

MAGNET S2

INTELLIGENCE REPORT

DTG: 260722-1800Z | Geographic Focus: Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
www.magnethf.com

REPORT IDENTIFICATION

Subject	Flock Safety ALPR Camera Deployment and Regulatory Divergence — Region 1 (CT/ME/MA/NH/RI/VT)
Purpose	Provide intelligence assessment of Flock Safety automated license plate reader (ALPR) camera deployment, state-level regulatory posture, and data-sharing risk across Region 1 for operator situational awareness and personal OPSEC planning.
DTG	260722-1800Z
Reporting Period	January 2026 – 22 July 2026
Geographic Focus	Region 1 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
Precedence	RR – ROUTINE
MagCon Status	3 – ELEVATED (NO CHANGE)
Sources	Multiple source reporting from Local, National, and International platforms. See source list.

SUMMARY (BLUF)

Region 1 shows the sharpest state-level regulatory divide of any MAGNET region reviewed to date: Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont are among a small group of U.S. states with meaningful statutory ALPR restrictions, Connecticut enacted new retention and sharing limits earlier in 2026, while Massachusetts and Rhode Island remain among the states with no ALPR-specific law despite active pending bills in both legislatures.

Connecticut's new law cuts local data retention from 30 to 21 days, restricts out-of-state sharing to neighboring states under specific conditions excluding immigration, reproductive-care, and gender-affirming-care investigations, and requires a judge-approved probable-cause warrant for other requestors — enacted after an investigative audit found one town's system alone had been searched 590,000 times in nine weeks.

Even within Connecticut's newly-restricted environment, municipal responses remain divided: Windsor ended its Flock contract outright and Killingworth was considering the same step, while Southbury and dozens of other Connecticut municipalities (47+ agencies statewide) continue adopting or expanding the technology.

Massachusetts presents a unique legal wrinkle not seen in other regions reviewed to date: its highest court held in *Commonwealth v. McCarthy* (2020) that a sufficiently dense ALPR network can invade a reasonable expectation of privacy under the state constitution, a precedent that could constrain future dense-network deployments even in the continued absence of a comprehensive statute.

BACKGROUND

Flock Safety is a private ALPR and public-safety technology vendor whose network has expanded to more than 100,000 camera devices nationwide, performing over 20 billion vehicle scans per month across more than 5,000 communities and roughly 4,500 law enforcement agencies as of mid-2026.

Region 1 consists of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont — a comparatively small, densely populated, and legislatively active region in which three states (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont) already sit in a small national tier of jurisdictions with meaningful ALPR-specific statutes.

Regional legislative activity has accelerated through 2026: Connecticut enacted new retention and sharing restrictions this year, while Massachusetts (H.3755, S.1648) and Rhode Island (H 8077) both have ALPR-specific bills pending as of this reporting period.

SITUATION

CONNECTICUT

At least 34 Connecticut police departments operate more than 200 Flock/ALPR cameras statewide, with more than 47 law enforcement agencies reported to have deployed the technology in some capacity. Following a multi-month investigative audit, the Connecticut legislature enacted new restrictions in 2026: local retention is now capped at 21 days (down from 30), data may only be shared with Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island and only if those states agree not to use it for immigration, reproductive-care, or gender-affirming-care investigations, and any other outside requestor must present a judge-approved probable-cause warrant rather than a vague investigative justification.

Municipal response has been mixed even after the new law took effect. Windsor's town council voted 5-4 in July 2026 to permanently disable and remove its 16 Flock cameras, following a records request showing the town's system had been searched 590,000 times over nine weeks; Killingworth was reported to be considering becoming the second Connecticut town to do the same. At the same time, Southbury's police department was advancing a \$42,500, 24-month, five-camera contract as of late June 2026, joining dozens of other Connecticut municipalities including Newtown, Westport, Wilton, Southington, and Glastonbury.

