

From: [Karen Miller](#)
To: [Lara Weisiger](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] License Plate Readers
Date: Thursday, September 23, 2021 6:06:07 PM

Dear Mayor and Council,

We are in favor of installing license plate readers in Alameda. This has been discussed over and over and the time is now.

Regards,

Karen and Keith Miller



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

From: [Lorin Laiacona Salem](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] for 9/20 meeting: license plate readers
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 9:32:21 PM

Mme. Mayor and Council,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any reconsideration of allowing Alameda's Police Department to install License Plate Readers anywhere in the city, even those not utilizing a third party operator to store the data. In my opinion, the April 2021 Buzzfeed article contained ample evidence that the APD cannot be trusted to properly use technology that invades citizens' privacy. I urge you to continue the principled stance you took in the past and reject any calls to authorize this intrusive technology.

Thank you,
Lorin Salem
Resident

From: [Marilyn Rothman](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] License Plate Readers
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 4:25:11 PM

I strongly oppose this installation, as there is ample evidence to be concerned that the system be used to the dangerous detriment of private citizens, especially as shown by historical and ongoing APD misuse of technology and force.

Thank you,
Marilyn Rothman
Alameda homeowner

From: [David Greene](#)
To: [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#)
Cc: [Nishant Joshi](#); [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); alamedanews@bayareanewsgroup.com; editor@alamedasun.com
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] City Council Priorities - LPRs (July 20, 2019, Item 2021-998)
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:19:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Council member Knox White and all,

Look at the attached link. The net of this is that some city councils are seeing how cheap it is to do their own research where it matters most – their own community. \$100k/yr to operate and store data for 36 cameras. Why not give it a shot? What does an officer cost per year (training/equipment/salary/benefits+pension)? And it's no secret LEO recruitment is more difficult today and compounded by the cost of living in Alameda. Do it for a couple of years and see what the result is. Why not? I know the council originally set aside \$500k for this, things would seem much more attainable now. It's a low dollar and potentially high return scenario. If considered not effective here in Alameda, nix the effort after a trial period. The equipment is leased. Is staff not seeing the opportunity here to bring to Council's consideration?

Alameda's own police dept was asking for it (don't know if they are done hitting their head against the wall on the topic with council). I have had a few discussions with APD officers and have done a ride-a-long over the past three years. One question I ask in each instance is how can the citizens better support making Alameda safer? In two of these discussions, LPRs came up as the first thing mentioned without prompt. In other discussions, LPRs were responded to with high support. The geography of Alameda as an island being so unique it would appear as having higher potential success in Alameda (compared to the potential value other cities already see).

<https://www.govtech.com/public-safety/license-plate-reader-cameras-virtually-gate-california-city.html>

Sincerely,
Dave Greene

On Tue, Jul 20, 2021 at 8:52 PM David Greene <writedg@gmail.com> wrote:

To Tony, and Trish:

Prior to the last election, I contacted both of you regarding your support on LPRs. Both of you replied in support. This said, I do recognize the fact there is an overall priority setting that needs to take place in any organization.

When I read the below from JKW, I see an approach of Council kicking-a-can-down-the-road. The best way to stall any project is to say it's being "further studied". It's even better to tie-up an initiative if you can throw in extraneous subject matter (i.e. speed cameras). This "study" work began in (and likely prior to) 2018 - when the Chief of Police Roller

RE: 10-B
9-21-2021

provided a report in Feb of that year. Three (plus) years later, and the below is all we have to show for it.

My question to all three of you: Punting to March of 2022 is going to materially provide... what? What exactly has staff been asked to flesh-out that hasn't already been found and that is believed to be decision making information not uncovered to date?

Thanks for the reply Councilmember Knox White.

Discouraged Citizen,
David Greene

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **John Knox White** <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>

Date: Tue, Jul 20, 2021 at 3:39 PM

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] City Council Priorities - LPRs (July 20, 2019, Item 2021-998)

To: David Greene <writedg@gmail.com>

Thank you for your email.

