

**City of Piedmont
COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT**

DATE: March 18, 2013

FROM: Rikki Goede, Chief of Police

SUBJECT: Update to Council and Community on License Plate Readers

RECOMMENDATION

Provide direction to staff on preferred option

DISCUSSION

On February 4, 2013, the City Council directed the police department to obtain a budgetary quote on what it would cost the City of Piedmont to install License Plate Recognition systems at all city ingress/egress points. The department contacted 3M (formerly PIPS Technology) who is the current vendor for the City's Automated License Plate Recognition System (ALPR) already installed and being used on a city patrol vehicle. They are also the ALPR vendor for several neighboring police departments including Oakland, San Francisco, Walnut Creek, San Leandro, Alameda, and Pittsburg, as well as the Alameda County Sheriff's Department and the Northern California Regional Information Center (NCRIC). This memo outlines the proposal specifics and budgetary cost analysis provided by 3M.

BACKGROUND

A total of 24 ingress/egress points were determined to exist between the cities of Piedmont and Oakland based on both the identification of streets and intersections on a map and actual physical site examinations by the vendor as well as members of the police and public works departments. An analysis of each street/intersection was conducted to determine both the type and number of cameras necessary for adequate data capture. Additionally, it was determined if an existing power source was available. Eighteen (18) of the twenty-four (24) sites had accessible PG&E power poles that could potentially be utilized for power. Five of the remaining sites had streetlights from which power could be drawn, and one site would require both the placement of a pole and power supply.

3M utilizes two types of cameras from which to capture data: SpikeHD P-382 and Spikelet Plus P-392. Both are high-resolution cameras, but the primary difference is in field of view with the P-382 delivering an 11-foot field of view for wider, multi-lane streets versus the P-392 that is lower wattage and delivers a 5-1/2-foot field of view more conducive to narrower, two-lane streets. The proposal recommends 29 P-392 and 28 P-382 cameras for a total of 57 devices. Additionally, each camera requires a termination box and a cellular router and chip for wireless capabilities. A total of 29 chips would be required, each of which would incur an on-going monthly fee as determined by the City's current wireless provider (Verizon).

Including all of the above described software and equipment, as well as mounting assembly hardware, sales tax, shipping costs, and the cost of labor to commission each of the 57 cameras, the estimated cost to the City of Piedmont would be \$978,716, not including installation. Additionally, an optional, but recommended, three-year extended maintenance warranty of \$174,700 would need to be considered, increasing the total to \$1,153,416.

As stated above, installation cost is not reflected in the above quote and would be an additional cost for the City. Installation of the above hardware would need to be done by a licensed electrical contractor after obtaining requisite authorization from PG&E and all necessary permits. 3M was unable to provide a budgetary cost analysis of installation for this proposal, because no contractors would provide an estimate without examination of each site and effectively bidding the project. It should be noted, as a sole source vendor, 3M can “turn key” the project and bid the project to electrical contractors familiar to the City thereby assuming responsibility for the entire project--a service they have provided to other cities who have undertaken similar License Plate Recognition projects. The “turn key” approach should be given serious consideration from the standpoint of time and efficiency necessary to complete the project.

In conclusion, there are three potential implementation options for the city to consider with regard to the License Plate Recognition project. These options and the pros and cons of each are as follows:

1. Full implementation at every ingress/egress point as outlined in the 3M bid
 - Pros: Complete coverage of the entire city and ensuring equal coverage at all points
 - Cons: Costly and time comprehensive and future upkeep and replacement costs would likely begin occurring in the same fiscal years ensuring costly future budgetary considerations
2. Phased-in implementation of the project over a period of two to three years
 - Pros: Less up front expense immediately; maintenance and replacement costs are constant but spread out over time; upgrades to newer technology are more easily attainable financially when purchased in stages
 - Cons: More time comprehensive with regard to implementation; public concern over implementation schedule of individual ingress/egress sites; initial budgeted equipment could become phased out and no longer available at latter implementation stages requiring additional “upgrade” costs to complete the LPR project
3. Choose 10-12 sites as determined by the police department based on major points of ingress/egress as well as ingress/egress points in higher crime areas and combine the fixed License Plate Recognition sites with additional mobile capabilities, such as additional patrol cars outfitted with cameras
 - Pros: More cost effective for the city; less time comprehensive and potentially can be fully operational by fall; additional mobile options such

as patrol cars can provide 24/7 scanning ability and greater coverage opportunities along with the ability to hit “hot spots” of crime when they develop; provides flexibility to add future fixed sites if desired

- Cons: Does not provide complete coverage immediately

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

As with any project, there are always additional cost considerations, both related and unrelated, which must be factored into the decision making process, as well. Some of these considerations include:

- Technology is a force multiplier, however, License Plate Recognition systems require adequate investigators to mine the information and conduct the necessary follow-up. Currently, the department is budgeted two investigators, however, one of those positions is the Juvenile/School Resource Officer. School safety is a high priority and establishment of a consistent liaison between the schools and police department is key to ensuring mandated protocols are met. Successfully accomplishing this goal requires a full-time commitment by the assigned officer as opposed to sharing additional criminal investigative duties. However, the deployment of License Plate Recognition systems will certainly generate additional investigative leads requiring follow-up that will be too labor intensive for one detective. Therefore, a third investigative position would need to be added to ensure necessary investigative and school safety efforts are met effectively.
- Finally, there exists a real possibility that, by the next fiscal year, the City of Piedmont will need to move from our current shared public safety communication system with the City of Oakland and join the East Bay Regional Interoperability Communication System (EBRICS). This would necessitate the purchase of new portable and vehicle radios (approximately \$3,500-4,500 per radio plus access fee costs) for all public safety as well as Public Works. Thus, this and other impending capital costs must be factored into the decision making process with regard to the License Plate Recognition project.