

Entrance Video Camera Decision Paper / Recommendation

1. Introduction. The Saddle Club Neighborhood (SCN) is a regular target for property theft, often accompanied by property damage, and has been for some time. Incidents range from someone simply rummaging thru an unlocked vehicle to breaking windows and entering the automobiles. Additionally, thieves have absconded with expensive yard equipment. Most alarmingly, one morning a young child getting ready to enter their parent's car to go to school found a thief already in the vehicle. These acts represent a clear and present danger to the security of our neighborhood and the safety of our children.

a. Problem Statement. Law enforcement needs actionable intelligence to pursue and build a case against the perpetrators. Currently, the SCN has no system or technology in place to provide the necessary evidence and, thus, the crimes continue to occur unabated. Even residents who have not been burglarized are affected by lower property values or the decreased ability to sell their home altogether due, in part, to these continued illicit activities. Home security systems play a part in the information management solution but are limited in scope and

b. Recommendation. Install License Plate Reading Cameras (LPRCs) combined with an associated technology that manages the collected information in such a manner that it is highly accurate, searchable, and secure.

2. Body.

a. Facts. Statistically, 82% of non-violent crimes in the United States go unsolved and approximately 70% of non-violent crime is conducted with the use of a vehicle. Law enforcement resources are limited and low police presence dictates that residence shoulder some measure of burden for providing prosecutable evidence if laws are to be enforced to the maximum potential.

b. Assumptions. Any attempt at addressing crime must be multifaceted, there is no one answer to the problem. While it is possible that these offenses are being by conducted by individuals on foot only, using no vehicle, statistics heavily suggest that a successful security program must address the vehicular component.

c. Solutions.

COA 1. Maintain the current status.

COA 2. Install a system owned and managed by the SCN HOA.

COA 3. Install a system owned, monitored and maintained by a service provider while maintaining ownership and control of collected information.

d. Analysis. Practical, timely and affordable information collection and analysis are the criterion by which to evaluate the proposed COA's.

e. Comparison.

COA 1. Attempt to address the issue of crime in the SCN without addressing the vehicular component.

Pros: Saves the expense of the LPRC or another video system

Cons: Leaves out a statistically vital security program component and significantly decreases likelihood of successfully addressing the crime issue in the SCN.

COA 2. A HOA owned means of collecting the required information may be utilized, such as commercially available video systems or off the shelf cameras from retailers.

Pros: Possibly saves money in the near term and may require no contract.

Cons: The HOA owns the hardware and associated equipment and, therefore, must bear the cost of hardware purchase, installation, maintenance and replacement. Maintenance, repair and replacement costs are difficult to estimate. Someone must be identified to research and identify possible systems and to install and maintain the equipment. The HOA must monitor the equipment's performance to determine functionality. Information is stored locally on a storage device, such as a removeable disc, making review of video after an event difficult. Searching collected information for actionable intelligence is labor intensive. Sharing information with law enforcement is difficult, even after searching acquired video and identifying suspects, as the information must be transferred from the removeable storage device. Video quality in systems not specifically designed to read vehicle information can only be deemed reliable in more expensive systems. No such system has been identified and more time, research and debate is required to identify such an option.

COA 3: Install Flock Safety LPRC cameras at each entrance to the neighborhood to address the vehicular component of crime in our neighborhood.

Pros: The HOA owns only the collected video information. All hardware is considered leased and its' function, maintenance, monitoring and replacement remains the responsibility of Flock Safety. Flock routinely checks the system for proper operation and automatically sends a technician to repair or replace defective equipment at no additional cost to the HOA. Software updates are conducted by Flock Safety at no additional cost. Video storage is cloud based, making it easily accessible, and is deleted automatically on a thirty-day rolling window in accordance with federal privacy law (180 days for LPRCs) for privacy. Access to video is highly controllable. It can be shared directly with law enforcement via internet by sending them the associated video file or giving them direct access to the information on the cloud. The Flock system includes user

access to software that utilizes a highly developed algorithm to analyze information and quickly identify possible targets using even incomplete information such as a partial plate or vehicle make, for example. "Hot List" technology identifies vehicles on police watch lists and alerts law enforcement as to their whereabouts. A two-year contract includes free installation. At \$19.80 per year, per camera, per household it is highly affordable.

Cons: Requires a minimum one-year contract. A one-year contract also requires a \$500 installation fee for each camera (a two-year contract waives installation fees.)

f. Conclusion: COA3 is the most cost effective, functional and timely course of action to address the current issue.

g. Final Recommendation: Install two Flock cameras at each entrance, one oriented to incoming traffic and the other to outgoing for highest fidelity, under a two-year contract. The installation fee is waived, and we can evaluate the system at its' highest state of functionality. If we decide at the one-year point that the second camera at each entrance is of no value then we can cancel the contract on two cameras, or all if they do not contribute to the overall solution, paying a \$500 removal fee for each camera. This would equate to the same cost of a one-year contract, having to pay the \$500 installation fee per camera, but we save the money if, as I suspect, we want to continue using the service. Total cost per household over that two-year period is \$158.42 (\$78.41/yr), highly affordable for what we would be getting.

3. POC R. Stuart Lindfors Jr, Saddle Club Safety and Security Committee chairman, saddleclubsc@gmail.com, (919) 656-5630.

Questions and Answers

The following questions were generated during the completion of the Camera Survey. The question and answer are posted in the Project 20-02 page of the Saddle Club Safety and Security website at www.saddleclubsb.org. A "Discussion" paragraph may have been added to pre-load the discussion during the meeting on the 30th.

Please submit any questions or concerns that you have for the Safety and Security Committee as a board member to saddleclubsc@gmail.com so they can be addressed prior to the meeting.

Survey Q&A

Q: Who will have access to the video?

A: We've not discussed video access at the board level yet. Permissions can range from anyone to, essentially, no one. My recommendation will be that access be limited to, generally speaking, the board president, designated members of the Safety and Security (S&S) Committee and, on a case-by-case basis, law enforcement. Privacy is of utmost importance. One of the nice pieces of the system is that license plates of residence can be entered into the program such that they will be ignored when a search is conducted after an incident. As mentioned in the proposal, other privacy protections include a 30 day rolling window in which stored video is deleted and a "Hot List" capability that helps focus searches. That was one of the really attractive pieces of the Flock system, privacy. On the S&S program side, Standard Operating Procedures are under development that will clearly dictate how the video is handled at our end. The SOP will be posted to the website for all residents to review and comment on.

Discussion: Video access will be clearly defined in the S&S SOP, currently under development.