

THORNTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM



Date: April 28, 2026

To: City Council

From: Chad Parker
Division Commander

RE: Follow-up: Responses to Council Inquiries Regarding the Thornton Police Department's ALPR Program

Honorable Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem and City Council Members,

This memo is responsive to the remaining questions from the April 7, 2026 City Council Planning Session regarding the police department's follow up presentation on the use of automatic license plate reader technology:

Question: How do the three agencies that require a case number or call for service number handle searches that are based on an alert received from the system?

Two of the agencies require their officers to request a call for service be created by dispatch. The officers then list this call for service number in the Case Report Number box. The remaining agency requires the box to be completed, but they do not require a trackable number to be entered. In situations surrounding alerts, they require officers to input information related to the search. For example, should a user be alerted to a vehicle stolen out of Thornton, they could indicate "Thornton Steal" or something similar in that field.

We have evaluated the benefits and drawbacks of these practices. Requiring a call for service number for something that is not a call for service would artificially inflate CFS numbers and have a detrimental impact on our ongoing efforts to be data driven in addressing public safety concerns in the community. This is in addition to requiring administrative steps that would place a significant and undue burden on our team members in dispatch already performing so many tasks. Recent changes made in the system, as discussed at the April 7 Planning Session, provide a clear expectation for users to include these numbers when appropriate, while allowing use of the system in those unique situations when an associated number is not available. The totality of the recent changes allows for user activity to be more easily audited to confirm appropriate use of the system.

Question: If agencies do not have MFA (multi-factor authentication), how do they comply, and is there an intention to make MFA a requirement?

With the help of the City's Cybersecurity Team, a comprehensive assessment of Flock's security features has been completed. This review incorporated independent research, direct system evaluation, vendor engagement, and analysis of publicly available responses. The assessment found no evidence of an active breach or immediate operational risk. Flock Safety has demonstrated measurable progress in addressing previously identified vulnerabilities and improving its overall security posture. In February 2026 Flock also retained a third-party firm tasked with implementing continuous adversarial testing of the system and its devices in attempt to proactively identify vulnerabilities.

Even though Flock does not currently require agencies to use MFA, their practice of leaving that decision to individual agencies is consistent with other LPR vendors that have been evaluated by TPD. Flock did however advise the company plans on implementing a mandatory MFA requirement for all users by the end of 2026.

Flock advised that the agencies not using MFA use a single sign on option. In these instances, users have to log into their main agency network in order to access their Flock system accounts. This configuration leverages the agency's existing network security, requiring users to authenticate through their primary workstation credentials.