1	
2 3	 Councilmember
4 5	Councilmember
6	
7 8	A BILL
9	
10 11	
12	
13	IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
14 15	
16	
17 18	Councilmember(s) introduced the following bill, which was
10 19	referred to the Committee on
20	
21	To prohibit the use of general video surveillance and biometric technology by
22 23	the District of Columbia government.
24	BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
25	That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Anti-Surveillance Act of
26	2002."
27	Sec. 2. Findings.
28	The Council of the District of Columbia finds that:
29	(1) As Justice Louis D. Brandeis wrote, "The right to be let alone [is] the
30	most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized [people]."
31	Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).
32	(2) As the District of Columbia Court of Appeals has stated: "The notion
33	that the individual exists for the good of the state is, of course, quite antithetical
34	to our fundamental thesis that the role of the state is to ensure a maximum of
35	individual freedom of choice and conduct." In re Osbourne, 294 A.2d 372 (D.C.
36	1972).

(3) The right of privacy "protects people, not places," *Katz v. United*States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967). Yet if the growing "power of technology to shrink

the realm of guaranteed privacy" is not controlled by legislation, science will

soon "leave the [citizen's privacy] at the mercy of advancing technology." *Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27 (2001).

- (4) The residents of the District of Columbia, and visitors to our city, have a reasonable expectation that they will not be the subjects of governmental surveillance if they are not engaged in conduct that appears to be unlawful.
- (5) The use of video cameras for general surveillance in public areas significantly diminishes the privacy and liberty that are the hallmarks of a free society.
- (6) General video surveillance in public areas such as streets, sidewalks, parks and plazas provides no significant benefit to public safety.
- (7) The primary purpose of the Metropolitan Police Department is to provide for the safety of District of Columbia residents in their communities. But many District of Columbia neighborhoods suffer from inadequate police presence.
- (8) Public safety will be better served if the resources that would be devoted to general video surveillance are used instead for increased community policing.
- (9) The use of general video surveillance in public areas such as streets, sidewalks, parks and plazas is therefore not warranted given its deleterious effect on individual freedom and its ineffectiveness for public safety purposes.
- (10) The mere presence of general video surveillance cameras in public areas such as streets, sidewalks, parks and plazas has the same deleterious effect, whether or not the cameras are in operation at any given time.

- (11) The use of biometric technology, whereby individuals may be identified by cameras and computers based upon physiological or behavioral characteristics such as the geometry of an individual's face, hands, iris, voice or handwriting, presents a serious threat to individual privacy and liberty.
- (12) The District of Columbia has a long established tradition of protecting the civil rights and civil liberties of its residents and visitors. As the nation's capital, the District of Columbia must be a beacon of freedom, setting an example for the protection of civil rights and civil liberties across the land.
- (13) The use of general video surveillance and biometric technology by the District of Columbia government should therefore be prohibited.
- 11 Sec. 3 Definitions.

- 12 As used in this Act:
  - (a) "Biometric technology" means any automated, photographic method of identifying or recognizing an individual based on physiological or behavioral characteristics, including but not limited to an individual's face, fingerprints, hand geometry, handwriting, iris, retina, vein, or voice.
  - (b) "District of Columbia government" has the same meaning as the term "District Government," as that term is defined in D.C. Official Code § 47-393(5), and additionally includes all persons acting as employees, agents or contractors of the District of Columbia, and all Business Improvement District corporations registered pursuant to the terms of D.C. Official Code Title 2, Chapter 12, Subchapter VIII.
  - (c) "General video surveillance" means the use of remotely-operated cameras to view or record activities occurring in outdoor public areas such as streets, sidewalks, parks and plazas; *provided, however,* that the term "general video surveillance" does not mean (i) the use, if otherwise lawful, of cameras to view or record the suspected criminal activities of specific individuals who are

under surveillance because they are suspected of engaging in, or being about to engage in, a criminal act; (ii) the use, if otherwise lawful, of cameras to monitor the exterior entrances and surfaces of District of Columbia government buildings for security purposes; (iii) the use, if otherwise lawful, of cameras to detect and record motor vehicles violating the traffic laws, when such cameras are activated by such violations and when such cameras are not capable of identifying the occupants of such vehicles; (iv) the use, if otherwise lawful, of cameras at points of traffic congestion for the purpose of real-time traffic control, so long as such cameras are not capable of identifying individuals or license plate numbers; and (v) the use, if otherwise lawful, of cameras installed on police vehicles to record the interactions between police officers and persons stopped or detained.

