

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item Agenda Item 2

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item Agenda Item 2

Select one City legislative body for the comment Public Safety Committee

Meeting Date August 12, 2020

Agenda Item Agenda Item 2

Name Min Kim

Email - -

Phone

City Pasadena

State CA

Zip Code 91344

Comments (under 200 words) It is entirely possible for Pasadena to outright ban facial recognition without passing a separate “transparency” and “accountability” ordinance. A Black-led grassroots movement spanning Pasadena, Los Angeles County, and the entire country has been taking to the streets to demand defunding and abolishing police. We reject the ACLU’s effort to co-opt this movement to enact “oversight” and “transparency” ordinances that no one asked for.

I consent to have my Yes
comment read out
loud during the
meeting.

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 2:59 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item 2. FACIAL RECOGNITION

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item 2. FACIAL RECOGNITION

Select one City legislative body for the comment Public Safety Committee

Meeting Date August 12, 2020

Agenda Item 2. FACIAL RECOGNITION

Name Larry D'Addario

Email

Phone

Address

City Pasadena

State CA

Zip Code 91107

Comments (under 200 words) I want to be sure the committee is aware that it is not only the PPD but also other City departments that use facial recognition (FR). In particular, the Rose Bowl, owned and controlled by the City via an NPO, is engaged in extensive use of FR for surveillance of event attendees. A Star News article on June 23 covered its use during the Jan 1 game this year; in it Rose Bowl Operating Company CEO George Cunningham claimed that it was only for "marketing purposes". That may be true

regarding the specific contract about which the newspaper inquired. But now a PRA request by ACLU has revealed that in Feb 2017 the RBOC planned to deploy 416 cameras at 104 metal detectors to capture multiple views of each attendee, and to have all checked by FR against data bases of undesirable people. They also planned to share their data with other SoCal entertainment venues. We need a ban on use of FR in Pasadena, not only by PPD but by all entities connected to the City.

Larry D'Addario

Resident, Council District 4

Member of ACLU Task Force on Pasadena Surveillance, which is part of the Pasadena Privacy For All coalition.

**I consent to have my
comment read out
loud during the
meeting.** Yes

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 3:06 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item 2

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item 2

Select one City legislative body for the comment	Public Safety Committee
Meeting Date	August 12, 2020
Agenda Item	2
Name	Mohammad Tajsar
City	Pasadena
State	CA
Zip Code	91104
Comments (under 200 words)	<p>My name is Mohammad Tajsar, a member of the Pasadena Privacy for All Coalition. Facial recognition is an inherently biased, flawed, and invasive technology that should be out of PPD's hands. I write to respond to two points that the Sergeant and PPD will be making today. First, they claim we shouldn't worry because facial recognition is an investigative tool only and cannot be used as the sole basis for an arrest. This is not a limitation at all, since all techniques—even dangerous or racist ones--are used for investigations only, and just about everything PPD does is an investigation. Nor is PPD's statement comforting, since police often rely on multiple considerations to make an arrest. Detroit Police Department had the exact same policy, yet they have on numerous occasions falsely arrested black men because of facial recognition errors. Second, PPD says the tech will reduce imminent threats to health and safety. But that has never been proved, and certainly not compared to existing less intrusive techniques. The</p>

reality is that facial recognition is neither necessary to public safety, nor demonstrated to show empirically sound safety outcomes even in combination with other techniques. PPD should come in line with cities across the country in rejecting its use by the police.

**I consent to have my
comment read out
loud during the
meeting.** Yes

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 3:25 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item 2

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item 2

Select one City legislative body for the comment Public Safety Committee

Meeting Date August 12, 2020

Agenda Item 2

Name David Chavez

City Pasadena

State CA

Zip Code 91103

Comments (under 200 words) I am writing today to call on the Public Safety Committee to ban the racist and junk science of facial recognition technology by the PPD and all city entities. Doing so is a first step toward dismantling the embedded racism of policing and surveillance in our city. We are in a historic moment to transform public safety away from the current policing and incarceration regime. We must transform the status quo in which the US holds 25% of all people incarcerated globally with majority Black and people of color.

Listen to community and science, not the PPD. Last month IBM ended making facial recognition technology for law enforcement saying it violates “basic human rights and freedoms.” Furthermore, MIT’s Media Lab also concluded that it has been used by police to “undermine human rights, and to harm Black people specifically, as well as Indigenous people and other people of color.” Both San

Francisco and Oakland have banned the use of this racist technology to protect civil and human rights.

Surveillance laws and technology historically have targeted Black peoples in this country and perpetuated white supremacy. Our city should not regulate or oversee racist technology, but instead must ban and dismantle it.

**I consent to have my
comment read out
loud during the
meeting.**

Yes

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 3:32 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item 2

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item 2

Select one City legislative body for the comment
Public Safety Committee

Meeting Date August 12, 2020

Agenda Item 2

Name Marlon Savinelli

Phone

Address

City Los Angeles

State CA

Zip Code 91001

Comments (under 200 words) I believe Pasadena should ban the blatant disregard of our civil rights that is facial recognition. This issue has already been raised in various other cities and towns across this country and the consequences are already making themselves known. We reject any attempt to bolster the already bloated state surveillance system.

I consent to have my comment read out loud during the meeting. Yes

Flores, Valerie

From: City Web
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 3:38 PM
To: Flores, Valerie
Subject: Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 on Agenda Item 2

Public Comment for Public Safety Committee Meeting on August 12, 2020 about Agenda Item 2

Select one City legislative body for the comment
Public Safety Committee

Meeting Date August 12, 2020

Agenda Item 2

Name June Williams

Email

City Pasadena

State CA

Zip Code 91103

Comments (under 200 words) It is entirely possible for Pasadena to outright ban facial recognition without passing a separate "transparency" and "accountability" ordinance. Surveillance bureaucracy laws pretend that police violence is not "transparent," as though it is not in our faces, on our necks, and piercing our flesh. as though surveillance is somehow separate from the rest of policing, and as though our communities cannot be trusted to ourselves name the impact of the oppression we face. We reject any law like this.

I consent to have my comment read out Yes