



Surveillance Impact Report

Weapons Detection System
Public Health

As required by San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B, departments must submit a Surveillance Impact Report for each surveillance technology to the Committee on Information Technology ("COIT") and the Board of Supervisors.

The Surveillance Impact Report details the benefits, costs, and potential impacts associated with the Department's use of Weapons Detection System (hereinafter referred to as "surveillance technology").

PURPOSE OF THE TECHNOLOGY

Surveillance technology may be deployed in the following locations, based on use case:

- San Francisco General Hospital, 1001 Potrero Avenue, Building 025
- San Francisco General Hospital, 1001 Potrero Avenue, Building 005
- San Francisco General Hospital, 1001 Potrero Avenue, Building 80/90

Description of Technology

This is a description of how the technology works:

The weapons detection sensor uses machine learning models to detect weapon signatures from sensor information gathered from visitors in real time. The sensory information gathered here refers to electromagnetic sensors and visual cameras. Weapon signatures and images collected on site are referred to as 'scan data.' The scan data collected from visitors to identify the presence of weapon(s) carried on their person.

Third-Party Vendor Access to Data

Data collected or processed by the surveillance technology will be handled or stored by an outside provider or third-party vendor on an ongoing basis. The Department will remain the sole Custodian of Record.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The impact assessment addresses the conditions for surveillance technology approval, as outlined by the Standards of Approval in San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 19B:

1. The benefits of the surveillance technology outweigh the costs.
2. The Department's Policy safeguards civil liberties and civil rights.
3. The uses and deployments of the surveillance technology are not based upon discriminatory or viewpoint-based factors and do not have a disparate impact on any community or Protected Class.

Surveillance Oversight Review Dates

PSAB Review: TBD (list all dates at PSAB, and write "Recommended: MM/DD/202X" for rec date)

COIT Review: TBD (list all dates at COIT, and write "Recommended: MM/DD/202X" for rec date)

Board of Supervisors Approval: TBD

The Department's use of the surveillance technology is intended to support and benefit the residents of San Francisco while minimizing and mitigating all costs and potential civil rights and liberties impacts of residents.

A. Civil Rights Impacts and Safeguards

The Department has considered the potential impacts and has identified the technical, administrative, and physical protections as mitigating measures:

The data collected is held for a short duration - at end of day, when the weapons detection system is turned off, information is deleted. Secondary checks are conducted when there is a detection flagged with the metal detection system. The weapons detection machine detects possible threats and sends information to a tablet that identifies with a highlighted box where there is a point of interest. At that point, the individual steps aside. The cadet reviews the area that the tablet has detected; this may be a backpack, purse, or another type of bag. It is reviewed and inspected; if there is no threat, the individual is cleared to conduct their business as normal. The main focus of the weapons detection machine is to identify possible threats harbored on a person. This tool does not look at individuals based on what a person looks like by physical appearance or economic status. The machine is an unbiased tool that identifies what could possibly be a weapon by the density of said item. Due to the sensitivity of the machine, it is possible for the machine to catch benign items that are ultimately found to not be weapons upon a secondary inspection.

The administrative safeguards are as follows: Users designated as Admins can select one of the following options:

- Results Only (Default): Alerts and images of all people passing through Express are stored. Scan data are not stored.
- None: No scan data, alerts, or images are stored on disk. Scan data, alerts, and images are only stored in the computer's memory until the alert is dismissed by the tablet operator.

Data is limited to those authorized to review data and cyber security-related technology .

The technical safeguards are as follows: Data stored on the Express computer's disk is automatically deleted after 30 days or sooner if the disk fills up, and room needs to be made for newer data.

The physical safeguards are as follows: Limited admin access to select few to change any options. Tablets are removed from the area and placed in a secured cabinet when not in use.

B. Fiscal Analysis of Costs and Benefits

The fiscal cost, such as initial purchase, personnel and other ongoing costs, include:

Number of Budgeted FTE (new & existing) & Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 7262 Maintenance Planner (2)• 8300 Sheriff's Cadet (20)• 0953 Deputy Director III (1)
--	---

	<i>Annual Cost</i>	<i>One-Time Cost</i>
Total Salary & Fringe	\$1,773,343.00	
Software	\$66,000.00	
Hardware/Equipment	\$66,000.00	
Professional Services	\$0.00	
Training	\$16,500.00	
Other	\$0.00	
Total Cost	\$1,921,843.00	

The Department funds its use and maintenance of the surveillance technology through:

General Fund.

COMPARISON TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The surveillance technology is currently utilized by other governmental entities for similar purposes.

Other government entities have used the surveillance technology in the following way: Other jurisdictions have used AI technology for weapons detection.

The effectiveness of the surveillance technology while used by government entities is determined to be the following: There have been several entities that are using this technology to assist with mitigating potential entry to sites with weapons. The system has flagged items such as, but not limited to, screwdrivers, chisels, scissors, and other hardware, handguns of various sizes, rifles, and long guns. Some agencies that use this technology include, but are not limited to, school districts, governmental agencies, and hospitals. Though there has been debate on the effectiveness of this detector, there has been an increase in the use of this type of AI-assisted weapons detection technology in order to safeguard the public.

The adverse effects of the surveillance technology while it has been used by other government entities are:

	Effect	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unanticipated Costs	Unanticipated costs can be incurred due to a tablet screen being broken or stolen. Replacement will need to be acquired due unforeseen incidents.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Failures	

Civil Rights
and/or Civil
Liberties
Abuses

Other