

OKC FOIA Round 2

Eleven follow-up requests after the March memo.

For the Oklahoma City Council's July 21, 2026 Flock renewal vote.

Why these eleven

The March 10, 2026 OKCPD Internal Memorandum (OCPD-2885-2026) confirmed in writing that the Department has no access controls, no prohibited-use policies, no discipline standards, no audit procedures, and no transparency reporting for the Flock Safety system. That was the receipts round.

Round 2 is the audit round. These eleven requests target the records the Department and the City cannot easily deflect - search logs, data-sharing agreements, the paper trail behind the June 2026 rewrite of Operations Manual Section 5-118, the specific documents any competent Flock program would already publish, the effectiveness metrics OKC has never produced, and the right-of-way and roadside-safety compliance records for every Flock pole in the city.

Filed together, they answer the question every council member should be asking before July 21: what have the cameras actually been used for, who has seen the data, has any of it prevented crime, are the poles even legal, and how do we know?

Filing sequence

File them in this order, not all at once. Bundling gives the Department a single "responsive review" window to slow-walk the whole batch. Sequencing forces each one to be processed on its own clock.

- Day 1 - File Request #3 (Section 5-118 revision records). Narrow, discrete, hard to deny.
- Day 2-3 - File Request #1 (audit logs). Highest effort for the Department; give it its own processing window.
- Day 4-10 - File Requests #2, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11 in whatever cadence you can manage. Request #11 goes to Public Works and Traffic Management, not to OKCPD Records - a different office, different reviewers, no bundling risk.

Log every reference number the agencies assign. Denials without a specific statutory citation are legally vulnerable - if that happens, the denial itself becomes documentable evidence.

Where to file

OKC's Records Officer handles most requests through **records@okc.gov** or the online portal. Requests specifically about police operations can be sent directly to OKCPD Records. Where a request spans both, cc both offices - the two hold different documents, as the March filings confirmed.

Request #1: OKCPD Flock Audit Logs

The single most consequential request in this pack. Flock's platform natively records every search; audit logs have broken every previous city scandal (Dunwoody, San Francisco 1.6M searches, Denver 1,400 outside queries, Mountain View 17 months of federal access). *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - OKCPD Flock Safety Audit Logs, June 2025 to Present

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

All Flock Safety system search records, query records, and audit-log records generated by Oklahoma City Police Department personnel between June 1, 2025 and the date of this response. These records are maintained by the Flock Safety platform in the ordinary course of its operation and are accessible to OKCPD through its administrative interface.

For each search or query, the responsive record should include, at minimum:

- The unique identifier of the OKCPD user who initiated the search (badge number, username, employee ID, or equivalent)
- The date and time of the search
- The search criteria entered (plate number, geographic area, time window, or other parameters)
- The value entered in the "case number," "incident number," or "reason" field, if any
- Whether the search returned a hit against a hot list or generated an alert
- Whether any images, records, or vehicle history were exported, downloaded, printed, or shared as a result of the search
- Whether the search retrieved data from Flock's National Lookup network (that is, from cameras operated by agencies other than OKCPD)

Flock's platform natively supports export in CSV, XLSX, and JSON. I request the responsive records in electronic form (CSV or XLSX preferred) delivered via email or downloadable link.

I do not request the personally identifying information of any private citizen whose vehicle appears in these records. Plate numbers may be redacted, provided the remainder of each row remains intact.

These are administrative records documenting the operation of a taxpayer-funded system. They are not investigative case files, and the general law-enforcement-

records exemption does not apply. If OKCPD contests any specific portion as exempt, I request a per-row citation to the specific statutory exemption relied upon.

I request a waiver of fees under 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as this request is filed in the public interest in connection with the City Council's pending Flock Safety contract renewal decision and is not for commercial use.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #2: National Lookup Participation and Data-Sharing Agreements

Forces OKCPD to answer in writing the question KOSU asked and the Department dodged in July 2026: does OKC's Flock data leave city limits, and to whom? *Send to OKCPD, cc the City Municipal Counselor.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Flock National Lookup Participation and All Outside-Agency Data-Sharing Agreements

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

1. A written statement confirming whether OKCPD participates in the Flock Safety "National Lookup" feature (or any equivalent multi-agency data-sharing function operated by Flock), including the current status of any account-level settings governing outside-agency access to OKC's Flock data.

