

Kalamazoo Flock Audit Log - Findings

Source	City of Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety, FOIA #P022224-061526
Period	January 1 - June 30, 2026, 6 full months
Released by	Magnetic Norse, magneticnorse.com
Records	140,561 rows as produced, 116,017 distinct searches

How to read this document

This sheet is split deliberately. **What it measures** is mechanical, and anyone can recompute every figure from the CSVs in this pack. **What it means** is argument, and it sits in labeled blockquotes. Nothing in the measurements depends on the arguments.

1. What the file is

The City produced 12 files: 2 standing monthly Flock reports per month, for 6 months. The `Source.Name` column stamps every row with the file it came from.

Series	Rows	Officer name	Contents
<code>...-Network-Audit.csv</code>	115,606	*** on every row	every agency that searched Kalamazoo's network, including Kalamazoo PD
<code>...-Audit.csv</code>	24,955	populated on every row	Kalamazoo PD only

The local report holds 24,955 rows and 24,954 searches, because 1 search is logged in it twice.

Neither report contains the other. The network report covers every agency, and the local report covers only Kalamazoo PD, but 412 Kalamazoo PD searches appear in the local report and not in the network one. Section 3 of the method sheet works through why.

24,542 search IDs appear in both series. The arithmetic:

```
140,561 raw rows
- 24,542 IDs that appear in both report series
```

- 2 further copies of one ID that appears 4 times, twice in each series
= 116,017 distinct searches

Across all 24,542 cross-series IDs there are **zero conflicts** on agency, time frame, search time, reason, networks searched, search type, license plate, case number, text prompt or moderation flag. One search listed in 2 reports.

The one field that does differ is `Filters`, on 8,206 of those IDs. The network report shows `Redacted` where the local report shows the actual filter selections, which is a difference in how Flock generates the 2 exports. The deduplicated file keeps the local copy, so no filter detail is lost.

What it means (argument): The City's July 8 partial denial said these records "are not held in the regular course of business." The file the City later produced is named, internally, after 12 routine monthly exports.

2. Who searched Kalamazoo's cameras

Agency	Searches	Share	With case number	Median networks touched
Michigan State Police	74,448	64.2%	50.9%	1,193
Kalamazoo MI PD	24,954	21.5%	9.7%	138
Michigan Department of Corrections	4,953	4.3%	99.9%	1,481
Grand Rapids MI PD	4,428	3.8%	15.2%	923
Kalamazoo County MI SO	2,543	2.2%	20.3%	10
Portage MI PD	1,951	1.7%	100.0%	1,238
Battle Creek MI PD	1,293	1.1%	46.2%	264
Western Michigan University MI PD	714	0.6%	18.3%	127

Agency	Searches	Share	With case number	Median networks touched
Kalamazoo Township MI PD	699	0.6%	64.1%	18
Lincoln Township PD MI	34	0.0%	32.4%	135

78.5% of searches of Kalamazoo's camera network were run by agencies other than Kalamazoo.

Grand Rapids MI PD appears only at the start. All 4,428 of its searches fall between January 1 and February 18, 2026, and it does not appear in the file again. The log does not say why.

3. Documentation

49,617 of 116,017 searches carried a case number (42.8%). 66,400 did not (57.2%).

The agency that owns the cameras documents the least of anybody on the list. Portage, next door, documents 100%.

Kalamazoo PD: 22,538 of its 24,954 searches carry no case number.

At the individual level, on the 177 Kalamazoo PD accounts in the log:

Account	Searches	With case number
Officer 103	1,580	2 (0.1%)
Officer 104	1,177	0
Officer 066	1,050	0
Officer 041	881	0
Officer 125	835	0

(Officer names were replaced with pseudonyms assigned by a random permutation that cannot be derived from this data or from any public record. See the method sheet. The full table is in 02_Analysis/09_kalamazoo_pd_searches_per_officer_pseudonymized.csv.)

apiLookup searches, 180 of them, carry a case number **0.0%** of the time.

