

THE FLORIDA ALPR TRANSPARENCY PROJECT

Northern Florida ALPR Transparency Report

An independent, records-based review of how automated license plate reader (ALPR) systems are procured, governed, deployed, and overseen by law enforcement agencies in Northern Florida.

Volume I — Putnam County Sheriff's Office

Prepared and authored by Sam Cornell

Working Draft — Version 1.0 • July 2026

A living document — revised as additional public records are received.

Author's Note

This report is a living document. It is prepared to the standard of a government audit or inspector-general review: it distinguishes documented facts from interpretation, cites primary-source records wherever possible, and clearly labels what remains unknown. Its purpose is not to reach a predetermined conclusion, but to build an accurate, publicly accessible factual record that residents, elected officials, journalists, and law enforcement agencies can rely on when discussing this technology.

As of this version, the report reflects records produced by the **Putnam County Sheriff's Office** in response to a request under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. Comparable requests have been submitted to the Alachua County and St. Johns County Sheriff's Offices. As those agencies produce records, the corresponding chapters and a cross-county comparison will be completed. Existing findings may be refined as additional documentary evidence becomes available.

Contents

Author's Note.....	2
Executive Summary.....	4
Methodology, Scope, and Limitations.....	5
How to Read This Report.....	6
Definitions.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Document Inventory.....	9
Chapter 1 — Background: Automated License Plate Readers.....	10
Chapter 2 — The Legal and Regulatory Framework.....	11
Chapter 3 — Putnam County Sheriff's Office: Program Overview.....	13
Chapter 4 — Document-by-Document Review.....	14
Chapter 5 — Consolidated Findings.....	20
Chapter 6 — Open Questions and Recommended Records Requests.....	22
Chapter 7 — Observations and Recommendations.....	23
Chapter 8 — Alachua County Sheriff's Office.....	24
Chapter 9 — St. Johns County Sheriff's Office.....	25
Chapter 10 — Cross-County Comparative Analysis.....	26
Appendix A — Document Index.....	27
Appendix B — Shared-Network Participants.....	28
Appendix C — Legal Authorities and Sources.....	30
Appendix D — About the Project.....	31

Executive Summary

This report presents an independent, records-based review of the Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) program operated by the Putnam County Sheriff's Office. It is the first phase of a broader project examining how ALPR systems are procured, governed, and overseen by law enforcement agencies in Northern Florida. Every material statement in this report is drawn from records the Sheriff's Office produced under Florida's Public Records Act, from the vendor's own documentation, or from Florida statutes and state agency guidance.

The report does not begin from the premise that ALPR technology is inherently beneficial or inherently harmful. It asks a defined set of practical questions — how the system was acquired, what it costs, what data it collects, how long that data is kept, who may access it, how its use is audited, where cameras are placed and under what authority, and what the public is told — and it answers those questions from the documentary record, identifying where the record is silent.

What the records establish

- **Scale and cost.** Putnam County contracted with Flock Group, Inc. ("Flock Safety") on December 18, 2023 for a 60-month term with an automatically renewing 60-month renewal term. The order form covers 18 Flock Safety Falcon cameras and the FlockOS platform at a stated contract total of \$231,500 (\$51,500 in year one, \$45,000 annually thereafter).
- **Activity.** The Sheriff's Office transparency data reports 20 cameras, roughly 278,993 unique vehicle detections, 51,951 hotlist alerts, and 324 user search sessions over a single 30-day window — for a county of roughly 74,000 residents.
- **A very large sharing network.** Putnam County's Flock network relationships extend to approximately 604 organizations across at least 15 states, including a federal Office of Inspector General, state agencies, university and railroad police, and private corporations.
- **A real statutory framework.** Florida law specifically regulates these systems: sections 316.0777 and 316.0778, Florida Statutes, govern installation in state road rights-of-way, cap data retention, and make plate images and data confidential and exempt from public disclosure. Roadside installations on the State Highway System require an FDOT General Use Permit.

What remains open

Several questions cannot be resolved from the records produced so far and are flagged for follow-up rather than assumed: the two-camera difference between the contract (18) and the published count (20); whether FDOT General Use Permits were issued for cameras installed in state rights-of-way (the records include permission letters but not the permits themselves); how user searches are audited for misuse; how the Sheriff's Office's own acceptable-use limits are enforced against outside agencies querying shared data; and what arrests or prosecutions, if any, are documented as attributable to the system. The Sheriff's Office maintains a Flock transparency portal, but as of the record reviewed it was configured as "Not Published."

These are presented as observations and recommendations for transparency — not as allegations of wrongdoing. The most useful contribution this report can make is an accurate, well-sourced record and a clear list of the questions a diligent oversight body would ask next.

Methodology, Scope, and Limitations

Methodology

This report was prepared using the following methods:

- Public records requests submitted under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, to the Putnam, Alachua, and St. Johns County Sheriff's Offices.
- Document-by-document review of the contracts, policies, interagency agreements, permitting correspondence, transparency data, and vendor materials produced in response.
- Comparison of those records against applicable Florida statutes, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) permitting rules, and Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) guidance.
- Reliance on primary-source records rather than media accounts wherever feasible; where secondary reporting is cited, it is identified as reporting.
- Planned field documentation of camera locations and installations, to be incorporated in a later revision.

Scope

This version covers only the records produced by the Putnam County Sheriff's Office. The Alachua County and St. Johns County chapters, and the cross-county comparison, are reserved and will be completed as records arrive. The report examines program governance, procurement, data practices, transparency, and the legal and engineering framework for physical installations. It does not evaluate the merits of any individual criminal investigation or second-guess particular law-enforcement decisions.

Limitations

- Some operational and technical details are exempt from disclosure by statute — in particular, plate images and data containing personal identifying information are confidential and exempt under section 316.0777(3), Florida Statutes.
- The absence of a record in the material produced does not necessarily mean the underlying practice does not exist; it means the practice is not documented in what was produced and is therefore identified as an open question.
- Vendor-supplied figures (for example, detection and search counts) are reported as the vendor and agency present them and have not been independently audited.
- Field verification of individual camera installations had not been completed as of this version.

How to Read This Report

Evidence and confidence scale

To keep documented facts separate from interpretation, every finding in this report carries one of three confidence labels:

- **PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE** Established directly by a government record, contract, policy, permit, or statute.
- **SUPPORTED INFERENCE** A reasonable conclusion drawn from one or more documents, identified as an inference.
- **OPEN QUESTION** Not yet answerable from the available record; flagged for a follow-up records request.

Numbering

Findings are numbered by chapter (for example, Finding 5.1 is the first finding in Chapter 5). Document reviews are numbered within Chapter 4 (Document Review 4.1, 4.2, and so on). This lets journalists, commissioners, and residents cite a specific finding precisely.

Definitions

For purposes of this report:

ALPR / LPR	Automated License Plate Reader (also "License Plate Reader"). A system of one or more fixed or mobile high-speed cameras combined with computer algorithms that convert images of license plates into computer-readable data (see § 316.0777(1)(c), Fla. Stat.).
OCR	Optical Character Recognition — the software process that reads plate characters from an image.
Vehicle detection	A single observation of a vehicle recorded by an ALPR camera, typically including the plate, a timestamp, location, and vehicle images.
Vehicle Fingerprint	Flock's term for characteristic-based search (for example, roof racks, bumper stickers, aftermarket wheels) that does not rely on the plate alone.
Search	A query run by an authorized user against stored ALPR detections.
Hotlist / Hot Plate	A list of plates of interest (for example, from NCIC/FCIC or an agency-generated list) that triggers an alert when detected.
Hit / Tag Hit	An alert that a detected plate matches a hotlist; under agency policy a hit must be human-verified before any action and does not by itself establish probable cause.
Retention period	How long detections remain accessible before deletion under policy and law.
Shared network	A set of participating organizations that have agreed to share and/or receive ALPR detections through the vendor's platform.
CJI / CJISSECPOL	Criminal Justice Information and the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Security Policy that governs access to it.
ROW	Right-of-way — land dedicated to a public road; state-road ROW is defined at § 334.03(21), Fla. Stat.