2. All written agreements, memoranda of understanding, data-sharing agreements, contracts, letters, or equivalent instruments between OKCPD (or the City of Oklahoma City acting on OKCPD's behalf) and any external agency that governs or authorizes the sharing of, or access to, ALPR data collected by OKC-operated Flock Safety cameras. "External agency" includes but is not limited to:

- Federal agencies (including ICE, HSI, FBI, ATF, USMS, DEA, DHS, and any Inspector General office)
- Any law enforcement agency outside the City of Oklahoma City, whether in Oklahoma or another state
- Any Oklahoma state agency, including OSBI, Oklahoma Highway Patrol, and the Department of Public Safety

- Any private entity, private security firm, or vendor other than Flock Safety itself

3. All records identifying outside agencies that have queried OKC's Flock data during the past 24 months, including the querying agency, the date, and the search criteria where recorded.

Requested format: electronic (PDF for narrative documents; CSV or XLSX for tabular data). Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date. If any portion is contested as exempt, please provide the specific statutory citation applicable to that portion.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #3: Section 5-118 Revision Paper Trail

Between February and June 2026, OKCPD quietly rewrote the Section 5-118 data-sharing rule. This request asks for the paper trail behind that rewrite: who initiated it, who approved it, whether Flock was consulted, whether council was notified. *Send to OKCPD. Filed July 3, 2026 by DeFlockOKC as reference OCPD-9710-2026.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - OKCPD Operations Manual Section 5-118 Revision Records, February to June 2026

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

All records related to the revision of OKCPD Operations Manual Section 5-118 (Automated License Plate Readers) between February 1, 2026 and June 30, 2026. Specifically:

- 1.** All internal memoranda, drafts, redlines, or comparison documents produced during that window that reflect proposed or adopted changes to Section 5-118.
- 2.** All emails, chat messages, or written communications between OKCPD personnel of any rank discussing proposed revisions to Section 5-118 during that window.
- 3.** All emails or written communications between OKCPD personnel and any employee, representative, or agent of Flock Safety discussing OKCPD's ALPR-related policies during that window.

4. All emails or written communications between OKCPD personnel and (a) the Office of the City Manager, (b) the Office of the Mayor, (c) the Municipal Counselor's Office, or (d) any member of the City Council discussing revisions to Section 5-118 during that window.

5. Any policy review board minutes, meeting notes, written recommendations, or written approvals that authorized the change to Section 5-118 that took effect in the June 2026 version of the Operations Manual.

Requested format: electronic (PDF). Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #4: Federal Agency Access to OKC Flock Data

The Mountain View analogue. Mountain View's Police Chief discovered ATF, Air Force, and GSA-IG had accessed local Flock data for 17 months without his knowledge - and terminated the contract as a result. This request asks whether the same is happening in OKC. *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Federal Agency Access to OKCPD Flock Safety Data

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

1. All records of federal agency access to OKC-collected Flock Safety data during the past 24 months. "Federal agency" includes but is not limited to Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Homeland Security Investigations (HSI), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the United States Marshals Service (USMS), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the General Services Administration Office of Inspector General, and any other federal law enforcement or investigative agency.

Responsive records should include, at minimum:

- The identity of the federal agency
- The date and time of access

- The mechanism of access (direct login, National Lookup query, formal information request, subpoena, warrant, task-force credential, or other)
 - The search criteria used, where recorded
 - Whether local OKCPD personnel authorized or were notified of the access at the time it occurred
2. All records of any federal task force, joint operation, or multi-jurisdictional investigation during that window in which OKC Flock data was made available to federal personnel.
3. Copies of any credentials, task-force MOUs, or account-sharing arrangements that grant federal personnel access to OKC's Flock systems.

