

September 1, 2026

Pocatello City Council

City of Pocatello
911 N. 7th Avenue
Pocatello, ID 83201

Re: Follow-Up Responses to City Council Questions Regarding Flock Safety

Dear Mayor Dahlquist and Members of the Pocatello City Council:

Thank you again for the opportunity to present to the Pocatello City Council and for the thoughtful questions raised during our discussion. As a follow-up, Flock Safety has prepared the information below to provide additional detail and clarification regarding the topics raised by Councilmembers.

The responses address data ownership and sharing, custom hot lists, employee access to customer data, emergency and legal requests, data retention, and examples of Flock-supported public safety outcomes in Idaho.

Where appropriate, we have also identified areas where the Pocatello Police Department may supplement these responses with its own independent research, local data, and supporting materials.

1. Data Access and Sharing (Councilmember Bates)

The City of Pocatello owns and controls 100% of its ALPR data. Flock does not have a general right of access to customer data, and no data sharing is enabled by default when a customer joins Flock.

What Flock's Contract Already Provides

- Flock does not own and will never sell agency data.
- The agency is the one that manages sharing capabilities.

Data Sharing Controls in the Platform

- **No sharing by default.** When Pocatello PD joined Flock, no sharing relationships were established automatically.
- **Agency-controlled sharing.** The City decides if, with whom, and under what conditions it shares data with other agencies — consistent with local and state law.
- **Revocable at any time.** Sharing permissions can be revoked by the Agency's Admin at any time through the platform.

flock safety

- **Audit trail.** Every search by an external agency against your shared data is permanently logged in your network audit. Any time your data returns a hit, that access is captured and preserved indefinitely.
- **Private customers cannot access law enforcement data.** Public agencies cannot share data with private entities.

Custom Hot Lists

How custom hot lists are created, managed, and maintained — and who has authority to create or modify them.

Custom Hot Lists are **entirely agency-created and agency-controlled**. Flock does not create, modify, or populate them. They are a tool that authorized Pocatello PD personnel use to track specific license plates of investigative interest.

Two Types of Hot Lists

Type	Source	Agency Control
Sourced Hot Lists (e.g., NCIC, NCMEC, State lists)	Government databases — updated up to 4x/day	Agencies subscribe; cannot edit directly
Custom Hot Lists	Created by agency personnel	Full agency control — create, edit, share, delete

Who Has Authority to Create or Modify Custom Hot Lists

Access is governed by **role-based permissions** assigned by the agency's Admin:

- **Custom Hotlist Admin:** Can access and edit all Custom Hotlist entries — both personal lists and organization-wide lists. Can also share, delete, or export lists.
- **Custom Hotlist Access:** Can create and manage their own personal lists; can view (but not edit) organization-wide lists.

The agency's Admin controls which roles receive which level of permission. Best practice is for investigators/detectives to hold Custom Hotlist Access, and for a supervisory or admin user to hold Custom Hotlist Admin.

How a Custom Hot List is Created

1. A user with the appropriate permission navigates to the Alerts tab → Custom Hotlists section.
2. They click **+ Add List** and name the list (e.g., "Stolen Vehicles – Case 2026-XXXX").
3. They set the **Audience** — either the entire organization or specific roles/users (useful for sensitive investigations).



flock safety

4. They enable or disable **Deconfliction**, which notifies another agency if they enter the same plate, prompting coordination without sharing case details.
5. They add plates individually or via CSV bulk upload, including a **case number, reason, expiration date**, and optional notes or media (e.g., BOLOs).

Key Governance Features

- **Expiration dates are required.** As of August 1, 2026, all Custom Hotlist entries require an expiration date (maximum one year), preventing indefinite, unreviewed entries.
- **Only the owning user can edit, share, or delete their list.** If a list is shared to another agency, only the originating organization can make edits.
- **Case numbers can be required.** Admins can configure the system to require a case number when adding or updating entries, ensuring accountability and auditability.
- **Limit of 5,000 unique plate entries** per organization across all active lists, a guardrail designed to prevent broad, dragnet-style monitoring and ensure lists remain focused on legitimate investigative purposes.
- **All activity is logged.** Every search, alert, and hotlist interaction is captured in the platform's permanent audit log.

