

37-Item CPRA Response Matrix

ACSO unified response reviewed against the actual production

Assessment is based on the files actually produced, not solely on the Sheriff's "see attached" descriptions.

#	Request	Sheriff response	Responsive records	What the records establish	Status	Missing	Issue and follow-up
1	Pre-Feb. 25, 2025 access, use, training, certification, subscriptions, participation, and related records.	See attached responsive records.	2023 MOU-access email chain; Aug. 2023 account/setup and sharing emails; Audit 2023-Feb 2025.csv; Flock Access email; monthly search totals; training-related emails.	ACSO signed an MOU in July 2023, received a Flock organization and administrator accounts in August 2023, added many users, trained/certified personnel, and conducted searches beginning August 2023.	Partially answered	Signed MOU; complete account entitlement/history; training certificates; user-role history; terms applicable after April 1, 2024; complete search/audit records; any invoices or agreements for 2023-24 access.	Issue: The records establish substantial pre-approval activity, but the production does not explain its full legal/contractual basis or scope. Follow-up: Produce the signed MOU, account/role/export records, certifications, and the complete terms governing 2023-24 access.
2	Source of pre-Feb. 25, 2025 access, including agreements, sponsorships, pilots, partnerships, or another-agency access.	See attached responsive records.	July 2023 MOU chain; Aug. 2023 Galt access/setup email; camera-sharing invitations; Sept. 2023 free-plan email; Jan. 2024 Community Tier notice.	Initial access came through a Flock MOU/free-plan arrangement and requests/shares from other organizations; Galt granted access.	Partially answered	The actual MOU; exact free-plan or Community Tier terms; list of networks actually accepted and accessible; any sponsoring/partner agreement; basis for continued searches after April 1, 2024.	Issue: Invitations are not proof of accepted access, and the production does not reconcile continued search activity with the announced free-access change. Follow-up: Identify each access source, date, account tier, accepted network, and governing agreement.
3	Records explaining 2023-24 Flock use and how access existed before the March 2025 service agreement.	See previously supplied and attached records.	Same records as items 1-2; monthly searches; administrative audit.	The records show operational searches, user administration, training, and interagency network access before the County camera contract.	Partially answered	A coherent explanation of the free/MOU/Community Tier lifecycle; what data/cameras were searchable; Board/County Administration notice; all prior records specifically identified.	Issue: The response relies on "previously supplied" records without identifying them and does not explain the 2024 access model. Follow-up: Provide a written record index and all agreements/terms explaining the 2023-24 access.

4	All ACSO-Flock communications and attachments from Jan. 1, 2023 to present.	See attached responsive records.	146 EMLs, extracted attachments, calendar records, marketing, deployment and training emails.	A large body of communications was produced, ranging from substantive sales/ implementation threads to automated marketing and system notices.	Partially answered / completeness unclear	Referenced but absent attachments, including signed MOU, Board packet/resolution, deployment maps, some project/proposal and training materials; search methodology and custodians.	Issue: Several email bodies refer to attachments or links that were not included as files. Follow-up: Supplement missing attachments and identify custodians, search terms, date completed, and any excluded systems/accounts.
5	Every agency authorized to access ACSO ALPR data, date granted, and access type.	See attached records; report does not produce date; agencies may view captured still images.	Agencies Allowed Access to ACSO Data - June 2026.csv; pending-share email.	The report lists 224 organizations receiving ACSO network sharing. A separate pending-request email shows possible permission types such as Search, Hot List, VMS live/ historical/download.	Partially answered	Grant dates; active vs pending/invited/revoked status; exact permission type; users/roles; alert access; audit of actual use.	Issue: The stated "view captured still images" description is not documented in the CSV and is less detailed than the permission types shown elsewhere. Follow-up: Export the full sharing configuration with dates, status, permissions, and revocations.
6	Every agency or organization whose ALPR data ACSO personnel may access.	See attached responsive records.	Networks Shared With ACSO.csv; sharing invitation emails.	The report lists 187 organizations sharing networks with ACSO, including at least 30 clearly out-of-state organizations and multiple network/product types.	Partially answered	Acceptance/activation date; active vs offered/pending status; role assignment; exact search/alert/video privileges; revocations; actual use.	Issue: A sharing invitation alone does not establish access, while network-list inclusion still does not prove a particular user had role access. Follow-up: Produce accepted/ active share exports and role/ network assignment history.
7	Installation date, activation date, and operational status of each current camera location.	See attached responsive records.	Camera Install Sheet.csv; deployment digest emails; Caltrans/permitting records.	Eight dated install entries are listed; deployment digests show gradual activation from 0 live in May 2025 to 8 installed/ live by late 2025, with two still pending at points.	Partially answered	Two of ten contracted cameras/locations; distinct activation dates; serial/ device IDs; current live/ offline status; relocation history.	Issue: The install sheet has only eight rows for a ten-camera contract and conflates repeated locations without device IDs. Follow-up: Provide a ten-device inventory with location, install, activation, current status, and relocation history.

