

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #5 – Proposed Agreement with Verkada, Inc.
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 8:08:17 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To: Honorable Members of the Santa Barbara City Council
(Sent via Clerk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

From: [REDACTED]

Re: Agenda Item #5 – Proposed Agreement with Verkada, Inc.

Date: August 23, 2026

The City Council is being asked to receive a report regarding the nonrenewal of the agreement with Flock Group, Inc. DBA Flock Safety, and the staff recommended alternative agreement with Verkada, Inc. for automated license plate recognition ("ALPR") services.

As residents of the City of Santa Barbara, we encourage the City Council to use this as an opportunity to evaluate the need for and the benefits of ALPR systems in general before the City enters into an expensive contract with Verkada.

In making such a determination, the important privacy interests of residents should be balanced against the legitimate needs of law enforcement. Only recently have many in our community even become aware of the existence of these ALPR cameras and there is obviously widespread concern. This is particularly true in the current federal law enforcement environment, which we believe the City Council should not ignore. While California state law contains a statutory scheme for the use of ALPRs by local jurisdictions, they are not required to use them.

The Staff Report does not provide current data concerning how effective ALPR technology has been in ensuring public safety in Santa Barbara. The Staff Report simply asserts in general terms that they enhance public safety; they offer no evidence to support this. Specific data regarding how ALPRs have been useful since they were installed in 2023 is important in determining if these systems are necessary and cost effective. Such information might include the number of investigative leads generated, the number of criminal cases in which such data was placed in evidence, the number of cases that would have remained unresolved if ALPRs had not been used, etc. Since there are press reports that ALPRs are sometimes inaccurate, data regarding how often they have misled local law enforcement should be considered as well.

Given the level of community interest, the City Council should weigh the privacy interests of the community against benefits of ALPR technology before entering into an agreement with Verkada.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 5
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 10:23:28 AM

Dear City Council Members,

I am a long-time city resident and vote in all elections. I strongly object to the city's use of cameras to track citizens who are just going about their everyday lives.

I appreciate that you are cancelling the Flock contract. However, please do NOT replace it with any other company. Evidence has come to light that Verkada has experienced data breaches, violations of email privacy laws, and using its technology to harass its own employees. These are warning signs of a bad company.

We are better than this. You are better than this.

Please do not vote for any mass surveillance technology for our city. Use the money to help Santa Barbara residents rather than to harm them.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Automatic License Plate Readers
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 10:24:42 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Councilmembers,

The people of Santa Barbara are plainly opposed to surveillance cameras put up by Flock Safety, and I applaud your decision to have them removed. Pivoting then to sign a contract with some other surveillance camera company flies in the face of public desire. Please cancel all plans to track the movements of Santa Barbarans by any company's automatic license plate reader cameras.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Santa Barbara CA 93101

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Replacing FLOCK with another surveillance service
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 11:14:29 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

One of the hallmarks of dystopian science fiction is the use of video surveillance. From Orwell's 1984, and Santa Barbara native Ray Bradbury's Fahrenheit 451 to the Hunger Games series, a totalitarian government enforces its power by knowing where people are at any given moment and sharing that information with other departments and entities. The FLOCK system and its equivalents do exactly that — surveillance of all people— in order to control and if desirable capture and imprison or deport them. That this system is dangerously invasive and is antidemocratic seems obvious to anyone who has read those books or seen those movies.

I do not want my movements surveilled.

Thank you—

[REDACTED]

Santa Barbara CA 93105

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Opposition to the implementation of ALPR
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 11:36:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning - I would like to submit a comment regarding the use of ALPR in our community. I understand the city has already agreed to terminate its contract with the Flock system which is good news given the abundance of reports of abuse of that system in nationwide incidents.

I understand the need for police to have some sort of monitoring system in place to prevent crime, but I am opposed to rushing into an agreement with another company (Verkada) that utilizes the same technology and may be just as dangerous and complicit in a surveillance state. There are far too many ways that this technology can be abused as is evidenced by the numerous reports of similar technologies.