For reference, the OKCPD Internal Memorandum dated March 10, 2026 (OCPD-2885-2026, Item 5) previously indicated that "no audit procedures exist in policies, SOPs, directives, training or guidance for Flock." If the Department's current position is that it cannot produce the above records because it does not maintain them, I request that this response be provided in writing so that it may be part of the public record on this matter.

Requested format: electronic. Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #5: System Administrator Identity and Approval Log

The June 2026 rewrite of Section 5-118 delegated approval of all data sharing to a single "System Administrator." This request asks who that person is and what they have approved. *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Flock System Administrator Records under Revised Section 5-118

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

The June 2026 revision of OKCPD Operations Manual Section 5-118 provides that "ALPR data may only be shared with other law enforcement agencies with the approval of the System Administrator." I request:

1. The name, title, and rank of the individual currently designated as the "System Administrator" for the Flock Safety platform at OKCPD, and their supervisory chain within the Department.
2. Any written policy, guideline, criteria, checklist, or procedure that governs how the System Administrator evaluates a request to share ALPR data with an outside agency.
3. All records of approvals or denials issued by the System Administrator under this authority since the June 2026 revision of Section 5-118 took effect. For each entry, the responsive record should include the requesting agency, the date of the request, the criteria applied, and the outcome.
4. The identity and job title of any prior individual who has served in the System Administrator role (or its functional equivalent) at any time since June 20, 2023.

Requested format: electronic. Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #6: Discipline and Complaints Related to Flock Use

Officers in other jurisdictions have been criminally charged for using Flock to stalk. This request asks whether any equivalent misuse has been alleged or acted on within OKCPD. *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Discipline Records and Public Complaints Related to Flock Safety Use

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

1. All records of Internal Affairs investigations, disciplinary actions, complaints, or corrective action taken against any OKCPD employee (sworn or civilian) related in whole or in part to that employee's use of the Flock Safety system, from June 20, 2023 to the present.
2. All records of complaints, tips, or reports received by OKCPD from members of the public alleging misuse of the Flock Safety system by OKCPD personnel

or by any outside agency granted access to OKC's Flock data, during that same window.

3. The written policies, procedures, or guidelines that OKCPD applies to open and investigate an allegation of Flock misuse (whether or not any such investigation has ever been opened).

For reference, the March 10, 2026 memorandum (Item 4) previously indicated that "no discipline standards specific to Flock have been established." If OKCPD's position is that no responsive records exist because no such investigation has ever been opened, please provide that confirmation in writing, along with the date the Department last conducted an internal review of Flock audit logs for potential misuse.

Personally identifying information of any officer subject to a completed and unsustained investigation may be redacted consistent with 51 O.S. § 24A.7. Sustained findings, discipline imposed, and the substance of any allegation of misconduct are public records under Oklahoma law.

Requested format: electronic. Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #7: Flock Training Curricula and Completion Records

Section 5-118 says ALPR data will be used only by "properly trained" personnel. This request asks what that training actually consists of, who has received it, and why the March 10 memo withheld the materials without citing a specific statutory basis. *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - OKCPD Flock Safety Training Materials and Completion Records

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

Section 5-118 of the OKCPD Operations Manual provides that ALPR data "will be used only by members of the Oklahoma City Police Department who have been properly trained in the use of ALPR for a legitimate law enforcement purpose." I request:

1. All training curricula, lesson plans, slide decks, videos, handbooks, roll-call materials, or written materials used to train OKCPD personnel on the use of the Flock Safety system, from June 20, 2023 to the present.
2. Records identifying which OKCPD personnel have completed Flock-specific training, along with the date and content of each training event. Personnel may be identified by badge number or employee ID rather than name if the Department prefers.
3. Copies of any training or certification materials provided to OKCPD by Flock Safety directly, whether formal or informal - including webinars, on-site training, and online modules.

For reference, the March 10, 2026 memorandum (Item 2) previously indicated that OKCPD "has training material for the use of Flock" that was being withheld as "law enforcement use only," without citation to a specific statutory exemption. I respectfully request that the Department cite the specific statutory basis for any withholding of these materials on a document-by-document basis, so that the sufficiency of any exemption claim can be evaluated.

