Permit Rules for the Movement of Oversize and Overweight Vehicles on the Arkansas State Highway System

Public Comments and Response

CAR Section: N/A

Comment Submitted By: Derrick Elrod, adelrod61@gmail.com

Comment:

No matter what good can be gained by the use of these LPRs, they are still an invasion of privacy and can be used for the wrong reasons. If they see inside and record occupants, they violate the 4th amendment.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR Section: N/A

Comment Submitted By: Arjae Sicley, arjaesicley@gmail.com

Comment:

I find your rules to be lacking in content.
Legitimate law enforcement activities? That is extremely objective and potientially (sic) opens the doors to rampant misuse by law enforcement.
This is a blatent (sic) violation of the publics (sic) right to privacy. There is no legitimate reason for these rules to include saving information for 150 days for any citizen. These rules can and will lead to misinterpetation (sic) and harrassment (sic) by law enforcement. Being investigated for mearly (sic) driving in the vicinity of a crime is outreageous (sic).
I do not mean to say alpr does not have any legitimate usages, and when restricted to these usages is a good thing, however I feel the same way as I felt when all the

magical dogs cropped up ---- With vague rules ---- such as these ---- this is allowing LE to be able to circumvent legal protections.
At this point LEO can not articulate the reasons for even stopping an individual half the time, and you want to give them another stupid reason "the alpr logged you a block away for this crime". When does all this stop? When one of your rule makers are harrassed or jailed on this misinformation?
Go back to your computer and draft some rules that make sense and are appropiate (sic) without dismantling the bill of rights. I could draft one for you if you would care to read them.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police. Anyone with access who misuses the LPR system that result in Arkansas Crime information Center data being released or disclosed to an unauthorized person is punishable under Arkansas Code § 12-12-212 (Class A misdemeanor or Class D Felony).

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR: N/A

Comment Submitted By: Sue Badzek, silvertipgrizzly@gmail.com

Comment:

I feel AR is invading privacy rights and is becoming communist instead of protecting and defending American Constitutional Rights. Do not put these cameras up in public.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

Permit Rules for the Movement of Oversize and Overweight Vehicles on the Arkansas State Highway System

Public Comments and Response

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR Section: N/A

Comment Submitted By: Thomas Cooper, tgcoop@sbcglobal.net

Comment:

I hereby object to the use of license plate readers due to an invasion of privacy.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

Department Response:

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

CAR Section: N/A

Comment Submitted By: Nicholas Boone, nsboone@ymail.com

Comment:

This message is intended to register a comment regarding the proposed license plate reader rules. I stand in principle against giving government more capability to surveil its citizenry. Thus, if the proposed rules will further restrict law enforcement's abilities to surveil and collect licence (sic) plate data, I support the rule change. If, on the other hand, the rules allow greater capability for law

enforcement and state agencies to collect data and surveil citizens, I oppose the proposed rules.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR Section: N/A

Comment Submitted By: TheCollosalDan (TUDTeam), mccandless236@gmail.com

Comment:

If these stationary cameras, are flock cameras. I would like to state that they most definitely appear to be a 4th amendment violation. There is a reasonable expectation of privacy in a vehicle and flock cameras violate that. An example of this occurred in Sherwood, a flock camera misidentified one letter on a license plate and reported that car as stolen, later in a parking lot a traffic stop was engaged, a female passenger was illegally arrested which caused a 1 month old infant to be left in the car alone. An innocent person arrested for something that had nothing to do with her. I can keep going with other incidents.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules

based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

Comment Submitted By: Nate H., nateh12@protonmail.com

CAR Section: N/A

Comment: We, a group of concerned citizens and residents of Northwest Arkansas, write to you today in the strongest possible terms to demand an immediate end to any and all approvals or permits for Flock Safety cameras on Arkansas state highways and right-of-way. As the Governmental Relations Officer overseeing the proposed License Plate Reader Rules, you hold a critical position at this pivotal moment. These AI-powered surveillance machines represent a direct, unconstitutional assault on our 4th Amendment rights against unreasonable searches and seizures. We will not stand by while our daily movements are harvested, tracked, and fed into a private corporate database without warrants, probable cause, or meaningful oversight.