I would like the council to table this discussion to allow more opportunity to understand how this will be used, and what safeguards will be employed as well as - probably most importantly - give the community which it portends to serve the ability and ample time to let our voices be heard. In addition I believe the council needs to do it's own due diligence into the technology given the implications and potential impact on the citizens they were elected to serve.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | CEO and Founder [Magenta Consulting](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: mass surveillance
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 12:17:42 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

MASS SURVEILLANCE CAN GO INTO THE WRONG HANDS AFTER THE TECHNOLOGY IS IN PLACE.

LAW ENFORCEMENT is putting their own kids/family/friends and the public at risk....
examples: stalking, following, violent protests, isolation, threats.

THESE companys DO NOT abide by LAWS.

Your "private" life is on video to be manipulated or made to frame you. This technology does not bring safety whatsoever. If it did, they would have found lost kids a long time ago. If it did, it wouldn't be pointed at places like public pools, bedrooms, national parks, etc.

ALSO NOT CONSTITUTIONAL.
THE FOURTH AMENDMENT clearly says

The Fourth Amendment protects the right of the people to be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures by the government.

AKA these are ILLEGAL SEARCHES happening daily!!!!

ILLEGAL SEARCHES!!!!

- sb county resident that cares about family safety

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Opinion on replacing flock camera with similar
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 1:42:37 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

The act of surveillance is the most heinous act of class warfare in modern history, and we did not get a vote on their installation. Just get rid of them, please. Then you can ask the citizens via a vote if they would agree to this: that is the principle of a democracy. Else, you are engaging in some other, more insidious form of austerity and lesser government.

Our overfunded SBPD and sheriffs can solve crime the old fashioned way, no one asked for this. No flock, no Axon, just no.

Sincerely,

Born and raised Santa Barbarian,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to Flock, Verkada, and Mass Surveillance in Santa Barbara!
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 2:26:52 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the expansion of surveillance technology in Santa Barbara and throughout Santa Barbara County.

While I am encouraged that the City canceled its contract with Flock, replacing one surveillance provider with another—whether Verkada or any similar company—does not address the underlying issue. The problem is not simply which company operates the technology; **it is the growing normalization of systems that monitor, record, and track the movements of people going about their daily lives.**

Across the country, surveillance technologies have expanded rapidly, often with limited public oversight, inadequate safeguards, and little transparency about how information is collected, retained, shared, or potentially misused. Once these systems are introduced, their scope can grow beyond their original purpose, while the public's ability to control them diminishes.

There is already a laundry list of examples nationwide involving the misuse of surveillance technology, including unauthorized access, inappropriate tracking, data breaches, inadequate oversight, and information being shared beyond its intended purpose. These problems are not isolated incidents. They reflect the inherent risks of building surveillance networks that collect sensitive information about ordinary people. As the surveillance state expands, those risks will only increase, along with the potential for abuse.

Public safety is important, but it should never be used to justify mass surveillance at the expense of privacy, civil liberties, and the freedom to move through our community without being continuously monitored. Residents and visitors should not have their movements documented, stored, or potentially accessed for purposes they never agreed to. Santa Barbara should reject the expansion of this surveillance infrastructure rather than replace Flock with Verkada or any comparable system.

I urge the City Council to reject proposals involving automated license plate readers, AI-enabled surveillance cameras, facial recognition, or other technologies that facilitate widespread tracking of residents and visitors. Instead, please prioritize public safety strategies that strengthen community trust without creating an infrastructure for mass surveillance.

Santa Barbara has an opportunity to show that protecting public safety and respecting personal privacy are not mutually exclusive. I hope the City will take that responsibility seriously.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Santa Barbara City Council Meeting August 25 / agenda item relating to replacement of Flock surveillance cameras with Verkada
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 4:21:49 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom It May Concern,

I write, as a Santa Barbara homeowner, in opposition to the proposed use of Verkada's automated license plate readers in Santa Barbara.

The City Council did the right thing by allowing the Flock agreement to expire. It should not be spending further tax payer dollars on surveillance of Santa Barbara residents, particularly where — as here — there are material unanswered questions about Verkada itself, Verkada's ability to access data collected on city cameras, Verkada's willingness to provide such access to federal and other agencies with or without Santa Barbara's authorization, whether / how Verkada's facial recognition technology might be integrated in the future, and who actually owns the data collected.

This feels premature, at best. Neither the City Council, nor the proponents of the Verkada agreement, have made a compelling case for use of *any* automated license plate reader technology, let alone a compelling case for Verkada's specifically. Nor have they articulated how any such agreement — both legally and in its technological implementation — will be de-risked in order to ensure the privacy and other rights of all who live in Santa Barbara.

