

# Flock Safety ALPR

## Municipal Procurement, Oversight & Resistance Signals

### Demand Brief

Municipal Intelligence Report | February 2026 | Prepared by MotionCount

### Summary

Flock Safety ALPR technology appeared in 17 city council proceedings across 17 U.S. cities in the last 90 days, spanning active procurement, contract renewal, surveillance oversight reporting, lobbying registration, integration into real-time crime center platforms, and **contract termination**. The signal landscape is bifurcated: cities are simultaneously expanding and canceling Flock deployments, often driven by the same underlying concerns about data-sharing with federal immigration enforcement and cross-jurisdictional access.

Three cities are actively resisting or terminating Flock contracts: Santa Cruz voted to terminate its Flock agreement and cease ALPR use. Denver redirected \$390K in Flock funding to the STAR crisis response program. Cambridge received an ACLU presentation opposing Flock adoption, with councillor-level questions on data-sharing practices and Shield Law compliance. Meanwhile, Oakland is approving a new Flock ALPR and PTZ camera agreement, Menlo Park has 32 of 35 Flock cameras operational, Palo Alto expanded its Flock deployment by 10 cameras, and Milwaukee renewed 31 cameras for \$182.9K. Fort Worth is integrating Flock ALPR data into a \$490K Peregrine Technologies real-time crime center platform. Flock registered two lobbyists in Cincinnati. Berkeley flagged Flock in a Sanctuary City compliance audit.

Below: city-level detail organized by signal type, with procurement status, contract values, oversight mechanisms, and the political dynamics shaping each decision.

### Contract Termination & Resistance

#### Santa Cruz, CA

Santa Cruz City Council voted to terminate its Flock Safety ALPR contract, cease all ALPR use immediately, and direct staff to explore alternatives only if a fully vetted, values-aligned system is identified. Concerns cited: Flock data-sharing practices, potential federal agency access conflicting with local values (particularly immigration enforcement), and broader national surveillance concerns. The current contract, fully paid, ends March 27, 2026 but can be terminated with 30 days notice.

Action	Value	Status
Flock ALPR Contract Termination	Fully paid	Terminated. Staff directed to return only with values-aligned alternative demonstrating local control, transparency, civil liberties protection, reduced cybersecurity risk.

**Signal:** Full termination with conditional return clause. Staff cannot bring back any ALPR proposal without meeting explicit civil liberties criteria. This is the strongest anti-Flock action in the current dataset. The motion language establishes a template other cities can adopt.

#### Denver, CO

Council member Parady introduced a budget amendment transferring \$390,000 from the Police Department Services & Supplies budget (earmarked for a Flock Safety contract) to the Support Team

Assistance Response (STAR) program within Public Health and Environment. This is a direct defunding action: surveillance dollars redirected to crisis response.

Action	Value	Status
Parady Amendment No. 15 to 2026 Budget	\$390,000	Flock funds transferred to STAR crisis response program. Police Dept budget reduced.

**Signal:** Budget-level defunding of Flock. The STAR reallocation frames the decision as a resource priority choice (surveillance vs. crisis response), not just a privacy objection. This framing is politically portable.

## Cambridge, MA

Two council communications signal active resistance to Flock adoption. Councillor Wilson transmitted an ACLU of Massachusetts presentation arguing against Flock, citing nationwide data sharing, potential violations of the Cambridge Welcoming Community Ordinance and Massachusetts Shield Law, and inadequate data security. Councillor Sobrinho-Wheeler submitted questions to CPD and Flock for the Public Safety Committee on data-sharing practices related to reproductive healthcare and gender-affirming care investigations, UASI grant funding, and audit transparency.

Communication	Source	Signal
ACLU presentation opposing Flock LPR	Cllr. Wilson	Recommends rejecting Flock. Cites nationwide data sharing, Welcoming Community Ordinance conflict, Shield Law risk, ICE/reproductive healthcare enforcement.
Questions to CPD and Flock for Public Safety Committee	Cllr. Sobrinho-Wheeler	Data sharing re: reproductive healthcare, gender-affirming care. UASI grant funding. Audit transparency.

**Signal:** Pre-procurement resistance. Cambridge has not yet contracted with Flock; these communications indicate organized opposition before any contract is signed. The Shield Law and Welcoming Community Ordinance arguments create legal, not just political, barriers to adoption.

