ART 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?**
>
> No

> 🔖 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?**
>
> Cultural Centers added cameras to provide coverage to spots not covered with the existing camera security system
>
> **5.3 Please list technology which was added (include manufacturer and model information.**
>
> Ring Camera system (1) and Doorbird buzzer units (3)
>
> **5.4 Please list how many units have been added.**
>
> 4

🔖 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): *

Department of Technology (DT) - SFAC and Microbiz Security Company, Tekleap and Doorbird - Cultural Centers (Tenant funded - not funded with City dollars)

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

The SF Arts Commission gallery cameras have been effective at monitoring almost 6,000 visitors to our Art Exhibitions at War Memorial over the last year. The nearest neighborhoods of Hayes Valley and the Tenderloin had 13,128 police incident reports since January 1, 2024 according to Data SF.

For Cultural Centers, SOMArts reported that the technology was effective. They shared footage with a rental client regarding an incident that occurred during their event, but they were not given a copy. According to Data SF, there were 7,780 police incident reports in the SOMA neighborhood since January 1, 2024.

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?

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.

The responses below related to Cultural Centers only.

Mission Cultural Center installed the Ring Camera system to provide coverage to spots not covered with the existing camera security system. The system is managed by their technical support specialist - Tekleap.

SOMArts reported installing 3 Doorbird buzzer units with live surveillance as part of their driveway access project. Units were installed by the SFPW Lock Shop, and all ongoing service issues are addressed by Doorbird directly. All Doorbird footage is for live-view only and is not stored.

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 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?

No

Total Annual Costs for the Surveillance Technology ⌄

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

0

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?

Yes

14.8 List total one-time Hardware/ Equipment costs for FY 2024-2025.

$15,000-20,000

14.9 Are there one-time Professional Services costs?

Yes

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

$3,000-6,000 (part of total listed in 14.8)

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:

No

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

General Fund

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