MAINE

Maine has passed one of the strongest state ALPR laws in the country, limiting retention periods and requiring warrants for certain types of access; Maine is also reported to be the only state that expressly prohibits ALPR use by private individuals altogether. Despite this, Flock Safety has run intensive marketing campaigns directed at Maine town officials, and the ACLU of Maine has requested records from towns and cities including York, Lewiston, Auburn, South Portland, Portland, Falmouth, Brunswick, and Sanford regarding their engagement with the company. Separate reporting has raised roadside-safety questions about the physical placement of Flock camera poles as the network has spread across the state.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire has banned state police from using ALPR systems entirely, the most restrictive state-level posture identified in Region 1 or in any MAGNET region reviewed to date. Current open-source reporting does not identify whether this ban extends to or is mirrored by municipal police departments, or whether local New Hampshire agencies operate Flock systems independently of the state-police restriction.

VERMONT

Vermont is categorized alongside New Hampshire, Maine, Arkansas, and Utah as one of a small group of states with meaningful statutory operational requirements governing law-enforcement ALPR use, including retention limits, usage policies, audit requirements, and access controls. Granular, jurisdiction-level reporting on specific Vermont Flock deployments was not identified in current sourcing.

MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts has no comprehensive ALPR statute, but its Supreme Judicial Court held in *Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, 484 Mass. 493 (2020), that a sufficiently dense ALPR camera network can invade a reasonable expectation of privacy under Article 14 of the state's Declaration of Rights, though the four-camera network at issue in that case did not itself cross that threshold. Two bills are currently pending: House Bill H.3755 would cap retention at 14 days absent a specific investigation, ban data sales, and require a warrant for outside access; Senate Bill S.1648 would prohibit ALPR use outright subject to narrow enumerated exceptions. Framingham police declined to renew their Flock contract in June 2026 after months of resident opposition, while in Brookline, the Select Board was weighing whether to formally access ALPR data generated by privately-installed cameras placed by a real estate company on the Brookline/Boston border.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island has no ALPR-specific state law; House Bill H 8077, sponsored by Rep. Matthew S. Dawson with nine co-sponsors, was heard by the House Judiciary Committee in March 2026 but had not been enacted as of this reporting period. The ACLU of Rhode Island is actively tracking and organizing against municipal deployments: Warren and Portsmouth town councils rejected camera proposals in December 2025 and January 2026 respectively, while Tiverton approved \$23,000 for four cameras (subject to a further council presentation) and South Kingstown was scheduled to discuss its own Flock use in late July 2026. After Portsmouth's rejection, Bristol's police chief separately approached the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority (RITBA) requesting cameras be installed on state-controlled property adjacent to the Mount Hope Bridge instead, a workaround that bypasses the local council's decision.

COMMENTS / ASSESSMENT

REGULATORY POSTURE: A SIX-STATE SPECTRUM

Region 1 spans nearly the full national range of ALPR regulatory postures within a single MAGNET region: Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont sit among a small national tier of states with meaningful statutory restrictions; Connecticut just enacted comparable protections in 2026; and Massachusetts and Rhode Island remain in the much larger group of states with no ALPR-specific statute, governed only by general Fourth Amendment doctrine and, in Massachusetts, a state constitutional privacy precedent.

CONTRACT STABILITY: SIMULTANEOUS EXPANSION AND CONTRACTION

Connecticut illustrates that statutory reform and municipal-level contract activity move independently: the same state that just tightened retention and sharing rules saw one town (Windsor) eliminate its program entirely, a second (Killingworth) considering the same, and a third (Southbury) advancing a new multi-year contract, all within weeks of each other. This suggests state-level regulation constrains what agencies can do with ALPR data without necessarily determining whether a given municipality keeps or drops the technology.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL EXPOSURE

Massachusetts' *Commonwealth v. McCarthy* precedent is a legal exposure vector not identified in other regions reviewed to date: a sufficiently dense Flock/ALPR network in a Massachusetts municipality could be vulnerable to a state constitutional challenge independent of any statute, unlike jurisdictions where Fourth Amendment doctrine alone applies. Rhode Island's Bristol/RITBA workaround — routing around a town council's rejection by seeking placement on state-controlled property — is a governance pattern MAGNET should watch for elsewhere in the region and nationally.