Research Questions

The report is organized around the questions a diligent oversight body would ask about any surveillance program:

Governance

- Who owns the data, and who controls access to it?
- Who audits use, and how often are policies reviewed?

Procurement

- How was the system purchased, and through what process?
- What is the total cost, when does the contract expire, and how can it be terminated?

Privacy

- How long is data retained, and what identifying information is stored?
- Can historical data be exported, and can outside agencies preserve it beyond local retention limits?

Transparency

- What information is made available to the public?
- What reports and metrics are generated, and are they published?

Engineering and siting

- Were installations properly permitted, and which entity owns the roadway?
- Are installations consistent with applicable state engineering and placement standards?

Document Inventory

The following records from the Putnam County Sheriff's Office form the evidentiary basis for Chapters 3 through 7. Each is examined in Chapter 4.

Document	Date	Type	Reviewed
Flock Safety Order Form / 5-year contract	Dec 18, 2023	Procurement / contract	Yes
General Order 4920.00 — ALPR Program	Eff. Nov 8, 2022	Agency policy	Yes
Flock transparency portal export	Jul 14, 2026	Vendor / agency data	Yes
Shared-network organization roster	Jul 14, 2026	Network participation	Yes
Lead Contract Agreement (CJIS vendor screening)	Aug 26, 2025	Interagency / CJIS	Yes
FDOT permission letter	Jul 31, 2023	Permitting correspondence	Yes
Notarized permission letter to Flock Group, Inc.	Dec 20, 2023	Permitting correspondence	Yes
FDOT letter — Camera #16 (Clay County line)	May 17, 2024	Permitting correspondence	Yes
Flock user guide (redacted)	n/d	Vendor training material	Partial (redacted)

Chapter 1 — Background: Automated License Plate Readers

Automated License Plate Reader systems are camera-based technologies that photograph passing vehicles and use optical character recognition to convert plate images into searchable data. Florida law defines an ALPR system as "a system of one or more mobile or fixed high-speed cameras combined with computer algorithms to convert images of license plates into computer-readable data" (§ 316.0777(1)(c), Fla. Stat.). In practice, modern systems capture more than the plate: a single detection commonly includes the date, time, location, direction of travel, images of the vehicle, and characteristics such as make, color, and distinguishing features.

The system deployed by the Putnam County Sheriff's Office is Flock Safety's Falcon fixed-camera platform, operated through the FlockOS software environment. According to the records reviewed, the system also participates in a broader network that lets authorized agencies query detections across participating jurisdictions, and it offers "Vehicle Fingerprint" search that filters on vehicle characteristics rather than the plate alone.

ALPR technology is used nationwide to locate stolen vehicles, identify vehicles tied to investigations, find missing persons, and generate investigative leads. Policies vary widely between agencies on retention, permitted uses, auditing, and interagency sharing. The technology has prompted sustained discussion among courts, legislatures, law enforcement, and civil-liberties organizations — supporters emphasizing investigative efficiency, others raising concerns about long-term retention, networked sharing, and the collection of data on people not suspected of any crime. This report takes no side in that debate; it documents how one Florida agency has implemented the technology and measures that implementation against the records and the law.

Primary sources for this section:

- Flock Safety Order Form and product documentation (produced by PCSO).
- § 316.0777, Florida Statutes (definition of ALPR system).
- Putnam County Sheriff's Office General Order 4920.00.

Chapter 2 — The Legal and Regulatory Framework

A common misconception is that ALPR deployment in Florida is unregulated. It is not. A specific statutory and administrative framework governs how these systems may be installed on state roads, how long their data may be kept, and whether that data is public. Understanding this framework is essential to evaluating any agency's program, because it defines what compliance looks like.

2.1 Installation in state rights-of-way — § 316.0777, Fla. Stat.

Section 316.0777 authorizes FDOT, at its discretion, to permit an ALPR system within the right-of-way of a road on the State Highway System when a law enforcement agency requests it for collecting active criminal intelligence or investigative information. The statute imposes several conditions of direct relevance to any audit:

- **No traffic-enforcement use.** An ALPR system "may not be used to issue a notice of violation for a traffic infraction or a uniform traffic citation." (§ 316.0777(2)(b).)
- **Placement standards.** Installation "must be in accordance with placement and installation guidelines developed by the Department of Transportation."
- **Agency cost and removal.** Installation and removal are "at the sole expense of the requesting law enforcement agency," and the system must be removed within 30 days after FDOT notifies the agency to remove it.
- **Retention cap.** Images and data "may not be retained longer than the maximum period provided in the retention schedule established pursuant to s. 316.0778."

The statute also makes the sensitive data confidential: images and data containing or providing personal identifying information obtained through an ALPR system are confidential and exempt from public disclosure under § 119.07(1) and Article I, section 24(a) of the Florida Constitution (§ 316.0777(3)). Such information may be shared by or to a criminal justice agency in its official duties, and an individual may obtain data tied to their own plate unless it is active criminal intelligence or investigative information (§ 316.0777(4)). The section was enacted in 2014 and amended in 2019 and 2023.

2.2 FDOT General Use Permit for license plate readers

FDOT implements section 316.0777 through a permitting process. Per FDOT's published guidance, an ALPR installation in State Highway System right-of-way "must be authorized through a General Use Permit in accordance with Rule 14-20.010 of the Florida Administrative Code." Key features of that process, as published by FDOT (revised May 23, 2024), include:

- The applicant must be a law enforcement agency, or an authorized representative applying on agency letterhead signed by the agency's chief executive.
- FDOT's Automated License Plate Recognition System Placement and Installation Guidelines apply to every application, and approved permits carry FDOT's "Special Provisions."
- Applications are filed through the FDOT One-Stop Permitting website (osp.fdot.gov) or the local FDOT Operations Center, using General Use Permit Application Form 850-040-05.
- Installation and removal are at the agency's sole expense, and the reader must be removed within 30 days of an FDOT removal notice.
- Approved LPR permits are valid for five years and may be renewed.

This is the mechanism directly implicated by the Sheriff's Office permission letters examined in **Document Reviews 4.6 and 4.7**: those letters authorize Flock Safety to apply for permitting on the agency's behalf — precisely the "authorized representative on agency letterhead" pathway FDOT describes. Whether the resulting General Use Permits were issued is examined as an open question.

2.3 Data retention — § 316.0778 and the state retention schedule

Section 316.0778 directs the Department of State, in consultation with FDLE, to establish a retention schedule setting a maximum period for which ALPR images and data may be retained. In other words, the outer limit on retention is fixed by a statewide schedule, and an agency's configured retention must fall within it. As documented in Chapter 4, the Putnam County contract and transparency data both state a 30-day retention period for detections.

