

Law Enforcement Use of Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Update

November 2026

Table of Contents

Members of the Crime Commission 2

Executive Summary 3

Virginia ALPR Statute 6

Virginia Case Law Update 7

Other State ALPR Statutes 8

Literature Synopsis Update 9

Crime Commission's 2026 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey Findings 13

Virginia Community Policing Act Data 39

Unauthorized Use – Charge and Conviction Data 42

Statewide Reporting on ALPR Use Data 43

Conclusion 43

Appendices:

- Appendix A: ALPR Checklist for Law Enforcement Agencies 45
- Appendix B: State ALPR Statutes (as of October 30, 2026) 48
- Appendix C: Crime Commission 2026 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey ... 50
- Appendix D: Crime Commission 2026 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey: Non-Responding and Non-Compliant Agencies 68

Members of the Crime Commission

House of Delegates Appointees
The Honorable Charniele L. Herring, *Chair*
The Honorable Karrie K. Delaney
The Honorable Patrick A. Hope
The Honorable Terry G. Kilgore
The Honorable Don L. Scott, Jr., *Speaker of the House*
The Honorable Wren M. Williams

Senate Appointees
The Honorable Scott A. Surovell, *Vice-Chair*
The Honorable L. Louise Lucas
The Honorable Mark J. Peake

Attorney General
Jae K. Davenport, *Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, Designee for Attorney General Jay Jones*

Gubernatorial Appointees
Anton Bell, *Commonwealth's Attorney for the City of Hampton*
Bruce Cruser, *Retired, Mental Health Virginia*
Kecia Evans, *Special Assistant, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights*

Crime Commission Staff
Kristen J. Howard, *Executive Director*
Colin L. Drabert, *Deputy Director*

Christina Barnes Arrington, Ph.D., *Senior Methodologist*
Justin Brewster, *Attorney*
Po Chau, *Attorney*
Caitlin A. Dorsch, *Research Analyst*
Kashea P. Kovacs, Ph.D., *Senior Research Analyst*
Amanda M. Muncy, *Senior Attorney*
Addie Namboodri, *Research Analyst*
Tracy M. Roe, *Senior Research Analyst*

Old City Hall
1001 East Broad Street, Suite 310
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Website: http://vscc.virginia.gov

Law Enforcement Use of Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Update

Executive Summary

Automatic license plate recognition (ALPR) technology is being used by many law enforcement agencies, other government agencies, and private entities across the United States. While definitions of ALPR vary, the Virginia Code defines an ALPR system as "a system of one or more high-speed cameras used in combination with computer algorithms to convert images of license plates, vehicles, or a combination of both into computer-readable data" (Va. Code § 2.2-5517). Benefits and concerns exist in relation to law enforcement use of ALPR technology. ALPR technology can aid with law enforcement investigations, such as those involving stolen vehicles and missing persons, increase the speed and efficiency of solving crimes, and may result in fewer citizen encounters. However, concerns continue to be raised about the privacy of individuals' public movements, transparency of use, data sharing and protection practices, and the disparate impacts of ALPR systems.

During the 2025 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, legislation was enacted that created a new statute to govern the use of ALPR systems by law enforcement. Prior to the passage of this statute, there were no statewide laws, regulations, or policies governing law enforcement agency use of ALPR in Virginia. Virginia's ALPR statute imposes numerous requirements on law enforcement agencies that use this technology, as well as various reporting measures to ensure that the public and the General Assembly are informed on how this technology is being used. Most of the statutory requirements took effect on July 1, 2025; however, some portions of the legislation had delayed effective dates to allow time for implementation and data collection.

Twenty-five (25) states, including Virginia, have statewide laws regulating law enforcement use of ALPR. No states ban law enforcement agencies from using ALPR. Vermont currently allows ALPR use by law enforcement agencies, but that authorization expires on July 1, 2027, when use will be prohibited. The Policing Project of the NYU School of Law evaluated how states regulate automated license plate readers and scored Virginia's ALPR statute among the top four states on their "*License Plate Reader Policy Scorecard.*" Further, recent rulings from the Virginia Court of Appeals in a criminal case and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in a civil case held that the use of ALPR systems in those cases did not violate the Fourth Amendment. Finally, while policy arguments continue to be made about the benefits and concerns

surrounding law enforcement use of ALPR, the body of research that rigorously evaluates ALPR system effectiveness across public safety outcomes remains limited.

The Crime Commission was directed to collect data and conduct two surveys on law enforcement use of ALPR as part of the 2025 ALPR legislation and to report its findings by the first day of the 2026 Regular Session and again by November 1, 2026. Survey findings from the 2025 Crime Commission ALPR survey revealed that some Virginia law enforcement agencies were not using ALPR in accordance with the new statute. Further, nearly one-third of law enforcement agencies did not respond to the survey. As a result, the Chair of the Crime Commission sent letters to non-responding and non-compliant agencies. Additionally, Crime Commission staff developed and published an ALPR checklist for law enforcement agencies and provided presentations at conferences for Virginia law enforcement.

In August 2026, Crime Commission staff conducted its second survey of all Virginia law enforcement agencies to re-assess their use of ALPR. 98% (351 of 359) of law enforcement agencies responded to the Crime Commission's 2026 ALPR use survey. The response rate to the 2026 survey was substantially higher than the 2025 survey. 54% (191 of 351) of responding law enforcement agencies reported using ALPR technology. However, some survey results may no longer contain the most up-to-date information on current use as Virginia law enforcement agency use of ALPR has been rapidly changing since the survey was disseminated, with some localities ending, suspending, pausing, or re-evaluating their use of ALPR. Therefore, Crime Commission staff did not make a determination as to whether agencies are fully in compliance with every single statutory provision. Last year's survey findings revealed several areas of non-compliance that were concerning regarding agency policies, data retention, and data sharing. This year's survey found that far fewer agencies reported non-compliance in these areas, specifically:

- 6 agencies reported <u>not</u> having a policy;
- 7 agencies reported data retention periods over 21 days;
- 1 agency reported continuously sharing ALPR system data with federal law enforcement agencies, however, that agency is no longer using an ALPR system; and,
- 4 agencies reported continuously sharing ALPR system data with other state law enforcement agencies.

Further, while instances of improper ALPR system data sharing and unauthorized ALPR system use were identified, those occurrences have been rare. It is a Class 1 misdemeanor for a law enforcement officer to unlawfully use an ALPR system. Seven (7) charges have been filed in two Virginia general district courts under Va. Code § 2.2-5517(N). All seven charges are still pending

due to the recentness of the filing dates. These charges appear related to incidents in James City County and Chesterfield County. Additionally, media reports highlighted incidents of alleged misuse in Richmond City, Henrico County, and Smithfield that did not result in criminal charges, as well as an incident in South Hill that pre-dates when the criminal penalty in the ALPR statute took effect.

Law enforcement agencies must report data under the Virginia Community Policing Act on traffic and other investigatory stops related to ALPR notifications. An analysis of preliminary data (January 1, 2026, to September 30, 2026) found that there were 759 ALPR-related stops involving nearly 800 persons who were subject to investigatory detention based on an ALPR notification. Males comprised the large majority of ALPR-related stops; however, Black males were disproportionately overrepresented relative to their population size in Virginia.

The Crime Commission's surveys and reports serve as interim updates on the use of ALPR as the statute requires Virginia law enforcement agencies to provide extensive data to the Virginia State Police (VSP) by April 1, 2027. Agencies must also publicly post this data on their agency or locality website. The VSP must publish a statewide aggregate report with all of this data by July 1, 2027, and annually thereafter. The Crime Commission will also report on the use of ALPR systems in July 2027 and each year thereafter for the following five years.

Survey results indicate that some law enforcement agencies are not in compliance with certain components of the ALPR statute. Additional requirements could be added to monitor and enforce compliance, such as independent auditing, enforcement action by the Attorney General, sanctions against officers who misuse ALPR, requiring written data sharing agreements, or explicit prohibitions against using ALPR for immigration and protected health care matters.

Virginia ALPR Statute

In 2024, the Crime Commission conducted a study and endorsed legislation to regulate law enforcement's use of ALPR systems.[1] As a result, the General Assembly enacted legislation during the 2025 Regular Session establishing statewide standards for the use of ALPR systems by Virginia law enforcement agencies.[2] Prior to the passage of this 2025 legislation, there were no statewide laws, regulations, or policies in Virginia governing law enforcement use of ALPR systems. The 2025 legislation codified numerous measures to regulate Virginia law enforcement use of ALPR systems at a statewide level, such as:

- Limits on permissible uses;
- 21-day data retention period;
- Restrictions on data sharing;
- Audits of searches on at least a monthly basis;
- Requirements to publicly post an ALPR policy and report data on usage;
- Creation of a vendor approval process;
- Imposition of a criminal penalty for unauthorized use; and,
- Exclusion of evidence obtained in violation of the law.[3]

Most of the provisions of Virginia's ALPR statute took effect on July 1, 2025; however, the enactment clauses of the 2025 legislation contained several delays:

- The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was required to retroactively issue land use permits for ALPR devices installed on state highway rights-of-way prior to the law's effective date by August 1, 2025;[4]
- Law enforcement agencies using ALPR prior to July 1, 2025, were required to engage in public awareness measures by September 1, 2025, if they had not previously done so;[5]
- Data under the Virginia Community Policing Act was required to be reported beginning January 1, 2026, to provide Virginia State Police (VSP) time to reprogram its systems;[6]
- The Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS) had until January 1, 2026, to approve ALPR systems for statewide use in Virginia;[7]

---

[1] Virginia State Crime Commission. (2025). *2024 annual report: Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR).* https://vscc.virginia.gov/Annual%20Reports/2024%20VSCC%20Annual%20Report%20-Law%20Enforcement%20Use%20of%20ALPR.pdf.
[2] 2025 Va. Acts ch. 720. *See* House Bill 2724 (Del. Herring) at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724. *See also* VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517 (2026).
[3] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517 (2026).
[4] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 10, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[5] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 12, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[6] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 3, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[7] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 4, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.

- Law enforcement agencies were required to use DPS approved ALPR systems beginning July 1, 2026;[8] and,
- Law enforcement agencies must provide their first report on ALPR use to VSP by April 1, 2027, and VSP must publish the first statewide report on such use by July 1, 2027.[9]

As of October 2026, all state agencies have completed the requirements set forth in the new ALPR statute:

- VSP developed and publicly posted a model ALPR policy;[10]
- VDOT retroactively issued 217 land use permits for ALPR systems;[11]
- DPS approved 10 ALPR systems for use in the Commonwealth;[12]
- VSP began collecting data on ALPR-related stops under the Virginia Community Policing Act; and,[13]
- Crime Commission staff disseminated its initial *Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* to all Virginia law enforcement agencies in November 2025 and published the survey findings in January 2026.[14]

Virginia Case Law Update

When the Crime Commission initially studied ALPR in 2024, at least four circuit courts and one federal district court in Virginia had denied motions to suppress warrantless searches of ALPR systems, while one circuit court had granted such a motion.[15] However, no appellate court in Virginia had issued a ruling related to law enforcement agency use of an ALPR system.

---

[8] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 2, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[9] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clauses 7 and 8, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[10] Virginia State Police. (2025, July 9). *Commonwealth of Virginia automatic license plate recognition system model policy*. https://vsp.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/VSP-ALPR-POLICY-FINAL-Rev-07092025.pdf. *See also* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 6, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[11] Virginia Department of Transportation (personal communication, August 27, 2026). *See also* Virginia State Crime Commission. (2026, January). *Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR) update*, at p. 3: "VDOT retroactively issued 215 land use permits for such ALPR systems, including 18 permits to VSP and 197 permits to localities." *See also* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 10, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[12] Virginia Department of General Services. *DGS ALPR approved list*. https://dgs.virginia.gov/content/dam/site-assets/dps/Documents/specifications/VA-230420%20Breakout%20of%20Products%20-%20DGS.pdf. (Retrieved 2026, Oct. 14). *See also* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 4, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[13] VA. CODE ANN. § 52-30.2(C) (2026). *See also* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 3, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724. *See also* Virginia Open Data Portal. *Community Policing Act data.* (July 1, 2020, to present). https://data.virginia.gov/dataset/community-policing-data.
[14] House Bill 2724, enactment clause 13, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724. *See* Virginia State Crime Commission. (2026, January). *Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR) update.* https://vscc.virginia.gov/2026/VSCC%20ALPR%20Report%20January%202026%20FINAL%20REVISED%20Jan%2021%202026.pdf.
[15] Virginia State Crime Commission. (2025, July). *2024 annual report. Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition. See* Appendix A, at

Since that time, the Virginia Court of Appeals issued a published opinion holding that the search of the ALPR system in that case did not violate the Fourth Amendment.[16] The Court of Appeals "…decline[d] to speculate…" at what point the placement of ALPR cameras might be so widespread as to infringe upon a person's reasonable expectation of privacy in their movements.[17] In addition, a federal court granted summary judgment in favor of the City of Norfolk and the Norfolk Police Department in a lawsuit alleging that the use of ALPR in Norfolk violated citizens' Fourth Amendment privacy rights.[18]

Other State ALPR Statutes

At the time the Crime Commission conducted its 2024 study on ALPR, at least 18 states had statewide regulations governing law enforcement use of ALPR.[19] As of October 2026, at least 25 states, including Virginia, have such statewide laws.[20] No states ban law enforcement agencies from using ALPR. Vermont currently allows ALPR use by law enforcement agencies, but that authorization expires on July 1, 2027, when such use will be prohibited.[21]

States with ALPR laws include:

- Alabama
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Florida
- Georgia
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Kentucky
- Maine
- Maryland
- Minnesota
- Montana
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- North Carolina
- Oregon
- Tennessee
- Utah
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Washington

https://vscc.virginia.gov/Annual%20Reports/2024%20VSCC%20Annual%20Report%20-Law%20Enforcement%20Use%20of%20ALPR.pdf.

[16] Robinson v. Commonwealth, 87 Va. App. 262 (Ct. of Appeals) (Apr. 7, 2026). *But see* Chatrie v. United States, 146 S. Ct. 2193 (June 29, 2026). While the *Chatrie* case involved geofencing, it is uncertain whether the reasoning in that case will have an impact on future ALPR litigation or rulings in Virginia.

[17] Robinson at 273.

[18] Schmidt v. City of Norfolk, 819 F.Supp.3d 492 (Eastern District) (Jan. 27, 2026).

[19] Virginia State Crime Commission. (2025). *2024 annual report: Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR). See* Appendix B, at https://vscc.virginia.gov/Annual%20Reports/2024%20VSCC%20Annual%20Report%20-Law%20Enforcement%20Use%20of%20ALPR.pdf.

[20] *See* Appendix B. *See also* National Conference of State Legislatures. (2026, September 28). *Automated license plate readers: State statutes*. https://www.ncsl.org/technology-and-communication/automated-license-plate-readers-state-statutes.