## Active Deployment & Expansion

### Oakland, CA

Oakland Police Department brought a resolution to council to approve surveillance use policy DGO I-32.1 (Community Safety Camera System) and award a two-year agreement to Flock Safety for ALPR and Pan Tilt Zoom cameras, operating system technology, and related services. This is a new deployment requiring policy approval under Oakland's surveillance oversight ordinance.

Action	Value	Status
Flock ALPR + PTZ Camera Agreement (2 years) + DGO I-32.1 Policy Approval	TBD	Resolution before council. Includes policy adoption, camera acquisition, and operating system. Multiple attachments and presentations.

**Signal:** New deployment in one of the Bay Area's largest cities. Oakland's surveillance oversight ordinance means this required public policy approval, creating a documented record. The PTZ camera scope goes beyond standard ALPR into broader video surveillance. Track council vote and any conditions imposed.

### Menlo Park, CA

Menlo Park PD quarterly report confirms 32 of 35 planned Flock Safety cameras are operational, with data retained for 30 days and accessible via a transparency portal. Reporting is structured around RIPA

compliance, use of force, AB 481 military equipment, and community engagement. No AB 481 equipment was used during the quarter.

Metric	Value	Status
Flock ALPR Cameras	32 of 35	Operational. 30-day data retention. Transparency portal active.
RIPA Contacts	1,784	Q4 2025 (Oct-Dec). Data reported to DOJ.

**Signal:** Mature deployment nearing full buildout. The transparency portal and quarterly reporting framework indicate Menlo Park has an active surveillance oversight structure. The 30-day retention policy is on the shorter end of the spectrum.

## Palo Alto, CA

Palo Alto's annual Surveillance Technology Report for FY 2025, filed under the 2019 Surveillance and Privacy Protection Ordinance, details Flock ALPR deployment: 10 additional cameras approved December 2024, FY2025 cost \$90,808 (grant and general fund). Data shared with 60+ local law enforcement agencies under MOUs, but not with federal or out-of-state agencies. One PRA request received. The report also covers Lenslock body/vehicle cameras (\$214.8K/yr), Starchase GPS tracking (\$224.7K over 3 years), and eCitation devices.

Technology	FY2025 Cost	Status
Flock ALPR (Fixed)	\$90,808	Expanded by 10 cameras (Dec 2024). Data shared with 60+ local LE agencies. No federal/out-of-state sharing.
Starchase GPS Vehicle Tracking	\$26,400/yr	Approved Apr 2025. 3-year contract NTE \$224,657.
Lenslock Body/Vehicle/Interview Cameras	\$214,800/yr	Full upgrade by Dec 2025.

**Signal:** Palo Alto's surveillance ordinance generates the most detailed public record of any city in this brief. The explicit no-federal-sharing policy is worth tracking for durability under changing federal enforcement priorities. The 60+ agency MOU network is the broadest data-sharing footprint in this dataset.

## Milwaukee, WI

Milwaukee Department of Administration granted a sole/single source waiver for Flock Group, Inc. to amend its contract by \$82,500, bringing the total to \$182,900 for renewal of 31 city-funded camera licenses (Jan 27, 2026 through Jan 26, 2027). Justification: Flock cameras are the only ones that connect with Axon's proprietary software for body-camera footage storage. An ACLU letter opposing the waiver is included in the attachments.

Action	Value	Status
Flock ALPR Camera License Renewal (31 cameras, sole source waiver)	\$182,900	Waiver granted. Sole source justified by Axon integration dependency. ACLU opposition letter filed.

**Signal:** The Axon integration lock-in is the key detail. Milwaukee's justification for sole-source status is that Flock is the only ALPR that connects with Axon body-cam storage. This creates vendor dependency across the surveillance stack: Flock + Axon become mutually reinforcing procurement defaults. The ACLU opposition letter signals organized resistance that may surface in future renewal cycles.

## Fremont, CA

Fremont City Council authorized a \$141,911 purchase order to All Traffic Solutions, Inc. for seven ATS Flock License Plate Reader Ready Radar Speed and Messaging Trailers. Funded by a CHP Cannabis Tax Fund Grant. These are dual-use trailers: traffic speed messaging plus LPR camera integration capability.

