

Please provide your input about the Domain Awareness Center (DAC) Draft Privacy Policy and Advisory Committee recommendations.
Open-Ended Response
I am grateful for the work of the Privacy Policy and Advisory Committee. I am a lifelong Oakland resident eager to protect our community's privacy rights. I support the recommendations.
I support the Oakland Privacy Group. Do NOT fund the Domain Awareness Center. Why would you want to live in a police state?
Yes! Strict limitations on surveillance are necessary to protect privacy and prevent abuse.
Sounds creepy and unconstitutional
This 'survey' is a complete misnomer: There ought be no DAC. No amount of 'policies' will guard the privacy of Oakland's citizenry. Not only is city-wide surveillance WRONG . . . it's also UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THE CITY of OAKLAND will be SUED. Which is quite the fun irony; as Oakland does not possess the financial means to PAY for The DAC.
I have been following the progress of the Domain Awareness Center since it first hit publicly. I a fellow Californian strongly support all the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. I support a standing privacy committee composed of outstanding public citizens Specific support for a surveillance equipment ordinance that doesn't encroach on person's right to privacy Specific support for penalties for wrongdoing.
I can see how spying on Oakland citizens might seem like a good idea on first blush. But please consider the long-term consequences of such surveillance before making this ill-judged investment.
As an Oakland resident and homeowner, I am deeply concerned about the implications of the DAC. I am writing to ask you to implement all of the Additional Recommendations, including a citywide privacy policy and a standing committee to oversee the activities of the DAC. As well, violations of DAC rules must be met with strict penalties - this is a power that would be very, very easy to abuse.
I strongly support all seven of the advisory committee recommendations, and submit the following additional points: 1. Strong support for all seven "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. 2. Specific support for a citywide privacy policy which could be used for this and future projects. 3. Specific support for a standing privacy committee which could propose additional recommendations and observe how the privacy policy is actually implemented. 4. Specific support for a surveillance equipment ordinance, which would prevent purchase of equipment which will ultimately used against our citizens rather than to protect them. 5. Specific support for penalties for wrongdoing and violation of the privacy policy so that the privacy policy can be enforced.
Hello. This is Tracy Rosenberg, executive director of Media Alliance, a democratic communications advocate located in Oakland. I am writing to encourage you to see the privacy package developed by the committee as a unified whole and as a model for a citywide policy. There is no doubt the City spoke up during the DAC process and said privacy is important to them. Supporting the whole package and extended it throughout the city is how the Council demonstrates a sincere response to the will of Oakland residents, which was overwhelmingly in support of limitations on surveillance. A standing privacy committee will allow Oakland to respond promptly and flexibly to new developments in technology, which as we know come fast and furious. Nothing about privacy and technology is static. The surveillance equipment ordinance is a crucial part of the package. Any and all technologies and equipment are subject to abuse and/or overreach and those kinds of problems occur when the rules of the road are not clear and where there is insufficient transparency. The ordinance provides a state of the art indemnification against both problems and will save Oakland a ton of money by preventing problems before they happen. Finally you should not be afraid to give the ordinance teeth with consequences for violations. This isn't punitive, its preventative. A policy with consequences is a policy that won't be disregarded too often and that is good for the residents of Oakland who won't be subject to random unfair or arbitrary privacy invasions and its good for the City of Oakland which will be sued far less often while modeling what the responsible use of surveillance looks like. Please support the privacy committee package in its entirety as a citywide privacy policy. Thank you for your consideration.
I very much support all the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. In particular, I very much support a citywide privacy policy, a standing privacy committee, and especially a surveillance equipment ordinance. Finally it is ESSENTIAL that there be penalties for wrongdoing.
I recommend the adoption of the seven recommendations put forth by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee.