[21] VT. STAT. ANN. tit. 23, §§ 1607 and 1609 (2026).

Independent 50 State ALPR Statutory Assessment

The Policing Project at the NYU School of Law published a model statute for ALPR use by law enforcement agencies[22] and developed a "scorecard" that assessed each state's statute across seven (7) key policy provisions, including:

- Privacy: Does the statute either (a) require law enforcement to obtain a warrant before accessing certain ALPR data or (b) limit retention of data to no longer than 30 days?
- False Positives: Does the statute require independent verification of a license plate match before initiating a stop based on an ALPR alert?
- Data Sharing: Does the statute establish a formal data sharing process to ensure that all sharing of ALPR data is authorized, lawful, and documented in writing?
- First Amendment Protected Activities: Does the statute limit the use of ALPRs to monitor those engaged in First Amendment-protected activities such as protests?
- Auditing: Does the statute mandate regular audits to assess compliance with legal requirements and detect misuse?
- Transparency: Does the statute require agencies to disclose information about ALPR use, either publicly or through reports to the legislature?
- Enforcement: Does the statute provide for exclusion, financial penalties, or other remedies for violations?

No state received a perfect seven (7) on the scorecard; however, Virginia's ALPR statute was one of only four states that received the next highest score of six (6) when compared to the model ALPR statute.[23] Virginia did not receive a perfect seven (7) on the scorecard as its statute does not require data sharing to be documented in writing.

Literature Synopsis Update

At the time the Crime Commission conducted its study on ALPR technology in 2024, staff completed a review of research and other literature relating to the use of ALPR by law

[22] *See* Policing Project at NYU School of Law. *Model statute authorizing and regulating the use of automated license plate readers* at https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58a33e881b631bc60d4f8b31/t/636f24acabef463fd35d68e2/1681495751487/Model+ALPR+Statute.pdf.

[23] Policing Project at NYU School of Law. *License plate reader policy scorecard*. https://alprscorecard.com/. (Retrieved 2026, Oct. 14).

enforcement.[24] The overall findings from that review remain consistent as of the time of this report. Various benefits and concerns continue to exist in relation to law enforcement use of ALPR.[25]

Some of the benefits identified are that ALPR technology:

- Helps to locate stolen vehicles and vehicles linked to missing or wanted persons;
- Develops leads and corroborates evidence;
- Increases the speed and efficiency of investigations;
- Results in fewer interactions with the public while conducting investigations; and,
- Produces evidence for use in court.

Conversely, concerns continue to be raised that ALPR technology:

- Collects and retains data on a vast number of vehicles, regardless of whether the driver or any occupants are engaged in criminal activity;
- Lacks transparency and uniformity in the collection and retention of data;[26]
- Allows for tracking of vehicles in real time or analyzing vehicle movements and patterns of behavior;
- May result in erroneous license plate reads or misuse of data;

[24] Virginia State Crime Commission. (2025). *2024 annual report: Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR).* https://vscc.virginia.gov/Annual%20Reports/2024%20VSCC%20Annual%20Report%20-Law%20Enforcement%20Use%20of%20ALPR.pdf.

[25] *See, e.g.*, Duong, M. (2024, May). *In detail: Automated license plate readers (ALPR).* Colorado Division of Criminal Justice. https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/Docs/Briefs/2024-05_InDetail-ALPR.pdf; Gierlack, K., Williams, S., LaTourrette, T., Anderson, J.M., Mayer, L.A., & Zmud, J. (2014). *License plate readers for law enforcement: Opportunities and obstacles*. Rand Corporation. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/247283.pdf, at pp. 13-21; Klawans, J. (2023, December 17). The pros and cons of license-plate reader technology. The Week. https://theweek.com/tech/automaticlicense-plate-readers. But see, e.g., American Civil Liberties Union. (2013, July). You are being tracked. https://www.aclu.org/you-are-being-tracked; Policing Project at NYU School of Law. Automated license plate readers. https://www.policingproject.org/automated-license-platereaders#:~:text=Absent%20regulation%2C%20the%20use%20of,resulting%20in%20unnecessary%20police%20contact; Rushton, B. (2023, November 20). License plate readers target minority neighborhoods. Investigative Post. https://www.investigativepost.org/2023/11/20/license-plate-readers-target-minority-neighborhoods/.

[26] *See, e.g.*, "Policy concerns: Lack of transparency and access controls" section in Díaz, Á. & Levinson-Waldman, R. (2020, September 10). Automatic license plate readers: Legal status and policy recommendations for law enforcement use. Brennan Center for Justice. https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/automatic-license-platereaders-legal-status-and-policy-recommendations; *See also* Lum, C., Koper, C. S., Willis, J., Happeny, S., Vovak, H., & Nichols, J. (2019). The rapid diffusion of license plate readers in U.S. law enforcement agencies. *Policing: An International Journal, 42*(3), 376-393. https://cebcp.org/wp-content/lpr/LPR-National-Survey-Report-2016.pdf. As discussed in this body of literature, large amounts of data on vehicle characteristics and patterns can be captured by ALPR systems for use by law enforcement agencies; however, the lack of public access to this data fuels concerns about its transparency and general usage. Data captured by ALPR systems is accessible to the law enforcement agency that procured the system, to any other law enforcement agency that has been given permission to access the system, and to any other entities with whom the procuring agency shares the data. An agency's internal accessibility of the data depends on the types of hot lists and any other data sources downloaded into the system.

- May lead to disparate impacts on communities of color, disadvantaged communities, and other vulnerable populations;[27] and,
- Gives rise to certain privacy and data protection issues, such as what data is collected, how long data is retained, and whether data is sold or shared.[28]

There continues to be a relatively limited body of research that rigorously evaluates ALPR effectiveness across various public safety outcomes.[29] However, there are three areas in which the existing body of research appears to agree.

First, the limited body of research suggests that ALPRs may be particularly effective in identifying stolen vehicles and plates, increasing the recovery of stolen vehicles, increasing arrests of individuals linked to vehicle thefts, and assisting law enforcement as an investigatory tool across various types of cases.[30]

---

[27] *See, e.g.*, Major Cities Chiefs Association. (2023, February). *Automated license plate reader technology in law enforcement: Recommendations and considerations.* https://majorcitieschiefs.com/wpcontent/uploads/2023/02/MCCA-Automated-License-Plate-Reader-Technology-in-Law-Enforcement.pdf, at p. 12; Joh, E. E. (2022). The unexpected consequences of automation in policing. *Southern Methodist University Law Review,* 75(3). https://scholar.smu.edu/smulr/vol75/iss3/3; Maass, D., & Gillula, J. (2015, January 21). What you can learn from Oakland's raw ALPR data. *Electronic Frontier Foundation*. https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2015/01/what-we-learnedoakland-raw-alpr-data; Keener, S., Keeter, T., & Taylor, B. (2026). Surveilling the Commonwealth: An analysis of surveillance technology proliferation in Virginia. *Urban Science*, *10*(5), 270, https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci10050270. For instance, research that has examined disparate impacts of ALPR use by law enforcement often lacks generalizability and fails to isolate the impacts related to ALPR deployment and usage from the impacts of other crime reduction or prevention strategies, such as gunshot detection technologies, which may also disproportionately affect communities of color, disadvantaged communities, and other vulnerable populations.

[28] These concerns associated with ALPR use are similar to those of other technologies, such as facial recognition and unmanned aircraft systems.

[29] *See, e.g.,* Koper et al. (2022). Do license plate readers enhance the initial and residual deterrent effects of police patrol? A quasi-randomized test. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 725-746; Koper, C., & Lum, C. (2019). The impacts of large-scale license plate reader deployment on criminal investigations. *Police Quarterly, 22*(3), 305-329; and, Shjarback, J.A. (2024). Examining police officers' perceptions of automated license plate readers before technology explanation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 35*(1), 3-21.

[30] *See, e.g.,* Koper, C., & Lum, C. (2019). The impacts of large-scale license plate reader deployment on criminal investigations. *Police Quarterly, 22*(3), 305-329; Koper et al. (2022). Do license plate readers enhance the initial and residual deterrent effects of police patrol? A quasi-randomized test. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 725-746; Koper et al. (2019). Optimizing the geographic deployment of hot spot patrols with license plate readers. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 15,* 641-650; Potts, J. (2018, March). Assessing the benefits of automated license plate readers. *The Police Chief*, *85*(3), 14–15; Shjarback, J. A., & Sarkos, J. A. (2025). An evaluation of a major expansion in Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, *8*(2), 225-242; Taylor, B., Koper, C., & Woods, D. (2012). Combating vehicle theft in Arizona: A randomized experiment with license plate recognition technology. *Criminal Justice Review, 37* (1), 24-50; and, Willis, J.J., Koper, C., & Lum, C. (2018). The adaptation of license-plate readers for investigative purposes: Police technology and innovation re-invention. *Justice Quarterly, 35*(4), 614-638.

Second, there is clear agreement that additional research is needed to more thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of ALPR use on public safety and community outcomes, such as the impact on crime rates, clearance rates, deterrence, displacement, community perceptions and concerns, as well as logistics relating to costs, benefits, privacy, and data protection.[31] In terms of community outcomes, there was a recent research article published relating to disparate impacts of ALPR deployment in various regions across Virginia.[32] Specifically, these researchers examined the distribution of ALPR devices and gunshot detection systems across census tracts in the City of Richmond, City of Norfolk, City of Roanoke, and Northern Virginia.[33] While there are inherent limitations to the study and more research is needed, the findings suggest that there are "high concentration hubs" in most of the regions examined and are concentrated within or immediately adjacent to communities of color.[34]

Finally, researchers emphasize that some of the inherent limitations of existing research measuring the effectiveness of ALPR may vary based on several factors, such as the amount and concentration of ALPR deployed, the type of ALPR deployed,[35] the location of the ALPR, the integration of ALPR with other law enforcement tools and technology,[36] and how officers are using ALPR in the field.[37]

---

[31] *See, e.g.,* Keener, S., Keeter, T., & Taylor, B. (2026). Surveilling the Commonwealth: An analysis of surveillance technology proliferation in Virginia. *Urban Science*, *10*(5), 270; Koper, C.S., Lum, C., Wu, X., Johnson, W., & Stoltz, M. (2022). Do license plate readers enhance the initial and residual deterrent effects of police patrol? A quasi-randomized test. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 725-746; Koper et al. (2019). Optimizing the geographic deployment of hot spot patrols with license plate readers. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 15,* 641-650; Lum, C., Koper, C. S., & Willis, J. J. (2017). Understanding the limits of technology's impact on Police effectiveness. Police Quarterly, 20(2), 135–163; Merola, L. M., Lum, C., & Murphy, R. P. (2018). The impact of license plate recognition technology (LPR) on trust in law enforcement: A survey-experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *15*(1), 55–66; Nhan, J., & Helfers, R. C. (2026). Cops and hotlists: Balancing security and privacy with ALPR technology. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice, and Principles*, *99*(1), 160-179; Shjarback, J.A. (2024). Examining police officers' perceptions of automated license plate readers before technology explanation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 35*(1), 3-21.

[32] Keener, S., Keeter, T., & Taylor, B. (2026). Surveilling the Commonwealth: An analysis of surveillance technology proliferation in Virginia. *Urban Science*, *10*(5), 270, https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci10050270.

[33] *Id.* The authors indicated the following jurisdictions were included in their defined Northern Virginia geographical area*:* Fairfax County, City of Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax City, and Falls Church.

[34] *Id.* The authors specifically found that, "the geospatial data identifies high-concentration hubs in the Hampton Roads region, the Richmond metropolitan area, and northern Virginia region. The demographic associations within these hubs are significant. In Norfolk and Richmond, ALPR and gunshot detection technologies are predominantly concentrated in census tracts where African Americans are the majority. Conversely, in the Northern Virginia region and Roanoke, surveillance technology is more prevalent in predominantly White census tracts, though these locations frequently border and/or are in areas with high Asian and Hispanic/Latino populations" at p. 16.

[35] An agency may deploy various types of ALPRs, such as fixed, mobile, or a combination thereof.

[36] For instance, additional technology and tools that could be considered include CCTV, law enforcement body worn cameras, gunshot detection systems, and forensic technology advancements.

[37] Lum, C., Koper, C. S., Lee, H., Nagin, D. S., & Sherman, L. (2025). Measuring the cost-effectiveness of new technologies in policing: The case of automatic license plate readers (ALPR). *Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing*, *9*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41887-025-00099-y; Lum, C., Wellford, C., Scott, T., Vovak, H.,

Crime Commission's 2026 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey Findings

The 2025 Virginia ALPR legislation directs the Crime Commission to collect data and conduct two surveys on law enforcement use of ALPR, and to report its findings by the first day of the 2026 Regular Session and again by November 1, 2026.[38]

Crime Commission staff disseminated its initial *Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* to all Virginia law enforcement agencies in November 2025.[39] The survey findings revealed that some Virginia law enforcement agencies were not using ALPR in accordance with the new statute.[40] In addition, almost one-third of law enforcement agencies did not respond to the survey. As a result, the Chair of the Crime Commission sent letters to non-compliant and non-responding agencies. Further, Crime Commission staff provided presentations at the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police and Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators 2026 Joint Winter Conference and the Virginia Sheriffs' 2026 Institute Spring Conference, as well as created and published an ALPR checklist for law enforcement agencies.[41]

J.A.S., & Goodier, M. (2024). Differences between high and low performing Police agencies in clearing robberies, aggravated assaults, and burglaries: Findings from an eight-agency case study. *Police Quarterly*, *27*(2), 135–157; Koper, C., & Lum, C. (2019). The impacts of large-scale license plate reader deployment on criminal investigations. *Police Quarterly, 22*(3), 305-329; Koper, C. S., Lum, C., & Willis, J. J. (2014). Optimizing the use of technology in policing: Results and implications from a multi-site study of the social, organizational, and behavioural aspects of implementing police technologies. Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 8(2), 212–221; Koper et al. (2022). Do license plate readers enhance the initial and residual deterrent effects of police patrol? A quasi-randomized test. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 725-746; Koper et al. (2019). Optimizing the geographic deployment of hot spot patrols with license plate readers. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 15,* 641-650; Lum, C., Hibdon, J., Cave, B., Koper, C.S., & Merola, L. (2011). License plate reader (LPR) police patrols in crime hot spots: An experimental evaluation in two adjacent jurisdictions. *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* 7(4), 321-345; McInerney, J. (2026). Eagle eyes: How the Chicago Police Department's video surveillance network is used to fight crime and its Fourth Amendment implications. *Journal of Law and Criminology*, *116*(1), 319-359; Taylor, B., Koper, C., & Woods, D. (2012). Combating vehicle theft in Arizona: A randomized experiment with license plate recognition technology. *Criminal Justice Review, 37* (1), 24-50; and, Shjarback, J.A. (2024). Examining police officers' perceptions of automated license plate readers before technology explanation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 35*(1), 3-21. Further, it should be noted that a national multi-site, quasi-experimental study by the National Policing Institute is currently underway that will capture the following key issues in their national ALPR evaluation: "the crime reduction impact of LPRs, the investigative value of LPRs, cost benefits, how to optimize use and placement of fixed-location LPRs, and best practices for privacy and data collection," at https://www.policinginstitute.org/projects/a-multi-site-evaluation-of-automated-license-plate-readers/.