Action	Value	Status
Flock-Ready LPR Radar Speed Trailers (7 units)	\$141,911	Authorized. Grant-funded (CHP Cannabis Tax). Dual-use: traffic calming + LPR capability.

**Signal:** Flock-compatible infrastructure entering through the traffic safety door, not the policing door. Grant-funded procurement reduces budget visibility. The 'Flock-ready' spec embeds the platform as a future default without requiring a standalone ALPR procurement decision.

## Los Angeles, CA (Studio City BID)

The Studio City Property-Based Business Improvement District FY2026 budget includes a \$40,000 carryover from 2025 earmarked for Flock Cameras, within a total budget of \$685,681. This is BID-funded (property assessments), not city general fund.

Action	Value	Status
Studio City PBID Flock Camera Allocation	\$40,000	Carryover from 2025. BID-funded via property assessments, not city budget.

**Signal:** Private BID funding bypasses municipal procurement oversight. Flock deployment via BIDs is a distinct channel from city police contracts and may not trigger surveillance ordinance review in cities that have one.

## Surveillance Stack Integration

### Fort Worth, TX

Fort Worth City Council authorized a \$490,000 sole-source agreement with Peregrine Technologies for Real-Time Crime Center law enforcement data integration software. The platform integrates CAD, RMS, Axon Evidence.com, and Flock ALPR into a single search interface. Currently, officers search these systems manually, taking hours or days per investigation. Peregrine's proprietary integration framework, ontology, and CJIS-compliant security model justify sole-source status. Funded contingent on a FY2025 UASI Homeland Security grant. The agreement appeared twice on the council agenda (Jan 13 and Feb 4 committee).

Action	Value	Status
Peregrine Technologies RTCC Data Integration (sole source)	\$490,000/yr + 4 renewals (3% annual increase)	Approved. Integrates Flock ALPR with CAD, RMS, Axon into unified search. UASI grant-funded. Enables regional intelligence sharing via Fort Worth Fusion Center (INTEX).

**Signal:** Flock is not the contract here; Flock is the data layer being consumed by a higher-order integration platform. This is the maturation pattern: ALPR data becomes an input to fusion center infrastructure. Once embedded in an RTCC, Flock becomes structurally difficult to remove because it is wired into the investigative workflow. The UASI/Fusion Center funding stream is federal. Track whether Cambridge's UASI grant questions (above) are probing the same funding mechanism.

## Compliance, Oversight & Public Concern

### Berkeley, CA

Berkeley's Sanctuary City Contracting Compliance Report for FY 2024-2025 notes that Flock Safety had a past short-term pilot program with federal agencies, which ended before the reporting period and has

not resumed. No compliance violations identified. The report confirms ongoing enforcement of the SCCO, which prohibits contracting with entities providing data broker or extreme vetting services to ICE.

**Signal:** Berkeley's SCCO creates a legal tripwire for Flock. If Flock resumes any federal pilot or data-sharing agreement with ICE, it would disqualify the company from Berkeley contracts. This is a dormant but live compliance risk for Flock in sanctuary cities.

## San Jose, CA

A public correspondence entry in the Jan 22-29, 2026 Public Record includes Elizabeth Agramont-Justiniano opposing Flock cameras being accessible to ICE and requesting an official response from Councilmember Tordillos. The correspondence appears alongside housing density and council conduct complaints.

**Signal:** Constituent-level opposition flagging the ICE access vector. Low signal intensity but indicates the Flock/ICE concern is reaching individual constituent correspondence, not just organized advocacy. Track whether this generates a council response or policy review.

## Lobbying Registration

### Cincinnati, OH

Flock Safety registered two lobbyists with Cincinnati City Council in December 2025-January 2026: Roland Vaughn (Government Affairs Professional) and Hector Soliman-Valdez (Director of Local Government Affairs). Both registered at 28 Liberty Ship Way, Suite 2815, Sausalito, CA 94965. Client business listed as Science and Technology; matters affecting Law Enforcement Technology.

**Signal:** Dual lobbyist registrations signal active pursuit of a Cincinnati contract. Flock is pre-positioning before a procurement or policy discussion reaches the agenda. Track Cincinnati Public Safety Committee and police department procurement for ALPR-related items in the next 90 days.