Common Use Cases

- Stolen or suspect vehicles tied to a specific case
- Vehicles associated with missing persons
- Supplementing NCIC for recently stolen vehicles (NCIC updates lag by ~6 hours; custom lists update immediately)

Successes and Outcomes

Publication	Article	City	State	Issue
Idaho News	New gunshot detection tech leads to quick arrest after Caldwell shooting incident	Caldwell	ID	Weapons
KIVI TV	Caldwell police say FLOCK cameras helped in police pursuit that started	Caldwell	ID	Pursuit

flock safety

	on I-84			
Idaho News 6 - KIVI	License plate readers help Caldwell police arrest juveniles accused of shooting	Caldwell	ID	Shooting
National Today	Police Chase Ends in Crash at Costco	Lewiston	ID	Stolen Vehicle
KHQ	Lewiston police catch car burglary suspect using Flock cameras and neighborhood footage	Lewiston	ID	Stolen Vehicle
Idaho State Journey	Pocatello man, 71, arrested in child sex abuse case after Flock LPR camera tracked his truck	Pocatello	ID	Child Abuse
Sherriff Blaine County Idaho	FLOCK Assists Aggravated Assault Arrest	Blaine	ID	Aggravated Assault
Local News 8	Safety v. Surveillance: Idaho Falls Police Chief responds to concerns	Idaho Falls	ID	Human Trafficking "We are solving a lot of crimes with license plate readers. There's a couple of big cases... – our young,



	about Flock cameras			early-teen girl that was kidnapped and trafficked across state lines" - Chief Bryce Johnson
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	---

2. Contract Review (Councilmember Nichols)

Emergency and exigent requests

As of August 21, 2026, Flock's updated [Terms and Conditions](#) no longer include the prior **Section 5.3** authority to disclose data at a government agency's request based solely on an imminent-harm situation.

Other agencies may submit emergency or exigent requests through Kodex as customer-initiated requests by selecting **Emergency** in the Legal Process field. Flock will process an emergency request only when it includes:

- The grounds for believing that there is a risk of death or serious physical injury and that Flock may possess information necessary to prevent it.
- The nature of the emergency requiring disclosure without delay.
- An explanation of how the requested information will help avert the threatened death or serious physical injury, and why the normal disclosure process would be insufficient or untimely given the requested deadline.
- The name and contact information of the law-enforcement officer or authorized government agent submitting the request.
- The categories of records sought, stated with particularity.
- The specific time period for which the records are requested.

Anonymized data and service improvement (Section 4.3)

In accordance with Flock's [Terms and Conditions](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), Flock may retain a small fraction—less than 1%—of images processed through Flock Services as training data.

Before the data is copied to a separate dataset, it is stripped of metadata and identifying information connecting it to a customer, including information such as the customer name, location, and timestamp. The resulting training data is used internally to maintain, improve, and optimize Flock Services, including the accuracy of vehicle recognition and optical character recognition (OCR).

Training data is maintained separately and is not combined in a manner that would render it personally identifiable. It is not sold or shared with third parties.



flock safety

Flock recognizes that each agency and its legal counsel may evaluate these practices in light of specific policy goals and local legal requirements. Flock remains committed to collaborating on contract language that aligns with Pocatello's operational requirements and legal standards, including any mutually agreed opt-out provision.

Data ownership, legal process, and retention

Flock's standard Terms and Conditions and its approach to legal process include the following protections:

- **Data ownership**
 - Customers retain all right, title, and interest in Customer Data generated through their use of the Flock platform. Flock does not sell Customer Data.
- **Redirection of legal process**
 - Flock considers the customer—not Flock—to be the proper recipient of any subpoena, court order, warrant, or other legal process seeking Customer Data. Flock will redirect such legal process to the affected customer rather than disclose data or respond on the customer's behalf, except as required by law.
- **Non-disclosure and legal challenges**
 - Flock does not disclose Customer Data in response to legal process unless disclosure is required by law. When necessary, Flock may challenge or object to demands for Customer Data, including through formal legal proceedings, and will assert available protections under federal and state law against improper disclosure.
- **Customer notification**
 - Consistent with Flock's [Terms and Conditions](#) and [Privacy Policy](#), Flock will notify customers when requests are received for their data unless legally prohibited from doing so.
- **Data retention and deletion**
 - LPR data is permanently deleted and irretrievable after the applicable customer retention period expires (30 days in ID). Flock cannot restore LPR data in response to a legal request once the data has been deleted.
- **Processing legal requests through Kodex**
 - Flock uses [Kodex](#) to securely receive, track, process, and respond to legal requests from government entities, law-enforcement agencies, and private customers.

- Flock's Evidence Division—a trained team within Flock's Legal Department—reviews and evaluates requests as they are received. Flock communicates its response to the requesting agency through Kodex.

3. Flock employee access to Pocatello data (Councilmember Paulsen)

Flock Safety employees do not have general or discretionary access to the City of Pocatello's ALPR cameras, footage, or associated customer data. The City owns and controls its ALPR data, and access is limited to authorized users and contractually defined purposes.

Flock personnel may access customer data only when reasonably necessary to provide customer support, troubleshoot or address system issues, or fulfill another defined contractual obligation—and, where applicable, with the customer's permission. Access is restricted to appropriately authorized personnel and is subject to applicable security requirements, including Level II certification for personnel accessing Criminal Justice Information (CJIS).