CAMERA EFFECTIVENESS VS. COMMUNITY TRUST-BUILDING: COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE

This comparative evidence bears directly on Region 1 jurisdictions currently weighing new, expanded, or discontinued Flock contracts (e.g., Southbury and Killingworth, CT; Tiverton and South Kingstown, RI; Brookline, MA).

Independent, non-vendor-funded evaluations of ALPR effectiveness remain limited and produce more mixed findings than vendor marketing suggests. The most rigorous controlled study of ALPR-focused deterrence, a randomized controlled trial conducted by the Police Executive Research Forum in Mesa, Arizona, found that LPR use in auto-theft hot spots did not appear to reduce that crime type. A subsequent National Institute of Justice quasi-randomized patrol study similarly found LPR use increased stolen-vehicle recoveries but did not reduce the likelihood of a new crime call while an officer was present, providing little clear evidence of general crime-prevention efficacy. A 2025 evaluation of a major ALPR expansion in Atlantic City, NJ produced mixed, model-dependent results, with some statistical models predicting crime increases associated with the intervention.

Broader closed-circuit television research is more consistent but still modest in scale. The most recent 40-year, 80-study Campbell Collaboration meta-analysis found CCTV associated with a significant but modest 16 percent overall crime reduction, driven heavily by a 51 percent reduction in parking-lot settings specifically, with substantially smaller effects in other settings; CCTV performed best when combined with other interventions rather than deployed as a standalone measure.

Community trust-building and procedural-justice-based policing show a different effect profile: smaller direct effects on crime, but stronger, more mechanistically established effects on citizen cooperation. A meta-analysis of community policing found limited direct effects on crime and fear of crime, but found community policing increases trust and satisfaction with police, which in turn increases citizens' willingness to report crime — a 'reporting effect' not driven by underlying crime-rate change. A dedicated meta-analysis of Tyler's procedural-justice model found consistent support that citizens who perceive police treatment as fair are more likely to view police as legitimate, and that perceived legitimacy predicts greater citizen cooperation and crime reporting; the same body of research finds that communities with low reporting rates nearly always have higher crime rates, while individuals who report victimization are less likely to be revictimized than those who do not report. A separate Campbell Collaboration review found community and problem-solving policing interventions produced the strongest crime-reduction effect sizes among disorder-policing strategies, while aggressive order-maintenance tactics generated no significant reduction.

Independent research on both interventions points to modest, narrowly-scoped direct effects rather than the broad reductions claimed in vendor-produced studies such as Flock Safety's self-reported customer survey claiming approximately 700,000 crimes solved annually nationwide. Camera systems appear to provide stronger investigative/case-clearance value than proven deterrence value, while trust-building interventions appear to strengthen the citizen-reporting pipeline that camera and other investigative data depend on to become clearance outcomes. Region 1 jurisdictions weighing new contracts against the region's growing regulatory and litigation exposure may find trust-building investment a lower-risk complement to, rather than substitute for, camera deployment.

ASSESSMENT CATEGORY	PROBABILITY
Additional Region 1 States Enacting New ALPR-Specific Legislation (12 mo.)	HIGH
Massachusetts or Rhode Island Enacting a Comprehensive ALPR Statute This Session	MODERATE
Additional Connecticut Municipalities Canceling Flock Contracts Following the New State Law	MODERATE
A Massachusetts Court Applying the McCarthy 'Dense Network' Standard to Strike Down a Specific Deployment	LOW-MODERATE
Continued Net Regional ALPR Expansion Despite Active Regulatory and Legislative Activity	HIGH

Note: HIGH probability for continued net expansion alongside HIGH probability for new legislation reflects two active, simultaneously true trends (regulatory tightening and continued municipal adoption) rather than a single unified trajectory, consistent with the pattern already observed within Connecticut.