Let us be crystal clear about what these cameras actually are. As explained by an IT professional with 20 years of experience as a chief network architect for Fortune 500 companies—who has designed data centers and now works on cloud infrastructure for one of the nation's largest loan origination firms—these are not "simple license plate readers," as Flock advertises. Their own patents, including US11416545B1, reveal a far more sinister reality: AI-powered object detection and tracking systems capable of classifying and following not just vehicles but pedestrians and people based on attributes. Every passing vehicle and person is captured, analyzed, and transmitted to Flock's private corporate cloud—built on AWS infrastructure—where the data becomes fully queryable by a multitude of state and federal agencies.

The City or County does not control that database. Arkansas residents have zero public records rights against a $7.5 billion private corporation answerable only to venture capital investors. Our movements are being monetized and centralized in a nationwide surveillance network. Over 75% of Flock customers enable cross-jurisdictional searches, turning isolated local cameras into a dragnet that tracks innocent Americans without their knowledge or consent. Flock did not reach its valuation on per-camera subscriptions alone—the math only adds up through this mass data harvesting. Worse, the companies and individuals behind this technology have a documented record of deception. Flock's CEO claimed under questioning that the company had no federal contracts.

That was a lie. Public records exposed a secret pilot program granting the U.S. Border Patrol access to local police camera data—without the knowledge or

consent of the cities paying for the systems. Flock integrates directly with Palantir, which holds a $30 million contract with ICE. Peter Thiel, Palantir's founder and a primary Flock investor, has built an ecosystem explicitly designed to fuse data for government surveillance. Palantir's own CEO recently admitted publicly that their technology is being weaponized as a "political instrument" to reduce the political power of certain voters. These are not separate entities—they are connected actors constructing the backbone of a national surveillance state, and Arkansas state highways are becoming the infrastructure for it. We are not anti-law-enforcement. We are pro-Constitution. These cameras create a warrantless, perpetual tracking system that chills free movement, invades privacy, and treats every Arkansan as a suspect. They have already been used nationwide to generate false positives, misidentify vehicles, and enable overreach far beyond legitimate crime-fighting. Allowing them on our state highways—under the guise of "public safety"—betrays the public trust and lays the groundwork for a future where our every drive is monitored by unaccountable tech oligarchs and their federal partners. We demand the following: 1. Immediately deny or revoke any pending ARDOT permits for Flock (or similar LPR) installations on state highways. 2. Strengthen the proposed License Plate Reader Rules to explicitly prohibit data sharing with federal agencies, ban object/pedestrian tracking features, mandate strict local data ownership and deletion (no corporate cloud retention), and require full transparency on all queries. 3. Conduct and publicly release audits of any existing Flock data usage by Arkansas agencies, including all federal access or sharing agreements. 4. Place a moratorium on further expansions until these issues are resolved through legislation protecting our 4th Amendment rights.

Mr. Rogers, the Arkansas State Highway Commission has the authority and the duty to protect citizens from this unconstitutional overreach. Do not allow our roadways to become corridors of corporate-government surveillance. Cancel these contracts, reject these permits, and send a clear message that Arkansas will not be complicit in building a mass surveillance network.
We expect a substantive response and will continue to monitor this issue closely. The eyes of Arkansas—and the Constitution—are upon you.

Proposed Solution: N/A

Accepted/Rejected: No change to the proposed rule

Department Response: The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police.

