



**MONEY VS. LOW HIT RATE · SCRIPT A**

## **Tiny hit rates for a huge privacy cost**

About 2.8 min at ~140 words/min · 394 words · Replace [Your Name]. Speak calmly. One speaker, one focus.

Tip: swap bracketed fields. Cite numbers carefully. End with the cancel / yearly-vote ask.

Mayor Crawford, members of City Council. My name is [Your Name], and I live in Crossville.

I support public safety. I also expect taxpayers to get honest numbers before we keep leasing these citywide surveillance cameras.

Crossville's Flock quote shows about ten Falcon plate-reader cameras for roughly twenty-five thousand dollars a year. That is real money for a small city, and the public still has not seen local results that show this money was well spent.

What we do have is public-records math from other agencies. The Electronic Frontier Foundation, a digital-rights group often called EFF, published a California table showing how often scanned plates matched wanted or stolen-vehicle lists: Roseville, CA, at about 0.03 percent, Glendale, CA, at 0.04 percent, and Burbank, CA, at 0.05 percent. EFF and MuckRock, a public-records journalism project, found an average hit rate around half a percent in a wider dataset, with many agencies far lower. Piedmont, California reporting worked out to roughly 0.0013 percent, meaning millions of scans for a handful of leads. A "hit" on one of those lists is not a cleared case. It is often just a match to a list.

Vendor marketing percentages are not a substitute for Crossville publishing who searched, why, what matched, and what closed. Until those numbers are on the record, we are paying for mass scanning and taking the sales pitch on trust.

If the hit rate elsewhere is routinely well under one percent of plate scans, Crossville should not renew on slogans like "it solves crime" or "extra eyes on the street." I am asking for a recorded answer before any money continues: what is Crossville's hit rate, what share of hits became arrests or recoveries, and how many ordinary drivers were scanned to get there? If Crossville PD and city leadership cannot put those answers in writing, the claim that this works is marketing, not budgeting.

### **THE ASK (say this)**

My ask is clear. Cancel Crossville's Flock contract and remove the cameras. Require a public hearing and a recorded City Council vote before any surveillance equipment is ever proposed again. If you will not cancel yet, take a recorded yes-or-no vote each year before any renewal, with no automatic renewal that skips a public vote, and publish monthly use reports the public can check. Thank you. I yield.

**Speaker prep visual (do not read aloud)****CrossvillePrivacy.org**

Community extract of public-record figures

**COMMUNITY EXTRACT OF PUBLIC-RECORD FIGURES****Flock Quote Q-00234 (facts only)**

Independent extract for Crossville residents. Not a Flock document, not an invoice, and not affiliated with Flock Safety or the City of Crossville.

This page restates dollar amounts, quantities, and dates from the 2022 Crossville PD proposal. It does not reproduce the vendor's layout, logo, or salesperson contact information.

- Quote number: Q-00234 (labeled a proposal / quote, not a signed invoice).
- Bill-to on the proposal: TN - Crossville PD, 115 Henry Street, Crossville, Tennessee 38555.
- Product: 10 Falcon ALPRs at a \$2,500 sales price each = \$25,000 recurring.
- One-time professional services: \$3,500.
- Proposal total: \$28,500 before tax.
- Contract start date printed on the proposal: 08/26/2022. Subscription term: 12 months.
- Atlas of Surveillance later listed 11 Crossville PD Flock ALPRs (Sept. 2025). Do not treat \$25,000/year as proven pricing for 11 cameras without current invoices.

Not legal advice. Confirm live invoices with city finance / a Tennessee Public Records Act request. [crossvilleprivacy.org](https://crossvilleprivacy.org)

Community extract of Quote Q-00234 figures (not the vendor PDF).