[38] 2025 Va. Acts ch. 720, enactment clause 13. *See* House Bill 2724 at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.

[39] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 13, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.

[40] Virginia State Crime Commission. (Jan. 2026). *Law enforcement use of automatic license plate recognition (ALPR) update*. https://vscc.virginia.gov/2026/VSCC%20ALPR%20Report%20January%202026%20FINAL%20REVISED%20Jan%2021%202026.pdf.

[41] *See* Appendix A. *See also* Virginia State Crime Commission. (2026, Apr. 24). *ALPR checklist for law enforcement agencies*. https://vscc.virginia.gov/ALPR%20Statutory%20Requirements%20Checklist%20April%202026%20FINAL.pdf.

In August 2026, Crime Commission staff disseminated its second survey to all Virginia law enforcement agencies to re-assess ALPR use as directed by the ALPR legislation.[42] The survey consisted of 38 questions relating to whether an agency uses ALPR technology, and if so, whether such use is consistent with the requirements of the ALPR statute, such as adoption of an ALPR use policy, retaining system data for no more than 21 days, and not sharing system data with other state or federal law enforcement agencies without legal process.[43]

It is important to note that findings from the Crime Commission's 2026 *Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* are based on self-reported agency practices at the time the survey was completed. Because of the 98% response rate of the 2026 survey, findings are far more generalizable to Virginia law enforcement use of ALPR technology as compared to the 2025 survey. However, survey findings may not reflect current practices as Virginia law enforcement agencies' use of ALPR is rapidly changing. Media reports and direct correspondence with Crime Commission staff indicate that numerous agencies are ending, suspending, or re-evaluating their use of ALPR generally or of specific ALPR vendors, or pausing the installation of additional ALPR cameras, including:

- Alexandria Police Department[44]
- Amelia County Sheriff's Office[45]
- Amherst County Sheriff's Office[46]
- Appomattox County Sheriff's Office[47]
- Arlington County Police Department[48]

---

[42] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 13, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[43] *See* Appendix C for a copy of the 2026 *Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* instrument.
[44] *See* Robinson, S. WUSA9. (2026, October 28). *Alexandria to shut down 61 Flock cameras amid privacy concerns but future of license plate readers remains uncertain*. https://www.wusa9.com/article/news/police/alexandria-shut-down-61-flock-cameras-amid-privacy-concerns/65-19f1169a-4c1d-43d5-a20b-8411a4c5e7e7; Adikari, S. NBC Washington. (2026, October 28). *'Data will be turned off within 48 hours:' Alexandria to exit Flock camera program.* https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/northern-virginia/alexandria-is-exiting-flock-camera-program/4173217/.
[45] *See* Gehlich, C. ABC8 News. (2026, October 15). *Amelia ends Flock contract after weighing benefits against privacy concerns.* https://www.wric.com/news/local-news/amelia-county/amelia-ends-flock-contract/.
[46] *See* Thomas, P. WDBJ7. (2026, September 7). *Bedford and Amherst counties, plus Lynchburg, are latest law enforcement agencies to drop Flock camera use.* https://www.wdbj7.com/2026/09/03/bedford-county-latest-law-enforcement-agency-drop-flock-camera-use/.
[47] *See* Simone, J. ABC13 News. (2026, September 3). *Appomattox sheriff suspends Flock camera contract after questioning data, storage practice*. https://wset.com/news/local/appomattox-sheriff-suspends-flock-camera-contract-after-questioning-data-storage-practice-september-2026.
[48] *See* Rogers, W. ABC7 News. (2026 September 15). *Arlington County officials say it will begin removing its Flock cameras*. https://wjla.com/news/local/arlington-flock-camera-board-license-plate-readers-end-autonomous-council-virginia-cars-vehicles-law-enforcement-police-concern-controversial; Bonk, V. WTOP News. (2026, September 17). *Arlington, Fairfax counties vote to stop use of Flock cameras and related technology*. https://wtop.com/virginia/2026/09/arlington-county-ends-use-of-flock-cameras-and-related-technology/.

- Augusta County Sheriff's Office[49]
- Bedford County Sheriff's Office[50]
- Bland County Sheriff's Office[51]
- Bridgewater Police Department[52]
- Campbell County Sheriff's Office[53]
- Charlotte County Sheriff's Office[54]
- Charlottesville Police Department[55]
- Christiansburg Police Department[56]
- Crewe Police Department[57]
- Damascus Police Department[58]
- Dumfries Police Department[59]
- Elkton Police Department[60]

[49] *See* Bordelon, L. Staunton News Leader. (2026, September 28). *Augusta County removes Flock Safety cameras*. https://www.newsleader.com/story/news/local/2026/09/28/augusta-county-virginia-flock-safety-cameras-removed/91985729007/?gnt-cfr=1&gca-cat=p&gca-uir=true&gca-epti=z117801p119450c119450e1198xxv117801d--55--b--55--&gca-ft=168&gca-ds=sophi.
[50] *See* 10 News. (2026, September 3). *Bedford County Sheriff's Office to shut down Flock Cameras until further notice*. https://www.wsls.com/news/local/2026/09/03/bedford-county-sheriffs-office-to-shut-down-flock-cameras-until-further-notice/.
[51] *See* Singer, J. WDBJ7. (2026, September 1). *Bland County Sheriff stops use of Flock cameras*. https://www.wdbj7.com/2026/09/01/bland-county-sheriff-stops-use-flock-camera/.
[52] *See* Falayi, K. Virginia Center for Investigative Journalism. (2026, September 10). *A small Virginia town de-Flocks.* https://www.whro.org/virginia-center-for-investigative-journalism/2026-09-10/small-virginia-town-de-flocks.
[53] *See* Smith, C. ABC13 News. (2026, September 2). *Campbell County Sheriff's Office to end use of Flock cameras*. https://wset.com/news/local/campbell-county-sheriffs-office-to-end-use-of-flock-cameras-sheriff-whit-clark-privacy-concerns.
[54] *See* Robertson, H. ABC13 News. (2026, September 9). *Charlotte County Sheriff's Office shuts down Flock camera system*. https://wset.com/news/local/charlotte-county-sheriffs-office-shuts-down-flock-camera-system-charlotte-county-board-of-supervisors-noah-davis-vice-chair-money-contract-09-september-2026.
[55] *See* Hart, J. CVILLE Right Now. (2025, December 16). City ends Flock pilot program over federal data base concerns. https://cvillerightnow.com/news/208802-city-ends-flock-pilot-program-over-federal-data-base-concerns/.
[56] *See* Trezevant, S. WFXR. (2026, August 26). *Christiansburg votes unanimously to end flock camera contract*. https://www.wfxrtv.com/news/christiansburg-votes-unanimously-to-end-flock-camera-contract/.
[57] Indicated on 2026 Crime Commission survey that the agency will be terminating its contract with Flock at the end of 2026.
[58] *See* Duncan, S. Cardinal News. *Damascus cancels Flock contract, joining other Virginia localities that have recently severed ties with the surveillance company*. https://cardinalnews.org/2026/10/08/damascus-cancels-flock-cameras-contract-joining-other-virginia-localities-that-have-recently-severed-ties-with-the-tech-company/.
[59] *See* Fields, O., & Simmons, L. DC News Now. *Dumfries Town Council votes 4-2 to remove Flock cameras*. https://www.dcnewsnow.com/news/local-news/virginia/prince-william-county/dumfries-town-council-votes-4-2-to-remove-flock-cameras/.
[60] *See* Caudle, Z. Augusta Free Press. (2026, July 21). *Community group persuades Elkton Town Council to cut ties with Flock*. https://augustafreepress.com/news/community-group-persuades-elkton-town-council-to-cut-ties-with-flock/.

- Fairfax County Police Department[61]
- Floyd County Sheriff's Office[62]
- Giles County Sheriff's Office[63]
- Goochland County Sheriff's Office[64]
- Halifax County Sheriff's Office[65]
- Hampden-Sydney College[66]
- Harrisonburg Police Department[67]
- Haysi Police Department[68]
- Henrico County Police Division[69]
- Henry County Sheriff's Office[70]
- James City County Police Department[71]
- King William County Sheriff's Office[72]

[61] *See* Lopez, M. S. FFX NOW. (2026, September 16). *Fairfax County board suspends Flock camera installations, as criticism grows in N. Va.*. https://www.ffxnow.com/2026/09/16/fairfax-county-board-suspends-flock-camera-installations-as-criticism-grows-in-n-va/; More, M. & Wilder, D. NBC Washington. (2026, September 25). *Fairfax County School Board bans all Flock-style cameras on school property.* https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/fairfax-county-school-board-bans-all-flock-style-cameras-on-school-property/4159270/.

[62] *See* Whitt, A. Floyd Times. (2026, July 7). *Sheriff Craig: Flock cameras 'are out' at end of contract*. https://www.floydtimes.com/sheriff-craig-flock-cameras-are-out-at-end-of-contract/.

[63] *See* Hunt, E. The Roanoke Times. (2026, August 27). *Giles sheriff's office ends Flock contract, cameras to come down*. https://richmond.com/news/state-regional/crime-courts/article_f688ccc7-a394-5dcd-b5cd-5c117269fd00.html?mode=nowapp.

[64] *See* Sabo, O. 12 on Your Side. (2026, August 28). *Goochland sheriff suspends use of Flock cameras*. https://www.12onyourside.com/2026/08/28/goochland-county-ends-flock-camera-use/.

[65] *See* 10 News. (2026, August 28). *Halifax County Sheriff's Office will not use Flock ALPR cameras*. https://www.wsls.com/news/local/2026/08/28/halifax-county-sheriffs-office-will-not-use-flock-alpr-cameras/.

[66] When conducting a follow-up with this agency relating to the 2026 Crime Commission survey, the agency indicated that they ended their contract and discontinued use of Flock cameras on August 21, 2026.

[67] *See* Keller, L. WHSV3. (2026, July 15). *Harrisonburg City Council pledges the removal of Flock cameras, to end contract late July*. https://www.whsv.com/2026/07/16/harrisonburg-city-council-pledges-removal-flock-cameras-end-contract-late-july/.; Lewis, I. The Breeze. (2026, September 23). *Harrison City Council passes ordinance to ban ALPR cameras*. https://www.breezejmu.org/news/harrisonburg-city-council-passes-ordinance-to-ban-alpr-cameras/article_aea52fa7-415b-45f2-ad6a-11ff64717132.html.

[68] Indicated on 2026 Crime Commission survey that the agency is going to stop using the system.

[69]*See* Henrico News. (2026, October 6). *Henrico Police to eliminate Flock cameras*. https://henrico.gov/news/2026/10/henrico-police-to-eliminate-flock-cameras/.

[70] *See* Johnson, L. WDBJ7. (2026, August 14). *Henry County sheriff suspends access to Flock camera system*. https://www.wdbj7.com/2026/08/14/henry-county-sheriff-suspends-access-flock-camera-system/.

[71] *See* Brockelman, H. WY Daily. (2026, October 28). *James City County ends Flock contract*. https://wydaily.com/latest/government/2026/10/28/james-city-county-ends-flock-contract/.

[72] *See* Macaulay, D. Daily Press. (2026, August 24). *King William County cancels contract for Flock cameras after vandalism, theft*. https://www.dailypress.com/2026/08/24/king-william-county-cancels-contract-for-flock-cameras-after-vandalism-theft/.

- Loudoun County Sheriff's Office[73]
- Lynchburg Police Department[74]
- Martinsville Police Department[75]
- Montgomery County Sheriff's Office[76]
- Mount Jackson Police Department[77]
- Nelson County Sheriff's Office[78]
- Prince Edward County Sheriff's Office[79]
- Rappahannock County Sheriff's Office[80]
- Richmond Police Department[81]
- Staunton Police Department[82]
- Weber City Police Department[83]
- Wythe County Sheriff's Office[84]

---

[73] *See* Augenstein, N. WTOP News. (2026, October 16). *How many Flock cameras are being used in Loudoun County? Board considers study.* https://wtop.com/virginia/2026/10/how-many-flock-cameras-are-being-used-in-loudoun-county-board-considers-study/.

[74] *See* Lynchburg Police Department (2026, August 19). *Lynchburg Police Department announces temporary pause of Flock ALPR cameras*. https://www.lynchburgvapolice.gov/news-updates/lynchburg-police-department-announces-temporary-pause-of-flock-alpr-cameras/; Vicario, C. ABC13 News. (2026, September 4). *Lynchburg ends Flock contract, debate continues over when to remove cameras*. https://wset.com/news/local/lynchburg-ends-flock-contract-but-camera-debate-isnt-over-city-council-flock-safety-september-2026.

[75] *See* Allard, A. ABC13 News. (2026, September 8). *Martinsville Police will not renew Flock camera contract after 2026*. https://wset.com/news/local/martinsville-police-will-not-renew-flock-camera-contract-after-2026.

[76] *See* WDBJ7. (2026, October 1). *Montgomery County will discontinue use of Flock cameras.* https://www.wdbj7.com/2026/10/01/montgomery-county-will-discontinue-use-flock-cameras/.

[77] This agency clarified that they were "having the Flock cameras removed today. Our contract runs out in October, but I had my maintenance department remove them today (08/18/2026)."

[78] *See* Johnson, L. WDBJ7. (2026, October 13). *Nelson County Sheriff's Office discontinues use of Flock cameras*. https://www.wdbj7.com/2026/10/14/nelson-county-sheriffs-office-discontinues-use-flock-cameras/; Cardinal Staff. Cardinal News. (2026, October 26). *Headlines from across Virginia: Nelson County is latest to drop Flock cameras, more…* https://cardinalnews.org/2026/10/26/headlines-from-across-virginia/.

[79] *See* Moore, J. The Farmville Herald. (2026, September 8). *Flock camera usage stopped in county*. https://farmvilleherald.com/2026/09/flock-camera-usage-stopped-in-county/.

[80] *See* Jackson, C. The Piedmont Journal Recorder. (2026, September 19). *Rapp Sheriff caves to residents' concern over FLOCK cameras*. https://pjrnews.com/articles/fire-rescue-leo/rapp-sheriff-caves-to-residents-concern-over-flock-cameras/; Maitin, T. Fauquier Now. (2026, September 22). *Rappahannock County ditches Flock cameras.* https://www.fauquiernow.com/news/rappahannock-county-ditches-flock-cameras-e6fd6e63.