INTELLIGENCE GAPS

- ▶ What is the current total Flock/ALPR camera count in New Hampshire and Vermont? No jurisdiction-level figures were identified in current reporting for either state.
- ▶ Does New Hampshire's state-police ALPR ban extend to or constrain municipal police departments, or does it apply solely at the state-police level?
- ▶ What specific statutory provisions do Maine's and Vermont's ALPR laws contain (exact retention period, warrant threshold, private-sector restrictions), beyond the high-level categorization available in current reporting?
- ▶ Will Massachusetts H.3755 or S.1648 advance out of committee this session, and which (if either) is more likely to be enacted?
- ▶ Will Rhode Island H 8077 pass in the current legislative session, and what specific retention and sharing limits does the final text contain?
- ▶ Has any Region 1 agency shared plate data with federal immigration enforcement without local authorization, comparable to incidents documented nationally?
- ▶ What is Killingworth, Connecticut's confirmed final contract status, given reporting as of early July 2026 described the decision as still pending?
- ▶ Did the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority approve Bristol's request to install cameras on state property adjacent to Portsmouth after the town council's rejection?

MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Members traveling through Region 1 should not assume uniform treatment of plate data across state lines; Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont carry meaningfully more statutory protection than Massachusetts or Rhode Island, and protections vary significantly even among the four more-regulated states.
- Where operating in Massachusetts or Rhode Island, treat ALPR data-sharing as effectively unregulated at the state level pending the outcome of pending bills (H.3755/S.1648 in Massachusetts; H 8077 in Rhode Island).
- Track Killingworth, CT's final contract decision and any additional Connecticut municipal responses to the state's new 21-day retention and restricted-sharing law.
- Monitor Massachusetts case law citing *Commonwealth v. McCarthy* for any ruling applying the 'dense network' standard to a specific municipal ALPR deployment.
- Watch for RITBA-style workarounds elsewhere in the region, in which a rejected municipal proposal is redirected to state-controlled property to bypass a local council's decision.
- Encourage Region 1 agencies weighing new or expanded ALPR contracts to pair camera investment with community trust-building and procedural-justice practices; independent research indicates trust-building strengthens the citizen-reporting pipeline that camera data depends on to become clearance outcomes, while camera deterrence effects alone remain modest and narrowly scoped in rigorous, non-vendor-funded studies.
- Reduce overall digital footprint, including migrating primary mobile devices used for MAGNET-related activity to de-googled builds (e.g., GrapheneOS-class operating systems) that do not run default Google Mobile Services, or equivalent de-Apple configurations, to limit continuous background location reporting to platform infrastructure.
- Do not use cell phones for purchases, including tap-to-pay/mobile wallet transactions. Mobile payment activity exposes real-time location and can be correlated to any Google or Apple account signed in on the device, regardless of whether that account is the one used for the transaction.
- Use offline-capable, login-free navigation applications such as Magic Earth in place of Google Maps or Apple Maps. Magic Earth does not require an account login to operate, reducing the number of platforms that receive continuous route and destination data during MAGNET-related travel.
- Where feasible, disable or restrict background location permissions for all non-essential applications on devices used for MAGNET activity, and periodically audit which applications retain 'always allow' location access.

MAGNET GUIDANCE

Members conducting field activity, meetups, or equipment transport within Region 1 should account for the region's sharp state-by-state regulatory divide when assessing plate-data exposure; a Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, or Vermont deployment does not carry the same data-sharing risk profile as one in Massachusetts or Rhode Island.

