What the portal publishes, and what it cannot establish

The transparency portal · Town of East Greenbush

What the portal publishes, and what it cannot establish

The Police Department’s FLOCK page links to a transparency portal hosted by the vendor. It is live, it is linked here as the Town links it, and nothing on this page argues that it should not exist. What follows is what it publishes, where it answers questions the Town has left unanswered, where it contradicts itself, and the three things it cannot do no matter how accurate it is.

transparency.flocksafety.com/east-greenbush-ny-pd

Page marked “Last updated: Wed Nov 18 2026”. Captured 19 November 2026 at 9:28 AM. Figures below are as of that capture and may since have changed.

Download report PDF Editable copy ODT

Print this page

The PDF is a frozen record of the portal as captured on 19 November 2026. The portal itself can change without notice.

What it publishes

30 days

Data retention

“The number of days data is retained”

5

Total cameras

LPR and other cameras

5

LPR cameras

Plate readers only

57

Searches

“User search sessions”, last 30 days

52

Hotlist hits

Last 30 days

133

Organizations that receive East Greenbush data

Including one federal agency

102

Organizations that share data into East Greenbush

From 17 states

It also publishes a policy section: what is detected (license plates, vehicles) and not detected (facial recognition, people, gender, race), an acceptable use policy, a list of prohibited uses, an access policy, a hotlist policy, and a downloadable CSV headed **Public Search Audit**.

Traffic enforcement, which the portal lists as prohibited

The published policy

Prohibited Uses, as published on the portal

*“Immigration enforcement, **traffic enforcement**, harassment or intimidation, usage based solely on a protected class (i.e. race, sex, religion), Personal use.”*

What follows comes from two separate sources, and they are not of equal weight. The first is the Town’s own linked portal contradicting itself on a single page. The second is a much larger body of records released by other police departments. Each is labelled below, and neither is mixed into the other.

Source one · the Town’s own linked transparency portal

The portal carries a downloadable **Public Search Audit** covering the previous thirty days. In the copy captured on 19 November 2026, covering 19 October to 17 November, two of the fifty-seven logged searches carry the offence type **Traffic Infraction**.

Date and time (UTC)	Offence type	Networks	Record identifier, as published
2026-10-30 22:03:32	**Traffic Infraction**	1	097df654-9f0c-46e0-8dbc-f2d742bc5e9f
2026-10-30 23:03:35	**Traffic Infraction**	1	b11f57a8-c3ef-4df6-b152-13a4712a2448

No outside data is involved in this one. The prohibition and the two searches are published by

the vendor, on one page, linked from the Town’s own police page, and captured at the same moment. A third search in the same file is logged as “Hit and Run/Car Accident”, which may fairly be a criminal investigation rather than enforcement, and is set aside.

The export itself

The Public Search Audit as downloaded from the portal on 19 November 2026 at 9:28 AM, unaltered. 57 rows covering 19 October to 17 November 2026, with the columns the portal publishes: record id, masked user id, search date, network count and offence type. The two Traffic Infraction rows quoted above are in it. Note what is not in it: no reason field and no case number field.

Public Search Audit · captured 19 Nov 2026 · 57 rows

The portal publishes a rolling thirty days, so this file is the only record of that window once it scrolls off. It is republished here exactly as downloaded so that anyone can check the two rows above against the source rather than taking this page's word for it.

Source two · audit files released by other police departments

The second source is not the portal. It is the body of network audit files that other agencies across the country have released under their own public records laws, in which searches run with East Greenbush credentials appear. Those records cover a far longer period than thirty days, and they carry the free-text reason the searching officer typed, which the portal does not publish.

56

Reason begins “Traffic Infraction”

8 Jan to 13 Jul 2026

62

Reason given as “VTL”

NY Vehicle and Traffic Law · 7 Feb to 13 Dec 2025

118

Combined, over seventeen months

102 of them reached over 5,000 networks

0

Of the 98 whose case-number field was visible

None

The reasons are the searching officer’s own words. Among them: *“Traffic Infraction - speed”*, run against 6,372 camera networks. *“Traffic Infraction - RECKLESS DRIVER”*. *“Traffic*

Infraction - TEMP TAG". And sixty-two entries reading simply *"VTL"*, the widest of which reached **6,410 networks**.

A further 44 searches give "Hit and Run/Car Accident" as the reason. They are excluded from the figures above, for the same reason the portal's one is excluded.

Two things have to be said alongside those numbers.

When the prohibition took effect is not established. The Prohibited Uses list is what the portal publishes now. These searches ran between February 2025 and July 2026. Nothing produced to me shows when that policy was adopted, whether it changed, or whether it was in force across that whole period. A reader should not assume it was.

These counts are a floor, not a total. A search appears in this body of records only if it reached a camera network belonging to an agency that has since released its audit file. A search confined to East Greenbush's own cameras leaves no trace in anyone else's records and cannot appear here at all. The real number is higher by an amount nobody outside the system can measure.

Where it answers what the Town has not

Four things published on that portal correspond directly to records I asked the Town for in writing, and have not received.

No response · 114 days

Request C, item 7. Records showing whether any federal agency has had access to Town ALPR data, and on what basis.

The portal lists, under organizations granted access to East Greenbush data: "[Federal] US Postal Inspection Service". It names no basis, no agreement and no date. The Town has given no response of any kind to the written request.

No response · 114 days

Request C, item 5. All records identifying agencies the Town shares data with, and the Town's requests to search other agencies' data.

The portal publishes both lists in full: 133 organizations outbound, 102 inbound. It does not publish the underlying agreements, which were item 6 of the same request, also unanswered.