What it means (argument): A case number is the only field in this system that ties a search to a real investigation. Without it there is nothing to audit against. Nobody outside the department can tell a legitimate query from a personal one, because the record the department keeps does not distinguish them.

4. Scope

- **Median search touched 1,185 camera networks.**
- **86,680 searches (74.7%) touched more than 500 networks.**
- Largest single search touched **6,398 networks.**
- **44,444 searches touched more than 500 networks AND carried no case number**, which is 38.3% of the entire log.

Networks touched by one search	Searches
1 or fewer	795
2 - 10	12,783
11 - 100	539
101 - 500	15,220
501 - 1,000	10,711
1,001 - 1,779	63,946
1,780 - 5,718	0
5,719 or more	12,023
total	116,017

No search in 6 months touched between 1,780 and 5,718 networks. The largest below the gap is 1,779, the smallest above it is 5,719, and every value in between is empty. That row of zeroes is the gap itself, not a missing row.

176 searches applied filters spanning 49 or 50 states plus Canada and Mexico. 11 of those covered all 50. The other 165 covered every state except Michigan, which is the state the cameras are in.

5. What the searches were for

Category	Searches	Share
Drugs / Narcotics	32,397	27.9%
Motor Vehicle Theft	15,763	13.6%
Wanted Person / Fugitive	12,892	11.1%
Weapons / Shots Fired	9,982	8.6%
Assault / Battery	6,287	5.4%
Homicide / Death Investigation	6,139	5.3%
Fleeing / Eluding	3,856	3.3%

Category	Searches	Share
Larceny / Theft	2,864	2.5%
Hit and Run	2,841	2.4%

205 categories in total, across 4,183 distinct reason strings.

Counted by keyword across the whole reason field. The search pattern behind each row is published in `02_Analysis/08_reason_keyword_counts.csv`, so every number here is checkable:

	Searches	Share
Missing / endangered / overdue person	1,411	1.22%
Juvenile / runaway / child	1,731	1.49%
Welfare check	890	0.77%
Suicide or suicidal subject	147	0.13%
Elderly / vulnerable adult / dementia	73	0.06%
Child sexual abuse material	36	0.03%
Immigration	24	0.02%

And, from the same field:

	Searches
Speeding, racing, burnouts, road rage	974
Trespassing	176
Littering	48
Training	37
Marked "routine"	37
Expired plate / no registration	16
Searches sharing results by URL ("More Like This")	66
Described as locating "pattern of life"	44
Following someone the note does not call a suspect	11

6. Search types

Type	Searches
lookup	71,996
lookup - Mobile	26,250
search (attribute search)	13,458
search - Mobile	3,335

Type	Searches
visual	389
convoy	291
apiLookup	180
freeform (AI text prompt)	52
multiGeo	50
searchSummary - Mobile	14
freeform - Mobile (AI text prompt)	2
total	116,017

All 54 AI freeform searches, counting both the desktop and mobile types, were run by the Michigan State Police, all were flagged allow by Flock's moderation, and all describe vehicles rather than plates. Full text is in 02_Analysis/04_ai_freeform_prompts.csv. Examples, verbatim:

```
objectClass:vehicle white ram 1500 damage to front passenger side, black side vents
objectClass:vehicle older sedan missing hubcap rear driver side
objectClass:vehicle a camoflauge jeep being towed objectClass:vehicle black ford
fusion with a decal in the middle of the rear windshield and no plate
```

What it means (argument): A plate search finds one car. A description search finds every car that matches the description. The people it returns who are not the person being looked for were never suspected of anything, and there is no record that they were returned.

7. The cameras

The City produced a Flock deployment tracker on July 22, 2026, listing every device with an installation date. It is in 03_Source_Documents and a cleaned copy is in 02_Analysis/10_camera_inventory.csv.

	Devices
LPR Camera	40
Flex LPR Camera	1
Compute Box	1
total	42

41 read INSTALLED and 1 reads Install. Install years, taken from the tracker's own scheduling column:

Year	Devices
2021	30
2022	5
2023	1
2024	2
2025	1
no year recorded	3

The City redacted Location Name, Latitude and Longitude on all 42 rows, and the Mayor's determination upheld that. The exemptions changed along the way. The July 8 denial withheld this item under MCL 15.243(1)(s) and (1)(u). The Mayor upheld it under (1)(n) and (1)(y). No document in the pack remarks on the difference.