I urge the City Council to vote NO on the proposed agreement with Verkada.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: NO Facial Recognition or Surveillance Networks
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 4:42:57 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the City Council,

I strongly oppose any surveillance network cameras, license plate readers, and/or facial recognition devices.

Please do not implement any of these items in our Santa Barbara City community. Not only are the devices all hackable, they statistically do not reduce crime, and as we've seen with multiple police stations, can be used by "professionals" for inappropriate harassment.

These devices often mistake or misidentify cars, license plates and humans. Their output has been followed blindly in many documented cases, causing individuals to be incorrectly persecuted, often at their own expense.

I also think these device contracts, including any incentives forwarded to the city council, should be fully disclosed in the meeting tomorrow to the public.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Kelly R. McAdoo](#); [Kelly Gordon](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#)
Cc: [Larry Behrendt](#); ipaige18@gmail.com; ana@causenow.org; [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Petition to Delay Contract with Verkada
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 4:48:58 PM
Attachments: [image1787615263723](#)
[image1787615263724](#)
[image1787615263725](#)
[Final Report - ALPR Alternatives Cal Poly.pdf](#)
[COMMUNITY FACT SHEET Verkada to SB City.pdf](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor, City Manager, Chief of Police, and City Council Members,

We would like to submit documents to be considered for tomorrow's agenda item 5. We want to be clear, our coalition is not simply here to oppose. We are here to **collaborate**. We believe that public safety and civil liberties are not opposing values, and we are committed to working alongside city leadership to find solutions that serve and protect every member of our community.

To that end, we are prepared to:

- **Share additional research** on privacy-respecting alternatives to both Flock Safety and Verkada
- **Facilitate community input sessions** to ensure resident voices are meaningfully included in this process
- **Hold off** on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.
- **Support** a comprehensive review of the City's existing privacy and data ordinances

We ask that the City commit to an **extended public comment period** before any new surveillance contract is finalized, and that all future meetings on this matter be **scheduled at 5:00 PM or later** to ensure full community participation.

Next Steps

We welcome the opportunity to meet again at your earliest convenience to discuss the enclosed materials and chart a path forward together. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us directly to schedule a follow-up meeting or request any additional information.

We understand you have our community's best interest at heart and we are here to support you in honoring that commitment.

Thank you sincerely for your time, your service, and your continued openness to community engagement.

With respect and solidarity,

805UndocuFund, Santa Babara Indivisible, Technology for Liberation, CAUSE

Attachments: 1. Community Fact Sheet, Think Before You Sign: A Coalition Call to Pause on Verkada 2. Analysis of Flock Safety Alternatives, Technology 4 Liberation, Cal Poly SLO, July 29, 2026

[Redacted] (She/Her/Ella)

Executive Director



PO BOX 1154, LOMPOC, CA 93436

Tel: (805) 200-8471 | Hotline: (805) 870-8855

[Website](#) | [Donate Now](#) | [Join our Mailing List](#) | EIN: 86-2230353



"Disaster recovery does not begin for anyone until everyone is included."

Analysis of Flock Safety Alternatives

Technology 4 Liberation

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

July 29, 2026

Executive Summary

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo students present this report as a grouping of suitable alternatives to Flock Surveillance ALPR systems. Our research examined four viable alternatives: one 3rd party ALPR vendor, two CCTV alternatives, and one student-project alternative. Additionally, our research examined seven non-viable alternatives to Flock Safety, highlighting that not all systems are suitable for Cal Poly's needs.

As an introduction to this report, we call reminder to why Flock Safety ALPR systems are inadequate for California Polytechnic State University. We live in an era of rampant authoritarianism in which instruments of mass surveillance are repeatedly misused across the United States. Flock Safety technologies have been used to stalk women and peaceful protestors, target racial minorities, and enforce anti-abortion policies across the United States (Langley & Feury, 2022; Maass & Alajaji, 2025; Ingraham, 2026).

As such, our report focuses on many privacy related criteria for a Flock Safety alternative. Particularly, we seek to present realistic Flock Safety alternatives that dignify student privacy while maintaining campus safety standards in tandem with the priorities of Cal Poly Public Safety. This report will analyze the patents, public statements, and other available information about ALPR and CCTV camera vendors to ensure a well-rounded and realistic suggestion of Flock Safety alternatives.