<p>Can committees 1 & 5 be combined?</p>
<p>I strongly urge the adoption of the seven recommendations put forth by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, as well as: 1. Strong support for all seven "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. 2. Specific support for a citywide privacy policy which could be used for this and future projects. 3. Specific support for a standing privacy committee which could propose additional recommendations and observe how the privacy policy is actually implemented. 4. Specific support for a surveillance equipment ordinance, which would prevent purchase of equipment which will ultimately used against our citizens rather than to protect them. 5. Specific support for penalties for wrongdoing and violation of the privacy policy so that the privacy policy can be enforced.</p>
<p>I am in favor of strong privacy rights for all Oakland citizens. I strongly support the "additional recommendations." The DAC policy does not go far enough. I strongly support a citywide privacy policy and a standing privacy committee. I specifically support defining and enacting a surveillance equipment ordinance. Last, I strongly support penalties for wrongdoing. Regards, Thomas Ballantyne 3829 Webster St #1 Oakland, CA 94609</p>
<p>I support and recommend the adoption of the seven recommendations put forth by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. In addition to the seven recommendations, I would like to see the following guidelines included: 1. Strong support for all seven "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. 2. Specific support for a citywide privacy policy which could be used for this and future projects. 3. Specific support for a standing privacy committee which could propose additional recommendations and observe how the privacy policy is actually implemented. 4. Specific support for a surveillance equipment ordinance, which would prevent purchase of equipment which will ultimately used against our citizens rather than to protect them. 5. Specific support for penalties for wrongdoing and violation of the privacy policy so that the privacy policy can be enforced.</p>
<p>I fully agree with and support the Ad Hoc Committee's seven additional recommendations. Without these I feel the Privacy Policy would not be effective. Additionally, I would like to see a citywide privacy policy which could be used for this and future projects. I would like a standing privacy committee which could propose additional recommendations and observe how the privacy policy is actually implemented. I would like a surveillance equipment ordinance, which would prevent purchase of equipment which will ultimately used against our citizens rather than to protect them. I would like to see penalties for wrongdoing and violation of the privacy policy so that the privacy policy can be enforced.</p>
<p>I strongly support all the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. Additionally, I support a citywide privacy policy and a standing privacy committee. And I support a surveillance equipment ordinance, as well as penalties for wrongdoing. The already-precarious relationship between Oakland citizens and OPD will only be exacerbated by this spy center, and OPD doesn't need to incur the liability of a distrusting citizenry, and the City of Oakland can't afford the inevitable onslaught of civil rights lawsuits by DAC's true target--protestors! Thank you for considering my opinion.</p>
<p>I support the Advisory Committee recommendations, and offer strong support for all the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope</p>
<p>Hello, I am a small business owner and resident in Oakland, and I strongly support all of the additional recommendations from the Advisory Committee. My business is in the data collection sector, and we disclose all of our methods of data collection and how we use the data. The city should do the the same. We must have a citywide privacy policy, privacy oversight committee, and stiff penalties for abusing data collected by the city. Additionally, mass surveillance equipment used by law enforcement should be considered illegal without a warrant. Data collection is very easy nowadays. However, we must be careful how we use that power. Having a strong privacy policy infrastructure and stopping the use of warrantless surveillance is a great step towards preserving the rule of law.</p>
<p>I strongly and unequivocally support the Privacy Committee's work. In particular, their recommendations for creating a city-wide privacy policy and a surveillance equipment ordinance are imperative in the world of ubiquitous governmental surveillance we have come to know that we live in. The people have a right to privacy, enshrined in the California Constitution but honored mostly in breach. The people have a right to be told of and make informed decisions about surveillance equipment. The City Council has an obligation to protect the civil liberties of its residents. Oakland can</p>

<p>take important steps in this regard by enacting the Privacy Committee's recommendations in full. To be effective, to protect our rights, these provisions must have teeth - no one should be allowed to abuse these technologies and data for personal gain or in an effort to do an end-run around constitutional protections without knowing there is significant possibility of consequences. Destroying someone's life with information is no less consequential that impairing them by physical injury. Insofar as the DAC itself is concerned, it should never be brought online. It is neither desired, not needed, as the Port's refusal to fund it clearly illustrates. There are far better things to do to benefit Oakland with the money otherwise needed to operate and maintain it.</p>