2.4 Statewide ALPR guidelines and CJIS

Two further layers apply. First, Florida's Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems (CJJIS) Council adopted statewide Guidelines for the Use of Automated License Plate Readers (revised and approved November 13, 2024), which address privacy restrictions and retention. Second, because ALPR platforms touch Criminal Justice Information, the FBI CJIS Security Policy requires agencies to execute a vendor security agreement covering any non-governmental personnel with access to that information — the subject of the Lead Contract Agreement reviewed at 4.5.

2.5 Public records law

Finally, Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, governs public access to agency records generally, and section 119.0701 imposes public-records duties on contractors acting on an agency's behalf. The Putnam County contract incorporates those contractor obligations directly, as discussed at 4.1. The public-records exemption for plate images and PII (§ 316.0777(3)) is a carve-out from this general presumption of openness; policy documents, contracts, permits, and aggregate statistics remain public.

Primary sources for this section:

- § 316.0777 and § 316.0778, Florida Statutes (2025).
- FDOT, "License Plate Readers," fdot.gov/traffic/trafficservices/lpr (rev. May 23, 2024); Rule 14-20.010, F.A.C.; Form 850-040-05.
- FDLE / CJJIS Council, Guidelines for the Use of Automated License Plate Readers (approved Nov 13, 2024).
- Chapter 119, Florida Statutes; § 119.0701 (contractor obligations).

Chapter 3 — Putnam County Sheriff's Office: Program Overview

Introduction

The Putnam County Sheriff's Office ("PCSO") is the first agency examined in this report because it was the first to produce responsive records. The materials provide a clear view of how a modern ALPR program is assembled: a vendor contract, an internal policy, an interagency screening agreement, permitting correspondence, participation in a large sharing network, and a public transparency component. This chapter establishes the factual record; Chapter 4 examines each document in sequence, and Chapters 5 through 7 draw findings and recommendations.

3.1 The program at a glance

Agency	Putnam County Sheriff's Office (Sheriff H.D. "Gator" DeLoach), Palatka, FL
Vendor	Flock Group, Inc. ("Flock Safety"), Atlanta, GA
System	Flock Safety Falcon fixed cameras, operated through FlockOS
Contract executed	December 18, 2023
Term	60 months, with an automatically renewing 60-month renewal term
Stated contract total	\$231,500 (\$51,500 year one; \$45,000 annually thereafter)
Cameras	18 Falcon units on the order form; 20 LPR cameras reported on the transparency portal
Retention	30 days (per contract and transparency data)
Governing policy	General Order 4920.00, Automatic License Plate Reader Program (eff. Nov 8, 2022)
Network reach	≈ 604 organizations across at least 15 states (see Appendix B)

3.2 Lifecycle of the program

Read together, the records trace a coherent lifecycle: the Sheriff's Office adopted an ALPR policy (General Order 4920.00, effective November 2022); executed a five-year Flock Safety contract (December 2023); authorized the vendor to seek FDOT permitting for roadside installations (permission letters of July and December 2023, and a specific request for a camera near the Clay County line in May 2024); entered a CJIS vendor-screening arrangement to cover Flock personnel with access to criminal justice information (August 2025); and joined a large multi-state sharing network, while maintaining a not-yet-published transparency portal that reports usage statistics. The chapters that follow examine each stage against the framework in Chapter 2.

Chapter 4 — Document-by-Document Review

This chapter examines each record in turn. For every document it states the purpose, the key provisions established by the text, the legal significance, and the questions the document does not answer.

Document Review 4.1 — Flock Safety Order Form and Five-Year Contract

Purpose. Establishes the commercial relationship between PCSO and Flock Safety, including equipment, term, price, renewal, and incorporated terms of service. Executed December 18, 2023.

Key provisions established by the document:

Customer	FL – Putnam County SO, 130 Orie Griffin Blvd, Palatka, FL 32177
Initial term	60 months
Renewal term	60 months; auto-renews unless either party gives ≥ 30 days' notice of non-renewal before the end of the then-current term
Payment terms	Net 30; annual plan, first year invoiced at signing
Retention period	30 days
Hardware / software	FlockOS (1, included); Flock Safety Falcon cameras (quantity 18, included)
Professional services	Standard implementation fee $\$650 \times 10 = \$6,500$
Year-one subtotal	\$51,500
Annual recurring	\$45,000
Contract total	\$231,500

Two features carry particular weight. First, the order form incorporates Flock's online Terms of Service by reference ("the terms and conditions located at flocksafety.com/terms-and-conditions"), so the full commercial and data terms are not contained within the produced packet. Second, the contract appends Putnam County-specific public-records provisions requiring the vendor, as a contractor under § 119.0701, Florida Statutes, to keep and maintain public records, provide copies at statutory cost, protect exempt records, and transfer all public records to the Sheriff at no cost on completion of the contract.

Legal significance. The five-year term with an automatic five-year renewal means the default path is a decade of operation unless the agency affirmatively gives notice in a narrow 30-day window. The incorporated Terms of Service are where data ownership, deletion, and any derivative-use rights are actually defined — which is why obtaining that referenced document is a priority follow-up.

Finding 4.1 Contract structure favors continuity by default.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

The agreement runs 60 months and renews automatically for a further 60 months unless either party affirmatively opts out at least 30 days before the term ends. The stated total is \$231,500 over the initial term.

Evidence: Flock Safety Order Form (Exhibit A) and Billing Schedule, executed Dec 18, 2023.

Significance: Elected officials reviewing the program should note the automatic-renewal mechanics and the limited

notice window when considering future oversight or reevaluation.

PENDING — *The Flock Terms of Service incorporated by reference were not included in the produced records. Obtaining them is necessary to confirm data ownership, deletion on termination, and any vendor rights to use or derive value from detections. Flagged for follow-up (see Chapter 6).*

Document Review 4.2 — General Order 4920.00 (ALPR Program Policy)

Purpose. The Sheriff's Office's internal policy governing ALPR use. Effective November 8, 2022; indexed to accreditation standard CFA 32.04.

Key provisions. The policy designates the Criminal Investigation Commander as ALPR Administrator; ties system access to operational need and defined access levels (Communications Center staff and supervisors, patrol deputies with filtered access, and Criminal Investigations detectives with full access); and requires training keyed to each access level.

On use and safeguards, the policy states authorized purposes including locating stolen or wanted vehicles, stolen tags, and missing persons, and supporting active-warrant, homeland-security, and interdiction work. It provides that a tag hit "does not establish probable cause for an arrest or stop in and of itself" and that a user must confirm a hit's validity before acting — a meaningful safeguard. It restricts "Hot Plate" entries to felony cases or missing/endangered persons, sets a 30-day default expiration for Hot Plates with supervisory review for extension, and directs that Hot Plates be removed once their investigative purpose is achieved. It confines all use to official law enforcement purposes and warns that misuse may result in discipline up to termination.

Notable descriptive point. The policy describes the Flock database as containing "any and all tag detections provided by commercial and government partners who use the system," and describes "Vehicle Fingerprint" search on characteristics such as roof racks, bumper stickers, and aftermarket wheels. It also contemplates both fixed cameras — placed at locations approved by the Director of Law Enforcement, Chief Deputy, or Sheriff — and mobile "ALPR trailers," including disguised trailers.

Finding 4.2 Policy includes hit-verification and hotlist-scope safeguards, but does not describe a periodic misuse audit.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

General Order 4920.00 requires human verification of hits before action, limits Hot Plates to felonies and missing/endangered persons with a 30-day expiration, and confines use to official purposes. It assigns access levels and a daily activity report for confirmed stolen-vehicle hits, but the produced policy does not set out a routine, documented audit of user search activity for misuse.

Evidence: General Order 4920.00 (eff. Nov 8, 2022).