Permit Rules for the Movement of Oversize and Overweight Vehicles on the Arkansas State Highway System

Public Comments and Response

CAR Section: 91-504(a)

Comment Submitted By: Axon Enterprises, lferreira@axon.com

Comment:

Axon Enterprise, Inc. respectfully requests that the Commission amend the bonding requirements in proposed §91-504 and §91-505 to exempt license plate reader (LPR) equipment owned outright by law enforcement or public safety agencies.

Axon sells LPR hardware directly to law enforcement agencies, who own the equipment upon purchase. The Proposed Rules, as written, make no distinction between (1) private commercial vendors placing vendor-owned equipment on ARDOT right-of-way under a lease or service contract, and (2) governmental agencies that own their equipment outright and deploy it for a public safety mission. This creates a structural disadvantage for agency-owned deployments relative to vendor-leased models, and imposes bonding costs of $10,000–$250,000 on governmental entities that are already subject to robust accountability mechanisms — appropriations oversight, procurement law, and ARDOT's existing permit revocation authority under §§ 91-108 and 91-512.

Exempting publicly-owned law enforcement LPR equipment from the bond requirement does not create a gap — it applies the same logic the Commission already codified for municipal utilities. The bond exists to protect ARDOT against the risk that a private commercial actor becomes insolvent or abandons its obligations. That risk does not exist for a governmental agency, which cannot dissolve and whose obligations run to the public.

The Proposed Rules already establish a two-track accountability system — and the bond is not part of the governmental track. The rules make this explicit in three places:

§ 91-107(b) limits bond-based enforcement to utilities "other than a municipal utility system." Increased bonding as a compliance remedy is already carved out for governmental entities by the rules' own language.

§ 91-107(c) and § 91-109(b) establish that when a municipal utility fails to comply, ARDOT's remedy is to perform the work directly and recover costs by offsetting state funds — not by drawing on a bond. The rules already contemplate a bond-free governmental accountability model.

§ 91-108 and § 91-604 apply universally: permit revocation and mandatory correction of hazardous installations at the owner's expense apply to all permit holders regardless of bond status. ARDOT retains full compliance authority over governmental entities without a bond in place.

The bond's purpose — ensuring right-of-way restoration if a permit holder abandons its obligations — applies most compellingly to private commercial actors at risk of insolvency or dissolution. Governmental agencies do not dissolve, and their obligations run to the public.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

This comment was supplied however it was difficult to address whether this was concerning the Utility Accommodation Policy or the Automatic License Plate Reader rules and has therefore been incorporated into both. The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police. All installations of LPR hardware on the right of way of the Department is governed by the permit process and if a bond is required it is to ensure the restoration of the Department right of way if the installation, maintenance, or removal causes damage to the property of the Department.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR Section: 91-505(a)

Comment Submitted By: Axon Enterprises, lferreira@axon.com

Comment:

Axon Enterprise, Inc. respectfully requests that the Commission amend the bonding requirements in proposed §91-504 and §91-505 to exempt license plate reader (LPR) equipment owned outright by law enforcement or public safety agencies.
Axon sells LPR hardware directly to law enforcement agencies, who own the equipment upon purchase. The Proposed Rules, as written, make no distinction between (1) private commercial vendors placing vendor-owned equipment on ARDOT right-of-way under a lease or service contract, and (2) governmental agencies that own their equipment outright and deploy it for a public safety mission. This creates a structural disadvantage for agency-owned deployments relative to vendor-leased models, and imposes bonding costs of $10,000–$250,000 on governmental entities that are already subject to robust accountability mechanisms — appropriations oversight, procurement law, and ARDOT's existing permit revocation authority under §§ 91-108 and 91-512.
Exempting publicly-owned law enforcement LPR equipment from the bond requirement does not create a gap — it applies the same logic the Commission