<p>I strongly support all the additional recommendations, specifically that the privacy policy should be citywide, have a standing privacy committee, include a surveillance equipment ordinance with funding for oversight and enforcement. There must be penalties for wrongdoing; whenever a surveillance system is built, there will be abuse. The question is whether it's going to be discovered and remediated. Thank you for your concern.</p>
<p>1. I strongly support all of the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than the DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. 2. I specifically support a citywide privacy policy. 3. I specifically support a standing privacy committee. 4. I specifically support a surveillance equipment ordinance. 5. I specifically support penalties for wrongdoing. 6. The overall process of public involvement at the beginning, and transparency throughout, are also urgently needed.</p>
<p>1. I support all the "Additional Recommendations." 2. I support a citywide privacy policy. 3. I support a standing privacy committee. 4. I support a surveillance equipment ordinance. We must reverse our galloping course into Stasi world. 5. I support penalties for wrongdoing. Without them, there is no deterrence and will be abuse - as there is currently. I thank the Committee for its long, hard work. Susan Harman, Ed.D. Bay Area Civil Liberties Coalition CodePink Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club</p>
<p>I strongly support all the "Additional Recommendations." These will have far more impact than DAC Policy, which is too narrow in scope. I urge a citywide privacy policy. I believe there should be a standing privacy committee. There should be a surveillance equipment ordinance. There must be penalties for wrongdoing. If not, it gives carte blanche for all manner of corrupt and illegal behavior by those within the system.</p>
<p>I write to express strong support for a surveillance equipment ordinance. I agree with all the "Additional Recommendations" and their appropriate scope. I also strongly support a citywide privacy policy and a standing privacy committee. It also necessary to have penalties for wrongdoing. Overall, I believe it is essential to involve the public at the beginning of these processes and to maintain transparency throughout.</p>
<p>Dear Oakland City Council, I strongly support all the Additional Recommendations. I strongly support the city wide Privacy Policy. It is essential that it cover the whole city because it supports accountability. It is essential to have a standing committee on privacy to maintain citizen input on this critical issue. I support the surveillance equipment ordinance and penalties for wrongdoing. Regards, Kaliya, Identity Woman Independent Advocate for the Rights and Dignity of our Digital Selves.</p>
<p>I strongly support the recommendations of the DAC Advisory Committee. Although the DAC offers significant additional capability for the security of the Port of Oakland, it also creates numerous risks of violation of the civil rights of Oakland residents and visitors, in particular those related to the Fourth Amendment to the US Constitution. It should be assumed that these violations will occur unless prevented, given the recent history of similarly powerful data-gathering programs in other jurisdictions and at the national level. I urge the City of Oakland to adopt all of the Committee's additional recommendations as well as its proposed policy; they will offer meaningful protection against the civil-rights risks that come with the security capabilities of the DAC. Recommendation 3 in particular, which would make violation of the Policy a misdemeanor, is an important step to ensure that these protections are effective.</p>
<p>If people view this as "too creepy", less people will want to spend time in Oakland.</p>
<p>Restore the Fourth strongly supports the recommendations of the DAC Ad Hoc privacy committee. We especially support the adoption of strong penalties for wrong doing and whistleblower protections. We have seen in other communities like Seattle that strong privacy ordinances are ignored if no penalties are applied for ignoring them. The surveillance technologies being contemplated as part of the DAC and related technologies are just the tip of the iceberg in terms of what will be available to law</p>

<p>enforcement in the near future. Oakland should lead the way in preserving the 1st Amendment rights essential to a free society from mass surveillance.</p>
<p>Please do not open the DAC. It is too intrusive and expensive. I would rather my taxpayer dollars be spent on opening libraries, fixing the streets, and providing services to youth and the poor. Please stop spying on us. Enough is enough. If you do open the DAC, please implement all of the suggestions made by this thoughtful committee. The public needs a say and oversight on mass surveillance.</p>
<p>Sounds okay, we want independent oversight over the program with plenty of input from the citizens. IMO: Many people are ignoring the dangers the city and port face because of the empowering of technology available at low cost to the individual and a turbulent international environment. Unlike many US cities, Oakland is a coastal city and that presents us with unique security challenges. The port of Oakland can help provide prosperity to California and this region. Prudent security will help us to compete among many nations, and security threats. We do not need to give up our liberty to protect our city.</p>
<p>I fully support having this privacy policy for the DAC. I believe any surveillance equipment installed by the city of Oakland should have to follow this policy or something similar. I think Shotspotter, LPR, and stingrays are far too intrusive to be given a 'free' ride.</p>