Flock employees do not independently search Pocatello's footage, determine how the City shares its data, or grant access to other agencies. Data-sharing permissions are controlled by the City's authorized agency administrators and may be revoked by the City at any time.

Searches and access activity are recorded in the Flock Platform's audit logs, including the Event Log and Network Audit. These logs are available for review by the City's authorized administrators.

4. Independent research and supporting materials (Councilmember Swanson)

- Pocatello Police Department to include its independent research, supporting data, and source materials regarding Flock-assisted investigations, data access, data sharing, retention, and system effectiveness.



Pocatello Police and ALPR's

City Council Follow-Up Work Session
10-8-26

Purpose of Today's Follow-Up

Answer the questions raised during the August 13 work session.

Share local success stories and independent research.

Clarify what Flock / ALPR technology does—and what it does not do.

Explain changes PPD is making to strengthen transparency, auditing, and communication.

Show how ALPR can serve as a force multiplier through an illustrative narcotics case study.

Questions Answered: Data Access & Sharing

Ownership

The City owns and controls its ALPR data. Flock states it does not own or sell agency data.

Sharing

No sharing is enabled by default. PPD controls which agencies may access shared data and can revoke access.

Accountability

External searches and hits against shared data are logged. Private customers cannot access law-enforcement data.

Questions Answered: Hot Lists, Contract & Employee Access

Custom Hot Lists

Agency-created and agency-controlled. Role-based permissions govern who can create, edit, share, or delete entries. Entries require expiration dates and activity is logged.

Contract Sections

Flock reports the former Section 5.3 imminent-harm disclosure language was removed Aug. 21, 2026. Section 4.3 permits a small, de-identified training sample for service improvement.

Flock Employee Access

Flock states it has no general right to browse customer data. Access is limited to defined support, security, legal, or customer-authorized purposes and is subject to controls.

Independent Research: What the Evidence Supports

Strongest finding: ALPR greatly expands plate-checking capacity and can improve stolen-vehicle detection and recovery.

2011 NIJ-supported field experiment: 8–10× more plates checked, nearly 3× as many stolen-vehicle hits, and about 2× as many recoveries.

Investigative benefits are plausible but depend on placement, staffing, and consistent investigator use.

Research does not establish that ALPR by itself reliably reduces overall crime; broad deterrence claims should be avoided.

PPD's position: ALPR is an investigative lead and force multiplier—not a substitute for police work or human verification.

Local Success Stories

Examples of ALPR supporting traditional police work

Felony Domestic Violence

A suspect vehicle was placed on a custom hot list. Two days later, an alert showed the vehicle returning toward the victim's residence. Detectives and patrol intercepted the vehicle and took the suspect into custody before he reached the residence.

Vulnerable Adult

A medically vulnerable missing adult left in a vehicle. ALPR information showed travel toward Twin Falls, helping narrow the search and coordinate with partner agencies. He was located near Elko, Nevada, about an hour after being reported missing.

Other PPD Examples

Prior PPD examples include locating an endangered juvenile, supporting the investigation of a local child-sex-abuse suspect, and identifying the travel of an escaped inmate through the area.

What Flock Safety Is Not

Not facial recognition and does not identify the driver.

Does not track cell phones or record conversations.

Does not issue speeding or red-light citations.

Does not replace officer investigation, judgment, or discretion.

Does not create automatic probable cause.

An ALPR alert or search result is an investigative lead that must be verified and evaluated with the other facts of the case.

Changes We Are Making

Strengthening transparency, accountability, and communication

Monthly Audits

Move from quarterly review to monthly audits of ALPR use. Supervisory review will focus on authorized purpose, case/reason documentation, and compliance with policy and law.

Transparency

Publish audit information on a regular schedule through the City's ALPR transparency process, with appropriate redactions and protection of active investigations.

Communication

Provide clearer public-facing explanations of access, sharing, hot lists, retention, safeguards, research, and documented outcomes. Continue reporting meaningful successes and changes.

Responsible Use: The Guardrails

Department policy and Idaho law govern authorized ALPR use.

Training is required before employees receive system access.

Users document a reason and/or report number when conducting searches.

Searches, alerts, sharing, and hot-list activity create audit records.

ALPR information must be corroborated; enforcement decisions remain with trained personnel.

Regular supervisory review and monthly audits provide an additional accountability layer.

Case Study: Narcotics Investigation Without ALPR

Illustrative scenario—not an actual PPD case

Detectives identify a suspected drug-trafficking vehicle but do not know where it is currently operating.

Traditional options may require repeated drive-bys, fixed surveillance, canvassing, records checks, and waiting for the vehicle to appear.