Requested format: electronic. Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #8: Flock Invoices, Contract Addenda, and Pre-Contract Pilot Records

Flock's business model, as documented in multiple jurisdictions, relies on installing cameras before contracts are signed. This request asks whether that happened in OKC before the June 20, 2023 contract, plus a current camera inventory to reconcile the contract's 90 with the community-mapped 299. *Send to the City of Oklahoma City Procurement, cc OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Flock Safety Invoices, Contract Records, and Pre-Contract Pilot Documentation

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

1. All invoices, purchase orders, payment vouchers, and receipts issued by or on behalf of the City of Oklahoma City to Flock Safety, Flock Group Inc., or any related entity from January 1, 2022 to the present. Line-item detail should be

included for hardware, installation, service, subscription, and optional feature charges.

2. All addenda, amendments, statements of work, change orders, or side agreements to the OKC Master Agreement with Flock Safety (Contract C241032 or any predecessor or successor contract).

3. All records related to any Flock Safety pilot program, evaluation period, free trial, courtesy deployment, or demonstration installation that took place within Oklahoma City prior to the June 20, 2023 execution of the Master Agreement. This includes but is not limited to:

- Correspondence with Flock Safety personnel regarding a pilot or trial installation
- Records identifying the physical location of any camera deployed prior to June 20, 2023
- Records identifying which OKCPD or City personnel authorized or requested any pre-contract installation
- Any invoices, payments, or in-kind services exchanged during the pilot period

4. A current inventory of every Flock camera operating under the OKC-Flock contract, including street address or intersection, mounting type (municipal streetlight, freestanding pole, private property, other), the date each installation was placed in service, and the specific authorization documenting each installation.

Requested format: electronic (PDF for narrative documents; CSV or XLSX for tabular data). Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #9: Effectiveness Reporting and Impact Metrics

The core question every council member should be asking: what have these cameras actually prevented? OKC has never published a Flock effectiveness report. Neither has any other Flock city, on purpose - if the actual impact were provable, Flock's own marketing would say so. Berkeley's peer-reviewed study found no statistically significant reduction in crime from ALPRs. This request asks whether OKCPD itself has produced or requested anything better. *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - OKCPD Flock Safety Effectiveness Reporting and Impact Metrics

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

- 1.** All internal or external reports, memoranda, briefings, presentations, dashboards, or written analyses produced by, for, or received by the Oklahoma City Police Department that quantify the crime-reduction impact, case-clearance impact, or any other measurable public safety impact of the Flock Safety system in Oklahoma City, from June 20, 2023 to the present.
- 2.** All correspondence in which OKCPD requested effectiveness data, outcome metrics, ROI analysis, or comparable materials from Flock Safety, Inc. or from any consultant, analyst, or academic partner.
- 3.** Any written performance objectives, key performance indicators (KPIs), success criteria, or milestones adopted by OKCPD to evaluate whether the Flock system is meeting the goals of its contract.
- 4.** Any records showing the specific criteria OKCPD applies to determine whether the Flock contract should be renewed or terminated at the end of the current term.

If no responsive records exist for any of the above, please confirm that in writing. A written confirmation that no effectiveness data has been produced or requested is itself a public record of interest, given that the City has paid approximately \$270,000 per year for this system since June 2023.

Requested format: electronic. Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #10: Stolen Vehicle Case Linkage and Outcome Data

Tulsa's own police captain cited a stolen vehicle recovery rate as the primary Flock justification - recovery, not prevention. OKC has never produced comparable numbers. This request forces the specific question: how many stolen vehicle cases has Flock actually helped close, and how does that compare to the pre-Flock baseline? *Send to OKCPD.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Stolen Vehicle Case Linkage to Flock Safety Searches

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I request access to and copies of the following records:

1. For each stolen vehicle report closed by OKCPD between January 1, 2022 and the date of this response, records identifying whether the Flock Safety system was cited as material to the recovery or arrest. Records should include, at minimum:
 - The case number or incident number
 - The disposition (recovered, arrest made, closed without recovery, other)
 - Whether Flock data was cited in the closing narrative, supplemental report, or arrest affidavit
 - If Flock data was cited, the date range of the Flock searches involved
2. Any aggregate reporting OKCPD maintains that summarizes the number of stolen vehicle cases in which Flock data was material, either monthly, quarterly, or annually.
3. Any aggregate reporting OKCPD maintains that summarizes the total number of stolen vehicle reports received, cases closed, and cases resulting in arrest for the periods January 2020 through May 2023 (pre-Flock deployment) and June 2023 through the date of this response (Flock era), broken out by year.