[81] *See* Goldkopf, E. WRIC. (2026, October 11). *Richmond residents react to mayor not renewing Flock contract, questions still unanswered*. https://www.wric.com/news/local-news/richmond/residents-react-not-renewing-flock-contract/.

[82] *See* Staunton Virginia Newsroom. (2025, December 19). City to terminate contract with Flock Safety for license plate readers. https://www.ci.staunton.va.us/Home/Components/News/News/2564/71; Graham, C. Augusta Free Press. (2026, February 11). *Staunton Police: Flock Safety license-plate reader cameras taken down*. https://augustafreepress.com/news/staunton-police-flock-safety-license-plate-reader-cameras-taken-down/.

[83] Indicated on 2026 Crime Commission survey that "at this time, Town Council has voted to dismantle the ALPR system."

[84] *See* 10 News. (2026, September 1). *Wythe County Sheriff's Office ends contract with Flock Safety*. https://www.wsls.com/news/local/2026/09/01/wythe-county-sheriffs-office-ends-contract-with-flock-safety/.

- Wytheville Police Department[85]

The key findings from the Crime Commission's 2026 *Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* are as follows.

1. 98% (351 of 359) of law enforcement agencies responded to the survey.

The survey was disseminated in August 2026 to all 359 Virginia law enforcement agencies,[86] including city police departments, college/university police departments, county police departments, other law enforcement agencies,[87] other state law enforcement agencies, primary sheriff's offices, secondary sheriff's offices, town police departments, and the Virginia State Police. The survey had a response rate of 98% (351 of 359).[88] Table 1 illustrates the response rate by type of agency.

Table 1: Survey Response Rate by Type of Agency

Type of Agency	Total Agencies	Total Responding Agencies	% Responding Agencies
City Police Departments	38	38	100%
College/University Police Departments	41	41	100%
County Police Departments	9	9	100%
Other Law Enforcement	17	17	100%
Other State Law Enforcement	10	10	100%
Primary Sheriff's Offices	86	86	100%
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	37	37	100%
Town Police Departments	120	112	93%
Virginia State Police	1	1	100%
TOTAL	**359**	**351**	**98%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[85] *See* 10 News. (2026, September 2). *Wytheville Police Department no longer using Flock Safety ALPRs*. https://www.wsls.com/news/local/2026/09/02/wytheville-police-department-no-longer-using-flock-safety-alprs/.
[86] The Crime Commission's *2025 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey* was submitted to 361 Virginia law enforcement agencies. This year's survey was disseminated to 359 Virginia law enforcement agencies due to the inclusion of one additional other state law enforcement agency and the removal of three other law enforcement agencies.
[87] Other law enforcement includes agencies such as airport police, railway police, and private police.
[88] This is a notable increase in response rate as compared to staff's 2025 survey, which had a 70% (251 of 361) response rate. This increase in response rate increases the generalizability of findings to better reflect all Virginia law enforcement agencies at the time of survey completion.

2. Over half (191 of 351) of responding agencies reported using ALPR technology.

Over half of the responding agencies, 54% (191 of 351), reported that their agency was using some type of ALPR technology at the time of survey completion.[89] As seen in Table 2, city police departments, county police departments, and primary sheriff's offices reported the highest use of ALPR technology across types of agencies.

Table 2: ALPR Technology Use by Type of Agency

Type of Agency	Total Responding Agencies	Total Responding Agencies Using ALPR	% Responding Agencies Using ALPR
City Police Departments	38	32	84%
College/University Police Departments	41	12	29%
County Police Departments	9	9	100%
Other Law Enforcement	17	2	12%
Other State Law Enforcement	10	1	10%
Primary Sheriff's Offices	86	63	73%
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	37	3	8%
Town Police Departments	112	68	61%
Virginia State Police	1	1	100%
TOTAL	**351**	**191**	**54%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

Responding agencies that use ALPR were also asked to indicate the manner(s) in which their agency uses this technology. Some agencies reported using ALPR technology in more than one manner. Specifically, 38% (73 of 191) indicated two or more manners of ALPR technology use. The manner in which agencies use ALPR technology varied:

- 71% (135 of 191) indicated that their agency contracts with a vendor for both ALPR system equipment/hardware and system software;
- 36% (69 of 191) indicated that their agency owns ALPR system equipment/hardware and contracts with a vendor to access ALPR system software;

[89] Four agencies were not included with the 191 agencies who reported currently using ALPR technology. The first agency indicated that while they are under contract with a vendor, they are only in the process of ALPR camera installment. The second agency reported only owning ALPR cameras with access to the ALPR system data being only available to another local law enforcement agency. The third agency indicated that they have an ALPR system, but have not yet implemented its use. The fourth agency indicated that their mobile ALPRs are not operational until the technology is officially launched.

- 35% (66 of 191) indicated that their agency is authorized to access another law enforcement agency's ALPR system;
- 21% (40 of 191) indicated that their agency accesses an ALPR system through a subscription with a vendor; and,
- 2% (3 of 191) indicated that their agency is using an ALPR system without a contract with a vendor.[90]

3. 93% (178 of 191) of agencies that use ALPR systems reported having a policy.

Virginia law requires law enforcement agencies using ALPR systems to have a policy on such use.[91] Agencies were asked to indicate whether they have a policy or policies relating to the use of ALPR technology. Table 3 illustrates the ALPR policy status by type of agency. Of the responding agencies using ALPR technology:

- 93% (178 of 191) reported having a policy;
- 2% (4 of 191) reported that their policy was in progress;
- 3% (6 of 191) reported not having a policy; and,
- 2% (3 of 191) did not answer the question.

Table 3: ALPR Policy Status by Type of Agency

Type of Agency	Total Agencies	Has a Policy	Policy in Progress	No Policy	Did Not Answer
City Police Departments	32	30	---	---	2
College/University Police Departments	12	11	---	1	---
County Police Departments	9	9	---	---	---
Other Law Enforcement	2	2	---	---	---
Other State Law Enforcement	1	1	---	---	---
Primary Sheriff's Offices	63	62	1	---	---
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	3	2	1	---	---
Town Police Departments	68	60	2	5	1
Virginia State Police	1	1	---	---	---
TOTAL	**191**	**178**	**4**	**6**	**3**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[90] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 191 and 100%, respectively, due to some agencies using ALPR technology in more than one manner.
[91] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(H) (2026).

4. While two-thirds of agencies using ALPR publicly post their policy, the remaining one-third of agencies do not appear to publicly post their policy.

Law enforcement agencies using ALPR systems are also required to publicly post their ALPR policy on their agency or locality website.[92] Of the 178 agencies that reported having a policy, 67% (119 of 178) provided a functioning link to the policy on their agency or locality website. Staff was unable to locate the publicly posted policies of the remaining 33% (59 of 178) of agencies due to several reasons, including:

- 24 agencies provided a link, but staff could not find an ALPR policy on the given website;
- 22 agencies did not provide a link;
- 8 agencies provided a link to an ALPR vendor transparency website that indicated the agency had a policy, but the actual policy was not viewable; and,
- 5 agencies provided a link that did not work (e.g., error code or message).

5. Flock Safety is the most widely used ALPR vendor by agencies.

Agencies were asked to indicate which ALPR vendor their agency currently uses. The large majority of responding agencies, 86% (165 of 191), reported Flock Safety as their ALPR vendor. Some agencies reported using more than one ALPR vendor. Specifically, 23% (43 of 191) of responding agencies reported having two or more ALPR vendors. Table 4 provides a list of ALPR vendors, along with the total number of responding agencies who currently use those vendors.[93]

Table 4: ALPR Vendors

ALPR Vendor	Total Agencies	% Agencies
Axon	38	20%
Flock Safety	165	86%
Leonardo	17	9%
Motorola	17	9%
Other ALPR Vendors[94]	12	6%

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[92] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(K) (2026).
[93] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 191 and 100%, respectively, due to some agencies using more than one ALPR vendor.
[94] Of the 12 agencies indicating "Other" for their agency's ALPR vendor, three (3) agencies reported using a separate ALPR system approved by DGS (e.g., Rekor Recognition Systems, Inc. and Sandoval Custom Creations, Inc (SCCI)). However, the other nine (9) agencies reported using an ALPR system that is not currently on the list of DPS-approved ALPR systems.

6. *Eight agencies (8 of 191) reported using an ALPR system that is not on the list of vendors approved by the Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS).*

The Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS) is required to publish a list of approved ALPR systems for use by law enforcement agencies in Virginia.[95] Law enforcement agencies must use ALPR systems that have been approved by DPS, which includes adhering to Virginia IT Agency (VITA) information security standards.[96] While nearly all responding agencies are using a vendor that appears on the DPS list, the following eight (8) agencies reported using a vendor that is not on the list:[97]

- Verkada (4 agencies);
- Comsonic (1 agency);
- Coreforce (1 agency);
- Hanwha/Optec (1 agency); and,
- Safefleet/Coban (1 agency).

7. *The number and type of ALPR cameras used by agencies varied significantly.*

The number and type of ALPR cameras used by law enforcement varied significantly across responding agencies. The large majority, 89% (170 of 191), reported using fixed ALPR cameras. However, some agencies reported using more than one type of ALPR camera. Specifically, 26% (49 of 191) of agencies reported using two or more types of ALPR cameras, while 9% (18 of 191) of agencies reported using all three types of ALPR cameras. Table 5 illustrates the number of agencies reporting use of various types of ALPR cameras, as well as the range in the number of camera types used by such agencies.[98]

Table 5: Number and Type of ALPR Cameras Used by Agencies

Type of ALPR Camera	Total Agencies	% Agencies	Range (# of cameras)
Fixed ALPR Cameras[99]	170	89%	1 to 150
Mobile ALPR Cameras[100]	63	33%	1 to 1,194
Portable ALPR Cameras[101]	42	22%	1 to 74

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[95] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 4, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[96] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(B) (2026).
[97] Virginia Department of General Services. *DGS ALPR approved list*. https://dgs.virginia.gov/content/dam/site-assets/dps/Documents/specifications/VA-230420%20Breakout%20of%20Products%20-%20DGS.pdf. (Retrieved 2026, Oct. 14). These 8 agencies include two city police departments, four primary sheriff's offices, and two town police departments.
[98] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 191 and 100%, respectively, due to some agencies using more than one type of ALPR camera. An additional 2% (4 of 191) of agencies reported other cameras such as LiveView technologies, other live cameras, or Motorola cameras. One agency did not respond to this question.
[99] Fixed ALPR cameras refer to devices mounted in a stationary location.
[100] Mobile ALPR cameras refer to devices mounted in a patrol vehicle.
[101] Portable ALPR cameras refer to devices that are movable for use in multiple locations.

8. 27% (52 of 191) of agencies reported acts of vandalism to their ALPR cameras.

Recent media reports have highlighted incidents of ALPR cameras being purposefully vandalized in Virginia.[102] As such, agencies were asked if any of their ALPR cameras had been vandalized. Of the responding agencies, 27% (52 of 191) reported that their agency's ALPR cameras had been vandalized.[103] The types of vandalism varied across agencies, with agencies reporting cameras being spray painted, covered with stickers or plastic bags, unplugged and/or cut power cables, stolen from light poles, cut down, hit purposefully by vehicles, turned away from the roadway, set on fire, or shot. Table 6 illustrates ALPR camera vandalism by agency type.

Table 6: ALPR Camera Vandalism by Agency Type

Type of Agency	Total Agencies Reporting ALPR Camera Vandalism
City Police Departments	11
College/University Police Departments	2
County Police Departments	6
Other State Law Enforcement	1
Primary Sheriff's Offices	24
Town Police Departments	8
TOTAL	**52**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey.*

9. Nearly all agencies reported data retention periods of 21 days or less; however, a small number of agencies (7 of 191) reported data retention periods of over 21 days.

Law enforcement agencies are required to purge ALPR system data after 21 days from the date of capture, unless such data is part of an ongoing investigation, prosecution, or civil action.[104] Agencies were asked to provide the retention periods for their ALPR system data. As seen in Table 7, nearly all responding agencies reported data retention periods of 21 days or less across all types of ALPR cameras:

[102] *See, e.g.,* Willett, M. WHSV3. (2026, August 17). *Luray Flock camera vandalism leads to shootout with deputy.* https://www.whsv.com/2026/08/17/luray-flock-camera-vandalism-leads-shootout-with-deputy/; Hall, B. WAVY10. (2025, December 11). *Suffolk man charged with destroying 13 Flock cameras.* https://www.wavy.com/news/local-news/suffolk/suffolk-man-charged-with-destroying-13-flock-cameras/?ipid=promo-link-block; Alvarez-Wertz, J., & Fox, A. WAVY10. (2026, September 22). *Flock surveillance cameras vandalized in James City County*. https://www.wavy.com/news/local-news/james-city-county/flock-surveillance-cameras-vandalized-in-james-city-county/.

[103] One agency did not respond to this question.

[104] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(E) (2026).

- 95% (161 of 170) indicated 21 days or less for data from fixed ALPR cameras;[105]
- 98% (62 of 63) indicated 21 days or less for data from mobile ALPR cameras;[106] and,
- 95% (40 of 42) indicated 21 days or less for data from portable ALPR cameras.[107]

Table 7: Data Retention Periods by Type of ALPR Camera

Data Retention Period	Fixed ALPR Camera	Mobile ALPR Camera	Portable ALPR Camera
21 Days or Less	161	62	40
Over 21 Days	6	1	2
Did Not Answer Question[108]	3	0	0
TOTAL	**170**	**63**	**42**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

Staff determined that there were 7 unique agencies that reported data retention periods of over 21 days.[109] For these 7 agencies, the data retention periods varied by the type of ALPR camera:

- Fixed ALPR cameras: 27 days to 30 days (6 agencies);
- Mobile ALPR cameras: 90 days (1 agency); and,
- Portable ALPR cameras: 30 days (2 agencies).

10. One-quarter (48 of 191) of agencies reported that their ALPR system is integrated or interfaced with some other form of technology.

Agencies were asked if their ALPR system was currently integrated or interfaced with any other technologies, such as video recording technology, audio recording technology, gunshot detection technology, and/or record management system technology. The majority of responding agencies, 73% (139 of 191), indicated that their agency's ALPR system was <u>not</u> currently integrated or interfaced with any other technologies. However, 26% (50 of 191) reported that their agency's ALPR system is integrated or interfaced with other technologies, as seen in Table 8 below.[110]

[105] 150 of these agencies reported a data retention of 21 days and 11 of these agencies reported a data retention time of *less than* 21 days.
[106] 59 of these agencies reported a data retention of 21 days and three (3) of these agencies reported a data retention time of *less than* 21 days.
[107] 35 of these agencies reported a data retention of 21 days and five (5) of these agencies reported a data retention time of *less than* 21 days.
[108] One agency did not respond to the survey question regarding the number and type of ALPR cameras used which provided the basis for responses to this question. Therefore, the agency is not included in this table but has been listed in Appendix D as not answering the survey question.
[109] These 7 agencies include one city police department, two primary sheriff's offices, and four town police departments. Two of these 7 agencies reported a data retention period of over 21 days for more than one type of ALPR camera (fixed and portable).
[110] The number of agencies adds up to over 50 due to some agencies reporting that their ALPR system integrates or interfaces with more than one type of other technology. Further, 1% (2 of 191) of agencies did not respond to this question.

