Yes, it reads well and is accurate.

Rick

RICHARD C. HELFERS, PH. D.

Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Public Administration
Social Sciences

W: 903-566-7399 | rhelfers@uttyler.edu | www.uttyler.edu

The University of Texas at Tyler | 3900 University Blvd. Tyler, Texas 75799

The University of Texas at Tyler

[?]

From: Nhan, Johnny <j.nhan@tcu.edu>
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 4:17 PM
To: Richard Helfers <rhelfers@uttyler.edu>
Cc: Adam Snow <adam.snow@flocksafety.com>; Holly Beilin <holly.beilin@flocksafety.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please look over this before I reply

This Message Is From an External Sender
This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Hi Rick,

Does this sound ok to you?

Hi Paul,

I appreciate the EFF looking at this and I have always been a supporter of you guys with issues such

as net neutrality. Part of what I'm trying to do is make sure that this type of technology is justified and has its limits. In fact, one of the topics that we're (Dr. Helfers and I) planning on publishing on independently from Flock Safety is looking at policies in place at different agencies have for camera placement, usage, access, etc.

As part of our IRB approval and typical of most research, a list of research participants is not something that is published or given out, including to us as researchers. Even if we did have that list, we would not be allowed to disclose the list as part of the approval. We only request data with identifiers masked with this type of large data sets because we would have to get written consent from every organization or person.

Flock is transparent in allowing us to view the data without the names of organizations, which is all that's required for the analysis. This will preserve access by these organizations to participate in future research. While this may seem counter to be transparent, the names of the agencies is irrelevant to us. I've conducted research where I specifically ask organizations providing data to me, for example, to remove names and other identifiers since we're only interested in aggregate statistical analysis. For this paper, we were looking to see if the statistics were run properly and did give input on that. We did get to look at the raw data without the names of agencies.

We did obtain a small sample of departments that we will be doing a deep dive into how the technology is being used as the next part of the survey to hopefully corroborate the findings in this quantitative analysis. Again, as part of our universities' review board, all identifiers are masked, including the department as part of the consent. So we will be using descriptors, such as "One detective from a large urban department located in the Northeast United States." Most studies are done this way but we will be asking in-depth on how the technology is used and as mentioned earlier, we will be looking at producing a paper that specifically is focused on privacy and access.