Dear Future of Privacy Forum,

I appreciate that you are fielding public comments regarding consent and collection of public derived data.

I have written blog post covering most of what I wish to present on the matter of Smart Cities environments; which can be found here. https://www.sheilamdean.com/blog/2016/10/3/really-smart-cities-regard-federal-rules-for-privacy

I think the most important contribution to Smart Cities Open Data development is the wellbeing and treatment of persons who have mental health issues, whom are homeless or who are in one way or another incapable of providing means of legal consent to collection and machine learned data processing of wireless data via IoT devices. The City of Seattle may have a constituency who leans against individual preferences, toward an aggressive total State assumption of municipal data from consumers on the loosely presumed presence of being either a traveller in their fair City or running across cameras. American citizens deserve as much, if not more local agency, than people who are foreign patrons of City environments when it comes to permissions with data collection. If they do not want their personal data scooped up and processed in a legal or technical experiment, audit provisions and processes need to be introduced pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 to protect people of this area.

I am aware of instances where local authorities feel prone to dismiss priovacy terms of local consumers. One such instance is the local camera system.

We need to put audit and consent controls in place for Cities to be legally compliant with local and federal laws. They should aim to provide more privacy because of their deep investment in federal infrastructure. More accountability is need. King County has an opportunity here to improve privacy in their processes. If this comment aids in that process, I hope my time is well spent.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dean