Two detectives assigned to an 8-hour surveillance period = 16 detective-hours before follow-up work, reports, or overtime.

If the vehicle never appears, the team may repeat the effort on another day.

Result: skilled investigators spend substantial time watching for movement instead of acting on a verified lead.

Same Case With ALPR: A Force Multiplier

Illustrative scenario

Investigators lawfully enter or search the known vehicle information for an authorized investigative purpose.

ALPR can provide a recent vehicle detection or alert that helps establish direction of travel or a likely area of activity.

Detectives still verify the information, conduct surveillance, develop probable cause, and make all enforcement decisions.

Instead of beginning with a citywide search, the team can focus limited surveillance resources where the vehicle was recently observed.

The technology does not do the investigation—it helps investigators start closer to the relevant place and time.

Illustrative Resource Comparison

The value is time redirected to investigative work

Resource	Traditional Start	ALPR-Assisted Start
Initial vehicle-location effort	2 detectives × 8 hrs = 16 hrs	1 detective × 1 hr review/verification*
Surveillance focus	Broad / uncertain	Narrowed by recent lead
Vehicle miles / fuel	Potentially repeated searching	More targeted deployment
Detective capacity	Time spent locating	Time shifted to case development

**Illustrative assumption for comparison only. Actual time savings vary by case, camera coverage, investigative need, and verification requirements.*

ALPR is one investigative tool among many.

Its clearest benefit is efficiency and becoming a force multiplier: helping personnel find relevant vehicle information faster and direct limited resources more effectively.

PPD will continue pairing all technology with training, human verification, policy, audits, and supervisory oversight.

The move to monthly audits and regular public communication is intended to strengthen transparency while preserving legitimate investigative needs.

Questions

ALPR / Flock Safety – Questions and Information Requested by Mayor and City Council Members

Date: August 13, 2026

The following questions and requests for additional information were identified from today's working session regarding the City of Pocatello's Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) system and Flock Safety:

Bates

- **Data Access and Sharing:** Clarification regarding when and under what circumstances Flock Safety may access or share City of Pocatello ALPR data. There is a desire to have the contract clearly state that Flock will not access or share City data without the City's authorization and/or notification, except where otherwise required by law.
- **Custom Hot Lists:** Additional information regarding how custom hot lists are created, managed, and maintained, including who has authority to create or modify them.
- **Successes and Outcomes:** Provide additional examples and documented successes demonstrating how the Flock ALPR system has assisted law enforcement and contributed to crime prevention or investigations.

Nichols

- **Contract Review:** Requested additional clarification regarding specific provisions of the Flock contract, particularly:
 - **Section 4.3 – Anonymized Data:** What data may be collected, analyzed, or anonymized by Flock and how that information may be used.
 - **Section 5.3 – Disclosure of Footage:** Under what circumstances Flock may disclose or provide access to ALPR footage and what notification or authorization requirements apply.

Paulsen

- **Flock Employee Access:** Clarification regarding whether Flock Safety employees can access City of Pocatello ALPR cameras, footage, or associated data, and under what circumstances such access may occur.

Swanson

- **Independent Research:** Requested academic studies or other independent research, not funded, commissioned, or otherwise driven by Flock Safety, demonstrating the effectiveness and benefits of ALPR technology in law enforcement and crime reduction.

AGENCY RESPONSE

Pocatello Police Department Experience With ALPR

Operational experience and responsible-use statement

The Pocatello Police Department's experience has been that Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) technology, when supported by appropriate training, regular audits, proper deployment, and authorized use, has been beneficial in solving crimes on a continuing basis. ALPR has served as a force multiplier by allowing officers, detectives, and dispatch personnel to review and act upon vehicle information more efficiently than would be possible through traditional methods alone.

ALPR does not replace sound police work, independent investigation, or the judgment of trained personnel. Instead, it provides an additional investigative lead that can help identify vehicles associated with criminal activity, locate stolen vehicles, develop timelines, identify possible travel patterns, and direct limited personnel and resources more effectively. Information obtained through ALPR must be verified and considered with the other facts and evidence available in each investigation.

Conditions that support effective and responsible use

- Training personnel on authorized purposes, system capabilities, verification requirements, and applicable policy.
- Conducting regular audits and supervisory review to promote accountability and ensure compliance.
- Deploying cameras strategically in locations where they can support legitimate public-safety and investigative objectives.
- Using ALPR data for authorized law-enforcement purposes and in accordance with Department policy, applicable law, and retention and access requirements.

When these safeguards and practices are consistently followed, ALPR technology enhances situational awareness, improves investigative efficiency, and helps personnel focus their time where it is most needed. Based on the Department's continuing operational experience, ALPR has proven to be a valuable investigative tool and force multiplier that assists the Pocatello Police Department in solving crime and serving the community.

