



Moore County Board of Commissioners

August 17, 2026 | 4:00 PM
Moore County Senior Enrichment Center
Grand Hall, 8040 US-15
West End, NC

MINUTES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Nick Picerno, Vice Chairman Jim Von Canon, Kurt Cook, John Ritter, and Tom Adams

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Picerno called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone in attendance.

INVOCATION

County Manager Wayne Vest offered the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chairman Jim Von Canon led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Picerno stated that the meeting was informational in nature and would not include a public comment period. He invited anyone wishing to provide comments to sign up to speak during the public comment period at a Regular Meeting.

1. FLOCK CAMERAS DISCUSSION

Sheriff Ronnie Fields opened the discussion by introducing Chief Deputy Andy Conway and Major Eric Galloway, characterizing Major Galloway as the subject matter expert on forensic and investigative technology. Sheriff Fields expressed appreciation to the Board and spoke directly to the public, urging attendees to approach the presentation with an open mind. He briefly highlighted two recent high-profile cases in Moore County in which Flock cameras proved instrumental: a double homicide at Woodlake, where camera data confirmed the suspect had left Moore County and enabled coordination with Virginia and Ohio authorities leading to an arrest the same afternoon; and a triple homicide investigation, in which Flock camera footage was used to verify a suspect's alibi. Sheriff Fields reiterated that Flock cameras are a critical tool for law enforcement and pledged to make himself and his staff available to answer further questions from the public.

Major Galloway presented a comprehensive overview of Flock Safety ALPR technology, covering its history, capabilities, legal framework, data security, and current use by the Moore County Sheriff's Office. *The presentation is hereby made a part of these minutes by attachment as Appendix A.*

Chairman Picerno asked Major Galloway to explain, in plain terms, the function of Flock cameras. Major Galloway explained that the camera captures an image of a vehicle traveling on a public roadway, transmits the image to a secure location, and allows law enforcement to search the information under authorized circumstances. He emphasized that this was the extent of the system's function.

Chairman Picerno further asked whether an officer must actively conduct a search to retrieve information, and Major Galloway confirmed that an inquiry is required. The Chairman then raised what he identified as the primary concern expressed by citizens—how the data is audited and how misuse is prevented, including access by officers from other agencies utilizing the shared network. Major Galloway and Sheriff Fields confirmed that all system activity is recorded in an audit trail and that monthly audits will be conducted. Sheriff Fields added that he had made it clear to his staff that anyone found misusing the system would be charged and terminated.

Chairman Picerno also relayed a citizen's concern regarding the potential risk to special operations personnel and their families residing in Moore County, specifically whether individuals with malicious intent could compromise the system to track them. Major Galloway reiterated the security measures in place and explained that any attempt to tamper with or compromise the camera hardware would generate an immediate alert. He further noted that a foreign actor seeking to surveil military personnel would have more accessible and less conspicuous means of doing so than attempting to breach a secured law enforcement system.

Vice Chairman Von Canon noted that Flock cameras have reportedly assisted in locating approximately 10,000 missing persons nationwide. He observed that the County's 10 cameras, distributed across approximately 700 square miles, constitute a relatively limited deployment and that privately operated cameras maintained by retailers, homeowners' associations, and individuals are already present throughout the County in substantially greater numbers. Vice Chairman Von Canon expressed his view that the Flock system is a useful investigative tool that does not replace traditional law enforcement methods. He stated his support for providing the Sheriff with the tools necessary to help maintain public safety.

Commissioner Ritter stated that his initial concern centered on the safety of military personnel; however, he said the presentation had given him a different perspective, noting that the system could also help protect those individuals by identifying potential threats within the County. He expressed appreciation for the Sheriff's commitment to conducting audits, and he stated that, with appropriate and ongoing oversight, he viewed Flock as a valuable law enforcement tool.

Commissioner Adams asked whether Flock retains the county's data on its own servers and whether that data could be aggregated, sold, or shared with third parties. Major Galloway responded that the data resides on Flock's servers for the duration of the retention period and is then deleted, and that he was not aware of any instance in which customer data had been sold. Sheriff Fields added that the contract explicitly prohibits data sales. Commissioner Adams also requested that aggregate Flock usage data be made available to the public on a regular basis. Sheriff Fields agreed, stating

that the information could be incorporated into the monthly statistical report currently provided to the Board.

Commissioner Cook acknowledged the strong emotional response from members of the public and reflected on both the tactical benefits and security concerns associated with the system. Drawing on his background in special operations, he noted his understanding of operational security and recognized that no system is completely immune to compromise, citing broader national cybersecurity challenges as context. He stated that he found the presentation to be balanced, addressing both the potential benefits and concerns associated with the program, and indicated that he would conduct additional research before reaching a personal conclusion.

