



## **PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE**

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, on matters listed on the agenda please email [PublicComment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PublicComment@losaltosca.gov)

**From:** [Pat Marriot](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External Sender]PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM #9 MAY 9, 2023  
**Date:** Sunday, May 7, 2023 9:56:56 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Council Members,

Just passing on some ALPR analysis from friends in Palo Alto. My main concern is privacy.

The city should clearly define who can access the data, what will be collected, how long data will be retained, safeguards for data protection, whether non-city entities can access, and what compliance procedures will be used.

LAPD should not provide direct online access or bulk transfer of data from license plate readers to any other agencies.

Here's the info from Palo Alto:

The California State Auditor conducted an audit of ALPR data collected by the Fresno Police Department, Los Angeles Police Department, Marin County Sheriff's Office, and Sacramento County Sheriff's Office. The audit found

- None of the agencies fully implemented the practices required by law since 2016 in Senate Bill 34, which includes training of personnel on use of the system and restrictions on transfer of ALPR data,
- Fresno, Marin and Sacramento all were unable to confirm who has access to the system, who is responsible for oversight, or how to delete ALPR data.
- Los Angeles PD did not even have a usage or privacy policy and the other agencies ones did not implement all the legally mandated requirements
- Sacramento shares their ALPR data with one thousand agencies.
- In Marin, a former employee retained access to the ALPR for over a year after resigning.
- Marin was also forced to settle a lawsuit with three residents who alleged the Sheriff was sharing data with federal, state and local agencies in violation of SB34.
- Milpitas does not keep track of who accesses their ALPR database.
- Daly City shares its data via an MOU with fusion center and 15 northern California

counties with no clear limit on what it can be used for.

- Pasadena, Long Beach and BART all shared their data with ICE despite all saying they would not.

Senator Weiner proposed SB 210 in 2021, a bill that would have required deleting all license plate data not related to an investigation after one day. The bill did not pass the senate. But license plate information of citizens who are not on the state or city's vehicle stop list or currently under investigation should not be retained by the city for more than one day and should not be shared with other agencies or commercial entities.

For some background information you can read:

CA State Auditor: <https://www.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2019-118/summary.html>

Independent ALPR Privacy Report:

<https://www.independent.org/publications/article.asp?id=14254>

Pat Marriott

**From:** [Jeanine Valadez](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [Angel Rodriguez](#); [Neysa Fligor](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT AGENDA ITEM #8 5/9/2023  
**Date:** Monday, May 8, 2023 2:02:37 PM

---

Mayor Meadows, City Councilmembers,

I stand firmly against the proposed ALPR pilot.

While ALPRs have been shown to identify stolen vehicles, there are no comprehensive data to prove they reduce crime clearance rates in general and definitely not specifically for property crime and burglary. It is very easy for even semi-sophisticated criminals to sidestep this surveillance method. Natural causes for mistaken license plate number ID by ALPRs are well documented...entire mini industries are emerging to enable obfuscation of the license plate.

Significantly, the staff report does nothing to provide more data to support the prior assertions by FLOCK and Staff, nor does it in any way provide the data requested by city council in earlier meetings. In fact, it drops quantitative metrics for success of the proposed pilot altogether!

This pilot wastes city money, gives residents a false sense of safety, and, because of Staff's evident lack of concern for performance metrics, sets the stage for ongoing expansion of more invasive and intense surveillance methods.

Jeanine Valadez

member of parks and rec commission but speaking as member of the public.