Table 8: Agencies Reporting ALPR System Integration or Interfacing with Other Types of Technology

Other Type of Technology	Total Agencies
Video recording technology	24
Real-time crime center technology[111]	20
Gunshot detection technology[112]	8
Body-worn camera technology	7
Audio recording technology	5
Computer-aided dispatch (CAD)	5
Record management system technology	4
Data synthesis technology[113]	2
Other technologies[114]	2

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

11. Various agency employees are authorized to conduct ALPR system data searches.

Agencies were asked which employees were authorized to conduct ALPR system data searches. Table 9 illustrates the types of employees who are authorized to conduct ALPR system data searches.[115]

Table 9: Types of Employees Authorized to Conduct ALPR System Data Searches

Type of Employees Authorized	Total Agencies	% Agencies
All Sworn Law Enforcement Officers	94	49%
Only Certain Sworn Law Enforcement Officers	83	43%
Only Certain Civilian (Non-Sworn) Employees	57	30%
All Civilian (Non-Sworn) Employees	1	1%
Other[116]	12	6%
Did Not Answer Question	6	3%

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[111] Real-time crime center technology examples include Fusus and Peregrine Technologies.
[112] Gunshot detection technology example includes ShotSpotter.
[113] Data synthesis technology examples include CrimeTracer or other search engines linking reports, arrests, CAD calls, booking data, etc.
[114] Other technologies reported by these agencies included mobile data terminal (MDT) technology and tax collection through local government technologies.
[115] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 191 and 100%, respectively, due to some agencies reporting more than one category of agency employee authorized to conduct ALPR system data searches.
[116] Other employees or combinations of employees reported by responding agencies included all sworn officers that have completed training, certain sworn officers and civilian employees that have completed training, chief of police only, dispatchers or communications officers, and crime analysts.

Agencies were also asked to briefly describe how their agency trains its employees to conduct searches of its ALPR system. Nearly all agencies, 95% (182 of 191), generally indicated that training took place prior to employees accessing and using their ALPR system. However, the manner in which such training was provided to employees varied widely across agencies, such as:

- Whether the training was in-person and/or online;
- Who was responsible for conducting the training (e.g., a representative from the law enforcement agency and/or a vendor training representative);
- Content of the training (e.g., agency policy, legal requirements, privacy protections, safety, and how to use the database); and,
- Frequency of any refresher training (e.g., bi-annual or annual).

12. Agencies reported that ALPR technology is used in various types of investigations.

Virginia law outlines the specific authorized purposes of ALPR use by law enforcement. While agencies are not required to report on specific uses until April 1, 2027,[117] the Crime Commission survey sought to capture the manner in which their ALPR technology has been used to assist in various types of investigations.

Criminal Investigations

One authorized purpose for ALPR use is "as part of a criminal investigation into an alleged violation of the Virginia Code or any ordinance of any county, city, or town where there is a reasonable suspicion that a crime was committed."[118]

In order to gain a cursory understanding of ALPR use in relation to certain types of criminal investigations, agencies were asked the frequency with which their agency's ALPR technology had been used to assist in a wide array of investigations.[119] Nearly all, 98% (188 of 191), agencies using ALPR technology responded to this question.[120] Table 10 illustrates the types of

[117] *See* House Bill 2724, enactment clause 7, at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724/text/CHAP0720.
[118] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(D) (2026).
[119] Survey respondents were asked to report if ALPR technology was used "very often" (e.g., multiple times a day), "often" (e.g., almost daily), "sometimes" (e.g., a few times a week), "rarely" (e.g., a few times a month), or "never" for each investigation type. This ordinal scale was transposed to a nominal scale of "at least some frequency" and "no frequency." The "at least some frequency" in ALPR use category combines the responses of "very often", "often", "sometimes", and "rarely" into one category, and the "no frequency" category combines the responses of "never" into the other category.
[120] Three agencies did not respond to this question.

investigations in which ALPR technology assisted with "at least some frequency." [121] The most commonly reported uses were for motor vehicle theft, larceny, criminal traffic offenses, burglary/B&E, assaults, and vandalism/destruction of property investigations.

Table 10: Frequency in Which ALPR System Technology Assisted in Investigations
(Agencies reporting "at least some frequency" of ALPR assisting with investigations)

Type of Investigation	Total Agencies	% Agencies
Motor Vehicle Theft (e.g., stolen or unauthorized use)	165	88%
Larceny (e.g., shoplifting receiving stolen goods, theft from vehicle)	164	87%
Criminal Traffic (e.g., hit and run, eluding, reckless driving)	149	79%
Burglary/B&E (e.g., residential or commercial)	144	77%
Assaults (simple or aggravated)	140	74%
Vandalism/Destruction of Property	138	73%
Drugs/Narcotics (distribution or possession)	135	72%
Weapon Law Violations	122	65%
Robberies	118	63%
Rapes or Other Sexual Assaults	111	59%
Fraud (e.g., bad checks, counterfeiting, forgery)	111	59%
Kidnappings/Abductions	105	56%
Homicide	100	53%
Trespassing	100	53%
Driving Under the Influence (DUI)	93	49%
Violation of protective orders	90	48%
Stalking	86	46%
Arson	68	36%
Human Trafficking	65	35%
Liquor Law Violations	52	28%

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*. n=188.

[121] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 188 and 100%, respectively, due to most agencies reporting more than one type of investigation with which their agency's ALPR technology assisted.

Active Investigations or Notifications Related to Certain Persons

Two other specific authorized purposes for law enforcement use of ALPR include:

- Part of an active investigation related to a missing or endangered person, including whether to issue an alert for such person, or a person associated with human trafficking; or,
- To receive notifications related to a missing or endangered person, a person with an outstanding warrant, a person associated with human trafficking, a stolen vehicle, or a stolen license plate.[122]

Staff also requested information to indicate whether their agency's ALPR system assisted with recovering a stolen vehicle, recovering a stolen license plate, locating a missing or endangered person, locating a human trafficking victim, locating a human trafficking suspect, apprehending a known suspect, and/or identifying an unknown suspect since January 1, 2026. Most, 86% (165 of 191), agencies using ALPR technology responded to this question.[123] These 165 agencies reported that ALPR assisted across a range of incidents since January 1, 2026:

- 80 agencies reported apprehending at least one known suspect;
- 75 agencies reported locating at least one missing or endangered person;
- 74 agencies reported identifying at least one unknown suspect;
- 55 agencies reported recovering at least one stolen vehicle;
- 54 agencies reported recovering at least one stolen license plate;
- 5 agencies reported locating at least one human trafficking suspect; and,
- 3 agencies reported locating at least one human trafficking victim.

13. No agencies reported using ALPR technology to enforce civil immigration laws.

Virginia law does not allow the use of ALPR technology to enforce civil immigration laws.[124] Agencies were asked if they were currently using ALPR technology to enforce civil immigration laws. 188 agencies responded that they were not using ALPR technology to enforce civil immigration laws. Three agencies did not answer the question.

14. Most agencies (163 of 191) reported that their ALPR systems "never" to "rarely" provided false positive hits or notifications; however, some agencies (22 of 191) reported that their systems "sometimes" to "very often" provided false positive hits or notifications.

[122] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(D) (2026).
[123] 26 agencies did not respond to this question.
[124] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(D) (2026).

One concern relating to ALPR use is the frequency of false positive hits and notifications.[125] Agencies were asked how often their ALPR system provided false positive hits or notifications. Slightly over half of responding agencies, 53% (101 of 191), indicated that their ALPR system "rarely" (e.g., a few times a month) provided false positive hits or notifications, with an additional 32% (62 of 191) reporting a frequency of "never." However, 12% (22 of 191) reported "sometimes," "often," or "very often" having false positive hits or notifications. Table 11 illustrates responses across all self-reported false positive hit or notification frequency levels.

Table 11: Frequency of ALPR System False Positive Hits or Notifications

Reported Frequency Level	Total Agencies	% Agencies
Never	62	32%
Rarely (e.g., a few times a month)	101	53%
Sometimes (e.g., a few times a week)	18	9%
Often (e.g., almost daily)	2	1%
Very Often (e.g., multiple times each day)	2	1%
Did Not Answer Question	6	3%
TOTAL	**191**	**100%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

15. Most agencies (160 of 191) conduct internal audits of ALPR searches at least every 30 days; however, some agencies (17 of 191) conduct such audits at more than 30-day intervals.

Virginia law requires that agencies have a policy to conduct internal audits of ALPR system searches at least every 30 days.[126] Agencies were asked how often internal audits of its ALPR system data searches were conducted. The large majority of responding agencies, 84% (160 of 191), reported that their agency conducted internal audits of its ALPR system data searches *at least* every 30 days, but 9% (17 of 191) reported that their audits occur at more than 30-day intervals.[127] Table 12 illustrates the number of agencies and their reported frequency of internal audits of ALPR system searches.

---

[125] *See, e.g.,* Koebler, J. 404 Media. (2026, July 13). *LAPD regularly pulled over innocent people because license plate readers flagged their cars as stolen*. https://www.404media.co/lapd-regularly-pulled-over-innocent-people-because-license-plate-readers-flagged-their-cars-as-stolen/. See also Macaluso, J., Griffin, D., Heikkila, A., and Matt, F. NBC News. (2026, Oct. 12). *Flock 'false flags' lead to frightening motorist encounters with police*. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/flock-false-flags-lead-frightening-motorist-encounters-police-rcna602484.

[126] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(H)(6) (2026).

[127] Participants were also asked to generally describe *how* their agencies conduct audits of the use of their ALPR system. Responses varied across agencies with many indicating a monthly review of all queries being conducted by a designated reviewer; a monthly review of randomly selected users by a designated reviewer; a review of queries for specific timeframes; use of audit assistance tools provided by the vendor; and, audits conducted by entities outside of the law enforcement agency (e.g., Virginia State Police, vendor).

Table 12: Frequency of ALPR System Internal Audits by Agencies

Frequency of Internal Audit	Number of Agencies	% Agencies
At Least Every 30 Days	160	84%
Over 30 Days	17	9%
Other[128]	*2*	1%
Uncertain	*7*	4%
Did Not Answer Question	5	3%
TOTAL	**191**	**100%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey.*

16. Most agencies (153 of 191) retain ALPR audit trail data for two years or less; however, some agencies (18 of 191) retain such data for more than two years.

Virginia law requires that law enforcement agencies purge ALPR audit trail data after two (2) years from the date of capture, unless such data is part of an ongoing investigation, prosecution, or civil action.[129] Agencies were asked to indicate the data retention period for their agency's audit trail data. As seen in Table 13, most responding agencies, 80% (153 of 191), reported data retention periods of 2 years or less, while others reported periods of over 2 years or indefinite retention. For the 18 agencies that reported audit trail data retention periods over 2 years, the data retention periods ranged from three (3) years to indefinite.[130]

Table 13: Audit Trail Data Retention Periods

Audit Trail Data Retention Period	Number of Agencies	% Agencies
Two Years or Less	153	80%
Over 2 Years	3	2%
Indefinite	15	8%
Unknown	5	3%
Other[131]	2	1%
Did Not Answer Question	13	7%
TOTAL	**191**	**100%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

[128] The other responses were that data was not retained and that an internal audit had not been completed since August 2026 when he became Chief.
[129] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(E) (2026).
[130] These 18 agencies include six city police departments, one college/university police department, one county police department, three primary sheriff's offices, and seven town police departments.
[131] One agency indicated that it does not retain the data and the other agency indicated that it depends on case disposition.

17. 81% (155 of 191) of agencies engaged in some type of public awareness measures relating to ALPR use; however, 27 agencies reported that they had not engaged in any public awareness measures.

Virginia law requires law enforcement agencies to promote public awareness of ALPR technology prior to implementing its use.[132] If an agency previously implemented ALPR and did not promote public awareness, the agency was required to promote such awareness by September 1, 2025.[133]

Agencies were asked to indicate which types of public awareness measures they had taken to inform the public about their use of ALPR technology. The large majority, 81% (155 of 191), of responding agencies indicated they had undertaken *at least one* public awareness measure relating to their agency's use of ALPR technology. Many agencies, however, indicated undertaking more than one measure. Specifically, 48% (91 of 191) of agencies reported engaging in two or more public awareness measures, while 34% (64 of 191) of agencies reported engaging in three or more measures. However, 14% (27 of 191) of responding agencies reported taking no public awareness measures relating to ALPR technology use.[134] An additional 5% (9 of 191) did not respond to this question. Table 14 illustrates the number of agencies that reported undertaking various public awareness measures.[135]

Table 14: ALPR Technology Public Awareness Measures by Agencies

Type of Public Awareness Measure	Total Agencies	% Agencies
Posting information on agency website	120	66%
Social media	61	34%
Presentations at local government meetings	53	29%
Meetings with community stakeholders	50	27%
Press releases	36	20%
Media interviews	34	19%
Roadway/community signage	4	2%
Other public awareness measures[136]	11	6%
Did not take any public awareness measures	27	15%

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*. n=182.

[132] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(R) (2026).
[133] 2025 Va. Acts ch. 720, enactment clause 12. *See* House Bill 2724 at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.
[134] These 27 agencies include one city police department, two college/university police departments, 8 primary sheriff's offices, two secondary sheriff's offices, and 14 town police departments.
[135] The number of agencies and percentages add up to over 182 and 100%, respectively, due to some agencies reporting that their agency engages in more than one type of public awareness measure.
[136] Other public awareness measures reported by these agencies included news reports, agency annual reports, Flock Safety transparency web portal, discussions with individual citizens, meetings with elected officials, and posting information on locality websites.

18. Most agencies (152 of 191) provide other Virginia law enforcement agencies with continuous access to their ALPR system data.

The Virginia ALPR statute only allows law enforcement agencies to share ALPR system data or audit trail data with other entities in Virginia as follows:

- Virginia law enforcement agency (see "law-enforcement officer" in Va. Code § 9.1-101);
- Commonwealth's Attorney;
- Criminal defendant or their counsel;
- Court order or a court-issued subpoena duces tecum in any criminal or civil proceeding;
- Vendor for maintenance or quality assurance purposes; or,
- To alert the public to an emergency situation, a missing or endangered person, a person associated with human trafficking, or a person with an outstanding warrant.[137]

Respondents were asked if their agency allows continuous access to its ALPR system data by any other Virginia law enforcement agencies. Continuous access was defined as another agency being able to access and search ALPR system data without making an individualized request to the agency for each search. The majority of responding agencies, 80% (152 of 191), indicated that their agency allows continuous access to other Virginia law enforcement agencies, while 18% (34 of 191) indicated that their agency does not allow continuous access to other Virginia law enforcement agencies.[138] Table 15 shows the number of agencies that allow continuance access to other Virginia law enforcement agencies by type of agency.

