

Note added by Michigan Plate Readers. Our message to the City's FOIA Coordinator on the documents request (WP-2026-09-29-A, the City's #2026-402-PD/IT), sent October 22, 2026, 4:26 pm, as a reply on the thread of the City's response of October 20. Text as sent; the lieutenant is referred to by role in the text itself; the quoted response is published separately. End of note.

Hello,

Thank you for the response, and for the order form, the quotes, the invoices and the email thread. Three items are open, and I would like to settle them before paying anything.

Item 4, the removal records. The itemization prices a search of the Directors' and Chiefs' email, about 105 messages, at \$455.30 with a \$227.65 deposit. My request asked for the work orders, the correspondence with Flock and the confirmations concerning the removal of each camera and the deletion of the City's data, held by the Police Department or the office that administers the Flock contract. The thread released under item 2 shows the lieutenant who handled the Flock account corresponding with Flock about the cameras, and I expect the removal and deletion records sit in the same place: his mailbox and Flock's support system. Could you tell me whether the records can be located there, and if not, on what finding under MCL 15.234(3) the search and redaction labor rests? The itemization says who can do the search; section 4(3) asks the public body to identify the unreasonably high cost that makes the labor chargeable in the particular instance, and the itemization does not.

Item 5, the policy. The response points to the Department's public policy library. I read its index, which lists 190 documents, and found no policy or general order on automated license plate readers or Flock. If the Department has one, current or prior, please send it; if it has none, a response saying so (i.e. that the record "does not exist under the name given by the requester or by another name reasonably known to the public body") is sufficient.

Item 6, the audits. The response denies this item as a request to compile or create a record. To clarify, this is asking for any existing audit memos, not compilation or a new audit. If there are no existing audit memos, you can certify non-existence in the same way as the policy.

The request also asked for a public-interest fee waiver or reduction under MCL 15.234(2), which the response does not mention. Could you let me know the City's decision on it?

I am glad to discuss any of this via phone or email if it'd be helpful.

Thank you,
Chance Ackley-Smith