

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**City Council Regular Meeting Agenda Item: 2i  
June 17, 2025**

AUTHORIZATION OF A TWO-YEAR  
SUBSCRIPTION AGREEMENT with Flock Safety to  
replace and expand the City's existing Vigilant  
Solutions Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR)  
cameras with Flock Safety ALPR cameras, for a not-  
to-exceed amount of \$161,600.

Public comment received after packet publication.

**From:** [Clean Walden Green](#)  
**To:** [Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** ALPR expansion in Walnut Creek  
**Date:** Friday, June 13, 2025 12:05:44 PM

---

This is an **EXTERNAL** email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

**ALWAYS** hover over the link to preview the actual URL/site and confirm its legitimacy.

Hello,

I am a long time Walnut Creek resident concerned about the proposed expansion of the ALPR system currently in Walnut Creek. The recent staff report written by Lieutenant Jeff Slater of the Walnut Creek Police Department discusses a proposal on how Flock safety will replace the existing ALPR system and mentions:

“The new ALPR system will require fewer cameras overall, while increasing coverage through strategic placement at new locations across the city”

In the proposal, no information was given as to the number or location of new proposed locations for the expanded ALPR system.

In this city, public notice is often physically posted and given well in advance for even simple maintenance issues like trimming or removing trees along public roadways. However, in this case of proposing an expansion of a public surveillance network that has the capability of allowing police departments from all over the state to track any residents vehicle, minimal details are given to either the council or the public, and the public is given barely four business days of notice!

Are these new cameras proposed for residential locations?

How many new locations will be added versus how many exist now?

Why do residents get posted notice well in advance for tree trimming etc but not for expansion of a surveillance system in their community?

I propose that the council revisit this issue at a future meeting AFTER public notice has been physically posted at the proposed new locations of ALPR cameras 30 days in advance of the meeting where such decisions are made. This is common practice for many other city projects and should certainly be the practice used in this situation since there is a direct resident impact.

It is wholly inappropriate for the public to be left out of such an important decision and for the council to be voting without complete information on what is actually proposed.

I support upgrading the ALPR cameras that we have at current locations throughout the city, but it is undemocratic to expand surveillance of the public without adequate public input.

- Taylor D.