[137] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(F) (2026).
[138] Five agencies did not respond to this question.

Table 15: Agencies Allowing Continuous Access to Other Virginia Law Enforcement Agencies by Agency Type

Type of Agency	Total Responding Agencies Using ALPR	Total Agencies Allowing Continuous Access	% Agencies Allowing Continuous Access
City Police Departments	32	25	78%
College/University Police Departments	12	8	67%
County Police Departments	9	7	78%
Other Law Enforcement	2	0	0%
Other State Law Enforcement	1	1	100%
Primary Sheriff's Offices	63	56	89%
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	3	0	0%
Town Police Departments	68	54	79%
Virginia State Police	1	1	100%
TOTAL	**191**	**152**	**80%**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

19. One (1) agency reported continuously sharing ALPR system data with federal law enforcement agencies, however, that agency is no longer using an ALPR system.

Virginia law does not allow law enforcement agencies to share ALPR system data with federal law enforcement agencies, except pursuant to a court order or court-issued subpoena duces tecum.[139] Agencies were asked three questions in relation to any type of ALPR system data sharing with federal law enforcement agencies:

- Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to any federal law enforcement agency pursuant to some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? [140]
  - 3 agencies responded that they shared such data in this manner.
- Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to a federal law enforcement agency WITHOUT requiring some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? [141]
  - 5 agencies responded that they shared such data in this manner.

[139] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(F) (2026).
[140] Four agencies did not respond to this question.
[141] Four agencies did not respond to this question.

- Does your agency currently grant continuous access to its ALPR system data to any federal law enforcement agency?[142]
  - 1 agency reported continuously sharing ALPR system data with federal law enforcement agencies, however, that agency is no longer using an ALPR system.[143]

Table 16 illustrates the number of agencies that reported sharing ALPR system data with a federal law enforcement agency and how such data was shared by type of agency.

Table 16: ALPR Data Sharing with Federal Law Enforcement Agencies

Type of Agency	Shared With Some Form of Legal Process	Shared Without Some Form of Legal Process	Provided Continuous Access
City Police Departments	2	3	--
College/University Police Departments	--	--	1
County Police Departments	1	--	--
Other Law Enforcement	--	--	--
Other State Law Enforcement	--	--	--
Primary Sheriff's Offices	--	1	--
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	--	--	--
Town Police Departments	--	1	---
Virginia State Police	--	--	--
TOTAL	**3**	**5**	**1**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

The five (5) agencies that reported sharing ALPR system data with a federal law enforcement agency without requiring some form of legal process were asked to discuss the nature of the data that was shared. Responses varied across the agencies:

- Two agencies indicated sharing related to terrorist attacks and/or threats;
- One agency indicated sharing with a federal agent after a request for case assistance;
- One agency indicated sharing after a request related to a murder investigation; and,
- One agency indicated sharing when related to criminal investigations only.

[142] Four agencies did not respond to this question.
[143] This agency reported that they ended their contract and discontinued use with their ALPR vendor on August 21, 2026 (personal communication, 2026, October 29).

20. Four (4) agencies reported continuously sharing ALPR system data with other state law enforcement agencies.

Virginia law also does not allow law enforcement agencies to share ALPR system data with other state law enforcement agencies, except pursuant to a court order or court-issued subpoena duces tecum.[144] Similarly, agencies were asked three questions in relation to any type of ALPR system data sharing with other state law enforcement agencies:

- Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to any law enforcement agency in another state pursuant to some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)?[145]
  - 5 agencies responded that they shared such data in this manner.
- Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to a law enforcement agency in another state WITHOUT requiring some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)?[146]
  - 4 agencies responded that they shared such data in this manner.
- Does your agency currently grant continuous access to its ALPR system data to any other law enforcement agency in another state?[147]
  - 4 agencies responded that they shared such data in this manner.

Table 17 illustrates the number of agencies that reported sharing ALPR system data with a law enforcement agency in another state and how such data was shared by type of agency.

[144] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(F) (2026).
[145] Four agencies did not respond to this question.
[146] Four agencies did not respond to this question.
[147] Four agencies did not respond to this question.

Table 17: ALPR Data Sharing with Other State Law Enforcement Agencies

Type of Agency	Shared With Some Form of Legal Process	Shared Without Some Form of Legal Process	Provided Continuous Access
City Police Departments	--	1	--
College/University Police Departments	--	--	--
County Police Departments	2	--	--
Other Law Enforcement	--	--	--
Other State Law Enforcement	--	--	--
Primary Sheriff's Offices	2	2	1
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	--	--	--
Town Police Departments	--	--	3
Virginia State Police	1	1	--
TOTAL	**5**	**4**	**4**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

The four (4) agencies that reported sharing ALPR system data with a law enforcement agency in another state without requiring some form of legal process were asked to discuss the nature of the data that was shared. Responses varied across the agencies:

- One agency indicated sharing with a neighboring jurisdiction after a request for case assistance;
- One agency indicated sharing occurred because a law enforcement agency in another state has access to their cameras;
- One agency indicated sharing occurred due to unauthorized use; and,
- One agency indicated sharing related to a burglary suspect in another state.

21. Over one-third (64 of 184) of agencies have continuous access to the ALPR system data of other private entities or government agencies in Virginia.

Virginia law does not prohibit private citizens, businesses, organizations, government agencies, or other entities from sharing their ALPR system data with Virginia law enforcement agencies.[148]

Agencies were asked to indicate if other entities provided their agency with continuous access to their ALPR system data. The majority of responding agencies, 65% (125 of 191), indicated that no entities provided their agency with continuous access to their ALPR data.[149] However, some agencies, 35% (65 of 184), did report that certain entities provided their agency with continuous

[148] *See* VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517 (2026).
[149] One agency did not respond to this question.

ALPR system data access, as illustrated in Table 18.[150] These 65 agencies reported that the following entities as provided continuous access:

- 48 agencies reported that at least one corporate business was providing such access;
- 18 agencies reported that at least one homeowner's association was providing such access;
- 10 agencies reported at least one local business was providing such access;
- 5 agencies reported at least one non-law enforcement government agency was providing such access;[151]
- 4 agencies reported at least one other entity was providing such access;[152]
- 2 agencies reported at least one individual citizen was providing such access; and,
- 1 agency reported at least one private organization was providing such access.[153]

22. 10% (20 of 191) of agencies reported instances of unauthorized use of their ALPR systems.

Virginia's ALPR statute punishes unauthorized access of an ALPR system, as well as unlawful dissemination of ALPR system data or audit trail data, as a Class 1 misdemeanor.[154] Agencies were asked whether they identified any incidents of unauthorized use of their ALPR system by any of their employees. The majority of responding agencies, 87% (167 of 191), reported that their agency had not identified any unauthorized use of its ALPR system by any of its employees. However, 10% (20 of 191) of agencies reported identifying unauthorized use of its ALPR system by an agency employee. An additional 2% (4 of 191) did not respond to this question. Table 18 illustrates the total number of agencies that reported identifying unauthorized use of its ALPR system by any of its employees by agency type.

[150] The number of agencies adds up to over 65 due to some agencies reporting that more than one type of entity providing continuous access.
[151] For example, public works, parking services, etc.
[152] For example, private apartment complexes, redevelopment and housing authorities, towing services, correctional facilities, etc.
[153] For example, places of worship, private schools, healthcare, sports or recreational venues, etc.
[154] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(N) (2026).

Table 18: Agencies Reporting Unauthorized Use by Agency Type

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies
City Police Departments	6
College/University Police Departments	1
County Police Departments	2
Other Law Enforcement	--
Other State Law Enforcement	--
Primary Sheriff's Offices	5
Secondary Sheriff's Offices	--
Town Police Departments	5
Virginia State Police	1
TOTAL	**20**

Source: Virginia State Crime Commission – *2026 Virginia Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey*.

The agencies that identified unauthorized use of their ALPR systems described the nature of the unauthorized use, such as:

- Searches for federal agencies;
- Searches for out-of-state agencies;
- Searches for other Virginia state law enforcement agencies;
- Officers searching for their own license plates;
- Queries coded incorrectly; and,
- Using incorrect or vague justifications for a search (e.g., using a federal warrant number instead of an internal case/call/warrant number).

Of the 20 agencies that identified unauthorized use, 13 provided the actions taken by the agency to remediate the unauthorized use, including:

- Remedial training;
- Actions taken in accordance with department policy;
- Investigation by the Virginia State Police;
- Notification to command staff;
- Referral to the department's internal affairs;
- Disciplinary action; and,
- Internal investigation resulting in separation.

Agency Survey Comments

Law enforcement agencies were requested to provide additional information on ALPR use to the Crime Commission. Most responses focused on:

- Significant public safety benefits of ALPR;
- Various types of crimes where ALPR use assisted law enforcement agencies;
- Enhanced officer safety due to the utilization of ALPR;
- ALPR allowing officers to use their time and resources more effectively;
- Considerations on how future changes to the ALPR statute could impact agencies, specifically smaller agencies; and,
- Suggestions for less burdensome and more streamlined data reporting.

Virginia Community Policing Act Data

Effective July 1, 2020, Virginia law enforcement agencies are required to collect certain data each time a law enforcement officer stops a driver of a motor vehicle, stops and frisks a person based on reasonable suspicion, or temporarily detains a person during any other investigatory stop.[155] Beginning January 1, 2026, law enforcement agencies are also required to report whether an ALPR notification was received prior to any such traffic and other investigatory stop ("stops") and, if so, the reason for the ALPR notification.[156] Staff completed an analysis of preliminary Virginia Community Policing Act data reported for the time period of January 1, 2026, to September 30, 2026.[157]

During this time, Virginia law enforcement agencies reported a total of 987,347 stops, of which less than 1% (759 of 987,347) were reported as being related to an ALPR notification.[158] If a stop was initiated as a result of an ALPR notification, then the law enforcement agency is required to

---

[155] VA. CODE ANN. § 52-30.2(C)(iii) (2026). *See also* Virginia State Police. (2026). *Community Policing Act Data Collection: Instructions and Technical Specifications, Version 6*. https://vsp.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Community-Policing-Data-Instructions-Technical-Specifications-v6_updated-20260227.pdf. This is a guidance document for the reporting of traffic and other investigatory stops provided by the Virginia State Police. Reporting requirements are defined on p. 5.

[156] *Id.*

[157] *See* Virginia Open Data Portal. *Community Policing Act data.* (July 1, 2020, to present). https://data.virginia.gov/dataset/community-policing-data. However, staff was provided with the most recently available preliminary Q1 to Q3 data directly from the Virginia State Police on October 28, 2026, for this analysis.

[158] These 987,347 reported stops involved 991,622 persons who were subject to investigatory detention as a result of such stops. Staff define ALPR-related stops as both stops initiated by an LPR query or hit and stops indicating a specific reason for which an LPR notification was received, regardless of whether an LPR query or hit was identified as the initial reason for the stop. The reason for initiating the stop was identified as an LPR query or hit in 94% (712 of 759) of these stops. The remaining 6% (47) of ALPR-related stops were initiated by another type of event, the majority of which were a traffic violation (72%; 34 of 47). The 759 ALPR-related stops were reported by 86 law enforcement agencies. At least one (1) ALPR-related stop was initiated in 61% (81 of 133) of localities in Virginia from January through September 2026.

indicate up to three specific reasons that such notification was received.[159] The reasons indicated for receiving an ALPR notification for the 759 ALPR-related stops included:[160]

- 29% (217 of 759) for an "other criminal investigation";
- 23% (178 of 759) for a stolen vehicle;
- 23% (175 of 759) for a stolen license plate;
- 20% (153 of 759) for an outstanding warrant or wanted person;
- 4% (29 of 759) for a missing person;
- 1% (6 of 759) for an endangered person; and,
- 1% (4 of 759) for human trafficking.

These 759 ALPR-related stops involved 789 persons who were subject to investigatory detention. Table 19 illustrates some of the demographic and situational information of these persons subjected to ALPR-related stops between January 1, 2026, and September 30, 2026.

As seen in Table 19, 74% (582 of 789) of persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop were male. Further, although 52% (412 of 789) of persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop were White, 42% (332 of 789) of persons were Black. This finding is notable in that Black persons comprise approximately 20% of Virginia's overall population, but accounted for 42% of all persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop during this time period.[161]

Based on this preliminary data, staff also examined the intersection between the race and gender of persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop. The data revealed that 38% (303 of 789) of persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop were White males and that 32% (253 of 789) of these persons were Black males. This finding is notable because Black males comprise approximately 9% of Virginia's overall population, yet accounted for 32% of all persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of an ALPR-related stop during this timeframe.[162]

---

[159] Virginia State Police. (2026). *Community Policing Act Data Collection: Instructions and Technical Specifications, Version 6*. https://vsp.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Community-Policing-Data-Instructions-Technical-Specifications-v6_updated-20260227.pdf. Guidance on reporting *LPR Notification* is defined on p. 13.

[160] Three (3) ALPR-related stops indicated more than one reason for receiving a LPR notification. As a result, the total number of stops and percentage adds up to over 759 and 100%, respectively.

[161] *See, e.g.,* United States Census Bureau. *QuickFacts- Virginia* at https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/VA.

[162] *See, e.g.,* United States Census Bureau. American Community Survey Data for 2022 - Virginia, Male, African American, Population at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data/data-via-ftp.html. This data source showed that African American males comprised 9% (785,066 of 8,683,619) of Virginia's population in 2022.

Table 19: Demographics and Situational Information of Persons Subject to Investigatory Detention as a Result of ALPR-related Stops (January 1, 2026 - September 30, 2026).

