

#### Item 4 – Update from Public Safety Camera Subcommittee Correspondence Received from Garrett Keating

Hello Public Safety Committee:

Below is an email I addressed to Chris Houlder and Chief Bowers of the Camera Subcommittee.

Chris and Chief Bowers,

The Chief's presentation at the community meeting last week raised some questions for me that I hope you can address in your discussions. I have not been able to obtain a copy of the presentation so I am going off my notes.

LPR statistics: since 2014 the LPRs have generated the following results:

- An average of 6538 plate hits per year.
- Over 100 leads in cases
- 118 arrested suspects
- 183 stolen/wanted vehicles recovered.

Assuming that a plate hit is a wanted vehicle, why so few results given the large number of hits? Is one factor that PD is not in the vicinity and cannot respond in time? What is done with the hit data – stored, shared with other agencies, traced to an owner (if stolen) or to the registered owner (if a warrant or ticket is out for the owner)? What percentage of total annual hits occur in the six LPR locations associated with the proposed public safety cameras (PSC)? Of those 6 locations, is it possible to apportion the hits to specific LRR cameras. The "heat" map seemed to indicate this was possible.

LPR Countermeasures: the Chief mentioned anecdotal examples of this but is there a real measure of how often this occurs? For example, is there a declining trend in the LPR data? In particular, does LPR data for the six cameras correlate with the number of crimes in that part of Piedmont? I recall that there are (or were) neighborhood districts on the crime map. Do you have the crime data reported by district?

Leveraged private security cameras: The Chief went through three recent crimes in Piedmont in which the private cameras seemed instrumental to the effectiveness of the LPR and PSC in two cases. The Oakland Ave phone "snatch" seems to have been totally resolved with images from the PSC – was the car plate determined from this camera? Private cameras played no role. In the two home invasions, the Chief mentioned that footage from private security cameras at the homes was used to provide identifying features of the vehicle which were then used to match similar characteristics on either the PSC (Scenic) or LPR (Scenic and Lorita) which lead to plate identification. As I understand the Chief's description, criminals drove into Piedmont, did not trip the LPR, committed the crime and were captured on a private security camera at the scene of the crime. That private footage was uploaded, viewed by a detective who then matched it with footage from the LPR and/or PSC to obtain plate information. How many cases have there been where footage from private cameras was used in

Item 4 – Update from Public Safety Camera Subcommittee Correspondence Received from Garrett Keating

conjunction with the PSC and/or LPR? Has the PSC been used to identify a vehicle associated with a crime which was subsequently identified by looking for it on the LPR?

These last questions I think are important to evaluate the location of PSC throughout Piedmont. The location of PSC with the LPR in Piedmont's highest crime neighborhood seems logical but is it redundant? A PSC network throughout that area of Piedmont will provide better surveillance for thefts that happen with the field of coverage – the phone snatch or car-breakins. Likewise, PSC can be used to obtain identifying features of cars in the vicinity of a crime and those features can then be used to identify the car on the LPR. Can PSC and LPR be used this way – to do a “blanket” check of all cars in the vicinity of a crime? If so, then the existing LPR may provide sufficient footage for review with just the addition of a few PSC (3) to augment that footage. If the remaining 3 PSC were disbursed around town, they could provide similar footage to augment LPR searches for crimes that occur in other parts of Piedmont.

It seems to me that private security footage was essential to PSC being a factor in solving the home invasion cases. Is that your interpretation?. If so, then PSC dispersed more around town may provide better retrospective footage for all crime in Piedmont. Finally, have you given any thought that such a concentrated network of cameras (and its absence in other parts of Piedmont) might shift crime?

Happy to discuss if you like. Garrett