Below are three independent studies and one research project that we identified as part of our review and response to the following request:

Independent Research: Requested academic studies or other independent research that was not funded, commissioned, or otherwise driven by Flock Safety, demonstrating the effectiveness and benefits of Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology in law enforcement and crime reduction.

These materials were selected to provide independent research and analysis regarding the use of ALPR technology, including its effectiveness as a law enforcement tool, its impact on criminal investigations and crime reduction, and its potential benefits to public safety.

Summary statement: *The Pocatello Police Department has found ALPR to be beneficial on a continuing basis when it is properly deployed, responsibly used, regularly audited, and supported by training and human verification.*



INDEPENDENT RESEARCH BRIEF

Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR)

One-page summary of independent academic and federally funded research

Overall conclusion. Independent research supports ALPR as an operational tool that can greatly expand plate-checking capacity and improve stolen-vehicle detection and recovery. Evidence that ALPR, by itself, broadly reduces crime or consistently raises case-clearance rates is limited and mixed. The strongest defensible claim is that ALPR improves specific law-enforcement capabilities; results depend on deployment strategy, camera placement, investigative use, staffing, and the outcome being measured.

Research	What it found	What it did not establish
Taylor, Koper & Woods (2011)	8–10x more plates checked; nearly 3x as many stolen-vehicle hits; about 2x as many recoveries.	No statistically significant reduction in auto theft.
Koper & Lum (2019)	Clearance rates improved descriptively for auto theft and robbery, especially in high-LPR areas; LPRs assisted some cases.	Controlled models did not establish a statistically significant LPR effect.
Koper et al. (2022)	LPR patrols increased stolen-vehicle recoveries in 785 patrols across 33 hot spots.	No increase in arrests and no measurable initial or residual deterrence.
George Mason / NIJ project	Independent, university-led research program produced multiple peer-reviewed studies and public datasets.	The grant itself is a research program, not a separate outcome study.

Combined assessment

- Operational benefit is the clearest finding: ALPR scans far more plates than manual checks and can increase stolen-vehicle hits and recoveries.
- Investigative benefit is plausible but deployment-dependent: location, density, investigator use, and integration with other tools matter.
- Broad crime-reduction claims should be avoided: the reviewed experiments did not show reliable general deterrence or overall auto-theft reductions.
- Funding independence: the cited work was supported by the U.S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice and conducted by independent researchers. No Flock Safety funding or commissioning is identified in the cited funding records or disclosures.

Recommended public-facing wording: *Independent research indicates that ALPR can materially improve plate scanning, stolen-vehicle detection, and recoveries, while evidence of broad crime reduction remains mixed.*

STUDY 1

Combating Auto Theft in Arizona

Bruce Taylor, Christopher S. Koper & Daniel J. Woods | National Institute of Justice final report | 2011

Research question. Does mobile LPR patrol outperform manual plate checking and normal patrol in identifying stolen vehicles and reducing auto theft?

Design and setting. A randomized field experiment conducted with the Mesa Police Department in Arizona. Phase 1 lasted 30 weeks and assigned targeted road routes to LPR patrol, manual checking, or normal patrol/control conditions. Phase 2 lasted 18 weeks and used 54 approximately one-square-mile auto-theft hot zones, randomly divided among LPR patrol, manual checks, and normal patrol.

Key findings

- LPR patrol checked 8 to 10 times more license plates than manual checks or normal patrol.
- LPR generated nearly three times as many stolen-vehicle hits and approximately twice as many vehicle recoveries.
- All stolen-plate hits, stolen vehicle/plate arrests, and recoveries of occupied stolen vehicles recorded during the experiment were attributable to LPR use.
- The study did not find a statistically significant reduction in auto theft, displacement, or diffusion of crime-control benefits.

Interpretation and limitations

What it supports. A strong operational-efficiency conclusion: LPR can multiply plate checks and increase the detection and recovery of stolen vehicles during targeted patrol.

What it does not support. A claim that short-term LPR patrol alone causes broad or sustained reductions in auto theft. Relatively low hit and arrest counts, implementation variation, and limited intervention dosage constrained the crime-reduction test.

Funding and independence. Sponsored by the National Institute of Justice under grant 2007-IJ-CX-0023. The 2011 report identifies federal—not Flock—research support.

Source: [NIJ publication page and full report \(NCJ 248635\)](#)

STUDY 2

The Impacts of Large-Scale License Plate Reader Deployment on Criminal Investigations

Christopher S. Koper & Cynthia Lum | Police Quarterly, 22(3), 305–329 | 2019

Research question. Did a large fixed LPR network improve the likelihood or speed of clearing auto theft, theft-from-vehicle/vehicle-parts, and robbery cases?