In March, I joined my colleagues Councilmembers Herrera Spencer and Daysog in directing staff to add this issue to our list of public safety/enforcement actions. This action included direction to treat the issue as a lower priority than the other, more broadly supported issues that moved forward at that meeting.

In reporting on progress/timelines on all of the items that Council directed in March, staff provided an update at our June 15/July 6 meetings and the council accepted it without comment or further direction. Here is the update on ALPR:

- Present a Staff Report for City Council to Consider Automatic License Plate Readers (and Speed Cameras) - Some work has already been done to evaluate the efficacy of ALPR systems. Staff is prepared to finalize that work and present a report to the City Council, but suggesting a 2022 timeframe, since the City Council discussion included a note to de-prioritize this effort, relative to others. Finally, speed cameras are not legal at this time in California, but could be further evaluated if that technology becomes a viable option.
 - Budget request - N/A (existing resources can be used)
 - Schedule - March 2022
 - Staffing - PD, CMO, Planning Building and Transportation, CAO
 - Intended outcome - Provide a policy perspective on ALPR (and possibly speed camera) efficacy so Council can provide policy direction to staff. If the City Council does wish to proceed, the new program would have to be budgeted.

This is consistent with recent council direction and as the timeline was literally just presented, I see no need to re-discuss the issue again.

I am extremely interested in any studies or reports that you might have seen that indicate efficacy ALPR programs, I have so far been unsuccessful in finding any and a review of crime rates in neighboring cities that have installed them doesn't suggest that they reduce incidents of crime. For this reason, the council's direction (back in March) was for well-researched information/studies to accompany the item so that our council and community can have an informed discussion before moving forward on a new, expensive technology.

If you have seen any studies that show ALPRs to be effective in reducing crime rates, I would be interested in seeing them and I think that they would go a great way in informing this discussion and issue.

Best,

John Knox White

City Councilmember, Alameda

(he/him/they/them)

From: David Greene <writedg@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2021 12:48 PM
To: Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft <MEzzyAshcraft@alamedaca.gov>; Malia Vella <MVella@alamedaca.gov>; Tony Daysog <TDaysog@alamedaca.gov>; Trish Spencer <tspencer@alamedaca.gov>; John Knox White <JknoxWhite@alamedaca.gov>
Cc: Nishant Joshi <njoshi@alamedaca.gov>; City Clerk <CLERK@alamedaca.gov>; Manager Manager <MANAGER@alamedaca.gov>; alamedanews@bayareanewsgroup.com; editor@alamedasun.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Priorities - LPRs (July 20, 2019, Item 2021-998)

Dear City Council,

With respect to all council members, please be reminded of the stated priorities outlined for the council by council (per city website):

- Preparing Alameda for the Future
- Protecting Core Services
- Supporting Enhanced Livability and Quality of Life
- Encouraging Economic Development Across the Island
- Ensuring Effective and Efficient Operations

Also, please be reminded the topic of License Plate Readers (LPRs) at ingress and egress points to the island was presented by the chief of police on June 19th of 2018 and the city manager was to bring further information back to council on Sept 4th of that year. This didn't happen. No substantive discussion leading to action has happened since, and it is further noted this item has been set for tabling but has been skipped over in both June and earlier this month.

In Feb of 2018, before all the above, the Alameda Chief of Police informed council the Piedmont Police Department saw a 37-38% drop in property crime since the installation of their city's cameras. Wouldn't it have been great if Alameda City Council would have acted in favor of all of its citizens? Afterall, LPR's check all the council priorities.

What is the hold up? The citizens of Alameda are feeling less and less safe in our own neighborhoods with crime statistics to back up these insecurities. And there is a very reasonable, cost effective, and readily available solution sitting in front of us in LPRs to be

uniquely effective given the geography of living on an island. Why the inaction?