Significance: The presence of verification and scope limits is a genuine safeguard; the absence of a documented periodic audit process is a reasonable subject for a follow-up request and a policy recommendation.

Document Review 4.3 — Flock Transparency Portal Export

Purpose. A vendor-hosted public webpage intended to disclose how the agency uses Flock technology, together with usage statistics. The export reviewed is dated July 14, 2026.

Key data established by the export:

Publication status	Not Published (as of Jul 14, 2026)
Cameras	20 LPR cameras; 20 total cameras
Detected	License plates, vehicles
Not detected	Facial recognition, people, gender, race
Data retention	30 days
Access policy	"All system access requires a valid reason and is stored indefinitely."
Hotlist policy	Hotlist hits require human verification prior to action
Acceptable use	Law enforcement purposes only; data owned by PCSO; never sold to third parties
Prohibited uses	Immigration enforcement; traffic enforcement; harassment or intimidation; use based solely on a protected class; personal use
Hotlist sources	NCIC, FCIC, NCMEC Amber Alert, FL Sanctioned Drivers, FL Expired Tags, FL Expired Licenses, FL Sex Offenders, FBI National Hotlist
Unique vehicles (30 days)	278,993
Hotlist hits (30 days)	51,951
Searches (30 days)	324

Legal significance. The stated prohibitions align with Florida law and Flock's own policy in important respects: barring ALPR use for traffic enforcement matches the statutory prohibition in § 316.0777(2)(b), and barring immigration enforcement and protected-class targeting reflects Flock's published acceptable-use limits. The 30-day retention is consistent with a short retention configuration. Two points warrant attention: the portal was "Not Published," so these disclosures were not visible to the public as of the record reviewed; and the access policy states that access records are "stored indefinitely," which should be reconciled with the 30-day detection-data retention so the public understands what is kept and for how long.

Scale in context. Roughly 278,993 unique vehicle detections in 30 days is a large figure relative to Putnam County's population (approximately 74,000 residents). The overwhelming majority of detections necessarily involve vehicles not connected to any crime — an observation about the nature of the technology, not a criticism of any particular use.

Finding 4.3 The transparency portal is built and populated but was not published.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

As of the July 14, 2026 export, the Sheriff's Office transparency portal contained current policies and statistics but its status was "Not Published," meaning the public could not view it.

Evidence: Flock transparency portal export, Putnam County FL SO, Jul 14, 2026.

Significance: Publishing the portal would be a low-cost, high-value transparency step and would make the agency's own stated safeguards publicly verifiable.

Document Review 4.4 — Shared-Network Organization Roster

Purpose. A roster of organizations appearing in Putnam County's Flock network relationships (sharing and/or receiving), dated July 14, 2026.

Key facts. The roster lists approximately 604 distinct organizations. Cross-referencing the entries by state token shows participation spanning at least 15 states — heavily Florida, Georgia, and Alabama, and also South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Indiana, Texas, Mississippi, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, New Mexico, and Missouri. The roster is not limited to municipal and county police; it includes state agencies, universities, a federal office, and private corporations.

Notable categories of participants include:

- **Federal.** "[Federal] US GSA Office of Inspector General" — listed among organizations both sharing with and receiving from Putnam County's network on the transparency export.
- **State of Florida.** Florida Highway Patrol; Florida Department of Law Enforcement; Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission police; Florida Department of Corrections; Florida Office of Agriculture Law Enforcement; Florida Department of Financial Services; and the State Attorney's Office, 7th Circuit.
- **Out-of-state and multi-agency.** Alabama Law Enforcement Agency; Texas Financial Crimes Intelligence Center; TN ROCIC; and the Chatham-Savannah Counter Narcotics Team, among many others.
- **Private and quasi-public.** Lowe's Corporation; CSX Railroad Police; Seminole Electric Cooperative; the Palatka Housing Authority; and numerous university police departments.

Legal significance. Section 316.0777(4) allows sharing of ALPR data by or to a criminal justice agency in the performance of official duties. The breadth of this roster raises a governance question rather than a legal conclusion: the Sheriff's Office's own acceptable-use policy (no immigration or traffic enforcement, no protected-class targeting) governs PCSO users, but a shared-network architecture makes Putnam detections queryable by outside organizations whose internal policies and query reasons PCSO does not control. Regional reporting in 2025–2026 documented that Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission police — a network participant here — performed immigration-related lookups across thousands of Flock networks on behalf of federal immigration authorities. That reporting is cited as reporting, not as a finding about Putnam County; but it illustrates precisely why the governance of who may query shared data, and under what enforceable limits, is the central open question this roster raises.

Finding 4.4 Putnam County's detections are exposed to a very large, multi-state network that includes federal, state, private, and out-of-state participants.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

The produced roster lists roughly 604 organizations across at least 15 states, including a federal Office of Inspector General, multiple state agencies, university and railroad police, and private corporations such as Lowe's and a rural electric cooperative.

Evidence: Shared-network organization roster (Jul 14, 2026); transparency portal "Sharing/Receiving Network Data With" lists.

Significance: The reach of the network is far broader than a single county, and the agency's own acceptable-use limits do not necessarily bind how partner organizations query shared data. How those limits are enforced network-wide is

Document Review 4.5 — Lead Contract Agreement (CJIS Vendor Screening)

Purpose. A "Lead Contract Agreement for Interagency Information Sharing" between the Panama City Beach Police Department (the "Lead Contract Agency") and PCSO (the "Contract Agency"), executed August 26, 2025, to satisfy FBI CJIS Security Policy requirements for vendor personnel who have access to Criminal Justice Information.

Key provisions. The agreement recites that both agencies contract with "FLOCK Safety, a private company, for services supporting the administration of criminal justice and systems containing CJI," and that CJIS policy requires a vendor contract for non-governmental entities with access to criminal history record information. Under it, the Lead Contract Agency fingerprints and screens Flock Safety employees who require "unescorted physical or logical access to CJI and/or CJI Systems and Networks," maintains the roster of authorized Flock personnel, ensures they complete security-awareness training and sign the CJIS Security Addendum, and notifies PCSO of denials, terminations, or disqualifying activity. Either party may terminate on 30 days' written notice.

Legal significance. The agreement is evidence of compliance with a specific federal requirement — a point in the program's favor. It also establishes, in the agency's own words, that Flock Safety personnel (a private vendor) may have logical access to criminal justice information systems. That is a material data-governance fact: the security of the program depends in part on a third-party vendor's employees, screened through another municipal agency hundreds of miles away in the Florida Panhandle.

Finding 4.5 Compliance with CJIS vendor-screening is documented, and it confirms private-vendor access to criminal justice information.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

PCSO satisfies the CJIS vendor-screening requirement through a lead-agency agreement with the Panama City Beach Police Department. The agreement's text confirms that Flock Safety employees may hold unescorted physical or logical access to CJI systems.

Evidence: Lead Contract Agreement, PCBPDP and PCSO, executed Aug 26, 2025.

Significance: Documented CJIS compliance is a strength; the confirmation of vendor access to CJI underscores why the incorporated Flock Terms of Service and audit practices matter.

Document Review 4.6 — FDOT Permitting Correspondence

Purpose. Correspondence relating to FDOT permitting for roadside installations. Two items are in the record: a July 31, 2023 letter from Sheriff DeLoach granting permission for Flock Safety "to apply for any necessary permitting for the Putnam County Sheriff's Office," and a May 17, 2024 letter to FDOT District 2 requesting that FDOT allow Flock Safety to apply for permits on the agency's behalf for a specific camera.