Design and setting. A quasi-experimental evaluation of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department's network, which included 95 readers at 44 fixed positions plus 14 mostly mobile or trailer-mounted units. Researchers compared pre- and post-installation case outcomes and used life-table and Cox proportional-hazards analyses, including geographic comparisons between higher- and lower-LPR areas.

Key findings

- In high-LPR divisions, the 26-week auto-theft clearance rate rose from 10.2% to 13.7%—a 3.5-point absolute increase and 34% relative improvement.
- For robberies not cleared the same day, high-LPR divisions showed a 26-week increase from 29.4% to 32.5%.
- The improvements were not statistically significant in multivariate models that controlled for case characteristics and broader time/place effects.
- Researchers found that LPR information sometimes contributed to identifying vehicles, suspects, or locations, but it was not always the sole or decisive factor.

Interpretation and limitations

What it supports. LPR networks may aid investigations and could improve outcomes for some serious crimes when cameras are strategically placed and investigators use the data consistently.

What it does not support. A causal claim that LPR deployment alone produced the observed clearance improvements. Other technology and practice changes may have contributed, and 77% of locations were concentrated in four divisions that generated only 29% of auto thefts and 31% of robberies.

Funding and independence. The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest and disclosed support from the National Institute of Justice, grant 2013-IJ-CX-0017—not Flock Safety.

Source: [NIJ record for the peer-reviewed article \(NCJ 253904\)](#)

STUDY 3

Do License Plate Readers Enhance the Initial and Residual Deterrent Effects of Police Patrol?

Christopher S. Koper, Cynthia Lum, Xiaoyun Wu, William Johnson & Megan Stoltz | Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18, 725–746 | 2022

Research question. Does using and visibly displaying LPR equipment strengthen the immediate and lingering crime-deterrence effects of police patrol at hot spots?

Design and setting. A quasi-randomized test involving 785 intermittent patrols at 33 crime hot spots over 4.5 months in a large suburban jurisdiction. Hot spots received 15- to 30-minute patrols by officers with or without vehicle-mounted LPRs. Researchers assessed recoveries, arrests, calls during patrol, time to the next call, and seriousness of the next call.

Key findings

- LPR-equipped patrols increased stolen-vehicle recoveries.
- LPR use did not increase arrests.
- LPR use did not reduce the likelihood of a new crime or disorder call while an officer was present.
- LPR use did not affect how soon the next call occurred or the seriousness of that call after the patrol ended.

Interpretation and limitations

What it supports. A focused enforcement benefit for locating and recovering stolen vehicles during patrol.

What it does not support. The theory that simply equipping general patrol vehicles with visible LPR units creates additional immediate or residual crime deterrence. The test covered one jurisdiction, 33 hot spots, and a specific patrol model; other uses or deployment patterns may perform differently.

Funding and independence. This publication is listed by NIJ as an output of George Mason University's competitive grant 2013-IJ-CX-0017. No Flock Safety funding is identified in the cited federal award record.

Source: [Open-access article and DOI](#)

RESEARCH PROGRAM

George Mason University / NIJ LPR Evaluation Project

Evaluating the Crime Control and Cost-Benefit Effectiveness of LPR Technology in Patrol and Investigations | Award 2013-IJ-CX-0017

Purpose. This competitive federal research award funded an independent university program examining LPR effectiveness in patrol, investigations, organizational adoption, public trust, and related implementation questions. It provides the funding and research framework for several publications, including Studies 2 and 3 in this document.

Award facts

- Awardee: George Mason University.
- Sponsor: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Award number: 2013-IJ-CX-0017.
- Competitive award; first funded in 2013; total federal funding listed by NIJ: \$553,713.
- NIJ lists peer-reviewed publications and public research datasets produced under the award.

How to characterize it

Independence value. The award record documents a government-funded, university-led research stream rather than vendor-sponsored research. It is strong evidence that the related publications were not commissioned or funded by Flock Safety.

Important distinction. The award page is not itself a separate empirical study and should not be counted as independent proof of effectiveness. Its value is documenting sponsorship, scope, publications, and datasets. The individual publications provide the actual findings.

Bottom-line response to the request

Supported statement. Independent research demonstrates that ALPR can substantially increase plate checks and stolen-vehicle detections and recoveries, and may assist investigations. The literature does not establish that ALPR deployment alone reliably reduces overall crime; effectiveness varies by use, placement, and outcome.

Transparency note. The funding conclusions in this report are based on the federal award records and disclosures available at the cited sources. The wording 'no Flock Safety funding identified' is more precise than claiming it is impossible that any undisclosed relationship existed.