Demographics and Situational Information	Number of Persons	Percentage of Total
Person Type[163]		
Driver	691	88%
Passenger	39	5%
Other Individual	59	7%
Gender[164]		
Male	582	74%
Female	197	25%
Other or Unknown Gender	10	1%
Race[165]		
White	412	52%
Black or African American	332	42%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander	18	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	<1%
Unknown Race	26	3%
Age[166]		
17 Years or Younger	27	3%
18-24 Years Old	150	19%
25-34 Years Old	209	26%
35-44 Years Old	172	22%
45-54 Years Old	124	16%
55-64 Years Old	57	7%
65 Years or Older	45	6%
Unknown Age	5	1%
Most Serious Action Taken[167]		
Arrest	342	43%
No Enforcement Action Taken	202	26%
Issued Citation or Summons	134	17%
Issued a Warning	111	14%
Whether Person Searched[168]		
Yes	372	47%
Whether Vehicle Searched[169]		
Yes	205	26%
Whether Force Used by Officer Against Person[170]		

[163] Virginia State Police. (2026). *Community Policing Act Data Collection: Instructions and Technical Specifications, Version 6*. https://vsp.virginia.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Community-Policing-Data-Instructions-Technical-Specifications-v6_updated-20260227.pdf. Guidance on reporting *person type* is defined on p. 14: "Indicate whether the person subject to investigatory detention is a Driver, Passenger, or Other Individual. Data should only be collected on persons that are the direct subjects of investigatory detention."
[164] *Id.* Guidance on reporting *gender* is defined on p. 16.
[165] *Id.* Guidance on reporting *race* is provided on pp. 14-15.
[166] *Id.* Guidance on reporting *age* is provided on p. 16.
[167] *Id.* Guidance on reporting *most serious action taken* is provided on p. 17.
[168] *Id.* Guidance on reporting whether *person searched* is provided on p. 19.
[169] *Id.* Guidance on reporting whether *vehicle searched* is provided on p. 20. Note: this includes 190 ALPR-related stops involving 205 persons subject to investigatory detention as a result of the stops.
[170] *Id.* Guidance on reporting whether *force used by officer* is provided on p. 20.

Yes	23	3%
Whether Force Used by Person Against Officer[171]		
Yes	13	2%
TOTAL	**789**	**100%**

Source: Virginia State Police, Virginia Community Policing Act. Preliminary Q1 to Q3 data provided to staff on 10/28/26. Analysis and table prepared by Crime Commission staff.

Unauthorized Use – Charge and Conviction Data

As previously noted, Virginia's ALPR statute punishes unauthorized use of an ALPR system as a Class 1 misdemeanor.[172] This criminal penalty took effect on July 1, 2025. Staff requested the total number of charges filed under Virginia Code § 2.2-5517(N) in Virginia district and circuit courts since July 1, 2025.[173] As of October 19, 2026, five charges involving one individual were filed in one district court and two charges involving another individual were filed in another district court.[174] All seven charges are still pending due to the recentness of the filing dates.[175] No charges were identified in any circuit court, and no convictions were identified in any Virginia court.[176] The seven charges in the two district courts appear to be related to allegations of unauthorized use by a former James City County Police Officer,[177] as well as by an intelligence investigator with the Chesterfield County Police Department.[178]

In addition, media reports have highlighted other incidents of alleged unauthorized use that did not result in criminal charges at the Richmond City Police Department,[179] the Henrico County Fire Marshal's Office,[180] and the Smithfield Police Department.[181] Finally, a media report also

[171] *Id.* Guidance on reporting whether *force used by subject* is provided on p. 20.
[172] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(N) (2026).
[173] Data provided by Virginia Supreme Court, Office of the Executive Secretary, general district court case management system, July 1, 2025 - October 19, 2026; Fairfax Circuit Court case management system, July 1, 2025 - October 19, 2026; and, Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission analysis of Virginia Supreme Court, OES, general district and circuit court case management systems, July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026.
[174] Virginia Supreme Court, Office of the Executive Secretary, general district court case management system, July 1, 2025 - October 19, 2026.
[175] *Id.*
[176] Virginia Supreme Court, Office of the Executive Secretary, general district court case management system, July 1, 2025 - October 19, 2026; Fairfax Circuit Court case management system, July 1, 2025 -October 19, 2026; and, Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission analysis of Virginia Supreme Court, OES, general district and circuit court case management systems, July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026.
[177] *See* Schlosser, P. James City County Government. (2026, Sept. 30). *Former James City County police officer charged following criminal investigation*. https://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/m/newsflash/home/detail/6916.
[178] *See* Mirshahi, D. VPM. (2026, Oct. 2). *Chesterfield police employee charged with misuse of Flock cameras*. https://www.vpm.org/news/2026-10-02/chesterfield-police-flock-safety-cameras-alprs-carpenter-jones-sturtevant-schmidt/.
[179] WTVR Web Staff. (2026, Apr. 30). *Richmond police sergeant loses Flock access after policy violation*. https://www.wtvr.com/news/local-news/richmond/richmond-police-flock-violation-april-30-2026.
[180] Henrico News. Henrico County, Virginia. (2026, Aug. 20). *Fire investigators' access to ALPR system removed in accordance with state law*. https://henrico.gov/news/2026/08/fire-investigators-access-to-alpr-system-removed-in-accordance-with-state-law/.
[181] Dujardin, P. The Virginia-Pilot. (2026, Oct. 11). *Smithfield police violated state law by sharing Flock data with FBI after ODU shooting*. https://www.pilotonline.com/2026/10/11/smithfield-police-shared-flock-data-with-fbi-after-odu-shooting-that-violated-state-law/.

identified a charge related to ALPR misuse by an officer in the South Hill Police Department for conduct that occurred in April 2025 before the new criminal penalty took effect.[182]

Statewide Reporting on ALPR Use Data

The ALPR statute requires comprehensive annual reporting on law enforcement use of ALPR beginning in 2027. Virginia law enforcement agencies must provide their first report on ALPR use to VSP by April 1, 2027,[183] and VSP must publish a statewide aggregate report with this data by July 1, 2027.[184] The Crime Commission will also continue to report on ALPR, with the next report due by July 1, 2027, and for each of the five years thereafter.[185]

Conclusion

Benefits and concerns continue to exist relating to the use of ALPR systems. Virginia enacted legislation in 2025 with numerous requirements to govern law enforcement agency use of ALPR systems. Prior to the passage of this legislation, there were no statewide laws, regulations, or policies governing law enforcement agency use of ALPR in Virginia. Most of the provisions of Virginia's ALPR statute took effect on July 1, 2025; however, some portions of the legislation had delayed effective dates.

Crime Commission staff disseminated surveys to all Virginia law enforcement agencies on ALPR use in November 2025 and August 2026. The response rate to the 2026 survey was substantially higher than the 2025 survey. About half of Virginia's law enforcement agencies reported using ALPR technology. Last year's survey findings revealed several areas of non-compliance that were concerning regarding agency policies, data retention, and data sharing. This year's survey found that far fewer agencies reported non-compliance in these areas. However, survey results indicate that some law enforcement agencies are not in compliance with other components of the ALPR statute. Further, while instances of improper ALPR system data sharing and unauthorized ALPR system use were identified, those occurrences have been rare.

Law enforcement agencies using ALPR systems started reporting data on ALPR-related stops under the Virginia Community Policing Act in January 2026. Agencies must report more comprehensive data on ALPR use to VSP by April 1, 2027. Agencies must also publicly post this data on their agency or locality website. The VSP must publish its first annual report based on this data by July 1, 2027. The Crime Commission will report on ALPR use by July 1, 2027, and will continue reporting annually for the five years thereafter.

---

[182] Nadeau, R. WRIC. (2025, Dec. 18). *Central Virginia officer accused of using police technology to snoop on ex's new boyfriend*. https://www.wric.com/news/local-news/mecklenburg-county/officer-accused-using-police-technology-snoop-new-boyfriend/.
[183] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(I) (2026).
[184] VA. CODE ANN. § 2.2-5517(J) (2026).
[185] 2025 Va. Acts ch. 720, enactment clause 11. *See* House Bill 2724 at https://lis.virginia.gov/bill-details/20251/HB2724.

The Virginia ALPR statute imposes numerous requirements on law enforcement agencies that use this technology, as well as various reporting measures to ensure that the public and the General Assembly are informed on how this technology is being used. Additional requirements could be added to monitor and enforce compliance, such as independent auditing, enforcement action by the Attorney General, sanctions against officers who misuse ALPR, requiring written data sharing agreements, or explicit prohibitions against using ALPR for immigration and protected health care matters.

APPENDIX A:

ALPR CHECKLIST FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

ALPR CHECKLIST FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) System Statutory Requirements
Virginia Code § 2.2-5517

Requirements Effective 7/1/25 Unless Otherwise Noted

☐ **Use ALPR only for the following authorized purposes:**
- As part of a criminal investigation into an alleged violation of the Virginia Code or any ordinance of any county, city, or town where there is a reasonable suspicion that a crime was committed;
- As part of an active investigation related to a missing or endangered person, including whether to issue an alert for such person, or a person associated with human trafficking; or,
- To receive notifications related to a missing or endangered person, a person with an outstanding warrant, a person associated with human trafficking, a stolen vehicle, or a stolen license plate.

☐ **Do not use ALPR to interfere with individuals engaged in lawful activities or to track individuals on the basis of lawfully protected speech.**

☐ **Purge ALPR system data after 21 days from the date of capture, unless such data is part of an ongoing investigation, prosecution, or civil action.**

☐ **Purge ALPR audit trail data after 2 years from the date of capture, unless such data is part of an ongoing investigation, prosecution, or civil action.**

☐ **Do not sell ALPR system or audit trail data.**

☐ **Do not share ALPR system or audit trail data with any other state, federal, private, or commercial entity.**

☐ **Only share ALPR system or audit trail data in Virginia as follows:**
- Virginia law enforcement agency (see "law-enforcement officer" in Va. Code § 9.1-101);
- Commonwealth's Attorney;
- Criminal defendant or their counsel;
- Court order or a court-issued subpoena duces tecum in any criminal or civil proceeding;
- Vendor for maintenance or quality assurance purposes; or,
- To alert the public to an emergency situation, a missing or endangered person, a person associated with human trafficking, or a person with an outstanding warrant.

☐ **Establish an agency policy on ALPR use and publicly post such policy on your agency or locality website.**
(See subsection H; see also Virginia ALPR System Model Policy)

☐ **Promote public awareness of your agency's use of ALPR.**

☐ **Do not install ALPR devices on state highway right-of-ways.**
(ALPR devices installed prior to 7/1/25 must have a permit from VDOT)

☐ **Report data on traffic stops related to ALPR notifications to Virginia State Police (VSP) as required by the Virginia Community Policing Act.**
(See Va. Code § 52-30.2; effective 1/1/26)

☐ **Use an ALPR system approved by the Division of Purchases and Supply (DPS).**
(See DPS Standards & Specifications for approved list; effective 7/1/26)

☐ **Ensure that any contract with an ALPR vendor includes the following:**
- ALPR system data and audit trail data will be the property of the law-enforcement agency;
- ALPR system meets the requirements for approval by the DPS; and,
- The vendor will immediately notify the law enforcement agency upon receipt of any subpoena duces tecum, execution of any search warrant, or any other request from a third party for such system data or audit trail data, unless disclosure of such subpoena duces tecum, search warrant, or request is otherwise prohibited by law (effective 7/1/26).

☐ **Report specific data to VSP by April 1 of each year and publicly post such data on your agency or locality website.**
(See subsection I; first report and public posting due by 4/1/27)

☐ **Respond to Crime Commission surveys on ALPR use.**

APPENDIX B:

STATE ALPR STATUTES (AS OF OCTOBER 30, 2026)

State ALPR Statutes (as of October 30, 2026)

State	Statute(s)
Alabama	Ala. Code § 41-9-620 Ala. Admin. Code r. § 265-X-6
Arkansas	Ark. Code Ann. § 12-12-1801 et seq.
California	Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.90.5 et seq. Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.29 Cal. Veh. Code § 2413
Colorado	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-72-113
Connecticut	Act of May 4, 2026, 2026 Conn. Acts 14 (Reg. Sess.) (Pub. Act No. 26-14)
Florida	Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 316.0777 and 316.0778
Georgia	Ga. Code Ann. § 35-1-22
Idaho	Idaho Code § 49-1432
Illinois	625 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/2-130
Kentucky	Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 189.632
Maine	Me. Stat. tit. 29-A, § 2117-A
Maryland	Md. Code Ann., Pub. Safety § 3-509
Minnesota	Minn. Stat. §§ 13.82, 13.824, and 626.8472
Montana	Mont. Code Ann. § 46-5-117 et seq.
Nebraska	Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 60-3201 et seq.
New Hampshire	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 261:75-b
New Jersey	A.G. Directive No. 2022-12 N.J. Stat. Ann. § 52:4CC-1 et seq.
New Mexico	N.M. Stat. Ann. § 29-22-1 et. seq.
North Carolina	N.C. Gen. Stat. § 20-183.30 et seq.
Oregon	Act of Mar. 31, 2026, 2026 Or. Laws ch. 77, §§ 4–9
Tennessee	Tenn. Code Ann. § 55-10-302
Utah	Utah Code Ann. § 41-6a-2001 et seq.
Vermont	Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 23, § 1607 et seq. (Note: Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 23, § 1609 prohibits ALPR use by government agency on or after July 1, 2027)
Virginia	Va. Code Ann. § 2.2-5517; § 9.1-116.10
Washington	Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 10.130.030 et seq.

Note: Indiana (regulation of use by homeowners' associations), Iowa (traffic enforcement), Kansas (definition in the Kansas Open Records Act), Michigan (included in General Schedule #11 for data retention by local law enforcement), and Oklahoma (uninsured vehicle enforcement program) also reference ALPR in their state laws.

APPENDIX C:

CRIME COMMISSION 2026 LAW ENFORCEMENT ALPR USE SURVEY

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Contact Information

The Virginia State Crime Commission is conducting a statewide survey of Virginia law enforcement agencies to assess their use of Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) systems and evaluate compliance with Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

Please respond to this online survey by August 31, 2026 (even if your agency does not currently use ALPR technology).

The results of this survey will be included in the Crime Commission's November 2026 report to the General Assembly. Individual survey responses may not be kept confidential.

If you have any questions, contact Kashea Kovacs at kkovacs@vscc.virginia.gov or (804) 967-3939.

"Automatic license plate recognition system" or "system" means a system of one or more high-speed cameras used in combination with computer algorithms to convert images of license plates, vehicles, or a combination of both into computer-readable data (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517).

*** 1. Law Enforcement Agency:**

*** 2. Name:**

*** 3. Email:**

*** 4. Is your agency currently using any type of ALPR technology? (Please select one.)**

- ◯ Yes (If YES, continue to the next section)
- ◯ No (If NO, thank you for completing this survey)

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency ALPR System Vendors

"Vendor" means a business, company, corporation, or other nongovernmental entity that contracts with a law-enforcement agency for the installation, use, or maintenance of an automatic license plate recognition system (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517).

5. In which of the following ways does your agency currently own, lease, or otherwise access ALPR technology? (Select all that apply.)