PACE tier: where movement to Region 1 activities is communications-sensitive, Primary and Alternate coordination should continue to rely on established MAGNET HF/JS8Call/VarAC BBS channels rather than cellular check-ins; cellular geolocation combined with ALPR vehicle tracking creates a more complete movement picture than either data source alone, regardless of the state's statutory posture.

Report any confirmed instance of a Region 1 agency sharing plate data involving MAGNET-relevant travel with unauthorized third parties, or any confirmed RITBA-style jurisdictional workaround, through standard S2 intake channels.

SOURCE LIST

- [1] [B2] WFSB — Connecticut's new rules and limits for license plate cameras; details the 21-day retention cap and restricted sharing conditions — <https://www.wfsb.com/2026/05/28/cts-new-rules-limits-license-plate-cameras/>
- [2] [B2] WTNH — Some Connecticut towns opting to turn off automated license plate reader cameras amid privacy concerns (Windsor, Killingworth) — <https://www.wtnh.com/news/connecticut/hartford/some-connecticut-towns-opting-to-turn-off-automated-license-plate-reader-cameras-amid-privacy-concerns/>
- [3] [B2] NBC Connecticut — 2 CT towns end contracts with automated license plate reader company Flock Safety; Windsor search-volume figures — <https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/local/two-towns-end-contracts-with-automated-license-plate-reader-company-flock-safety/3755508/>
- [4] [B2] The Southbury Record — Southbury, CT weighs a new \$42,500 Flock camera contract; statewide CT agency count — <https://southburyrecord.com/2026/06/26/southbury-weighs-flock-license-plate-reader-cameras/>
- [5] [B2] ACLU of Rhode Island — Flock Safety ALPR Cameras 101 — Rhode Island municipal tracker and advocacy campaign — <https://www.riaclu.org/campaigns-initiatives/introduction-to-flock-cameras-in-rhode-island/>
- [6] [B2] Rhode Island Current — Commentary on pending RI ALPR bill H 8077 and regional legislative comparison — <https://rhodeislandcurrent.com/2026/04/06/police-surveillance-cameras-offer-a-false-choice-between-public-safety-and-privacy/>
- [7] [B2] Yahoo News (wire) — After Portsmouth said no, Bristol, RI chief seeks RITBA workaround for Mount Hope Bridge cameras — https://news.yahoo.com/portsmouth-said-no-bristol-chief-090053919.html?fr=sycsrp_catchall
- [8] [B2] ACLU of Maine — License plate readers and public surveillance; Maine's ALPR law and municipal tracking — <https://www.aclumaine.org/publications/license-plate-readers-and-public-surveillance/>
- [9] [B2] WGME — As Flock cameras spread across Maine, safety advocates question some roadside poles — <https://wgme.com/news/i-team/as-flock-cameras-spread-across-maine-safety-advocates-question-some-roadside-poles>
- [10] [B2] Yahoo News (Boston.com wire) — Brookline, MA to vote on accessing privately-installed Flock camera data; MA/RI regulatory-gap context — <https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/brookline-vote-accessing-data-privately-014128142.html>
- [11] [B2] RecordingLaw.com — Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) Laws Explained (2026); Commonwealth v. McCarthy summary — <https://www.recordinglaw.com/us-laws/automated-license-plate-readers/>
- [12] [B2] ObscureIQ — License Plate Surveillance State Legality Map (2026); state-tier ALPR regulation categorization — <https://www.obscureiq.com/license-plate-surveillance-legality/>
- [13] [A1] Massachusetts Legislature — Bill H.3755 official text; proposed 14-day retention cap, warrant requirement, and data-sale ban — <https://malegislature.gov/Bills/194/H3755/House/Bill/Text>
- [14] [B2] Boston.com — Framingham, MA police decline to renew Flock contract after months of resident opposition — <https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2026/06/25/framingham-police-will-not-renew-flock-safety-contract-after-months-of-resident-opposition/>

Submit reports through established MAGNET situational awareness channels. To Learn More About MAGNET, Visit www.MAGNETHF.COM