Source: [NIJ award record and list of grant-funded publications](#)

ALPR as a Force Multiplier

Illustrative Narcotics Investigation Case Study

Pocatello Police Department | Training / Policy Discussion

This is an illustrative scenario, not an actual PPD case. Time and cost figures are assumptions used to demonstrate resource impacts.

Purpose

This case study demonstrates how Automated License Plate Recognition (ALPR) can support narcotics detectives by reducing time spent trying to locate a known investigative vehicle. The comparison is not intended to suggest that ALPR replaces surveillance, interviews, records work, probable-cause development, or officer judgment. Rather, it shows how a recent, lawfully obtained vehicle lead can help detectives deploy limited personnel more efficiently.

Scenario

Narcotics detectives are investigating a suspected mid-level narcotic distributor. Through traditional investigative work, they identify a vehicle believed to be associated with the investigation. The vehicle is legally registered, the plate is known, and detectives have an authorized law-enforcement purpose for attempting to locate it. They do not yet know where the vehicle is currently operating, and they still need independent investigative work before any enforcement action can occur.

Approach A: Investigation Without ALPR

- Detectives begin with records checks, prior addresses, known associates, and locations developed during the investigation.
- Two detectives conduct drive-bys and fixed surveillance at likely locations. The vehicle does not appear during the first several hours.
- The team expands the search to other known locations and may need to repeat surveillance on a different day or shift.
- Additional personnel may be asked to watch for the vehicle during normal patrol activity, but those officers have competing calls for service.
- Even when the vehicle is eventually located, a significant amount of investigator time may already have been spent simply trying to establish where to begin focused surveillance.

Illustrative Resource Impact Without ALPR

Assumption	Illustrative Amount	Operational Effect
Detectives assigned	2	Two investigators unavailable for other case work
Initial surveillance/search period	8 hours each	16 detective-hours
Vehicle searching / drive-bys	Repeated	Fuel, mileage, and unproductive travel
Outcome if vehicle is not found	Repeat effort	Additional hours or overtime may be required

Using the assumptions above, the team spends 16 detective-hours before accounting for reports, coordination, follow-up, or any second surveillance period. The largest cost is not only wages or fuel; it is opportunity cost. Those same hours cannot be used for interviews, warrant preparation, informant follow-up, digital evidence review, or other active investigations.

Approach B: ALPR-Assisted Investigation

- Detectives use the known plate for an authorized investigative search or alert consistent with law and department policy.
- A recent ALPR detection provides a lead showing that the vehicle was observed in a particular area and direction of travel.
- The detective verifies the plate and vehicle characteristics and evaluates whether the information is relevant and current enough to guide the next investigative step.
- Instead of beginning with broad searching, the team deploys to a narrower area and conducts traditional surveillance.
- Detectives still establish identity, conduct surveillance, corroborate activity, develop probable cause, and make all enforcement decisions. The ALPR result is only a lead.

Illustrative Resource Impact With ALPR

Assumption	Illustrative Amount	Operational Effect
Initial ALPR review and verification	1 detective × 1 hour	Provides a recent starting point
Focused surveillance	2 detectives × 3 hours	6 detective-hours
Total illustrative detective time	7 hours	Compared with 16 hours in the traditional-start example
Illustrative time redirected	9 detective-hours	Available for case development or other investigations

Under this simplified example, the ALPR-assisted start redirects approximately 9 detective-hours. This is not a guaranteed savings figure; actual results depend on camera coverage, timing, the quality of the vehicle information, the investigative objective, and the need for corroboration. The point is that ALPR can reduce the amount of time highly trained personnel spend searching for a vehicle before substantive investigative work begins.

Illustrative Cost and Capacity Comparison

A department can calculate the financial effect using its own fully burdened hourly cost. For example, if the combined salary, benefits, vehicle, and operating cost assigned to a detective-hour were represented by C, then the illustrative nine-hour reduction equals $9 \times C$ in redirected capacity. This is better understood as recovered investigative capacity than as a guaranteed cash savings: the detectives remain on duty, but their time can be applied to higher-value tasks.

Measure	Without ALPR	ALPR-Assisted Example
Initial/focused detective time	16 hours	7 hours
Search area	Broad / uncertain	Narrowed by recent lead
Vehicle miles and fuel	Potentially repeated	More targeted
Overtime risk	Higher if repeated	Potentially reduced
Primary detective activity	Locating the vehicle	Developing and corroborating the case

Why This Is a Force Multiplier

A force multiplier does not mean the technology performs the detective's job. It means the same number of personnel can use their time more effectively. ALPR can help move an investigation from "Where is the vehicle?" to "What does this verified lead tell us, and what lawful investigative step comes next?" That shift can reduce unproductive surveillance, unnecessary vehicle travel, and repeated deployment while allowing detectives to spend more time on interviews, evidence, warrants, coordination, and other cases.