Consider:

1. We already have Police Department Policy 462 which outlines use of LPR's that already exist in approx. 12 patrol cars today. It is a policy in line with the use of LPRs across many law enforcement organizations. It is not like we are breaking new ground here. Alameda only needs extension of current policy to stationary locations.
2. In a time when Alameda is considering alternatives to utilizing Police, we should seek to make them more efficient and effective at their core functions to better make use of all city resources. By recent measures, Police staffing is down. Why not see this, recognize recruitment difficulties, and be proactive to better extend what we have? The cost of the camera system and its ROI is well below that of equivalent staffing and legacy pension costs.

The arguments against LPRs have been heard. If one is to believe and favor the arguments against LPRs, then it also must be believed there is absolutely no regard for contractual requirements in our country. You also must believe that all your other data (credit cards, cell phones, atm withdrawals, banking data, investment data, social media postings, crime scene investigations and evidence, etc.) are immaterial to pulling together the larger case against people doing bad things. You have to not recognize that, in addition to anyone passing a car sitting in a driveway, 1,000's of DMV employees and other state and private sector actors have access to vehicle registration and license information. You have to also believe rhetoric that places those who may have broken the laws we as a society have enacted above those who haven't. These positions simply do not offset the benefits of LPRs.

I feel less safe today in Alameda than in any of the previous 19 years of my residency. I have seen published statistics that support these feelings as not being counter to reality. LPRs are not a magic solution. They are an effective strategic tool toward improving the safety of me and my neighbors.

Let's move on installing ingress/egress LPRs. The bad guys will know they are there and be less likely to come here to practice their craft. The good guys will know the city is taking action to protect their law abiding taxpayers.

Sincerely,

Dave

David Greene

Sand Hook Isle, Alameda, CA

c. 510-919-5024

--

David Greene

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/davidgreene/>

Home Office: 510-814-8961 (try first, note line is not text capable)

c. 510-919-5024

--

David Greene

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/davidgreene/>

Home Office: 510-814-8961 (try first, note line is not text capable)

c. 510-919-5024

--

David Greene

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/davidgreene/>

Home Office: 510-814-8961 (try first, note line is not text capable)

c. 510-919-5024

From: [Rob Halford](#)
To: [Malia Vella](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [John Knox White](#)
Cc: [Manager Manager](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support of License Plate Readers in Alameda
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 2:51:01 PM

Dear Members of the City Council,

I am writing to add my support to the many Alamedans asking that the necessary steps be made to implement, with expediency, license plate readers at all points of ingress and egress in our town. This can be a valuable tool to our crime-fighting efforts in an environment in which many types of crime are becoming more prevalent.

It's important that criminals, both in Alameda and in surrounding communities, understand that Alameda is not an easy target due to an under-equipped police force. The more likely they are to experience consequences for malign behavior, the better the chance they will opt against committing these offenses against Alamedans.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Rob Halford

From: [Kris Motola](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#); [City Clerk](#); [Eric Levitt](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] License Plate Readers
Date: Monday, July 19, 2021 4:35:20 PM

Councilmembers,

I am writing as an Alamedan concerned with the substantial decrease in public safety, whether real or perceived. I am aware that certain officials state that crime is down and that social media amplifies certain crimes but having lived here longer than 8 years I cannot remember so many shootings, violent and armed robberies as well as general lawlessness from shoplifting to hazardous driving. The bottom line is that many people feel that a lot of the sense of security going to Southshore or the bank is seriously eroded as we read story after story of increasingly violent crimes against Alameda residents.

While not all crime is from non-Alamedans we believe a significant portion is (and have requested but not received a breakdown of demographics, include city of residence, of those arrested for crimes committed in Alameda). Alameda is fortunate for many things and one of them is that our geography is uniquely suited for license plate readers. LPRs have been adopted by multiple bay area cities and they have reported immediate success, so much so that some such as Piedmont have been aggressively expanding their LPR network. Given the number of crimes committed in stolen cars, LPRs would immediately alert APD to a stolen car entering Alameda and have a headstart on preventing crime and not just responding after the fact.

