

In addition, below are comments from Susan Pollay on behalf of the DDA:

\* This proposed ordinance is calling security cameras “surveillance” cameras. Don’t the two terms have different meanings? Shouldn’t we delineate the differences between the two types of camera systems?

\* The parking structures are unique, in that they are psychologically viewed by many as very scary places. Because downtown relies on people feeling safe, the parking structures must be included as one of the city-owned sites where security cameras are permitted.

\* Cameras in parking facilities have been used to help the police to identify individuals that have damaged very expensive parking equipment. More importantly, the parking structures are near night clubs and bars with late night drinking (e.g. Necto, Scorekeepers, former Dream Night Club). We have had instances where bar patrons that took their bar fights into the structures resulting in stabbings and more. Having video footage for these crimes would be an important tool to help our police as they do their work with many few officers than we had a decade or more ago.

\* Knowing that a camera is present may also help protect parking attendants who are handling cash. Again, a security reason for having a camera.

\* The outside perimeter definition includes sidewalks outside city facilities but it doesn’t specify alleys. In downtown we have a public alley on one side of all parking structures. And nearly all of these structures have a pedestrian entrance/exit into these alleys. Thus alleys should be included as a perimeter element.

\* Re: the DDA District, I believe that there are residences on nearly every single block of downtown (e.g. upstairs loft apartments & condo’s, as well as the more visible large apartment buildings). Thus it would be nearly impossible to designate a residential neighborhood in downtown.