8	All grant/funding applications, awards, agreements, reimbursements, reports, correspondence, and related ALPR funding records.	See attached responsive records.	BYRNE SCIP worksheet; OES HSGP docs; PG&E record; Flock claim; EBMUD records; July 2026 funding email.	The production identifies Homeland Security, Byrne SCIP, PG&E/minor-equipment, and possible EBMUD funding/payment context.	Partially answered	Complete applications, award letters, grant agreements, approvals, reimbursement requests, accounting ledgers, partner agreements, and correspondence tying each dollar to cameras/services.	Issue: The records provide amounts and fragments but not a complete funding chain. Follow-up: Produce the complete grant and accounting files by funding source and fiscal year.
9	Specific grant sources referenced in the Feb. 25, 2025 Board item.	See attached responsive records.	Same funding records as item 8.	Funding sources and approximate allocations can be inferred, including FY21 Homeland Security, Byrne SCIP, PG&E, and tax/minor-equipment entries.	Partially answered	The complete Board-referenced grant source documentation and reconciliation to the \$45,500 first-year invoice.	Issue: The produced fragments do not clearly reconcile all sources to the Board agenda amount and invoice. Follow-up: Provide a source-by-source funding reconciliation and the underlying award/approval records.
10	Monthly total number of ALPR searches from inception to present.	See attached responsive record.	Searches by month 2023 to June 2026.csv.	Monthly totals begin in August 2023 and total 4,080 through June 2026.	Fully answered as to monthly totals	User-level/detail logs were not requested in this item, but monthly totals do not explain the pre-contract access basis.	Issue: The first searches predate County-camera approval and installation. Follow-up: No supplementation needed for the monthly-count component; cross-reference the pre-contract access follow-up.
11	Whether any federal agency, task force, contractor, employee account, or indirect federal access existed.	No such records exist; ACSO only shares with California law-enforcement agencies.	Outgoing and incoming sharing reports; NCRIC references.	No federal account is expressly identified in the produced reports. The records do show NCRIC/fusion-center and broad sharing relationships requiring closer classification.	No responsive records claimed / unresolved	Search description; indirect access through fusion centers, joint task forces, shared state/local accounts, contractors, or downstream sharing; account-domain review.	Issue: The statement about outgoing California sharing does not answer whether federal or task-force personnel had indirect access. Follow-up: Describe the search and produce or confirm records for direct and indirect federal/task-force/contractor access, including NCRIC.
12	All agencies/entities/users that accessed, queried, received alerts, or otherwise used ACSO data.	Non-investigatory audit logs and agency search-privilege list supplied; other details withheld as investigatory.	Outgoing agency list; administrative audit; monthly searches.	The production identifies configured organizations and administrative activity, but not actual outside access, queries, alerts, or users.	Partially answered / material withholding	Non-investigatory fields from access/search logs; dates, agency/user identity, action type, result count, role, alert delivery; withholding log and segregability explanation.	Issue: The administrative audit is not an access/search audit, and an agency privilege list is not evidence of actual use. Follow-up: Produce segregated non-investigatory metadata and identify withheld record categories and fields.