Chairman Picerno addressed the audience at several points during the meeting regarding outbursts from members of the public. He reminded attendees that the meeting was structured as an informational workshop and not a public comment session, and that disruptions could result in removal. Near the close of the meeting, Chairman Picerno responded to calls from the audience for a public vote on the cameras, clarifying that the Board of Commissioners does not have the authority to direct the operations of an elected Sheriff, and that concerns about the legal framework governing ALPR use should be directed to state legislators in Raleigh.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Commissioner Adams, seconded by Commissioner Cook, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the August 17, 2026, Special Meeting of the Moore County Board of Commissioners at 5:27pm.


 Chairman Nick Picerno
 Vice Chairman Simon Cane


 Clerk to the Board Jennifer Parks





County of Moore
—North Carolina—

Flock Safety

Automated License Plate Readers
August 17, 2026





County of Moore
—North Carolina—

Flock Safety ALPR

Facts, Law & Operational Reality

Why We're Here

- Understand the technology
- Understand the law
- Understand how Moore County uses it
- Address common questions and concerns
- Provide information for those who want to be more informed

ALPR Technology Isn't New

- 1990s – Optical Character Recognition (OCR)
 - Improvements over time for increased accuracy
- Early 2000s – Automated license plate readers
 - Patrol Vehicles
 - Toll Roads
 - Parking Systems
 - Traffic Enforcement Cameras

What Flock Changed

Traditional ALPR

Mobile Cameras

Local Storage

Stand-alone Systems

Limited inquiries

Higher Infrastructure Costs

Flock

Stationary Cameras

Secure Cloud Storage

Network

Improved inquiries

Lower Costs



North Carolina Has Regulated ALPR

- 2015 – Legislation Enacted (Chapter 20, Article 3D)
- Authorizes and regulates law enforcement agencies use of ALPR
 - Restricts government use to law enforcement and public safety functions
 - Criminal Investigations, Arrests, Prosecutions, Post-Conviction Confinement, or Supervision
 - Apprehending individuals with outstanding warrants
 - Locating missing persons
 - Locating lost or stolen vehicles
- Addresses
 - Agency policies on data retention limits and privacy, sharing with other agencies, training, supervisory oversight, audits, system maintenance
- Prohibits the sale of captured plate data

North Carolina Has Regulated ALPR

What's NOT a lawful basis for an ALPR search in NC

Inquiries based on:

- Political beliefs
- Religious beliefs
- Lawful associations
- Lawful activities – including travel
- Simple curiosity
- Personal interests



What Does An Image Tell Us?

- License Plate
- Date/Time
- Camera Location
- Vehicle Description (photo, color, make, model)
- Basic Features (racks, stickers, toolbox)

What Doesn't An Image Tell Us?

- Who was driving the vehicle
- Who the vehicle is registered to
- Where the vehicle visited
- The vehicle's destination
- Why the vehicle was there



How is Moore County Using It?

- 10 Cameras (MCSO)
- Spread Across 700 Square Miles
- 30-day Data Retention
- Access to 23 Municipal Cameras in Moore County
- Optional Private Cameras

Why Information Sharing Matters

Crime and public safety matters don't see county lines:
Benefit is efficiency of resources

- Amber Alerts
- Missing Persons
- Stolen Vehicles
- Wanted Persons
- Human Trafficking
- Child Exploitation
- Criminal Investigative Leads



July 2026

- ~0.003% of Moore County SO ALPR Traffic
- 46 Unique Plate Inquiries
- On 31 Separate law enforcement matters, including:
 - Stolen Vehicles
 - Drug Investigations
 - Wanted Persons
 - Breaking & Entering
 - Child Sexual Exploitation
 - Death Investigations
 - Child Abuse
 - Human Trafficking
 - Missing Person
 - Shooting Investigation

Public Safety Benefit - Alerts

- 924 stolen license plate alerts
- 272 stolen vehicle alerts
- 127 violent person alerts
- 78 sex offender alerts
- 41 alerts for vehicles associated with wanted persons
- 26 gang or suspected terrorist alerts
- 6 missing persons



99.997% Of Vehicular Traffic Never Queried

- Who were those 99.997% of vehicles?
 - We Don't Know.
- Not authorized for viewing under NC law
- Hard delete after 30 days

How Is This Different From Everyday Police Work?

Law Enforcement Officers Routinely:

- Observe vehicles
- Read license plates
- Run license plates
- Check VINs
- Check vehicle registration owner(s)/statuses
- Conduct traffic stops
- Document traffic stops, including vehicle descriptions
- Speak with drivers
- Identify vehicle occupants



How Is This Different From Everyday Police Work?

