

**From:** [Erik Purins](#)  
**To:** [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] May 5 2026 - Concerns about non-APD use of flock cameras (5-C 2026-5859)  
**Date:** Monday, May 4, 2026 3:00:49 PM

---

Hi council members,

I saw that the May 5 meeting concerns a recommendation to accept the annual report data from the police department.

I wasn't able to download the attachments, which currently (2026-05-04 1:57pm) say they are unavailable.

But I did find an excerpt online that showed a graphic from the report, and it says that there are 14 unnamed sources who aren't the city, that queried our flock camera data.

\* <https://www.themorningbun.com/can-city-of-alameda-trust-flock-safety/>

As a resident, I demand transparency over whether the 14 unnamed groups asking queries against our camera data, are on behalf of federal agencies that don't have flock contracts - namely, ICE/ATF/CBP - or agencies in Florida and other states, deputized to query on their behalf.

I also would like a figure that describes how many queries APD has issued on behalf of other agencies, and a review of what other camera networks APD has queried.

I would also appreciate a breakout of how descriptive and accurate (or vague) the query reasons are given for queries we originate, as well as incoming queries by the other 14 agencies.

This is because flock has demonstrated flagrantly ignoring user data and privacy policies, not disabling and uninstalling cameras to retrieve their equipment when contracts end, and questionable ethics around access to video footage of children. They have also encouraged corrupting influence around police forces' descriptions of queries being run.

Independent journalism has revealed that flock is not a good steward of city data and policies. See for example:

\* flock using cameras within day care centers during sales demos

(<https://www.404media.co/city-learns-flock-accessed-cameras-in-childrens-gymnastics-room-as-a-sales-pitch-demo-renews-contract-anyway/>)

\* florida agencies deputized to help ICE using flock (<https://www.404media.co/floridas-wildlife-cops-are-searching-thousands-of-flock-cameras-for-ice/>)

\* police departments coached to be as vague as possible when describing why they're using flock (<https://www.404media.co/police-told-to-be-as-vague-as-permissible-about-why-they-use-flock/>)

In an example of bad faith, when the city of Verona, Wisconsin canceled their flock camera contract, flock continued to use the cameras, would not uninstall the cameras when asked, and the city went and encased the video cameras with black plastic bags. Only then would flock come uninstall their equipment.

\* <https://boltsmag.org/verona-wisconsin-ends-contract-flock-ai-surveillance-cameras/>

I'm raising these points, because there are other vendors capable of securing video footage, limiting access to video footage, and I believe it's time we stopped using these cameras, and look for a new ALPR vendor. The new vendor and the contract with this vendor should specify things like data retention windows, security policies around access, and privacy-forward features.

Although it's frustrating to revisit this decision, I'm ok with spending more money to begin a new purchase cycle that focuses on data privacy and citizen's rights, over the far reaching video surveillance opportunities that flock offers. With flock's track record, the city can't afford current and future rights violations.

The City of Alameda needs to purchase ALPRs from other commercial vendors, those that can run on-site or within Alameda-controlled compute environments (AWS, etc).

I strongly urge the council to terminate our contract with flock, bag up the cameras and uninstall them, and proceed with new purchases. And to coordinate with any other agencies - public and private - that may be placing flock cameras within the boundary of The City, and to encourage them to remove that equipment from Alameda.

Thank you for your service, and your attention to the stewardship of our privacy.

Erik Purins  
1000 Versailles Ave.  
Alameda, CA 94501  
(341) 222-7829

**From:** [Lars R. Damerow](#)  
**To:** [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Please do not continue the Flock contract  
**Date:** Monday, May 4, 2026 12:30:22 PM

---

Hello,

I'm an Alameda resident and have been disappointed to see Flock cameras installed around the island. I recognize that license plate readers are helpful for public safety and investigations, but Flock specifically has become very difficult to trust. They have happily cooperated with ICE and even have shared information with police in Texas who were searching for someone whom they claim had an abortion. Even though Flock says they removed some states, including California, from the tool they provide for national license plate searches, they have shown themselves to be perfectly willing to grant sweeping surveillance to the government in communities that don't push back.

Please, don't let Alameda be a community that Flock surveils. If we must have automated license plate readers in our city, find a vendor that can be audited and trusted to only share information with local police and only for investigation that warrants it.

Thank you!

--

lars r. damerow

**From:** [Catherine Egelhoff](#)  
**To:** [CITYCOUNCIL-List](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Flock cameras  
**Date:** Saturday, May 2, 2026 8:44:13 PM

---

Dear City Council,

I am very concerned about the City Of Alameda's contract for flock cameras. I've just read The Morning Bun column today, May 2, which details the use and abuse of flock cameras. Please look into the possibilities of Ice getting data from Alameda. None of us want that.

Sincerely,

Catherine Egelhoff.