- [ ] Our agency owns ALPR system equipment/hardware and contracts with a vendor to access ALPR system software.
- [ ] Our agency contracts with a vendor for both ALPR system equipment/hardware and system software.
- [ ] Our agency accesses an ALPR system through a subscription with a vendor.
- [ ] Our agency is authorized to access another law enforcement agency's ALPR system.
- [ ] Our agency is using an ALPR system without a contract with a vendor.
- [ ] Other (please specify):

6. Which ALPR vendor(s) does your agency currently use? (Select all that apply.)

- [ ] Axon
- [ ] Flock Safety
- [ ] Motorola
- [ ] Leonardo
- [ ] Other (please specify):

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency ALPR System Cameras and Data Retention Periods

See Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

7. How many ALPR system cameras does your agency currently own or lease?

(Note: The terms "camera," "reader," and "device" are used interchangeably. One camera = one reader = one device)

Total Number of Fixed ALPR Cameras (mounted in a stationary location):

Total Number of Mobile ALPR Cameras (mounted in or on a patrol vehicle):

Total Number of Portable ALPR Cameras (movable for use in multiple locations):

Other (please specify the type and total number of cameras):

8. Have any of your agency's ALPR system cameras been vandalized?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If YES, please briefly discuss:

9. What is the data retention period (in days) for the ALPR system cameras your agency currently owns or leases?

Fixed ALPR Cameras:

Mobile ALPR Cameras:

Portable ALPR Cameras:

Other (please specify the type and total number of cameras):

10. Is your agency's ALPR system(s) currently integrated or interfaced with any of the following technologies? (Select all that apply.)

- [ ] Audio recording technology
- [ ] Body-worn camera technology
- [ ] Computer-aided dispatch (CAD)
- [ ] Data synthesis technology (e.g., CrimeTracer or other search engine linking reports, arrests, CAD calls, booking data)
- [ ] Facial recognition technology
- [ ] Gunshot detection technology (e.g., ShotSpotter)
- [ ] Record management system technology
- [ ] Real-time crime center technology (e.g., Fusus, Peregrine Technologies)
- [ ] Video recording technology
- [ ] None of the above
- [ ] Other (please specify):

11. Which of the following entities provide your agency with continuous access to their ALPR data? (Select all that apply.)

- [ ] Corporate business(es) (e.g., Costco, Lowes, Target, Walmart)
- [ ] Homeowners association(s)
- [ ] Individual citizen(s)
- [ ] Local business(es)
- [ ] Non-law enforcement government agency (e.g., public works, parking services)
- [ ] Private organization(s) (e.g., places of worship, private schools, healthcare, sports or recreational venues)
- [ ] None of the above
- [ ] Other entities (please specify):

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency Use of ALPR

See Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

*** 12. Does your agency currently have a policy or policies relating to the use of its ALPR technology? (Please select one.)**

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Other (e.g., in approval process, in development):

*** 13. Please provide the website link(s) where your agency's ALPR policy or policies are publicly available:**

14. Which of the following public awareness measures has your agency taken to inform the public about its use of ALPR technology? (Select all that apply.)

- ☐ Information on agency website
- ☐ Mailings/flyers
- ☐ Media interviews
- ☐ Meetings with community stakeholders
- ☐ Press releases
- ☐ Public presentations at local government meetings
- ☐ Roadway/community signage (signs on roads or in neighborhoods indicating ALPR in use)
- ☐ Social media
- ☐ Our agency has not taken any public awareness measures relating to its ALPR system use
- ☐ Other (please specify):

15. How frequently has your agency's ALPR technology been used to assist in the following types of investigations? (Please select one response per row.)

Frequency scale: Rarely (e.g., a few times a month), Sometimes (e.g., a few times a week), Often (e.g., almost daily), Very Often (e.g., multiple times each day)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Uncertain
Homicides	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Aggravated assaults	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Simple assaults	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Robberies	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Rapes or other sexual assaults	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Stalking	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Violation of protective orders	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Kidnappings/abductions	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Human trafficking	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Burglary/B&E (e.g., residential or commercial)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Larceny (e.g., shoplifting, receiving stolen goods, theft from vehicle)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Motor vehicle theft (e.g., stolen or unauthorized use)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Vandalism/destruction of property	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Trespassing	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Arson	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Fraud (e.g., bad checks, counterfeiting, forgery)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Criminal traffic (e.g., hit and run, eluding, reckless driving)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Driving under the influence (DUI)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Drugs/narcotics distribution	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Drugs/narcotics possession	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Liquor law violations	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Weapon law violations	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

16. Since January 1, 2026, has your agency captured any data on the number of ALPR system queries based on the type of criminal offense? (Please select one.)

(*See* Virginia Code § 2.2-5517(I)(3))

◯ Yes (If YES, please go to Question #17)

◯ No (If NO, please go to Question #18)

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency Use of ALPR

See Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

17. Since January 1, 2026, approximately how many ALPR system queries were conducted for the following types of criminal offenses? (Please indicate the approximate number of queries by offense type; if none, enter 0.)

Homicides	
Aggravated assaults	
Simple assaults	
Robberies	
Rapes or other sexual assaults	
Stalking	
Violation of protective orders	
Kidnappings/abductions	
Human trafficking	
Burglary/B&E (e.g., residential or commercial)	
Larceny (e.g., shoplifting, receiving stolen goods, theft from vehicle)	
Motor vehicle theft (e.g., stolen or unauthorized use)	
Vandalism/destruction of property	
Trespassing	
Arson	
Fraud (e.g., bad checks, counterfeiting, forgery)	
Criminal traffic (e.g., hit and run, eluding, reckless driving)	
Driving under the influence (DUI)	
Drugs/narcotics distribution	
Drugs/narcotics possession	
Liquor law violations	
Weapon law violations	
Other (please specify):	

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency Use of ALPR

18. Since January 1, 2026, approximately how many times has your agency's ALPR system assisted with any of the following? (Indicate approximate number of times; if none, enter 0.)

Recovered a stolen vehicle	
Recovered a stolen license plate	
Located a missing or endangered person	
Located a human trafficking victim	
Located a human trafficking suspect	
Apprehended a known suspect	
Identified an unknown suspect	
Other (please specify):	

19. Is your agency currently using ALPR technology to enforce civil immigration laws? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

20. How frequently does your agency's ALPR system provide false positive hits or notifications? (Please select one.)

(A "false positive" is when an ALPR camera incorrectly reads a plate, e.g., 8 for a B.)

- ◯ Never
- ◯ Rarely (e.g., a few times a month)
- ◯ Sometimes (e.g., a few times a week)
- ◯ Often (e.g., almost daily)
- ◯ Very Often (e.g., multiple times each day)

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Agency ALPR System Data Sharing with Other Virginia Law Enforcement Agencies

"Continuous access" means that another agency is able to access and search your agency's ALPR system data without making an individualized request to your agency for each search.

"System data" means all forms of data collected or generated by an automatic license plate recognition system, including images of license plates, vehicles, any identifying characteristics of vehicles, the date, time, and location of an image, and any peripheral images collected from which analytical data may be extracted (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517).

21. Does your agency currently allow continuous access to its ALPR system data to any Virginia law enforcement agencies? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

22. How many of the following types of Virginia law enforcement agencies currently have continuous access to your agency's ALPR system data? (Indicate number of agencies; if none, enter 0.)

Number of local law enforcement agencies:	
Number of state law enforcement agencies:	
Number of campus law enforcement agencies:	
Number of private law enforcement agencies:	
Number of other Virginia law enforcement agencies:	

23. Since January 1, 2026, have any of the following types of Virginia law enforcement agencies made an individualized request for your agency's ALPR system data? (Select all that apply.)

"Individualized request" means that the other entity asked your agency to conduct a search of your agency's ALPR system data for information needed by that entity.

- [ ] Virginia local law enforcement agency
- [ ] Virginia state law enforcement agency
- [ ] Virginia campus law enforcement agency
- [ ] Virginia private law enforcement agency
- [ ] Not applicable. No Virginia law enforcement agency has made an individualized request since January 1, 2026.
- [ ] Other (please specify):

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

ALPR System Data Sharing with Federal Law Enforcement Agencies

See Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

24. Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to any federal law enforcement agency pursuant to some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

25. Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to a federal law enforcement agency WITHOUT requiring some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If YES, please discuss the nature of the data that was shared:

26. Does your agency currently grant continuous access to its ALPR system data to any federal law enforcement agency? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

ALPR System Data Sharing with Other State Law Enforcement Agencies

See Virginia Code § 2.2-5517.

27. Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to any law enforcement agency in another state pursuant to some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

28. Since January 1, 2026, has your agency provided any of its ALPR system data to a law enforcement agency in another state WITHOUT requiring some form of legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena)? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If YES, please discuss the nature of the data that was shared:

29. Does your agency currently grant continuous access to its ALPR system data to any other law enforcement agency in another state? (Please select one.)

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

ALPR System Audits

"Audit trail" means all records of queries and responses in an automatic license plate recognition system, and all records of actions in which system data is accessed, entered, updated, shared, or disseminated, including the (i) date and time of access; (ii) license plate number or other data elements used to query the system; (iii) specific purpose, as set forth in subsection D, for accessing or querying the system, including the offense type for any criminal investigation; (iv) associated call for service or case number; and (v) username of the person or persons who accessed or queried the system (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517).

"Audit trail data" means all forms of data collected or generated by an automatic license plate recognition system for purposes of producing an audit trail (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517).

30. What is the data retention period for your agency's ALPR audit trail data?

31. Which employees of your agency are authorized to conduct ALPR system data searches? (Select all that apply.)

- [ ] All sworn law enforcement officers
- [ ] Only certain sworn law enforcement officers
- [ ] All civilian (non-sworn) employees
- [ ] Only certain civilian (non-sworn) employees
- [ ] Other (please specify):

32. Briefly describe how your agency trains its employees on conducting searches of its ALPR system data:

33. How frequently does your agency conduct internal audits of its ALPR system data searches?

- [ ] Daily
- [ ] Weekly
- [ ] Bi-weekly
- [ ] Every 30 days
- [ ] Other (please specify):

34. Briefly describe how your agency conducts audits of its ALPR system use:

35. Has your agency identified any unauthorized use of its ALPR system by any of its employees?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If YES, please briefly discuss the nature and circumstances of such instances and actions taken to remediate.

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

ALPR System Data Reporting Requirements

36. Does your agency have any challenges or concerns with reporting data on traffic stops related to ALPR notifications to the Virginia State Police as required by the Virginia Community Policing Act (Virginia Code § 52-30.2)?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

If YES, please briefly discuss such challenges or concerns and any recommendations to improve the process:

37. Does your agency have any challenges or concerns with the requirement to report specific data on its ALPR system use to the Virginia State Police beginning April 1, 2027 (Virginia Code § 2.2-5517(I))?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No
- ◯ Uncertain

If YES or UNCERTAIN, please briefly discuss such challenges or concerns and any recommendations to improve the process:

2026 Law Enforcement Survey: Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR) Systems

Additional Comments

38. Is there any other information that you would like to share with the Crime Commission about ALPR technology or the laws governing its use?

APPENDIX D:

CRIME COMMISSION 2026 LAW ENFORCEMENT ALPR USE SURVEY: NON-RESPONDING AND NON-COMPLIANT AGENCIES

Crime Commission 2026 Law Enforcement ALPR Use Survey
Non-Responding and Non-Compliant Agencies

Non-Responding Agencies

- **8 agencies did not respond to the survey.**

Town Police Departments:

- Bloxom Police Department
- Clinchco Police Department
- Eastville Police Department
- Gordonsville Police Department
- Kilmarnock Police Department
- McKenney Police Department
- Pocahontas Police Department
- White Stone Police Department

Agency ALPR Policy

- **6 agencies reported not having an ALPR policy.**

  College/University Police Department:
  - Virginia Union University Police Department

  Town Police Departments:
  - Alberta Police Department
  - Boones Mill Police Department
  - Drakes Branch Police Department
  - Onley Police Department
  - Weber City Police Department

- **4 agencies reported having an ALPR policy in progress.**

  Primary Sheriff's Office:
  - Buckingham County Sheriff's Office

  Secondary Sheriff's Office:
  - Newport News Sheriff's Office

  Town Police Departments:
  - Big Stone Gap Police Department
  - Kenbridge Police Department

- **3 agencies did not answer the survey question on whether their agency has an ALPR policy.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Covington Police Department
  - Norfolk Police Department

  Town Police Department:
  - Haysi Police Department

Data Retention Periods

- **7 agencies reported ALPR system data retention periods over 21 days.**

  City Police Department:
  - Covington Police Department

  Primary Sheriff's Offices:
  - Page County Sheriff's Office
  - Surry County Sheriff's Office

  Town Police Departments:
  - Boones Mill Police Department
  - Cedar Bluff Police Department
  - Parksley Police Department
  - Victoria Police Department

- **4 agencies did not answer the survey question on their agency ALPR system data retention periods.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Norfolk Police Department

  College/University Police Department:
  - Virginia Union University Police Department

  Town Police Departments:
  - Alberta Police Department
  - Rocky Mount Police Department

Data Sharing with Federal Law Enforcement Agencies

- **1 agency reported providing continuous access to its ALPR system data to federal law enforcement agencies.**

  College/University Police Department:
  - Hampden-Sydney College Police Department (This agency reported that they ended their contract and discontinued use with their ALPR vendor on August 21, 2026.)

- **4 agencies did not answer the survey question on whether their agency provides continuous access to its ALPR system data to federal law enforcement agencies.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Covington Police Department
  - Norfolk Police Department
  - Portsmouth Police Department

  Town Police Department:
  - Occoquan Police Department

- **5 agencies reported a specific incident where ALPR system data was shared with a federal law enforcement agency without legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena).**

  City Police Departments:
  - Richmond Police Department
  - Virginia Beach Police Department
  - Winchester Police Department

  Primary Sheriff's Office:
  - Frederick County Sheriff's Office

  Town Police Department:
  - Smithfield Police Department

- **4 agencies did not answer the survey question on whether their agency shared ALPR system data with a federal law enforcement agency without legal process.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Covington Police Department
  - Norfolk Police Department
  - Portsmouth Police Department

  Town Police Department:
  - Occoquan Police Department

Data Sharing with Other State Law Enforcement Agencies

- **4 agencies reported providing continuous access to its ALPR system data to other state law enforcement agencies.**

  Primary Sheriff's Office:
  - Lunenburg County Sheriff's Office

  Town Police Departments:
  - Stanley Police Department
  - Tappahannock Police Department
  - Timberville Police Department

- **4 agencies did not answer the survey question on whether their agency provides continuous access to its ALPR system data to other state law enforcement agencies.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Covington Police Department
  - Norfolk Police Department
  - Portsmouth Police Department

  Town Police Department:
  - Occoquan Police Department

- **4 agencies reported a specific incident where ALPR system data was shared with an out of state law enforcement agency without legal process (e.g., court order, search warrant, administrative subpoena).**

  City Police Department:
  - Winchester Police Department

  Primary Sheriff's Offices:
  - Frederick County Sheriff's Office
  - Lunenburg County Sheriff's Office

  Virginia State Police

- **4 agencies did not answer the survey question on whether their agency shared ALPR system data with an out of state law enforcement agency without legal process.**

  City Police Departments:
  - Covington Police Department
  - Norfolk Police Department
  - Portsmouth Police Department

  Town Police Department:
  - Occoquan Police Department


VIRGINIA STATE
CRIME COMMISSION