

Note added by Michigan Plate Readers. Our question letter on the documents request (MCSO-2026-10-04-A), sent October 15, 2026, 2:11 pm, as a reply on the thread to the Assistant Corporation Counsel's message of 10:33 am; its question 7 answers her 12:17 pm reply on the system exports request (MCSO-2026-10-04-B). Text as sent, her first name replaced by her role; the quoted thread is left out. End of note.

Hi [the Assistant Corporation Counsel],

Thank you for your response. I have a few clarifying questions. I'm happy to go over them by phone if that's easier.

1. Deposit, due date and time frame. The statement asks for the full \$335.89 as a deposit. Under MCL 15.234(8) a deposit "must not exceed 1/2 of the total estimated fee"; the County's FOIA Procedures and Guidelines say 50%. Your two emails read as though the \$335.89 pays for the search and a second statement for producing the records will follow. Is the \$335.89 the County's estimate of the total fee for this request, or a charge for the search with the production fee to come? If it is the total, the deposit is at most \$167.94. If it is not, could you send me the estimate of the total before I pay anything, with the deposit amount, the date the deposit must be received (MCL 15.234(14)) and your estimate of the time it will take to provide the records (MCL 15.234(8))?

2. Labor. Could you tell me the hourly wage and position behind the \$92.46 and \$117.01 rates, and whether a fringe-benefit multiplier is included and at what percentage (MCL 15.234(1)(a), (b), (2))? Your email says the fee is to find out what, if anything, is available. Could you identify the nature of the unreasonably high costs that make search labor chargeable on this request (MCL 15.234(3))? Could you also tell me what the half hour of Corporation Counsel processing covers, and send the detailed itemization of the six fee components on the County's Fee Statement form (MCL 15.234(4), (8)), broken out by the numbered items of my request, as the request asked, so that I can narrow it if I need to?

3. Items 1 and 2. I searched the meetings site you linked. It holds the Board's three approvals of the Sheriff's Office's Flock purchases, each at committee and at the Full Board: the June 14 and 15, 2023 contract (committee item 6.b, Board item 13.b), the November 8 and 27, 2023 extension (item 10.e at both) and the January 23 and 25, 2024 purchase of fifteen cameras (committee item 9.e, Board item 13.e), with their recommendation sheets, minutes and votes, unsigned copies of the order forms and master agreement, Flock's sole-source letter and the Sheriff's Office's January 2024 exempt-purchase request. I have copied those from the site. It does not hold the signed agreements, any invoice (the County's check registers list ten paid Flock invoices by number), any purchase order, any exempt-purchase approval for the 2023 contract and extension, the state grant records for the January 2024 purchase, any agreement or order form for the testing period the Sheriff's Office's website describes, or any Board item on the program after January 25, 2024. Could you process those with the request, give me the specific webpage address for any that is on a County site (MCL 15.234(5)), and certify any that does not exist (MCL 15.235(5)(b))?

4. Item 3. This item asks for the license plate reader or Flock policy, standard operating procedures, hot-list criteria and audit policy in effect at any point in the time frame, including superseded versions, and any list of approved search reasons and any record showing whether a search reason is required. This refers to the Sheriff's Office's own policy and settings. Any of those the Sheriff's Office holds are the County's records, regardless of what Flock may also hold. Could you include them? If it has none, could your reply include the certificate MCL 15.235(5)(b) describes, stating that the record does not exist under the name given or by another name reasonably known to the County?

5. The denied portion. Your email says a portion of my request is denied. Could you tell me which items,

and on what basis (MCL 15.235(5))?

6. Fee waiver. My request asked for a public-interest fee waiver or reduction under MCL 15.234(2). Could you let me know the County's decision?

7. My exports request. Your reply of 12:17 pm on my second request of October 4 says it is granted pending fees and is duplicative of the first. The two are separate requests. The first asks for documents: agreements, approvals, policies, the camera list, audits. The second asks for exports from the Sheriff's Office's Flock account: the search and network audits, the sharing settings, the hot-list logs, the alerts and the user list. The first request's item 7 says system exports are not requested under it. Could you confirm that the second request will be processed on its own? The statement attached to that reply has the same name as the first. Is the \$335.89 one estimate for both requests, or is the second statement a separate estimate for the exports? Your email also says an accurate fee statement will follow payment. Under MCL 15.234(8) a deposit is based on a good-faith calculation of the total fee, so could you send the estimate for each request before I pay? For the exports, running an export is labor for making a digital copy (MCL 15.234(1)(e)), and questions 1, 2 and 6 above apply to that request as well.

Thanks,
Chance