Flock:

- A photograph of a vehicle – not automatically viewed
- On a public roadway
- At one moment
- Unavailable after 30 days

Flock Doesn't Make Decisions

ALPR data is one piece of a much larger puzzle:

- Evidence
 - Case circumstances
 - Witnesses
 - Camera footage
 - Fingerprints
 - DNA
 - ALPR
- These must be considered together. Ultimately, officer judgement is what makes decisions

Is It Secure?

- Encryption throughout the data lifecycle. AES-256 encryption for cloud stored data. TLS 1.3 for data in transit
- Restricted, roll-based permissions and access controls
- Multi-factor authentication and SSO to prevent unauthorized access
- User-level audit logging
- Limited data retention and automatic deletion – hard delete/unrecoverable
- Customer-controlled data sharing

Is It Secure?

- Secure cloud infrastructure and key management
 - Amazon Web Service (AWS) and AWS Key Management – based encryption controls
 - CJIS related law enforcement data maintained using AWS GovCloud infrastructure
- SOC 2 Type II & ISO 27001 security standards/certification
- Penetration testing and vulnerability management
- Over the air security updates

Constitutional Considerations

- KATZ v. UNITED STATES
- NEW YORK v. CLASS
- UNITED STATES v. KNOTTS
- CALIFORNIA v. CIRAULO
- UNITED STATES v. JONES
- CARPENTER v. UNITED STATES
- CHATRIE v. UNITED STATES (back to 4th Circuit)

Constitutional Considerations

SCHMIDT v. NORFOLK (US District Court, Virginia)

- Norfolk Flock system comprised of 176 cameras, structured in 75 groups across 66 square miles, does not constitute a search under the Fourth Amendment
- Katz, Knotts, Jones, Carpenter all cited, among others
- “localities and states have the freedom to experiment with new policies and technologies, including innovative approaches to policing.”
- Quoting Carpenter: “The Court is cautious to not hinder law enforcement’s use of modernizing surveillance capabilities in the public sphere lest the Court embarrass the future”
- “Such experimentation is best achieved with input from the public and with guardrails erected by state legislatures or local governing bodies, as is the case in Virginia.”
- “observing that sometimes new technology provides ‘increased convenience or security at the expense of privacy, and many people may find the tradeoff worthwhile,’ whereas at other times ‘concern about new intrusions on privacy may spur the enactment of legislation to protect against these intrusions’ thus causing privacy standards to be ‘governed primarily by statute and not by case law.’”



Constitutional Considerations

SCHMIDT v. NORFOLK (US District Court, Virginia)

- Distinguishing this case from Jones, Carpenter, and others, the Court questioned at what point this type of surveillance could go too far. “While a definitive answer to that question is elusive, what is readily apparent to this Court is that, at least in Norfolk, Virginia, the answer is: not today.”



Constitutional Considerations

North Carolina General Statute 20-63:

- NC registration plates “shall be and remain property of the State”
- Vehicles intended to be operated on public roadways must register the vehicle and display the government issued plate
- Plates must remain externally visible and readable on the rear of the vehicle
- Motorists required to keep the plate clean and free from dust and dirt
- Concealing or altering the plate is prohibited
- Prohibits covering a plate with a device “designed or intended to prevent or interfere with the taking of a clear photograph”



Other Considerations

- Military Security
- Deliberate misuse by individuals/accountability. “Objectively reasonable” standard
- Periodic assessment of growth vs. need
- Opinions of other entities involved in public interests
- Upcoming Court decisions
 - Full impact/Partial impact/No impact
 - Unintended Consequences
- Legislative Updates – Keep it current/relevant
- Public transparency
- How Flock complements other resources

Constitutional Considerations

KATZ v. UNITED STATES

- Government wiretapping a phonebooth was unconstitutional
- Two-part test established to determine what ‘places’ are subject to Fourth Amendment protection from searches.
- “What a person knowingly exposes to the public, even in his own home or office, is not a subject of Fourth Amendment protection.”
- KATZ later referenced more than 40 times in court opinions from United States v. Jones and more than 100 times in Carpenter v. United States. Justices repeatedly expressed that Jones and Carpenter cases were subject to secondary issues beyond Katz and that Katz was not invalidated.



Constitutional Considerations

NEW YORK V. CLASS

- Officer reaching into a vehicle and moving papers to view the VIN was constitutional.
- “Because of the important role played by the VIN in the pervasive governmental regulation of automobiles and the efforts by the Federal Government through regulations to assure that the VIN is placed in plain view, respondent had no reasonable expectation of privacy in the VIN. The placement of papers obscuring the VIN was insufficient to create a privacy interest in the VIN.”
- “The court has recognized that the physical characteristics of an automobile and its use result in a lessened expectation of privacy therein.”
- “Moreover, automobiles are justifiably the subject of pervasive regulation by the State. Every operator of a motor vehicle must expect that the State, in enforcing its regulations, will intrude to some extent upon that operator’s privacy.”



