limited to, the below enumerated categories:

1. A written list of methods for storing bookmarks and DAC Data, including how the data is to be secured, segregated, labeled, or indexed;
2. A written list of who may access the DAC System and DAC Data and persons responsible for authorizing such access; and
3. Auditing mechanisms that track and record how the DAC System and DAC Data are viewed, accessed, shared, analyzed, modified, bookmarked, deleted, or

retained. For each such action, the logs shall include timestamps, the person who performed such action, and a justification for it (e.g., specific authorized use).

4. DAC System Usage: An overview of how the DAC System is used including:
 - a. Listing and number of incident records by incident category
 - b. Timing required to close an incident record
 - c. Actionable events, non-actionable events, and false alarms.
5. Public Safety Effectiveness: Summary, general information, and evaluations about whether the DAC is meeting its stated purpose, to include a review and assessment of:
 - d. Crime statistics for geographic areas where the DAC was used;
 - e. The frequency in which DAC was used to bookmark or retain data for potential criminal investigations;
 - f. The occurrences in which DAC Data was shared for potential criminal investigations;
 - g. Lives saved;
 - h. Incidents in which assistance was provided to persons, property, land and Natural Habitat security,
6. Data Sharing: A summary of how the DAC data is shared with other non-City entities, to include a review and assessment of:
 - i. The type of data disclosed;
 - j. Justification for disclosure (e.g., warrant, memoranda of understanding, etc.)
 - k. The recipient of the data;
 - l. Dates and times of disclosure; and
 - m. Obligations imposed on the recipient of shared information.
7. Data Minimization: A reporting of the incidents, if any, of disclosure of DAC Data that do not comply with the Policy, follow-up procedures, resolutions and consequences.
8. Protected Activity Exception: A reporting of the incidents, if any, of the use of the Protected Activity Exception waiver, as provided in Section VIII B, copies of written certifications, follow-up procedures, resolutions, and consequences.
9. Dispute Resolution: A summary and description of the number and nature of complaints filed by citizens or whistleblowers and the resolution of each, as required or permitted by the City's Whistleblower program.
10. Requests for Change: A summary of all requests made to the City Council for approval of the acquisition of additional equipment, software, data, or personnel services, relevant to the functions and uses of the DAC and the pertinent data, including whether the City approved or rejected the proposal and/or required changes to this Policy before approval.
11. Data Retention: A summary of the data retained within the DAC Application and an assessment of compliance to the Data Retention requirements as stated in the Policy.
12. System Access Rights Audit: The process to provide access and specific permission levels to authorized persons/staff working in the DAC function.
13. Public Access: A summary of the public records requests received, responses, and an evaluation of the appropriateness of records submitted and timeliness of responses.

14. Cost: Total annual cost of the surveillance technology, including ongoing costs, maintenance costs, and personnel costs; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the following internal control reviews and audits shall apply to the DAC data/system:

VIII. INTERNAL CONTROL REVIEWS AND AUDITS

A. Internal Control Reviews

The Compliance Officer will perform regular self-assessments (internal control reviews) of the DAC's Internal Controls and will summarize the findings and remediation plans, if any, and report these to the City Administrator and City Auditor and be made publicly available to the extent the release of such information is not prohibited by law.

B. Audits

The City Auditor will consider the function of the DAC and the relevant risks to the private data retained to determine the scope and frequency of performance audits to be conducted by the City Auditor.

Quarterly and as needed audits of the DAC System will be conducted and made publicly available to the extent the release of such information is not prohibited by law, by the Compliance Officer to ensure compliance with this Policy. The audit shall include the following information and describe any corrective action taken or needed:

C. Annual Report

The Compliance Officer shall prepare and present an Annual Report that summarizes and includes the results of Internal Recordkeeping, Internal Control Self-Assessments, and Independent Audits to the extent the release of such information is not prohibited by law, and present it to the appropriate Committee of the City Council or to the City Council at a public meeting at a designated timing each year. The City Council should use the Report and the information it is based on to publically reassess whether the DAC benefits outweigh the fiscal and civil liberties costs; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the following records management protocols shall apply to the DAC data/system as follows:

IX. RECORDS MANAGEMENT

A. The DAC Staff will be the custodian of records; responsible for retention, access to information, and responding to requests for information under California's Public Records Act.

B. DAC Staff must comply with all relevant and applicable Data Retention policies and procedures, regulations and laws; and be it

X. PUBLIC INFORMATION REQUESTS

FURTHER RESOLVED: That to the extent the release of such information is not prohibited by law, all protocols, public records, including but not limited to use logs, audits, DAC Data, and any sharing agreement, shall be available to the public upon request; and be it

XI. SANCTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT REMEDIES

FURTHER RESOLVED: That violations of this Policy shall result in consequences that may include retraining, suspension, termination, and if applicable, criminal fines and penalties, or individual civil liability and attorney's fees and/or damages as provided by law, depending on the severity of the violation; and be it

XII. SEVERABILITY

FURTHER RESOLVED: That if any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Policy is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Policy. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted this Policy and each section, subsection, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that one or more other sections, subsections, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

JUN 02 2015

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, _____


PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES - BROOKS, CAMPBELL WASHINGTON, GALLO, GUILLEN, KALB, ~~KAPLAN~~, REID, and PRESIDENT GIBSON MCELHANEY - 7

NOES - 0

ABSENT - Kaplan - 1

ABSTENTION - 0

ATTEST: 
LaTonda Simmons
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council
of the City of Oakland, California