13	Policies, audits, compliance reviews, or reports about outside sharing and Civil Code compliance.	Policies previously supplied and online; see attached responsive record.	General County IT Use and Security Policy; sharing reports; previously supplied ALPR policy (not duplicated in ZIP).	The production contains configuration reports and a generic IT policy, but no ALPR-sharing compliance review or audit report.	Partially answered / mostly unanswered	ALPR-specific sharing procedures, periodic reviews, Civil Code compliance assessments, approvals, misuse checks, and audit findings.	Issue: The attached generic IT policy is not an ALPR data-sharing compliance record. Follow-up: Identify and produce ALPR-specific compliance/audit records or confirm none exist after a documented search.
14	The policy referenced in the Sept. 13, 2023 email, including drafts, prior versions, approvals, and memoranda.	Policy manual previously supplied and online.	Previously supplied final policy only; no draft/approval file in current ZIP.	A final/current policy exists, but the record referenced as being prepared in September 2023 is not traced through drafting or approval.	Unanswered	Sept. 2023 draft; revision history; Lexipol workflow/metadata; approval/adoption record; implementation memo; prior versions.	Issue: Providing the current manual does not answer the request for drafts and approval history. Follow-up: Produce drafts, version history, approvals, or confirm none were retained and describe the search.
15	Audits, compliance/policy reviews, misuse/discipline/administrative reviews, or corrective actions since Jan. 2023.	Refer to audit log; no other records. Misuse/discipline/corrective-action records, if they existed, would be personnel records.	Administrative audit CSV.	The CSV shows system-administration events, not compliance findings or search-use review.	Partially answered / mostly unanswered	Confirmation whether misuse or corrective-action records exist; segregated non-identifying/aggregate portions; audit-review reports; policy review records.	Issue: The response is hypothetical ("if they existed") and does not clearly state whether a search found such records. Follow-up: State whether each category exists and produce segregable non-personnel portions or a category-specific withholding description.
16	All categories of data captured, processed, stored, retained, or available through Flock.	See attached responsive records.	Contract/draft agreement; training and product materials; search/product emails.	Records describe still images, plate and vehicle attributes, Vehicle Fingerprint/search features, timestamps/location/direction, hotlists/alerts, exports, and potentially shared video/audio products from other agencies.	Partially answered	A system-specific data dictionary; enabled/licensed fields; storage locations; retention by category; distinction between ACSO cameras and shared networks.	Issue: Generic marketing describes capabilities that may not be enabled for ACSO. Follow-up: Produce enabled-feature configuration, data dictionary, and contract/order-form mapping.
17	Whether Vehicle Fingerprint is used and what characteristics are captured/searchable.	See attached responsive records.	Contract/product materials; search/training emails.	Vehicle characteristics such as make, color, body type and other visual attributes are described as searchable; the contract references Enhanced LPR/Vehicle Fingerprint capabilities.	Partially answered	Feature-enabled status for ACSO; exact characteristics; retention; audit of use; distinction between marketing claims and active configuration.	Issue: Marketing and contract language do not conclusively prove which feature fields ACSO actually enabled or used. Follow-up: Provide configuration screenshots/export and current feature list.