The camera near the county line. The May 17, 2024 letter concerns "Camera #16 U.S. 17 NORTH OF C.R. 214 (SUN GARDEN RD) SB," described as "just inside the Clay County line," to be "utilized by both Putnam and Clay Counties." The letter states plainly that Putnam County's Flock cameras "are also utilized, through permissions, by agencies outside of Putnam County," naming the Clay County Sheriff's Office.

Legal significance. These letters map directly onto the FDOT General Use Permit pathway described in Chapter 2: a chief executive's letter on agency letterhead authorizing a representative to apply. U.S. 17 is a state road, so a camera in its right-of-way falls squarely within § 316.0777 and the General Use Permit requirement. The correspondence shows the agency initiating that process; it does not, however, include the issued permit.

Finding 4.6 The record shows permit applications were authorized, but the issued FDOT General Use Permits are not in the produced record.

○ OPEN QUESTION

The Sheriff's Office authorized Flock Safety to seek FDOT permitting (July 2023) and specifically requested permission to permit a state-road camera near the Clay County line (May 2024). The produced records do not include the resulting General Use Permits, which § 316.0777 and FDOT Rule 14-20.010 require for right-of-way installations.

Evidence: PCSO letters of Jul 31, 2023 and May 17, 2024; FDOT LPR permitting guidance; § 316.0777, Fla. Stat.

Significance: Whether valid five-year General Use Permits were issued and remain current for each right-of-way camera is a central engineering-compliance question, answerable through a records request to FDOT One-Stop Permitting.

Document Review 4.7 — Notarized Permission Letter to Flock Group, Inc.

Purpose and content. A December 20, 2023 letter from the Sheriff's Office to Flock Group, Inc. (Atlanta, GA), granting permission for Flock Safety "to apply for any necessary permitting for the Putnam County Sheriff's Office," executed before a Florida notary public. It is the notarized companion to the July 31, 2023 permission letter.

Significance. The notarized form reinforces that the agency formally delegated permitting to the vendor. It confirms the delegation but, like the other correspondence, is upstream of the permits themselves; it does not establish that any particular installation was ultimately permitted or inspected.

Document Review 4.8 — Flock User Guide (Redacted)

Purpose and content. Vendor-produced operational and training material describing how authorized users interact with the system. The copy produced is redacted and consists largely of interface screenshots, limiting the text available for review.

Significance. The user guide corroborates the operational picture drawn from the General Order and transparency data — search, alerting, and hotlist management — but its redactions mean it cannot be relied on for detailed findings. It is catalogued here for completeness and as a candidate for a more complete (or less redacted) production.

Chapter 5 — Consolidated Findings

This chapter gathers the findings from the document reviews and adds cross-cutting observations that emerge only when the records are read together. Each carries a confidence label.

Finding 5.1 The camera count is internally inconsistent across the records.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

The December 2023 order form lists 18 Flock Safety Falcon cameras, while the July 2026 transparency export reports 20 LPR cameras. The two-unit difference is not explained by the produced records.

Evidence: Flock Order Form (18 Falcon); transparency portal (20 cameras).

Significance: The difference may reflect cameras added after the initial order (for example, the Clay County-line camera), but the records do not document the addition. Reconciling the count matters for both cost tracking and permitting.

Finding 5.2 Configured retention for detections is short (30 days), but the treatment of access/audit logs is described as indefinite.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Both the contract and the transparency data state a 30-day retention period for vehicle detections. The transparency portal separately states that system access "is stored indefinitely."

Evidence: Order Form (30-day retention); transparency portal (access "stored indefinitely").

Significance: A short detection-retention window is privacy-protective and consistent with the statutory retention-schedule cap. The public should be told clearly what is kept for 30 days versus indefinitely, and the indefinite access-log retention should be reconciled with retention law.

Finding 5.3 The program's stated safeguards are largely consistent with Florida law, where the records address the point.

● PRIMARY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

The prohibition on traffic-enforcement use tracks § 316.0777(2)(b); the exclusion of facial recognition, gender, and race from what is detected, the human-verification requirement for hits, and the felony/missing-person limit on hotlists are all documented safeguards.

Evidence: Transparency portal; General Order 4920.00; § 316.0777, Fla. Stat.

Significance: An accurate report should credit documented compliance as readily as it flags open questions. These are real safeguards, and noting them strengthens the report's credibility.

Finding 5.4 Whether right-of-way installations are properly permitted cannot be confirmed from the record.

○ OPEN QUESTION

The records document the authorization to seek FDOT permits but not the issued General Use Permits required for readers in State Highway System right-of-way.

Evidence: PCSO permission letters; § 316.0777; FDOT Rule 14-20.010; Form 850-040-05.

Significance: This is the single most concrete engineering-compliance question and is directly answerable through FDOT. It should be resolved before any conclusion is drawn in either direction.

Finding 5.5 Network exposure greatly exceeds local control.

● SUPPORTED INFERENCE

Putnam detections are reachable by roughly 604 organizations across at least 15 states, including federal, state, private, and out-of-state participants, while the agency's acceptable-use limits by their terms bind PCSO users.

Evidence: Shared-network roster; transparency portal sharing lists; § 316.0777(4).

Significance: The gap between local policy and network reach is the report's most significant governance theme and the strongest basis for follow-up requests about sharing agreements and query auditing.

Finding 5.6 No records were produced documenting program effectiveness or a periodic misuse audit.

○ OPEN QUESTION

The transparency data reports activity volumes (detections, hits, searches) but the produced records do not include arrests or prosecutions attributable to the system, effectiveness studies, or a routine audit of user searches for misuse.

Evidence: Transparency portal; General Order 4920.00 (no periodic audit described).

Significance: Effectiveness and audit records are the natural evidence base for any policy decision about renewal or expansion and are appropriate subjects for a follow-up request.

Chapter 6 — Open Questions and Recommended Records Requests

The following requests would resolve the open questions above. They are framed as ordinary public-records requests to the relevant custodians and are designed to be answerable.

To the Putnam County Sheriff's Office

1. The Flock Terms of Service incorporated by reference in the order form, and any master agreement, addenda, or statements of work not previously produced.
2. Records reconciling the camera count (18 on the order form versus 20 reported), including any additions, relocations, or trailer deployments and their dates.
3. Any written audit policy and the results of any audits of user search activity for the past three years, including the downloadable "public search audit" the transparency portal references.
4. Records identifying every network-sharing agreement or setting, and the criteria the agency uses to decide which outside organizations may access its detections.
5. Any records documenting arrests, recovered vehicles, or prosecutions attributed to ALPR information, and any effectiveness evaluations or reports to command staff.
6. Records showing the criteria and approvals for camera placement (the General Order requires approval by the Director of Law Enforcement, Chief Deputy, or Sheriff).

To the Florida Department of Transportation (One-Stop Permitting / District 2)

7. All General Use Permits (Form 850-040-05) issued to or on behalf of the Putnam County Sheriff's Office for ALPR installations, including the camera at U.S. 17 north of C.R. 214 near the Clay County line, together with the associated Special Provisions and any inspection or compliance records.

Cross-cutting

8. The current statewide ALPR retention schedule established under § 316.0778 (Department of State, in consultation with FDLE), to confirm the maximum lawful retention period.
9. Any interagency agreements or MOUs governing Putnam County's participation in the shared network, including with the Clay County Sheriff's Office referenced in the May 2024 FDOT letter.

