

**Community Responses to Flock Safety ALPR Programs**

---

**California Jurisdictions That Have Taken Action**

The following California cities and counties have taken formal action regarding Flock Safety ALPR programs in the past 18 months:

- Oakland (2025): City Council voted to terminate its Flock contract following concerns about data-sharing with federal agencies and ICE. The decision followed community organizing and a Council audit finding gaps in oversight.
- Hayward (2025): Suspended use of Nationwide Search feature and initiated a compliance review after the AG’s El Cajon enforcement action.
- South Lake Tahoe (2025): Terminated contract following community opposition and concerns about immigration enforcement use.
- Santa Cruz County: Adopted a Surveillance Use Policy requiring Board of Supervisors approval before any surveillance technology is deployed using County resources.
- Alameda County: Adopted similar surveillance oversight ordinance; Flock deployments within county subject to review.
- San Jose: Subject to a verified complaint (SIREN v. City of San Jose, Nov. 2025) alleging SB 34 violations related to data-sharing practices.
- El Cajon: Sued by Attorney General Bonta in October 2025 for sharing ALPR data with federal and out-of-state agencies in violation of SB 34.

**National Examples**

Outside California, several jurisdictions have also taken restrictive action:

- Minneapolis, MN: City Council voted to terminate Flock contract following community campaign citing civil liberties and immigration enforcement concerns.
- Takoma Park, MD: Terminated contract; city passed resolution prohibiting use of ALPR data for immigration enforcement purposes.
- Several jurisdictions in Washington, Colorado, and Illinois have adopted or are considering ALPR oversight ordinances in response to Flock-related controversies.

**Common Themes**

Across jurisdictions that have taken action, several themes recur:

- Data-sharing with federal immigration enforcement was the most frequently cited concern, followed by Flock’s conduct as a vendor (unauthorized camera installations, failure to honor deactivation requests, lack of proactive disclosure of network capabilities).

- 
- Scope creep: ALPR data has been documented as being used to track individuals crossing state lines to access abortion services and for other purposes beyond local crime investigation.
  - Effectiveness questions: Research on whether ALPR cameras reduce crime is inconclusive. Studies show modest improvement in clearance rates for some property crimes near cameras, but no consistent evidence of broader crime reduction.

*End of Attachment A*