I understand people's security concerns but APD has has LPRs on patrol cars for years without incident (that I am aware of). The same successful policies could be carried over to stationary LPRs.

The city council tentatively approved them a few years ago but the project stalled. We implore the city council to move ahead with installing LPRs on the bridges and tube, at least on a probationary basis for a year to see what the results are.

Thank you for your time,
Kris Motola

From: [David Greene](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Malia Vella](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Trish Spencer](#); [John Knox White](#)
Cc: [Nishant Joshi](#); [City Clerk](#); [Manager Manager](#); alamedanews@bayareanewsgroup.com; editor@alamedasun.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] City Council Priorities - LPRs (July 20, 2019, Item 2021-998)
Date: Sunday, July 18, 2021 12:47:59 PM

Dear City Council,

With respect to all council members, please be reminded of the stated priorities outlined for the council by council (per city website):

- Preparing Alameda for the Future
- Protecting Core Services
- Supporting Enhanced Livability and Quality of Life
- Encouraging Economic Development Across the Island
- Ensuring Effective and Efficient Operations

Also, please be reminded the topic of License Plate Readers (LPRs) at ingress and egress points to the island was presented by the chief of police on June 19th of 2018 and the city manager was to bring further information back to council on Sept 4th of that year. This didn't happen. No substantive discussion leading to action has happened since, and it is further noted this item has been set for tabling but has been skipped over in both June and earlier this month.

In Feb of 2018, before all the above, the Alameda Chief of Police informed council the Piedmont Police Department saw a 37-38% drop in property crime since the installation of their city's cameras. Wouldn't it have been great if Alameda City Council would have acted in favor of all of its citizens? Afterall, LPR's check all the council priorities.

What is the hold up? The citizens of Alameda are feeling less and less safe in our own neighborhoods with crime statistics to back up these insecurities. And there is a very reasonable, cost effective, and readily available solution sitting in front of us in LPRs to be uniquely effective given the geography of living on an island. Why the inaction?

Consider:

1. We already have Police Department Policy 462 which outlines use of LPR's that already exist in approx. 12 patrol cars today. It is a policy in line with the use of LPRs across many law enforcement organizations. It is not like we are breaking new ground here. Alameda only needs extension of current policy to stationary locations.
2. In a time when Alameda is considering alternatives to utilizing Police, we should seek to make them more efficient and effective at their core functions to better make use of all city resources. By recent measures, Police staffing is down. Why not see this, recognize recruitment difficulties, and be proactive to better extend what we have? The cost of the camera system and its ROI is well below that of equivalent staffing and legacy pension costs.

The arguments against LPRs have been heard. If one is to believe and favor the arguments against LPRs, then it also must be believed there is absolutely no regard for contractual requirements in our country. You also must believe that all your other data (credit cards, cell phones, atm withdrawals, banking data, investment data, social media postings, crime scene investigations and evidence, etc.) are immaterial to pulling together the larger case against people doing bad things. You have to not recognize that, in addition to anyone passing a car sitting in a driveway, 1,000's of DMV employees and other state and private sector actors have access to vehicle registration and license information. You have to also believe rhetoric that places those who may have broken the laws we as a society have enacted above those who haven't. These positions simply do not offset the benefits of LPRs.

I feel less safe today in Alameda than in any of the previous 19 years of my residency. I have seen published statistics that support these feelings as not being counter to reality. LPRs are not a magic solution. They are an effective strategic tool toward improving the safety of me and my neighbors.

Let's move on installing ingress/egress LPRs. The bad guys will know they are there and be less likely to come here to practice their craft. The good guys will know the city is taking action to protect their law abiding taxpayers.

Sincerely,
Dave

David Greene
Sand Hook Isle, Alameda, CA
c. 510-919-5024