Chapter 7 — Observations and Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered for consideration by the Sheriff's Office and the Board of County Commissioners. They are intended to improve transparency and public confidence, and they presume good faith; none asserts that wrongdoing has occurred. Several would cost little and could be adopted quickly.

- 10. Publish the transparency portal.** The portal is already built and populated; publishing it would make the agency's own stated safeguards and statistics publicly verifiable.
- 11. Obtain, retain, and make available the FDOT General Use Permits.** Confirm that every right-of-way camera is covered by a current five-year permit and reconcile the camera count in the process.
- 12. Adopt and publish a written audit policy.** Commit to periodic, documented review of user searches for misuse, and report the results in aggregate.
- 13. Clarify retention publicly.** State plainly what is kept for 30 days (detections) versus what is "stored indefinitely" (access logs), and confirm both against the statewide retention schedule.
- 14. Review and document network-sharing governance.** Publish the criteria for sharing detections with outside organizations, and describe how the agency's acceptable-use limits are enforced against partner queries.
- 15. Publish placement criteria and effectiveness metrics.** Disclose how camera locations are chosen and what outcomes (arrests, recoveries, cases) the agency attributes to the program.

A note on tone. This project's value depends on being accurate and fair. Where the records show compliance and thoughtful safeguards — the hit-verification rule, the exclusion of facial recognition and protected characteristics, the short detection-retention window, and documented CJIS screening — this report says so. Where the records leave questions unanswered, it asks them rather than assuming the answer. That discipline is what makes the document useful to commissioners, journalists, and residents alike.

Chapter 8 — Alachua County Sheriff's Office

PENDING — A public-records request has been submitted to the Alachua County Sheriff's Office under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. This chapter will be completed on the same document-by-document model as Chapter 4 once responsive records are produced. Reserved sections: 8.1 Documents Reviewed · 8.2 Program Overview · 8.3 Document Reviews · 8.4 Findings.

Note. Alachua County appears in Putnam County's shared-network roster (see Appendix B), so the two programs are already connected at the data level. That connection will be examined directly once Alachua County's own records are in hand.

Chapter 9 — St. Johns County Sheriff's Office

PENDING — A public-records request has been submitted to the St. Johns County Sheriff's Office under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. This chapter will be completed on the same model as Chapter 4 once responsive records are produced. Reserved sections: 9.1 Documents Reviewed • 9.2 Program Overview • 9.3 Document Reviews • 9.4 Findings.

Chapter 10 — Cross-County Comparative Analysis

PENDING — This chapter will compare Putnam, Alachua, and St. Johns Counties side by side once all three sets of records are available.

Planned comparison dimensions (Putnam County values shown; others to follow):

Dimension	Putnam County	Alachua County	St. Johns County
Vendor / system	Flock Safety Falcon / FlockOS	—	—
Cameras	18 (contract) / 20 (portal)	—	—
Contract term	60 mo. + 60 mo. auto-renewal	—	—
Stated total cost	\$231,500 (initial term)	—	—
Detection retention	30 days	—	—
Transparency portal	Built; not published	—	—
Network participants	≈ 604 orgs, 15+ states	—	—
FDOT permits confirmed	Open question	—	—

Appendix A — Document Index

Full citations for the records reviewed in this volume.

16. Flock Safety Order Form (Exhibit A) and Billing Schedule — FL – Putnam County SO — executed December 18, 2023 (incorporating Flock Terms of Service at flocksafety.com/terms-and-conditions; with PCSO public-records addendum under § 119.0701).
17. Putnam County Sheriff's Office General Order 4920.00, "Automatic License Plate Reader Program," effective November 8, 2022 (accreditation standard CFA 32.04).
18. Flock Safety transparency portal export, Putnam County FL SO, dated July 14, 2026 (status: Not Published).
19. Shared-network organization roster, Putnam County FL SO, dated July 14, 2026.
20. Lead Contract Agreement for Interagency Information Sharing (CJIS vendor screening), Panama City Beach Police Department and Putnam County Sheriff's Office, executed August 26, 2025.
21. Letter, Sheriff H.D. DeLoach, granting Flock Safety permission to apply for permitting, July 31, 2023.
22. Notarized letter to Flock Group, Inc. granting permission to apply for permitting, December 20, 2023.
23. Letter to FDOT District 2 requesting permitting permission for Camera #16 (U.S. 17 north of C.R. 214, "Sun Garden Rd," near the Clay County line), May 17, 2024.
24. Flock Safety user guide (redacted), no date.

Appendix B — Shared-Network Participants

The following organizations appear in Putnam County's Flock network roster dated July 14, 2026 (sharing and/or receiving). The list is reproduced from the produced record and sorted alphabetically; it contains approximately 604 entries, including a small number of duplicate or deactivated entries as they appeared in the source. Inclusion indicates a network relationship as recorded by the platform; it is not a statement about any particular organization's use of the data.