This request seeks operational and statistical data, not investigative case files. Individual case narratives, witness statements, and personally identifying information may be redacted, provided the disposition, date, and Flock-material flag remain intact.

If OKCPD does not track this linkage in a reportable form, please confirm that in writing, along with a description of any manual or informal process used to determine whether the Flock system is contributing to case outcomes.

Requested format: electronic (CSV or XLSX preferred for tabular data). Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, as above.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

Request #11: Right-of-Way Permits and MUTCD Compliance for Flock Pole Installations

A different attack surface entirely. The federal MUTCD (Section 2A.19) requires sign and marker supports inside the roadside clear zone to be crashworthy - breakaway, yielding, or shielded. State DOTs apply the same principle to camera poles. Roadside safety advocates have documented widespread non-compliance in Maine, Colorado, Tennessee, Iowa, South Carolina, and Texas, and ODOT has already directed Pryor Creek and Bartlesville to remove Flock cameras from state highway right-of-way. OKC has never publicly disclosed whether its ~90 installations were reviewed for clear-zone compliance. *Send to City of OKC Public Works and Traffic Management, cc OKCPD Records.*

Subject line

Open Records Request - Right-of-Way Permits, Engineering Approvals, and Roadside Safety Compliance for Flock Safety Pole Installations

Body

Pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act, 51 O.S. §§ 24A.1 et seq., I respectfully request the following public records relating to the siting, permitting, and roadside-safety compliance of automated license plate reader (ALPR) camera poles - commonly known as Flock Safety cameras - installed within the corporate limits of Oklahoma City, including any such poles located within city-maintained rights-of-way, state highway rights-of-way inside the city, or on city-owned property.

Background and context. The City of Oklahoma City currently expends approximately \$270,000 per year on its Flock Safety contract. A material share of these devices is mounted on freestanding poles provided by the vendor rather than on pre-existing municipal infrastructure. The federal Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 2A.19, requires that post-mounted sign and object marker supports within the clear zone be crashworthy - meaning breakaway, yielding, or shielded by a longitudinal barrier or crash cushion - and defines "crashworthy" by reference to NCHRP Report 350 and the AASHTO Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH). Independent investigations in multiple states have documented that a substantial portion of installed Flock poles do not meet these standards, and the Oklahoma Department of Transportation has affirmatively directed other Oklahoma municipalities to remove Flock cameras from state-highway right-of-way, taking the position that ALPRs are "only statutorily authorized for verifying vehicle insurance" on state ROW. The City's March 10, 2026 internal memorandum regarding the Flock program did not address pole-installation compliance.

1. Right-of-way permits. Copies of every revocable right-of-way permit, utility permit, encroachment permit, or equivalent authorization issued by the City of Oklahoma City (including the Public Works Department and the Traffic Management Division) for the installation of any Flock Safety camera pole or ALPR device on city right-of-way, city-owned property, or city-owned infrastructure, from January 1, 2022 to the date this request is fulfilled. For each

permit, please include the application, the approved plan set, the site address or GPS coordinates, the name of the licensed contractor performing the work, and any conditions of approval.

2. Engineering approvals and approved plans. All engineered drawings, foundation details, base-plate specifications, and manufacturer cut sheets submitted to or approved by the City for Flock Safety pole installations - including, specifically, any documentation identifying whether each installed pole uses a breakaway base (such as the X-Squared or Flock Safety FLK2-4 Breakaway configuration approved by the Missouri DOT) or a fixed, non-yielding base.