Constitutional Considerations

UNITED STATES v. KNOTTS

- “Beeper” used to help law enforcement track a vehicle upheld as constitutional
- “A person traveling in an automobile on public thoroughfares has no reasonable expectation of privacy in his movements from one place to another. When Petschen traveled over the public streets he voluntarily conveyed to anyone who wanted to look the fact that he was traveling over particular roads in a particular direction”
- “Nothing in the Fourth Amendment prohibited the police from augmenting the sensory faculties bestowed upon them at birth with such enhancements as science and technology afforded them in this case.”
- “Insofar as respondent’s complaint appears to be simply that scientific devices such as the beeper enabled the police to be more effective in detecting crime, it simply has no constitutional foundation. We have never equated police efficiency with unconstitutionality, and we decline to do so now.”
- Use of technology in this case described as “merely a more effective means of observing what is already public.”



Constitutional Considerations

CALIFORNIA v. CIRAULO

- Aerial photograph of backyard from aircraft ruled constitutional.
- “The Fourth Amendment protection of the home has never been extended to require law enforcement officers to shield their eyes when passing by a home on public thoroughfares. Nor does the mere fact that an individual has taken measures to restrict some views of his activities preclude an officer’s observations from a public vantage point where he has a right to be and which renders the activities clearly visible.”

Constitutional Considerations

UNITED STATES V. JONES

- Officers attached a GPS tracking device to a private vehicle and followed every movement for 28 days
- Attaching the device constituted a search under the Fourth Amendment due to the trespass into the private areas of that vehicle when it was attached
- Other officer actions, such as surveillance using a camera in public places, were not challenged in this case
- Justices confirmed the rulings from prior Supreme Court decisions and contrasted them with the facts of Jones, stating “This Court has to date not deviated from the understanding that mere visual observation does not constitute a search.”
- The justices went on to state that even if other surveillance methods had been used for a 4-week period, “our case suggest that such visual observation is constitutionally permissible.”
- They accepted that achieving the same result through electronic means would require further consideration, but they acknowledged that issue was not addressed in this case.



Constitutional Considerations

UNITED STATES v. JONES

- The court established the fundamental principal of analysis to be used in future Fourth Amendment considerations regarding government surveillance.
- “Monitoring that generates a precise, comprehensive record of a person’s public movements that reflects a wealth of detail about their familial, political, professional, religious, and sexual associations” could be ascertained from GPS monitoring
- None of these can be ascertained using current ALPR systems on public roadways in Moore County.

Constitutional Considerations

CARPENTER v. UNITED STATES

- Detailed Cell Site Location Information (CSLI) acquired by law enforcement over an extensive period of time was a search.
- Analysis relied heavily on principals established in Jones
- Reaffirmed the principals established in Katz, Knotts, and other Supreme Court decisions
- “The decision today is a narrow one.” and expressly stated they weren’t attempting to “call into question conventional surveillance techniques and tools, such as security cameras.”
- The government obtained 12,898 CSLI data points cataloging one person’s movements
- The issue before the Court was the phone being attached to the user, providing a detailed and comprehensive record of the person’s movements
- Court again acknowledged that this level of information allowed the government to track familial, political, professional, religious, and sexual associations.



Constitutional Considerations

CARPENTER v. UNITED STATES

- The facts of this case were contrasted with vehicle privacy in public places – “A car has little capacity for escaping public scrutiny.” Whereas cell phone data achieved “near perfect surveillance, as if it had attached an ankle monitor to the phone’s user.”
- The Court stated, “Yet this case is not about ‘using a phone’ or a person’s movement at a particular time. It is about a detailed chronicle of a person’s physical presence compiled every day, every moment, over several years.”
- Current Court decisions based on ALPR use by government entities do not hold that ALPR data allows the government to create a detailed chronicle of a person’s movements to the point of constituting a search under the Fourth Amendment.
- Fourth Circuit has accepted a new case for review, *Schmidt v. City of Norfolk*, regarding the use of Flock ALPR



Constitutional Considerations

CHATRIE V. UNITED STATES

- Broad, yet detailed Google geo-location data obtained by the government was a search
- The Court referred back to Carpenter in recognizing that Google geo-location data contained significantly more information than the cell site data in Carpenter, making this case an easy ruling as a search. They did not decide constitutionality or legality. That was deferred back to Fourth Circuit Court.
- This case was again differentiated from other cases: Referring back to Knotts - “And still another feature of Knotts makes it inapt here: that the surveillance there was confined to public roads. That fact was crucial to the Court’s decision: “A person traveling in an automobile on public thoroughfares has no reasonable expectation of privacy,” Knotts explained, because the car is always ‘in plain view.’ By contrast, the movements that Location History reveals are not limited to public streets.”