Required Safeguards

- Use only for an authorized law-enforcement purpose and consistent with department policy and applicable law.
- Document the reason for the search and the related case/report information when required.
- Treat every ALPR result as an investigative lead—not automatic probable cause.
- Verify the plate, vehicle, timing, and surrounding facts before taking enforcement action.
- Maintain training, role-based access, supervisory review, and regular audits.
- Protect legitimate investigative information while providing appropriate public transparency about policy, auditing, and aggregate use.

Conclusion

In a narcotics investigation, locating a known vehicle can consume significant personnel time before detectives reach the substantive investigative work. ALPR can provide a timely vehicle lead that narrows the starting point, helping detectives focus surveillance and redirect hours toward case development. Used with human verification, policy, audits, and supervisory oversight, ALPR functions as a force multiplier because it improves how limited personnel, time, fuel, and investigative resources are deployed—not because it replaces traditional police work.

From: [Schei, Roger](#)
To: [City.Council](#)
Cc: [Teuscher, Amy](#)
Subject: ALPR Success Story
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 2:59:07 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

I wanted to share a recent success story demonstrating the value of Flock technology in assisting officers with a high-risk domestic violence investigation.

Recently, officers responded to the neighborhood of North 9th Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho, for a reported domestic disturbance. During the investigation, it was determined that the victim had sustained injuries that met the elements of Felony Domestic Battery. The suspect had left the area prior to my arrival.

Due to the seriousness of the incident and the potential risk to the victim, Officers entered the suspect's vehicle into my custom Flock hotlist, identifying the vehicle as being associated with probable cause for the felony domestic violence offense.

Two days later, Flock technology generated an alert when the suspect's vehicle was detected entering Pocatello and traveling toward the victim's residence. Detectives and patrol officers were able to quickly intercept the vehicle, locate the suspect inside, and take him into custody for Felony Domestic Battery.

This incident is a great example of how Flock can provide law enforcement with timely, actionable information that may otherwise be difficult to obtain. Officers had significant concerns that the suspect could return to the victim's residence and potentially cause further harm. The Flock alert provided officers an opportunity to intervene before the suspect reached the residence.

Without access to Flock, officers would have had little chance of knowing the suspect had returned to the area until after he reached the victim's residence.

This case demonstrates the importance of Flock as an investigative and officer-safety tool. It helped provide officers with an early warning, allowed for a coordinated response, and ultimately assisted in taking a potentially dangerous suspect into custody while helping protect the victim from further harm.

Flock technology did not replace traditional police work—it enhanced it by providing officers with timely information, enabling them to act quickly and potentially prevent further violence.

We will continue to provide you with information. Thank you for your continued support.



Roger Schei #5164
FBI NA #257
Chief of Police
Phone: (208) 234-6113
www.pocatello.gov/370/Police

From: [Bartschi, Zachary](#)
To: [Schei, Roger](#)
Cc: [Teuscher, Amy](#); [Anderson, Eric \(Police\)](#); [Rasmussen, Mary](#)
Subject: Flock Success
Date: Friday, September 4, 2026 1:42:20 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Chief Schei,

I wanted to share a recent success involving the use of our Flock cameras and ALPR technology.

Recently, a Sergeant was assigned to investigate a missing person report. During the investigation, the Sergeant quickly learned that the missing person was a vulnerable adult who had recently suffered a stroke and was experiencing severe confusion, along with significant heart-related medical issues. The individual had last been seen leaving in a vehicle, and a description of the vehicle was provided.

Using the available vehicle information and our ALPR resources, the Sergeant was able to determine that the vehicle had traveled into the Twin Falls area. Recognizing the seriousness of the situation, the Sergeant entered the individual into NCIC as a missing vulnerable adult and coordinated with law enforcement partners in an effort to locate him.

Approximately one hour after he was reported missing, the adult was located near Elko, Nevada. Due to his medical condition, he was transported to a regional hospital for medical care and was ultimately reunited with his family.

I thought this was a great example of how ALPR technology, when combined with good police work and coordination between agencies, can have a direct impact on public safety. In this case, the technology allowed the Sergeant to quickly identify the direction of travel, narrow the search area, and provide actionable information to other law enforcement.

While we often discuss the value of ALPR technology in terms of identifying suspects, locating stolen vehicles, and solving crimes, this is an important reminder that it can also be a life-saving tool. The Sergeant's quick actions and effective use of the available technology helped locate a medically vulnerable person hundreds of miles away in a very short period of time.

I wanted to make sure you were aware of this success and the positive impact the technology continues to have for our officers and the community.

Thanks,

Zac

Zac Bartschi #5240
Captain Patrol Division
911 N. 7th Ave, Pocatello, ID 83201



Phone: 208-234-6100

www.pocatello.gov/370/Police