No response · 114 days

Request A, item 4. The retention period applicable to audit and search logs, and all logs retained.

The portal's Access Policy states: *"All system access requires a valid reason and **is stored indefinitely**."* If that is accurate, those records exist, nothing has expired, and nothing has been deleted. That rules out expiry as a reason these records cannot be produced.

No response · 114 days

Request A, items 1 and 2. The network and organization audits: every search run, with searching user and agency, date and time, stated reason, parameters and scope.

The portal carries a button headed “Public Search Audit · Download to view searches performed over the last 30 days”. Anyone may take it. It is narrower than what was requested, with the user identifier masked and no reason or case number field, but it is a search audit, it is public, and it is two clicks from the Town’s police page. The written request for the full version has had no response.

The two sharing lists

Receiving East Greenbush data

133

Organizations the portal lists as granted access to East Greenbush NY PD data. One is federal: the US Postal Inspection Service. Nine are outside New York.

Outside NY: Connecticut (4) · New Jersey (2) · Massachusetts · North Carolina · Texas

Sharing data into East Greenbush

102

Organizations the portal lists as sharing their data with East Greenbush NY PD, drawn from seventeen states. Forty-three organizations appear in both directions.

AL · DE · FL · GA · IL · IN · KS · MA · MI · NE · NY · OH · PA · RI · SC · TN · TX

The portal states that sharing is opt-in and governed by defined agreements. **No such agreement has been produced to me.** Request C item 6 asked for any written sharing agreement, memorandum of understanding or reciprocal arrangement with another agency, and has had no response.

Why five cameras is a floor and not a total

The portal reports five total cameras and five plate readers. Taken at face value, that is a count of the devices in the Town’s own Flock account. It is not a count of the plate readers operating within the Town.

My request of 16 July defined an ALPR device as any plate reader or AI-assisted vehicle surveillance camera from any vendor, and defined *within the Town* as anywhere inside the corporate boundaries **regardless of who owns the land, pole or structure it is mounted on, and regardless of whether the Town, another government agency or a private party owns or operates it.** Item 3 asked for the agreements, permits, licences, right-of-way authorisations and pole attachment agreements that would identify them. **The Town produced no responsive records.**

The Town's own paperwork carries a second figure as well: the agreement was amended to reduce deployment from nine cameras to five. The record of that amendment, and of who was authorised to sign it, is still unanswered as item 5 of Request G.

One Town record does name locations. **Resolution 40-2025** grants permission, subject to New York State Department of Transportation approval, to install plate reader equipment in State right of way at five places: eastbound Turnpike at the Sewer Treatment Plant, northbound Genet School and Route 4, Route 4 at Hewitt's, southbound Troy Road at Grandview Drive, and westbound 3rd Avenue Extension at Krey Boulevard. The same resolution names the funding: the 2023 Governor of New York Grant for New Technology and Equipment to Prevent and Solve Crimes and Improve Public Safety.

That resolution describes equipment the Town asked to place in State right of way. It does not establish what else may be mounted within the Town by anyone else, which is what item 3 asked for and did not get. Read Resolution 40-2025.

So the honest statement is a floor. **At least five.** No record produced to date establishes a total.

Three things it cannot do

One. It is not the Town's page. The address is on `flocksafety.com`, not `eastgreenbush.org`. It is published, hosted and controlled by the vendor. It can be changed, moved or withdrawn without notice to the Town or to the public, and a page on a vendor's server is not a Town record held in the Town's custody. It would not render to a plain fetch when I tried it, so the Town cannot archive or verify it with ordinary tools either.

Two. How its figures are produced is not established. Nothing produced to me shows whether they are generated automatically from the system, compiled by hand, or assembled some other way; who reviews them before publication; how often they update; what period each covers; or whether anyone at the Town has ever checked them against the system itself. That question has never been put to the Town. It should be.

Three, and this is the one that matters. Even taking every figure as accurate, a published summary is not the underlying record and cannot stand in for one. A count of searches is not the search log. A statement about retention is not the retention setting. A list of agencies is not the sharing agreements. A page showing what the system reports does not establish what the system holds, and it cannot show what is absent from it.

One open question, stated as a question

Two published records of the same period do not agree, and I cannot explain why.

Between 19 October and 10 November 2026, the portal's public audit shows ten searches touching more than five thousand networks. For that same period, audit files released by other police departments under their own public records laws record ninety-three East Greenbush searches reaching their networks. **Forty of those ninety-three carry a network count, and each of the forty touched between 5,129 and 5,202 networks.** In the remaining fifty-three the releasing agency withheld the network count, so their scope is not established.

The portal's wording may account for part of this: it counts *"user search sessions"*, and one session might contain several searches. Nothing on the page says so, and no one outside the vendor can check it. I am not asserting that either figure is wrong. I am saying that the two cannot both be a complete account of the same month, and that the published one is the only figure a resident has any way of seeing.

What should be asked

One request would resolve most of this page. Records establishing how the figures on the Town's linked transparency portal are generated: from what source, by what process, how often they refresh, whether any Town officer reviews them before publication, and whether the Town has ever compared them against the system itself.

That question has never been put. The answer is either a process document, which would tell a resident a great deal, or nothing at all, which would tell them more.

On the question of fault. Nothing on this page asserts that the Town or the vendor has published anything knowing it to be wrong. A transparency page is better than no transparency page, and East Greenbush links to one. The point is narrower and it is about where a resident can and cannot get an answer. A page the Town does not host, cannot audit, and has not been asked to explain is not the same thing as the Town answering a question in its own words, on its own record, over its own signature.