## Sec. 4. Prohibitions.

- (a) The District of Columbia government is prohibited from conducting or engaging in general video surveillance.
- (b) Within thirty days of the effective date of this Act, all remotely-operated video surveillance devices that have already been deployed by the District of Columbia government for the purpose of conducting general video surveillance shall be removed.
- (c) The District of Columbia government is prohibited from obtaining access to the live video surveillance feeds of other public or private entities, provided, however, that the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department may obtain access to the live video surveillance feed of another entity when (i) that entity's operation of the surveillance camera is itself lawful; (ii) the camera operated by such entity would be lawful if operated by the District of Columbia government; and (ii) the video feed will provide images of exigent

- circumstances threatening the life or safety of individuals in the District of Columbia.
  - (d) The District of Columbia government is prohibited from obtaining access to video surveillance recordings from other public or private entities except pursuant to a lawfully-obtained search warrant, subpoena or court order.
  - (e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the District of Columbia government is prohibited from conducting or engaging in video surveillance of individuals or groups engaged in expressive public events such as demonstrations, rallies, marches, picketing or handbilling.
  - (f) The District of Columbia government is prohibited from using biometric technology.
  - Sec. 5. Reporting requirements.

- (a) Any employee, agent or contractor of the District of Columbia government who has knowledge of facts that may constitute a violation of this Act shall report them in writing to the head of his or her agency or to the Inspector General of the District of Columbia within seven days of acquiring such knowledge. The Mayor shall take appropriate action to inform District of Columbia employees, agents and contractors of their obligations under this Act.
- (b) Within thirty days of receiving such a report, or of otherwise becoming aware of facts that may constitute a violation of this Act, the Inspector General and the head of any District of Columbia agency shall submit a written report to the Mayor and the Council setting forth the results or status of any investigation that has been conducted and the results or status of any disciplinary action that has been taken or proposed. If an investigation or disciplinary proceeding is open at the time of such report, follow-up reports shall be submitted every sixty days until any investigation or disciplinary proceeding is concluded. All such

- 1 reports shall become public documents upon the conclusion of any
- 2 investigation or disciplinary proceeding.
- 3 Sec. 6. Penalties.

- (a) Any employee, agent or contractor of the District of Columbia government who (i) violates this act, or (ii) causes another person to violate this act, or (iii) has knowledge of facts that may constitute a violation of this Act and fails to report them to the head of his or her agency or to the Inspector General of the District of Columbia within seven days of acquiring such knowledge, shall be
- subject to appropriate disciplinary action including dismissal and shall be
   subject to an administrative fine not to exceed \$5,000.
  - (b) Any employee, agent or contractor of the District of Columbia government who (i) violates this act, or (ii) causes another person to violate this act, or (iii) has knowledge of facts that may constitute a violation of this Act and fails to report them to the head of his or her agency or to the Inspector General of the District of Columbia within seven days of acquiring such knowledge, shall be guilty of the crime of video spying and shall be imprisoned for not more than five years and fined not more than \$50,000.
    - Sec. 7. Private cause of action.
  - Any person adversely affected by a violation of this Act may bring an action in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for declaratory and injunctive relief and for damages. The court may award reasonable attorneys fees to such a person who is a prevailing party in such an action.
    - Sec. 8. Fiscal impact statement.
  - The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement in the committee report as the fiscal impact statement required by section 602 (c)(3) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(3)).

1 Sec. 9. Effective dates.

(a) This Act, except for section 5(b) thereof, shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of a veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto), a 30-day period of Congressional review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)), and publication in the District of Columbia Register.

(b) Section 5(b) of this Act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of a veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto), a 60-day period of Congressional review as provided in section 602(c)(2) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(2)), and publication in the District of Columbia Register.