[Federal] US GSA Office of Inspector General · Acworth GA PD · Adairsville GA PD · Adamsville AL PD · Adrian MI PD · Akron OH PD · AL - Jacksonville State University Campus PD · AL - Sylacauga PD · Alabama Law Enforcement Agency (ALEA) · Alabaster AL PD · Alachua County FL SO · Alachua FL PD · Albany GA PD · Albertville AL PD · Alcoa TN PD · Alpharetta GA PD · Altamonte Springs FL PD · Ancient City Capital · Anderson IN PD · Angier NC PD · Apopka FL PD · Argo AL PD · Ashland AL PD · Athens-Clarke County GA PD · Atlanta GA PD · Atlantic Beach FL PD · Atlantis FL PD · Attalla AL PD · Auburn AL PD · Avon IN PD · Baker County FL SO · Baldwin County GA SO · Ball Ground GA PD · Banks County GA SO · Barrow County GA SO · Bartow County GA SO · Bay County FL SO · Bay Harbor Island FL PD · Baytown TX PD · Belle Isle FL PD · Ben Hill County GA SO · Bessemer AL PD · Bibb County AL SO · Birmingham AL PD · Blackshear GA PD · Blairsville GA PD · Bloomfield NM PD · Bloomingdale GA PD · Blue Ridge GA PD · Bonifay FL PD · Boynton Beach FL PD · Bradford County FL SO · Brantley County GA SO · Brent AL PD · Brevard County FL SO · Brighton AL PD · Brookhaven GA PD · Brookside AL PD · Broward County FL SO · Bryan County GA SO · Bullitt County KY SO · Bulloch County GA SO · Buncombe County NC SO · Burke County GA SO · Butts County GA SO · Byron GA PD · Calera AL PD · Calhoun County AL SO · Calhoun GA PD · Camden AL PD · Camden SC PD · Canton GA PD · Cape Coral FL PD · Cape Girardeau MO PD · Carroll County GA SO · Carrollton GA PD · Cartersville GA PD · Casselberry FL PD · Cedartown GA PD · Center Point AL PD · Centerville AL PD · Chadbourn NC PD · Chambers County AL SO · Chamblee GA PD · Chatham County GA PD · Chatham County GA SO · Chatham-Savannah Counter Narcotics Team · Chatsworth GA PD · Chattahoochee FL PD · Cherokee County AL SO · Cherokee County GA SO · Chilton County AL SO · Chipley FL PD · City of Dexter (GA) · Clarkston GA PD · Clay County FL SO · Clayton County GA PD · Clayton County GA SO · Clayton NC PD · Clearwater FL PD · Cobb County GA PD · Cobb County GA SO · Cocoa Beach FL PD · Cocoa FL PD · Coconut Creek FL PD · Coffee County AL SO · Coffee County GA SO · Coker AL · Colbert County AL SO · College Park GA PD · Collier County FL SO · Colquitt County GA SO · Columbia County FL SO · Columbia County GA SO · Columbiana AL PD · Columbus GA PD · Conyers GA PD · Cook County GA SO · Cookeville TN PD · Coosada PD AL · Coral Springs FL PD · Cordova AL PD · Covington GA PD · Coweta County GA SO · Crestview FL PD · Crisp County GA SO · Cross City FL PD · CSX Railroad PD · Cullman County AL SO · Dade City FL PD · Dale County AL SO · Daleville AL PD · Dallas County AL SO · Dalton GA PD · Danielsville GA PD · Darlington County SC SO · Davenport FL PD · Davie FL PD · Daytona Beach FL PD · Daytona Beach Shores FL PD · Decatur AL PD · Decatur County GA SO · Decatur GA PD · Defuniak Springs FL PD · DeKalb County GA PD · DeLand FL PD · Demopolis AL PD · Department of Natural Resources - GA · Desoto County FL SO · Dillard GA PD · Dixie County FL SO · Doraville GA PD · Dothan AL PD · Double Springs AL PD · Dougherty County GA PD · Douglas County GA SO · Douglas GA PD · Douglasville GA PD · Dublin GA PD · Duluth GA PD · Dunwoody GA PD · Easley SC PD · East Point GA PD · Eatonton GA PD · Edgewater FL PD · Effingham County GA SO · Escambia County FL SO · Etowah County AL SO · Eufaula AL PD · Eustis FL PD · Eutaw AL PD [Inactive] · Fairburn GA PD · Fairfield AL PD · Fannin County GA SO · Fayette County GA SO · Fayetteville GA PD · Fernandina Beach FL PD · Fish and Wildlife Commission FL PD · Fitzgerald GA PD · FL - Belleair PD · FL - Department of Corrections · FL - Florida Department of Financial Services - Division of Consumer Services · FL - Hollywood PD · FL - State Office of the Attorney General - 7th Circuit · FL - Sanford PD · Flagler County FL SO · Florence AL PD · Florence County SC SO · Florida Atlantic University FL PD · Florida City FL PD · Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) · Florida Highway Patrol · Florida Office of Agriculture Law Enforcement · Florida State University Campus PD FL · Flowery Branch GA PD · Floyd County GA PD · Forest Park GA PD · Forrest County MS SO · Forsyth County GA SO · Fort Lauderdale FL PD · Fort Mill SC PD · Fort Pierce FL PD · Fort Walton Beach FL PD · Fort Worth TX PD · Franklin County FL SO · Franklin County GA SO · Franklin GA PD · Fruitland Park FL PD · Fulton County GA PD · Fulton County GA SO · Fultondale AL PD · Gadsden County FL SO · Gainesville FL PD · Gainesville GA PD · Garden City GA PD · Gardendale AL PD · Geneva AL PD · Gilchrist County FL SO · Glades County FL SO · Glencoe AL PD · Grantville GA PD · Gray GA PD · Green Cove Springs FL PD · Greenville AL PD · Greenville GA PD · Greenville SC PD · Griffin GA PD · Groveland FL PD · Gulf Breeze FL PD · Gulf County FL SO · Gulf Stream FL PD · Gulfport FL PD · Guntersville AL PD · Gwinnett County GA PD · Habersham County GA SO · Hackleburg AL PD · Haines City FL PD · Hall County GA SO · Hamilton AL PD · Hamilton County FL SO · Hampton GA PD · Hanceville AL PD · Hapeville GA PD · Hardee County FL SO · Harris County GA SO · Hart County GA SO · Hartselle AL PD · Havana FL PD · Hayden AL PD · Heflin AL PD · Helena AL PD · Hendry County FL SO · Henry County GA PD · Hernando County FL SO · Hiawassee GA PD · High Springs FL PD · Highland Beach FL PD · Hillsborough County FL SO · Hinesville GA PD · Hiram GA PD · Hogansville GA PD · Hokes Bluff AL PD · Holly Hill FL PD · Holmes County FL SO · Homerville GA PD · Homewood AL PD · Houston County AL SO · Houston County GA SO · Houston TX PD · Hueytown AL PD · Huntsville Airport AL PD · Huntsville AL PD · Indialantic FL PD · Indian Harbour Beach FL PD · Indian River County FL SO · Indian River County FL SO (2) · Indian River Shores FL PD · Irondale AL PD · Irwin County GA SO · Jackson AL PD · Jackson County FL SO · Jackson County GA SO · Jackson GA PD · Jacksonville Beach FL PD · Jacksonville FL SO · Jasper AL PD · Jasper County GA SO · Jasper County IN SO · Jasper GA PD · Jefferson County FL SO · Jefferson GA PD ·

