

Dear Chair Prozanski, Vice-Chair Thatcher, and Members of the Committee,

My name is Anthony Diggs. My professional career is dedicated to computer forensics and data science, specifically the collection and analysis of data to a legally defensible standard. I am writing to provide a technical perspective on the proposed ALPR amendment SB 1516-2.

While the zero-trust architecture and vendor restrictions in sections 4, 8, and 10 are necessary improvements to data security, they do not resolve the fundamental issue: that mass surveillance with guardrails is still mass surveillance.

In computer forensics, we judge a tool's utility by its precision. Audits of ALPR systems consistently show that over 99% of captured data has zero investigative value. For example, the Albany, OR Flock Transparency Portal shows that images of over 27,000 unique vehicles were captured in the last 30 days (1/11/26-2/11/26), yet only 3 generated a "hit". These are not the metrics of a targeted investigative tool, but a dragnet that indexes an entire population to find a statistical outlier.

SB 1516-2 reflects massive concessions to law enforcement's desire for operational convenience, and asks us to accept a compromise where limited security (end-to-end encryption) is offered as a substitute for liberty (the right to not be tracked). Accepting this compromise simply because it is "better than nothing" is unwise. If passed, I believe this amendment will lead to the rapid expansion of ALPR systems across our communities by law enforcement agencies who interpret it as a "thumbs up" from the state.

We've heard support for ALPR systems from various leaders, including members of this commission, based on reports that they "allow police to do their job more efficiently", but the efficiency of the police has never been the barometer of a free society. By codifying these systems, we are not balancing interests; we are tilting the playing field to favor a future of constant, automated state observation.

Finally, in a time of legitimate concern regarding the overreach and increasingly mob-like tendencies of federal law enforcement, I must emphasize the obvious: that Oregon's sanctuary status becomes an objective impossibility in a mass surveillance environment. There are no state-level privacy shields (and no

standards of encryption) capable of preventing federal agencies from using court orders to compel the location and behavioral data these systems collect.

I urge the committee to reject SB 1516-2 in defense of the safety, privacy, and liberty of all Oregonians.

Respectfully,

Anthony Diggs