



MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY MEMORANDUM

No. AM 195-2023

Meeting Date: March 21, 2023

1 **From:** Assembly Members Joey Sweet, Felix Rivera and Daniel Volland

2
3 **Subject:** AN ORDINANCE OF THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY AMENDING
4 ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 3.102, *MUNICIPAL*
5 *USE OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES*, TO BAN THE
6 *ACQUISITION, USE, OR ACCESSING OF FACIAL RECOGNITION*
7 *TECHNOLOGY WITH LIMITED EXCEPTIONS, AND TO*
8 *REORGANIZE THE CHAPTER.*
9

10 Facial recognition surveillance technology is gaining popularity across the country
11 and its use becoming more and more pervasive with law enforcement.
12 Unfortunately, oversight on the federal and state levels is lagging as no real
13 regulatory framework has been developed to address the harmful effects of the
14 technology. The Municipality of Anchorage does not yet possess or use any facial
15 recognition technology, other than the common features on mobile devices for
16 unlocking by the user, nor does it currently have any policies regarding the
17 technology, making now the best time to be proactive and adopt responsible,
18 comprehensive legislation like this proposed ordinance.
19

20 This ordinance accomplishes two main objectives: (1) it prohibits the Municipality
21 from acquiring and using facial recognition technology, with narrow exceptions; and
22 (2) it creates an enforcement mechanism that allows for discipline against municipal
23 employees found violating the ordinance and assesses liability against the
24 municipality for such misuse. This latter tool is by creation of
25 a private cause of action allowing persons subjected to facial recognition
26 surveillance to seek relief in Superior Court and establishes presumptive amounts
27 for damages.
28

29 Facial recognition surveillance technology works by mapping individual faces
30 gathered through surveillance technology and compares faces to available
31 databases such as driver's licenses, mug shots, etc. However, the technology is
32 notoriously unreliable as it does not always accurately recognize faces, and use of
33 the technology is an area ripe for abuse.¹ In particular, it has the lowest ability to
34 recognize the faces of people of color and women. According to a report by the
35 National Institute of Standards and Technology following its testing of face
36 recognition algorithms used by developers around the globe, the technology
37 disproportionately affects people of color by mis-identifying people of color most
38 frequently out of all demographics.² Even more jarring, technology users can lower

¹ See DeGeurin, Mack, "The FBI Tested Facial Recognition Software on Americans for Years, New Documents Show," Gizmodo, March 7, 2023 (<https://gizmodo.com/fbi-facial-recognition-janus-horus-1850198100> accessed March 9, 2023).

² Bushwick, Sophie, "How NIST Tested Facial Recognition Algorithms for Racial Bias," Scientific American, December 27, 2019 (<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-nist-tested-facial->

1 confidence levels if they do not get matches at higher confidence levels, leading to
2 even lower accuracy for identification.

3
4 The lack of regulation and oversight ensures a lack of transparency from facial
5 recognition companies and providers. The approach of this ordinance is to prohibit
6 municipal departments from contracting with such companies or purchasing their
7 products for use, unless it's an exception approved by the Assembly and codified,
8 or temporarily by resolution, and require transparency by the reporting of these
9 municipal uses.

10
11 Moreover, the technology brings with it pernicious data privacy concerns. Unlike
12 other forms of data, faces cannot be encrypted. Thus, any data breach involving
13 facial recognition data would increase potential for identity theft, stalking, and
14 harassment. While users subjected to other data breaches can change passwords
15 and financial data, people cannot change their faces and unequivocally would not
16 consent to such invasion of their likeness. Beyond the individual desire to maintain
17 personal privacy, the potential for abuse of this technology is limitless and would
18 open the Municipality up to liability if responsible regulation is not implemented now.

19
20 This ordinance is simple, yet comprehensive. It draws from examples of similar local
21 bans enacted by the cities of Portland, Oregon, Oakland, California, and Portland,
22 Maine. It bans the Municipality from acquiring the technology or conducting
23 business with facial recognition companies; it also considers the nature of public
24 safety and has some narrow, limited exceptions for law enforcement such as for
25 partnership with other agencies and use of facial recognition on personal devices.
26 Any exception must be codified, or if time is of essence approved temporarily by
27 resolution.

28
29 **We request your support for the ordinance.**

30
31 Reviewed by: Assembly Counsel's Office

32
33 Respectfully submitted: Joey Sweet, Assembly Member
34 District 5, East Anchorage

35
36 Felix Rivera, Assembly Member
37 District 4, Midtown Anchorage

38
39 Daniel Volland, Assembly Member
40 District 1, North Anchorage