Jeffersontown KY PD · Jemison AL PD · Jesup GA PD · Johns Creek GA PD · Jones County SO - GA · Jonesboro GA PD · Juno Beach FL PD · Jupiter FL PD · Jupiter Inlet Colony FL PD · Justice IL PD · Kennesaw GA PD · Kimberly AL PD · Kissimmee FL PD · Lady Lake FL PD · LaFayette County FL SO · LaGrange GA PD · Lake Alfred FL PD · Lake City FL PD · Lake Clarke Shores FL PD · Lake County FL SO · Lake Hamilton FL PD · Lake Mary FL PD · Lake Park GA PD · Lake Wales FL PD · Lakeland FL PD · Lamar County MS SO · Lancaster County SC SO · Lantana FL PD · Largo FL PD · Lauderdale County AL SO · Laurens County GA SO · Lavonia GA PD · Lawrence County AL SO · Lawrenceville GA PD · Lawtey FL PD · Lee County AL SO · Leeds AL PD · Leesburg AL PD · Leesburg FL PD · Leon County FL SO · Lexington NC PD · Liberty County FL SO · Liberty County GA SO · Lighthouse Point FL PD · Lilburn GA PD · Lincoln AL PD · Lithonia GA PD · Live Oak FL PD · Livingston AL PD · Locust Grove GA PD · Long County GA SO · Longboat Key FL PD · Lowe's Corporation · Lowndes County GA SO · Luverne AL PD · Lynn Haven FL PD · Lyons GA PD · Macon County AL SO · Madison County GA SO · Madison GA PD · Maitland FL PD · Manalapan FL PD · Manatee County FL SO · Manchester GA PD · Margaret AL PD · Margate FL PD · Marianna FL PD · Marietta GA PD · Marion County FL SO · Marshall County AL SO · Martin County FL SO · Mascotte FL PD · McDonough GA PD · McIntosh County GA SO · Melbourne FL PD · Meriwether County GA SO · Metter GA PD · Miami Dade (Duplicate, don't use) · Miami FL PD · Miami FL PD (Duplicate) · Miami Gardens FL PD · Miami Springs FL PD · Miami-Dade FL SO · Midfield AL PD · Milton GA PD · Miramar FL PD · Monroe County GA SO · Monroe County TN SO · Monroe GA PD · Montevallo AL PD · Montezuma GA PD · Montgomery AL PD · Montgomery County TN SO · Moody AL PD · Morgan County AL SO · Morgan County GA SO · Morris AL PD · Moultrie GA PD · Moundville AL PD · Mount Dora FL PD · Mountain Brook AL PD · Mountain City TN PD · Murray County GA SO · Muscle Shoals AL PD · Muscogee County GA SO · Nassau County FL SO · Neptune Beach FL PD · New College of FL PD · New Smyrna Beach FL PD · Newnan GA PD · Newton County GA SO · Niceville FL PD · Norcross GA PD · North Miami FL PD · North Palm Beach FL PD · Northport AL PD · Oakland FL PD · Oakwood GA PD · Ocala FL PD · Ocean Ridge FL PD · Ocala GA PD · Ocoee FL PD · Oconee County GA SO · Odenville AL PD · Oglethorpe County GA SO · Okaloosa County FL SO · Okeechobee County FL SO · Oneonta AL PD · Opelika AL PD · Orange Beach AL PD · Orange County FL SO · Orlando FL PD · Osceola County FL SO · Oviedo FL PD · Oxford AL PD · Oxford MS PD · Ozark AL PD · Palatka FL PD · Palatka Housing Authority (FL) · Palm Bay FL PD · Palm Beach County FL SO · Palm Beach FL PD · Palm Beach Gardens FL PD · Panama City Airport FL PD · Panama City Beach FL PD · Panama City FL PD · Parrish AL PD · Pasco County FL SO · Paulding County GA SO · Peach County GA SO · Peachtree City GA PD · Pelham AL PD · Pell City AL PD · Pembroke Pines FL PD · Pensacola FL PD · Peotone IL PD · Perry FL PD · Phenix City AL PD · Pickens County GA SO · Pierce County GA SO · Pike County GA SO · Pinecrest FL PD · Pinellas County FL SO · Pinellas Park FL PD · Pittsboro IN PD · Plant City FL PD · Pleasant Grove AL PD · Poarch Creek Tribal AL PD · Polk County FL SO · Polk County FL SO - Flex · Pooler GA PD · Port Orange FL PD · Port Saint Joe FL PD · Port St. Lucie FL PD · Powder Springs GA PD · Prattville AL PD · Priceville AL PD · Putnam County GA SO · Quincy FL PD · Rabun County GA SO · Ragland AL PD · Rainbow City AL PD · Reynolds GA PD · Richland County SC SO · Richmond County GA SO · Richmond Hill GA PD · Riverdale GA PD · Riviera Beach FL PD · Rock Hill SC PD · Rockdale County GA SO · Rockledge FL PD · Rome GA PD · Roswell GA PD · Russell County AL SO · Russellville AL PD · Sale City GA PD · Samford University AL PD · Sandy Springs GA PD · Sanibel FL PD · Santa Rosa County FL SO · Sarasota County FL SO · Sarasota FL PD · Sauk Village IL PD · Savannah PD - GA · Scottsboro AL PD · Screven GA PD · Sea Ranch Lakes FL PD · Sebastian FL PD · Selma AL PD · Seminole County FL SO · Seminole Electric Cooperative (FL) · Senoia GA PD · Shelby County AL SO · Simpsonville SC PD · Smyrna GA PD · Snellville GA PD · South Daytona FL PD · South Fulton GA PD · South Miami FL PD · Southside AL PD · Spalding County GA SO · Sparta GA PD · Spartanburg County SC SO · Spartanburg SC PD · Springfield FL PD · Springville AL PD · St. Augustine FL PD · St. Cloud FL PD · St. Johns County FL SO · St. Lucie County FL SO · St. Petersburg FL PD · Statesboro GA PD · Steele AL PD · Stone Mountain GA PD · Stuart FL PD · Sugar Hill GA PD · Sumner County TN SO · Sumter County FL SO · Sumter County GA SO · Sunrise FL PD · Surry County NC SO · Suwanee GA PD · Suwannee County FL SO · Tallahassee FL PD · Tampa FL PD · Tarpon Springs FL PD · Tarrant AL PD · Taylor County FL SO · Temple GA PD · Texas Financial Crimes Intelligence Center · Thomas County GA SO · Thomaston GA PD · Thomasville GA PD · Thomson GA PD · Tift County GA SO · Titusville FL PD · TN ROCIC · Town of Eva AL PD · Town of Hildebran (NC) · Town of Pomona Park (FL) · Transylvania County NC SO · Treasure Island FL PD · Troup County GA SO · Troy AL PD · Trussville AL PD · Turner County GA SO · Tuscaloosa AL PD · Tuscaloosa County AL SO · Tuscumbia AL PD [Inactive] · Tuskegee AL PD · Tybee Island GA PD · Tyrone GA PD · Union City GA PD · Union County FL SO · University of Alabama - Birmingham Campus AL PD · University of North FL PD · University of South Florida at St. Petersburg FL PD · University of South Florida FL PD · Upson County GA SO · Valdosta State University GA PD · Vandalia OH PD · Venice FL PD · Vero Beach FL PD · Vestavia Hills AL PD · Vidalia GA PD · Villa Rica GA PD · Village of Palm Springs FL PD · Volusia County FL SO · Wakulla County FL SO · Walker County AL SO · Walker County GA SO · Walton County FL SO · Walton County GA SO · Ware County GA SO · Warner Robins GA PD · Warrior AL PD · Washington County FL SO · Washington County SO - GA · Watauga County NC SO · Waycross GA PD · West Melbourne FL PD · West Palm Beach FL PD · White County GA SO · Whitfield County GA SO · Wilkinson County GA SO · Wilton Manors FL PD · Winder GA PD · Winfield AL PD · Winter Park FL PD · Woodbury GA PD · Woodstock AL PD · Woodstock GA PD · Zephyrhills FL PD

Appendix C — Legal Authorities and Sources

Florida statutes and rules

- § 316.0777, Fla. Stat. (2025) — ALPR systems; installation within state-highway rights-of-way; public-records exemption.
- § 316.0778, Fla. Stat. — ALPR systems; records retention (Department of State, in consultation with FDLE).
- § 334.03(21), Fla. Stat. — definition of right-of-way.
- Chapter 119, Fla. Stat. — Public Records Act; § 119.0701 — contractor public-records obligations; § 119.011(3) — definitions of active criminal intelligence/investigative information.
- Rule 14-20.010, F.A.C. — General Use Permit; FDOT General Use Permit Application Form 850-040-05.

Agency guidance and reporting

- FDOT, "License Plate Readers," fdot.gov/traffic/trafficservices/lpr (revised May 23, 2024).
- FDLE / CJIS Council, Guidelines for the Use of Automated License Plate Readers (approved November 13, 2024).
- FBI CJIS Security Policy (CJISSECPOL), as administered in Florida by the FDLE CJIS Systems Officer.
- Contemporary reporting on ALPR networks and immigration-related queries (e.g., NPR, TCPalm, 404 Media, ACLU), 2025–2026 — cited as reporting for context only.

Appendix D — About the Project

The Florida ALPR Transparency Project is an independent, evidence-based review of how automated license plate reader systems are procured, deployed, governed, and overseen by law enforcement agencies in Northern Florida. Using records obtained under Florida's Public Records Act, official policies, contracts, engineering documentation, and field observations, the project seeks to create a comprehensive, publicly accessible record of how these systems operate. It is written to the standard of a government audit or inspector-general review, distinguishing documented facts from interpretation and clearly identifying where additional information is still needed.

The project does not begin with a predetermined conclusion. Its objective is to build a factual foundation that lets residents, elected officials, journalists, and policymakers have an informed discussion about this technology. Every significant finding is supported by primary-source documents wherever possible, with citations to contracts, policies, correspondence, and statutes. Where the evidence is incomplete, the report identifies unanswered questions and recommends additional records requests rather than speculating.

Author. This report was prepared and authored by Sam Cornell. Corrections and additional records are welcome and will be incorporated into future revisions; this is a living document.