## Secondary Signals

City	Activity	Relevance
Denton, TX	Flock reference in council data (details limited)	Requires direct follow-up. Likely ALPR contract or discussion.
Appleton, WI	Flock reference in council data (details limited)	Requires direct follow-up.
Boerne, TX	Flock reference in council data (details limited)	Small city. Likely new procurement or pilot.
Hagerstown, MD	Flock reference in council data (details limited)	Requires direct follow-up.

## What This Means

**The political terrain for Flock Safety is splitting along a fault line that did not exist 18 months ago.** Across the 17 cities in this dataset, three distinct dynamics are operating simultaneously:

**Resistance is crystallizing into repeatable templates.** Santa Cruz's termination language (values-aligned alternative, local control, civil liberties criteria) and Denver's budget reallocation (surveillance dollars to crisis response) are portable political formulas. Cambridge's pre-procurement opposition uses legal arguments (Shield Law, Welcoming Community Ordinance) that apply in any sanctuary or shield-law jurisdiction. EFF's 2025 investigations into Flock data-sharing practices provided the evidentiary foundation for several of these local actions. The pattern documented by Sarah Hamid at EFF, where elected officials began treating surveillance procurement as a political decision rather than an administrative one, is visible in this data at the council-agenda level.

**Deployment is deepening, not just expanding.** Fort Worth's Peregrine RTCC integration represents the maturation of Flock from a standalone ALPR product into a data layer consumed by fusion center infrastructure. Milwaukee's Axon integration dependency creates vendor lock-in across the surveillance stack. Fremont's Flock-ready traffic trailers embed the platform through a non-policing procurement channel. These are structural entrenchments that make future removal harder, regardless of political will.

**The ICE access question is the common thread.** Santa Cruz, Cambridge, Berkeley, San Jose, and Milwaukee's ACLU opposition letter all cite federal immigration enforcement access as the core concern. This is not an abstract privacy argument; it is a concrete policy conflict between local sanctuary/welcoming ordinances and Flock's network data-sharing architecture. Flock's response to these concerns, as documented in EFF's reporting, has been to blame users and downplay harms rather than restructure data access controls. As long as that remains the case, every sanctuary city with a Flock contract faces a latent compliance risk.

**Three triggers to watch:** (1) Cincinnati: lobbyist registrations signal a procurement push; track Public Safety Committee and police department agendas. (2) Oakland: council vote on the Flock ALPR + PTZ agreement will set precedent for the East Bay's largest city. (3) Federal enforcement posture under the current administration may accelerate both deployment (cities seeking federal grant funding) and resistance (cities defending sanctuary policies against federal data demands).

## Signal Classification by City

City	Signal Type	Value	Direction
Santa Cruz	Termination	Existing contract	<b>AGAINST</b>
Denver	Defunding	\$390,000	<b>AGAINST</b>
Cambridge	Pre-procurement opposition	N/A	<b>AGAINST</b>
Oakland	New deployment	TBD (2 years)	<b>FOR</b>
Menlo Park	Operational	32 of 35 cameras	<b>FOR (deployed)</b>
Palo Alto	Expansion + oversight	\$90,808/yr	<b>FOR (expanding)</b>
Milwaukee	Renewal (sole source)	\$182,900	<b>FOR (contested)</b>
Fremont	Flock-ready equipment	\$141,911	<b>FOR (indirect)</b>
Los Angeles	BID-funded cameras	\$40,000	<b>FOR (private)</b>
Fort Worth	RTCC integration	\$490,000/yr	<b>FOR (embedded)</b>
Berkeley	Compliance audit	N/A	<b>NEUTRAL (monitoring)</b>
San Jose	Public correspondence	N/A	<b>AGAINST (constituent)</b>
Cincinnati	Lobbying	N/A	<b>PRE-SALE</b>

*This report was generated by MotionCount, a municipal intelligence platform that tracks and analyzes city council decisions across 100+ U.S. cities at matter-level depth. Data sourced from 17 city council proceedings, November 2025 through February 2026.*

*This brief represents a single snapshot. MotionCount tracks these signals continuously as projects move through committee, council, and procurement, so you see demand forming before the RFP hits the street. Questions or want a custom brief for your territory? [iban@motioncount.com](mailto:iban@motioncount.com)*