18	Image resolution, dimensions, format, and quality.	No responsive record exists.	None.	The production does not answer the technical image-specification request.	No responsive records claimed	Search details; any vendor spec, sample export metadata, procurement specification, or camera configuration.	Issue: Other produced marketing/spec materials do not supply precise dimensions or format. Follow-up: Confirm custodians/systems searched and request the technical specification from Flock if held by ACSO.
19	Screenshots, manuals, training, or records showing the user view of reads, alerts, searches, or history.	See attached records; requested screenshot records do not exist.	Training emails/links, product materials, Nova one-sheet, system notices.	The production provides descriptions and external training links, but few preserved user-interface records and no ACSO screenshots.	Partially answered	Locally retained manuals, webinar decks/recordings, help-center exports, user training attachments, sample reports, and any screenshots embedded in Board/training materials.	Issue: External links are not preserved records and may change or become inaccessible. Follow-up: Produce archived copies of materials relied upon or identify why they were not retained.
20	Whether system captures cropped plates, full vehicles, multiple/ front/rear/side images, or combinations.	See attached responsive records.	Contract/product materials and training communications.	Records support still-image capture and vehicle imagery/ attributes, but do not provide a definitive ACSO camera-by-camera imaging specification.	Partially answered	Camera orientation, number of images per detection, plate crop versus context image, front/rear capability, and sample metadata.	Issue: Generic vendor materials may describe products not deployed in Amador County. Follow-up: Produce deployed-camera specifications and configuration records.
21	Whether any available device can capture/ process audio, detections, video, clips, continuous video, still images, or other media.	See attached records; Amador cameras capture only still images.	Contract/order materials; product marketing; incoming shared-network report.	The County-purchased Falcon devices appear contracted as LPR still-image cameras. Other jurisdictions share networks labeled Condor, Raven, PTZ, VMS and related products with ACSO.	Partially answered	Enabled access to shared video/audio networks; whether users had roles for VMS/live/historical/ download; device-level capability/configuration.	Issue: The answer about Amador-owned cameras does not fully address devices or functionality “available to” ACSO through sharing. Follow-up: Produce role/ network configuration for non-LPR shared products and clarify whether ACSO users can access them.
22	Whether audio/video/ non-ALPR functions are enabled, licensed, subscribed to, or available under ACSO agreement.	ACSO could access these from other jurisdictions if shared.	Contract; incoming sharing report; pending-share permission email.	The contract is for Falcon LPR/ FlockOS-related services; incoming network names indicate possible shared VMS, Condor, Raven and PTZ availability.	Partially answered / unclear	Exact enabled permissions and accepted networks; whether any ACSO user can access live/historical video, downloads, audio detections, or alerts.	Issue: The response concedes possible access but does not identify what is actually shared or enabled. Follow-up: Provide an export of roles, networks, and product permissions for all ACSO users.

23	How images are generated: stills, video extraction, buffered video, or another method.	See records; contact Flock for technical details.	Contract/product materials.	The Sheriff states deployed cameras capture still images, but the production lacks an authoritative technical record explaining the imaging pipeline.	Partially answered	Technical specifications or vendor correspondence held by ACSO; camera configuration and firmware documentation.	Issue: A factual answer is not a substitute for responsive records if ACSO relied on vendor materials. Follow-up: Produce any held technical materials or identify the search and confirm none are retained.
24	Materials requested/ reviewed/relied upon about image capture, Vehicle Fingerprint, video, audio, and collected data.	See attached responsive records.	Flock sales emails, draft agreement, sole-source letter, product/ marketing emails, training links, Nova materials.	ACSO received substantial Flock-authored marketing and technical explanations.	Partially answered	Missing attachments/linked resources; preserved demos/recordings; Board packet FAQ/privacy materials; evidence of what ACSO actually relied on.	Issue: Many records are generic marketing, and some referenced resources were not produced. Follow-up: Produce archived copies of referenced materials and identify which were used for policy/procurement decisions.
25	Copies of records responsive to the immediately preceding technical-materials item.	Request unclear; see above.	Same materials as item 24.	The intended cross-reference is reasonably apparent from context, but no separate clarification was sought.	Unanswered / treated as unclear	Clarification communication and complete copies of all item-24 records.	Issue: The response labels the item unclear rather than seeking clarification before closing it. Follow-up: Confirm item 25 was intended to request copies of item-24 records and supplement any omitted materials.
26	Category-by-category retention periods, storage locations, and whether retained by Flock, ACSO, or both.	See attached records; Flock stores captured images 30 days; investigating agencies may keep flagged/ downloaded images longer.	Contract; Feb. 2025 retention email chain; policy previously supplied; audit/search reports.	Flock default image retention is 30 days and one-year cloud retention was offered for extra cost. Administrative/search-related records persist longer than 30 days.	Partially answered	Retention for searches, alerts, hotlists, audit logs, metadata, exports, flags, downloaded images, evidence, shared video/ audio; storage locations and deletion rules.	Issue: The broad request is answered primarily with one sentence about captured images. Follow-up: Provide a retention schedule/data map for every requested category.

