



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS CLERK OF COMMITTEES

June 28, 2022

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE MATTERS COMMITTEE

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Lance L. Davis	Chair	Present	
Ben Ewen-Campen	Vice Chair	Present	
Willie Burnley Jr.	City Councilor At Large	Present	
Jefferson Thomas ("J.T.") Scott	Ward Two City Councilor	Present	
Jesse Clingan	Ward Four City Councilor	Present	

Others present: David Shapiro - City Solicitor, Rich Melillo - School Administration, Lt. Sean Sheehan - SPD, Luisa Oliveira - Director of Public Space and Urban Forestry, Aneesh Sahni - Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, Peter Forcellese - Legislative Clerk.

The meeting took place virtually via GoToWebinar and was called to order at 6:02 PM by Chair Davis and adjourned at 7:34 PM on a roll call vote of 5 in favor (Councilors Clingan, Scott, Burnley, Ewen-Campen and Davis), none against and 0 absent.

Chair Davis announced that this would be the last meeting of this committee prior to the Council's summer recess.

Approval of the June 7, 2022 Minutes

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
----------------	-----------------

213489: Requesting approval of the Surveillance Technology Impact Report for Guardian Indoor Active Shooter Detection System.

Chair Davis informed the committee that the Administration received, and provided to the committee, a report containing proprietary information on the Guardian Indoor Active Shooter Detection System (GIASDS) and he asked City Solicitor David Shapiro how the report should be managed by the committee for discussion. Solicitor Shapiro acknowledged that the report was received and said that he was unable to determine what part(s) of the report contained propriety information, other than what the vendor stated was, therefore, he advised Chair Davis that any discussion of the report should be done in Executive Session. Director Sahni informed the committee that a vendor representative was not able to attend tonight's meeting to answer questions. Chair Davis thought it best to hold off sharing the information in the report until there is a clear understanding of what is, and is not, proprietary.

Director Sahni responded to questions asked at the last meeting on this subject, saying that the School Department will budget \$2,500 to \$5,000 per year for the maintenance of the GIASDS. With

regard to the cessation of use of the system in other city buildings, Director Sahni explained that it was stopped because there was no one available to oversee it. He noted that the school situation is different in that it has the assistance of Mr. Rich Melillo from the School Department's Administration involved and will be overseen by the city's Director of Emergency Management. Mr. Melillo told the committee that technology in the district was improved with respect to safety and that in 4 years of using the GIASDS at the old high school, there were no false positives. He stressed the one second notification time of an event which would permit lockdown procedures to begin within 10-15 seconds.

Councilor Ewen-Campen commented that this matter shows the value of the Surveillance Oversight Ordinance. He stated that his concerns about privacy, system effectiveness, false positives and cost have been addressed, verbally. What he is looking for now is documentation showing that his concerns have indeed been addressed, so that he can show that to his constituents who are opposed to the system. He wants a clearer explanation of what sounds the system can and cannot detect, and that there is no human interaction in the system's decision making. Councilor Clingan doesn't have concerns, since the system was used in the old high school for four years.

Councilor Ewen-Campen moved for approval, **subject to written confirmation of the information provided in committee as well as more specific information in the impact report to explain the recording capacity and the impact on civil liberties.**

RESULT:	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Davis, Ewen-Campen, Burnley Jr., Scott, Clingan

213947: Proposing an amendment to the Surveillance Oversight Ordinance (Chapter 10, Article III, Sec 10.63) to remove the exemption for body-worn cameras.

Chair Davis stated that he wants to get the conversation started on this topic and he noted that the City Council struck the funding for this technology from the FY-23 budget. He noted that there is a policy for body worn cameras included in the collective bargaining agreements with the Police Department and that when this ordinance was first drafted, body worn cameras were exempted.

Councilor Ewen-Campen explained that his original draft did include body worn cameras, but that issue was part of an active debate during contract negotiations at the time. Now that a policy has been implemented, he would like guidelines applied to the use of body worn cameras. Over the next couple of weeks, he is planning to work with the ACLU and the Council's Legislative Analyst on the matter and he encouraged the administration to also reach out to the ACLU. Councilor Ewen-Campen said that if the item is approved, the next step would be for the administration to provide an impact report for the use of body worn cameras.

Councilor Burnley said that from his perspective, this is not a technology that can be accessed solely by the Police Department. Councilor Scott would like to vote on the item tonight.

Director Sahni stated that the administration understands that the Council wants a deeper conversation of the use of body worn cameras and intends to work with the Council on the matter.

Chair Davis said that when the conversation is taken up on the impact report, he wants to hear from the city Labor Counsel.

Councilor Scott moved for approval.

RESULT:	APPROVED. [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Davis, Ewen-Campen, Burnley Jr., Scott, Clingan

214036: Requesting approval of the attached Dog Rules and Dog Park Rules.

Director Oliveira commented that there was a situation with an abutter at the Ed Leathers dog park and that the item before the committee is intended to apply a mutual resolution to that matter. The main change to the city dog rules is that no more than five dogs will be allowed in that park at one time. Director Oliveira also noted that no one person may bring more than three dogs to any dog park in the city at the same time. City Solicitor Shapiro informed the committee that there was a Small Claims Court case in which a partial resolution was reached, however the case was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Solicitor Shapiro stated that there is no ongoing litigation on the matter.

Councilor Ewen-Campen asked how enforcement is handled when more than five dogs are at the park and Director Oliveira said that typically, enforcement isn't done. Councilor Clingan said he understands it's a quality-of-life issue and if these rules are respected, it might cut down on the noise emanating from the park. He wondered what a fair enforcement plan would be and Director Oliveira said that the city could check with the Police Department and Animal Control about that. Director Oliveira noted that this was the only complaint received about this park. Councilor Burnley commented that enforcement is handled by Animal Control and the Chief of Police and he would like to hear more about enforcement from Animal Control.

There are four off leash recreational areas in the city and there are not any additional municipal dog parks being planned, due to the scarcity of locating suitable spaces. Chair Davis would prefer not to limit use of the dog parks and Councilor Clingan asked how the city came up with occupancy numbers for the dog parks. Director Oliveira commented that there is a formula for how many dogs would be allowed in a specific square foot area, adding that since it's not a problem in other parks, the formula wasn't applied to them. There had been a request to lock the park's gates at night and Director Oliveira said that the gates may be locked, but she noted that it is a public park and no other park is locked at night. Councilor Clingan asked that Animal Control Officers visit Ed Leathers dog park while on duty. Director Oliveira said there was also a request to add a row of trees as a buffer, but that would create a safety hazard because it would block the view of the park.

RESULT:	APPROVED. [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Davis, Ewen-Campen, Burnley Jr., Scott, Clingan

Reference Material:

- Impact Report - GIASDS_Updated_07.14.22_for CC approval (with 213489)
- Impact Report - GIASDS_Updated_07.14.22_redline_for CC approval (with 213489)