already codified for municipal utilities. The bond exists to protect ARDOT against the risk that a private commercial actor becomes insolvent or abandons its obligations. That risk does not exist for a governmental agency, which cannot dissolve and whose obligations run to the public.
The Proposed Rules already establish a two-track accountability system — and the bond is not part of the governmental track. The rules make this explicit in three places:
§ 91-107(b) limits bond-based enforcement to utilities "other than a municipal utility system." Increased bonding as a compliance remedy is already carved out for governmental entities by the rules' own language.
§ 91-107(c) and § 91-109(b) establish that when a municipal utility fails to comply, ARDOT's remedy is to perform the work directly and recover costs by offsetting state funds — not by drawing on a bond. The rules already contemplate a bond-free governmental accountability model.
§ 91-108 and § 91-604 apply universally: permit revocation and mandatory correction of hazardous installations at the owner's expense apply to all permit holders regardless of bond status. ARDOT retains full compliance authority over governmental entities without a bond in place.
The bond's purpose — ensuring right-of-way restoration if a permit holder abandons its obligations — applies most compellingly to private commercial actors at risk of insolvency or dissolution. Governmental agencies do not dissolve, and their obligations run to the public.

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

This comment was supplied however it was difficult to address whether this was concerning the Utility Accommodation Policy or the Automatic License Plate Reader rules and has therefore been incorporated into both. The Automatic License Plate Reader System Act was adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 and is codified in the Arkansas Code at § 12-12-1801 et.seq. Act 668 of 2025 required the Arkansas Highway Police to promulgate these rules based on these statutes. These rules are based on and consistent with the rules of the Arkansas State Police. All installations of LPR hardware on the right of way of the Department is governed by the permit process and if a bond is required it is to ensure the restoration of the Department right of way if the installation, maintenance, or removal causes damage to the property of the Department.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

Permit Rules for the Movement of Oversize and Overweight Vehicles on the Arkansas State Highway System

Public Comments and Response

CAR Section: 150-102-3

Comment Submitted By: Bureau of Legislative Research

Comment:

Is there a reason that the definition for "alert" differs from that in Arkansas Code § 12-12-1802(1)?

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

This language tracks the specific language used in the Department of Public Safety, Division of Arkansas State Police rules found at 12 CAR § 224-102. The term is used in a different context throughout the rules and the Arkansas Highway Police wanted to maintain uniformity with the Arkansas State Police.

Accepted/Rejected: No change to the proposed rule

CAR Section: 150-103(a)

Comment Submitted By: Bureau of Legislative Research

Comment:

This subsection provides: "Use of LPR systems is restricted to legitimate law enforcement purposes." Is this referring just to members' use? See Arkansas Code § 12-12-1803 (permitting private landowners, private leaseholders, or commercial businesses to use an automatic license plate reader system in certain enumerated circumstances).

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

This language tracks the specific language used in the Department of Public Safety, Division of Arkansas State Police rules found at 12 CAR § 224-102. The

term is used in a different context throughout the rules and the Arkansas Highway Police wanted to maintain uniformity with the Arkansas State Police.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR: 150-103(d)

Comment Submitted By: Bureau of Legislative Research

Comment:

This subsection references certain items as the property of the “division”. Which division is being referenced?

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

Internally, the Arkansas Highway Police are referred to as a Division of ARDOT.

Disposition: No change to the proposed rule

CAR: 150-104(b)

Comment Submitted By: Bureau of Legislative Research

Comment:

This subsection limits the sharing of data to other law enforcement agencies only as outlined in the rules and Arkansas Code § 12-12-1803. Is this citation correct? See Arkansas Code § 12-12-1804 providing that “[c]aptured plate data obtained by a law enforcement agency under § 12-12-1803(b)(1) that indicates evidence of an offense may be shared with other law enforcement agencies.”

Proposed Solution:

N/A

Department Response:

Permit Rules for the Movement of Oversize and Overweight Vehicles on the Arkansas State Highway System

Public Comments and Response

The citation was incorrect in the current rules of the Arkansas State Police at 12 CAR § 24-1104 rules and was not identified during our review. The code citation should be Arkansas Code § 12-12-1804.

Disposition: Accepted