27	Explain conflict between 30-day Flock retention and Policy 473.5 minimum one-year server storage, including downloads/exports/local storage.	Same 30-day/flagged/downloaded statement.	Feb. 19-25, 2025 email chain; contract; final policy previously supplied.	ACSO identified the conflict before Board approval; Flock said one-year retention costs extra and default data deletes after 30 days. No produced record shows the "necessary changes" were made.	Unanswered / major unresolved conflict	Meaning of "the server"; policy revision or implementation decision; download/export/flag procedures; local storage; category-specific retention; evidence/case file rules.	Issue: The response repeats 30 days but does not reconcile or implement the one-year policy provision. Follow-up: Produce all policy drafts/revisions and a written, record-supported reconciliation of the two retention rules.
28	All ALPR vendors/products researched, considered, compared, demonstrated, or discussed before choosing Flock.	See attached responsive records.	Flock communications/proposals; historical Vigilant purchase orders, claim and 2023 renewal quote.	The records show extensive engagement with Flock and an existing Vigilant investigative-data subscription. They do not show a documented competitive vendor review.	Partially answered / claimed research not substantiated	Identity of the claimed second company; communications, demos, quotes, notes, product comparisons, and search methodology for other vendors.	Issue: Historical Vigilant purchasing is not the same as a contemporaneous comparison of Flock with competing ALPR camera vendors. Follow-up: Identify every vendor considered and produce all related records, or state that no comparative research records exist.
29	Criteria, factors, requirements, or standards used to compare ALPR vendors/products.	See attached responsive records.	Flock sales materials and vendor-authored sole-source letter.	Flock promoted its network, product suite, pricing and deployment approach. No ACSO-authored evaluation criteria were produced.	Unanswered	Requirements list, scoring, procurement criteria, privacy/data-sharing/retention standards, technical requirements, cost comparison.	Issue: A vendor-authored sole-source letter is not an agency evaluation framework. Follow-up: Produce evaluation criteria or confirm none were documented.
30	Reports, studies, analyses, notes, charts, scoring, recommendations, or records about vendor evaluation/selection.	See attached responsive records.	Flock proposal/quote, draft agreement, sole-source letter; Vigilant purchasing records.	No comparison report, scoring sheet, recommendation memo, or independent analysis was produced.	Unanswered	All evaluation/selection work product and internal notes; records held by Sheriff, GSA, County Administration, County Counsel, IT, purchasing.	Issue: The response points to records that do not perform the requested evaluation. Follow-up: Search all relevant custodians and produce the evaluation records or state none exist.
31	All ACSO-Flock communications and attachments Jan. 2023-Mar. 31, 2025.	See attached responsive records.	EMLs through March 2025 and attachments.	Substantive sales, MOU, mapping, quote, policy/retention, Board and kickoff communications were produced.	Partially answered / completeness unclear	Missing signed MOU, maps, Board packet/resolution, project attachment, recordings, and other referenced attachments; custodian/search detail.	Issue: Several chains refer to absent attachments or external-only resources. Follow-up: Supplement missing attachments and provide a production index tied to custodians and date range.