The 2025 agreement in this pack lists 39 Flock Safety LPR units and 1 LPR Flex. Purchase order P-041089 lists a renewal for 35 cameras plus 4 new cameras and 1 new Flex, which is the same 39 and 1. The tracker lists 40 and 1. Nothing in the documents explains the extra unit.

8. Who else can search this data

The Mayor's determination states that the City supplemented its response by "providing complete and unredacted versions of all data-sharing agreements, memoranda of understanding, or interoperability agreements between the Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety and any federal agency, state agency, or private entity governing access to or use of Flock Safety ALPR data."

What arrived was 1 memorandum of understanding, with Kalamazoo County Consolidated Dispatch. It is in `03_Source_Documents`.

9 outside agencies appear in the log. The largest of them, Michigan State Police, ran 74,448 searches of Kalamazoo's cameras in these 6 months, which is 64.2% of the total. Behind it, 4,953 from Michigan Department of Corrections and 4,428 from Grand Rapids MI PD.

That MOU has 2 defects on its face. Only Flock signed it, on June 11, 2026; the signature and date fields for both Kalamazoo County Consolidated Dispatch and Kalamazoo Public Safety are empty, and the document says it commences once fully executed. Its numbered sections also run 8, 10, 11, with no section 9. It is reproduced exactly as produced.

What it means (argument): By the City's own account, that MOU is the complete set. If that is right, 9 outside agencies ran 91,063 searches of Kalamazoo's cameras under no written agreement at all, and the largest of them is the state police.

9. What is not in this file

The City redacted 2 columns before releasing it, and this release did not change that:

- **License Plate** reads REDACTED on 98,737 rows. The other 17,280 are blank. Those are overwhelmingly search types that take no plate input, though 20 rows of those same types do carry one. The method sheet has the exact breakdown.
 - **Case #** was also redacted. The file shows whether a case number existed, never what it was.
-

10. What was removed before publication

Everything removed is listed, line by line, in REDACTION_LOG.csv. It says what kind of thing came out and what the text reads now. It does not reprint what was taken.

Personal identifiers, 417 rows out of 140,561, which is 0.30%:

Type	Distinct entries	Rows
Named private individual	33	144
State or offender identification number	32	167
License plate	16	24
Internal report number, including 2 structured serials	12	56
Named officer or federal agent	6	18
Street address	1	4
Physical description of a private individual	1	4
Specific incident location	1	4
Out-of-state county naming a warrant's origin	1	6
Total	103	417 distinct rows

10 rows carried 2 of these, which is why the entry rows sum to 427 and the distinct row count is 417.

2 of the name entries also carried a date of birth, 1 carried an age, and 1 carried a personal phone number.

Case numbers, 3,306 rows. 225 case numbers that operators typed into the free-text notes column were replaced with stable labels, [CASE-A] through [CASE-HQ]. The City redacted the Case # column; these had leaked around it. The labels keep every finding intact, including that [CASE-A] alone accounts for 980 searches over 4 months.

Officer names. 177 Kalamazoo PD account names were replaced with pseudonyms, Officer 001 through Officer 177, assigned by a random permutation. The same account gets the same pseudonym, so per-account analysis is intact. The map has not been published and does not exist outside a private working file.

Nothing else was altered, no row was deleted, and no number was changed.

Both files are included: the log exactly as the City produced it, 140,561 rows with redactions applied, and a deduplicated working copy, 116,017 rows. They agree on every figure in this document.

11. Corrections

If any figure here is wrong, the underlying CSV is in this pack. Check it and tell me. Corrections get posted publicly.

mags@magneticnorse.com

Magnetic Norse is a project of Central Ventures LLC, a for-profit business. Not affiliated with Flock Safety, Flock Group Inc., or any government agency. This document reports what the records show. It does not establish intent.