3. MUTCD, AASHTO, and NCHRP/MASH compliance records. Any certification, engineering memorandum, sign-off, or written determination by a City engineer, a contracted engineer, or the vendor confirming that each Flock pole installation complies with (a) MUTCD Section 2A.19 crashworthiness requirements, (b) the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide clear-zone standards, and (c) NCHRP Report 350 or AASHTO MASH crash-test criteria. If no such certification exists for a given installation, records reflecting that fact are equally responsive.

4. ODOT correspondence. All correspondence - including email, letters, memoranda, meeting notes, and text messages - between any City of Oklahoma City official or employee and the Oklahoma Department of Transportation regarding Flock Safety camera poles, ALPR devices, state-highway right-of-way, waiver applications, removal requests, or roadside-safety compliance, from January 1, 2022 to the date of fulfillment. This request specifically includes communications concerning ODOT's directives to other Oklahoma municipalities (such as Pryor Creek and Bartlesville) to remove Flock cameras from state ROW.

5. Complaint and incident records. Any citizen complaint, 3-1-1 report, code-enforcement referral, insurance claim, tort claim notice, or internal service ticket concerning a Flock Safety camera pole - including but not limited to reports of poles struck by vehicles, poles obstructing sight lines, poles installed between the roadway and a guardrail, poles leaning or damaged, or poles installed without visible permits - from initial deployment to the date of fulfillment. Also requested are any police reports, traffic-crash reports, or incident reports in which a Flock pole is identified as a struck object, fixed object, or contributing roadside feature.

6. Inventory and location records. A current list or geospatial dataset identifying each Flock Safety camera location within Oklahoma City, indicating for each site (a) whether the camera is mounted on pre-existing city infrastructure (streetlight, traffic-signal mast arm, utility pole) or on a freestanding Flock-provided pole, (b) the posted speed limit of the adjacent roadway, (c) the offset distance from the edge of the traveled way, and (d) whether the location falls within an ODOT-maintained right-of-way.

Fee waiver requested per 51 O.S. § 24A.5, on the ground that release of these records is in the public interest and not for commercial purpose - they concern

approximately \$270,000 in annual public funds, the safety of the traveling public on Oklahoma City roadways, and the City's compliance with federal roadside-safety standards. If any portion of the fee waiver is denied, please contact the requester before incurring any charge so the scope may be narrowed. Electronic production (PDF or native format) preferred. If any responsive record is withheld in whole or in part, please cite the specific statutory exemption relied upon and produce all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions.

Please confirm receipt and provide an anticipated response date.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Address]

[Your Phone / Email]

After you file

Whatever comes back - a full response, a partial production, a denial, or silence - is useful. Here is what to do with it:

- Track every reference number. The agencies will assign one (OKCPD numbers begin with "OCPD-", City requests begin with "ORR-"). Log the reference, the filing date, and the anticipated response date.
- Save every response. PDFs, emails, denials, even "no responsive records" replies. These are part of the public record now.
- Ask for the statutory basis of any withholding. Oklahoma's Open Records Act requires a specific citation. Denials without one are legally vulnerable.
- If a fee estimate seems punitive, request an itemized breakdown and reference the fee-waiver language in the request. Excessive fees are documentable evidence of noncompliance.
- If the response window slips past 30 days without a written extension, that itself is documentable. "Prompt and reasonable" is the statutory standard.
- Send what you get to DeFlockOKC@proton.me. We publish the receipts, we help residents in other cities file the same requests, and we make sure no finding disappears.

What each response confirms

A production - anything at all - gives us evidence to work with. Even an incomplete response documents what OKCPD was tracking (or not tracking) at a specific point in time.

A denial without statutory citation is a procedural violation of the Open Records Act. That becomes campaign material.

A confirmation that no responsive records exist is itself a story. The Department cannot produce audit logs because it does not run audits. It cannot produce federal-access records because it has no procedure to track them. That is the answer.

Silence past 30 days is documented noncompliance. File an appeal citing the response-time obligation.

Track our filings and their responses: **DeFlockOKC.com/records.html**