32	All ACSO communications with any other ALPR vendor/provider/reseller/consultant from Jan. 2023-Mar. 31, 2025.	See attached responsive records.	Historical Vigilant quote/purchase records; July 2026 fiscal email; no contemporaneous non-Flock communication EMLs.	A Vigilant renewal quote dated October 2023 exists, but no communications with a competing vendor were produced.	Unanswered / materially incomplete	Emails and attachments with Vigilant/Motorola or any other vendor; procurement/reseller correspondence; records explaining the quote and renewal decision.	Issue: The stated response implies responsive communications were attached, but the production contains no actual non-Flock vendor communication thread in the requested period. Follow-up: Produce the communications or confirm after a documented search that none exist.
33	RFIs/RFPs/RFQs, vendor responses, proposals, quotes, demos, literature, pricing, or marketing from ALPR vendors.	See attached responsive records.	Flock quote/proposal/draft contract/marketing; Vigilant renewal quote; historical POs.	Flock pricing and marketing and one Vigilant subscription quote were produced. No RFI/RFP/RFQ or broader competing proposals were found.	Partially answered	Any formal solicitation, competing quote/proposal, demo material, reseller response, and procurement file.	Issue: The record set is overwhelmingly Flock-authored and does not demonstrate market-wide solicitation. Follow-up: Confirm whether a solicitation occurred and produce all vendor responses.
34	Meetings, demos, presentations, webinars, trainings, or discussions with ALPR vendors, including date, attendees, vendor, subject.	See attached responsive records.	Calendar invitations; email chains; training and meeting notices.	Numerous Flock meetings, mapping calls, budget meetings, demos, kickoff and trainings are documented.	Partially answered	Attendance records, meeting notes, recordings, agendas, and any non-Flock vendor meetings.	Issue: Calendar invitations show scheduled events but not attendance or substance. Follow-up: Produce attendance/notes/recordings and identify canceled versus held events.
35	Why Flock was selected over competitors, including recommendations, approvals, comparisons, or justification.	See attached responsive records.	Flock-authored sole-source letter; Flock sales emails; Board/procurement communications; Vigilant historical records.	The production shows Flock advocating for its product and assisting with procurement, but no ACSO-authored comparison or documented reasoned choice over a competitor.	Unanswered	Decision memo; recommendation; comparative price/features; procurement justification; final decision-maker and approval chain.	Issue: A vendor-authored sole-source letter does not independently establish why ACSO selected Flock over alternatives. Follow-up: Produce the agency's selection rationale and decision records, or confirm the choice was not documented.

36	Privacy, civil-liberties, constitutional, surveillance, retention, sharing, accuracy, reliability, or misuse concerns considered during selection.	See attached responsive records.	Retention email chain; Flock FAQ/privacy/marketing references; final policy previously supplied.	The production documents one concrete retention concern and vendor-provided privacy messaging. It does not show a broad, independent civil-liberties or reliability analysis.	Partially answered / mostly unanswered	County Counsel/IT/privacy review; accuracy/error analysis; data-sharing risk assessment; misuse controls; constitutional analysis; public-impact assessment.	Issue: The retention conflict was recognized, yet no produced record shows its resolution before or after approval. Follow-up: Produce all issue analyses and identify whether County Counsel or Administration reviewed them.
37	Communications/reports/recommendations to Sheriff, Undersheriff, command staff, County Administration, County Counsel, or Board about selecting Flock.	See attached responsive records.	Internal forwards, Flock sales/Board preparation threads, quote/contract/deployment records.	Some command-staff communications and Board-preparation activity are documented.	Partially answered	Complete internal decision chain; County Administration, GSA/purchasing, County Counsel and Board communications/ attachments; recommendation and approval record.	Issue: The production is vendor-email heavy and thin on internal County decision records. Follow-up: Search all named custodians and produce the internal recommendation/ approval file and missing Board attachments.