New Policy Objectives & Criteria

The proposed new systems are analyzed in the coming sections under the following criteria:

1. Artificial intelligence technology cannot be overly invasive (i.e. no facial identification, gait tracking, or similar features, similar to Flock Safety’s 2022 patent 1146545B1 which can categorize recorded individuals by clothing, weight, height, race, and gender),
2. No outbound data sharing with third parties,
3. Data is recorded and stored locally, and
4. Technical feasibility (i.e. the vendor’s capability to work the size and scale of Cal Poly).

Each criteria aligns with security and privacy practices suggested by organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, who have commented on the violative nature of Flock’s AI algorithms (ACLU, 2026). Furthermore, they center Cal Poly’s public safety commitment to alternatives in collaboration with Associated Students Inc.’s formal demand for Flock’s termination in resolution #26-11 (Resolution Calling for the Removal of Flock Safety Cameras from CAL POLY Campus, 2026)

A criteria-matrix analysis will be applied to each proposed policy alternative. A sample matrix is pictured below. *See Tables 2 & 3 for policy analysis using criteria-matrix diagrams.*

Table 1. Sample Criteria-Matrix Diagram

Vendor Name	Vendor Type	AI Rating	Data Sharing Rating	Data Storing Rating	Technical Feasibility	Overall Rating
Vendor A	ALPR	4	1	1	2	2
Vendor B	CCTV	5	4	3	4	4

Each metric is graded on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being in full violation of our proposed criteria, and 5 being in full compliance with our proposed criteria. The “Overall Rating” column averages out the scores of the three criteria, summarizing the overall compliance of each alternative.

Flock Alternatives

As mentioned, our team has identified four suitable alternatives to Flock Safety: One ALPR, two CCTV, and one student-faculty project alternative. The identified vendor for an ALPR alternative is Plate Smart. The two CCTV alternatives are Ventura Low Voltage & Security, and 2M Technologies. We have also concluded that we could suggest a student-faculty CCTV/ALPR option, allowing the “Learn by Doing” philosophy to create a bespoke solution.

Below is a criteria-matrix analysis of proposed alternatives as well as a criteria-matrix of non-alternatives.

Table 2. Criteria-Matrix Analysis of Proposed Alternatives

Vendor Name	Vendor Type	AI Rating	Data Sharing Rating	Data Storing Rating	Technical Feasibility	Overall Rating
Plate Smart	ALPR	4	3	5	5	4.25
Ventura Low Voltage & Security	CCTV	5	5	5	2	4.25
2M Technologies	CCTV	2	5	3	3	3.23
Student-Fac	CCTV	3	5	5	2	3.75

ulty Project						
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 3. Criteria-Matrix Analysis of Flock Non-Alternatives

Vendor Name	Vendor Type	AI Rating	Data Sharing Rating	Data Storing Rating	Technical Feasibility	Overall Rating
Genetec	ALPR	3	4	2	5	3.5
Leonardo	ALPR	0	3	5	5	3.25
Motorola	ALPR	2	1	2	5	2.25
Avigilon	ALPR	2	2	1	4	2.25
Verkada	ALPR	1	2	2	5	2.5

Comparative Analysis of Flock Alternatives

While a truly incorruptible solution would include zero AI or data sharing capabilities, and no alternative endorsed or accepted by this report or its authors may break the 4 main criteria outlined above, we recognize the evolving security landscape and have included both ALPR and CCTV options among the proposed alternatives. Students are confident in the governing bodies of California Polytechnic State University, Associated Students Incorporated, and Academic Senate, to make a good faith decision that represents the community's best interests.

Drawbacks for Platesmart include potential limited data sharing (likely configurable to “inbound-only” if present) and the presence of ALPR detection, while benefits include locally hosted data, a formal privacy commitment, and enterprise reliability (Platesmart, 2026). Ventura Security, a custom-built CCTV solution from a local vendor, aligns highly with many criteria, the primary drawback being concerns around enterprise feasibility (Ventura Low Voltage and Security, 2026). 2M Technologies has a robust solar CCTV product line with edge AI capabilities just short of ALPR (basic object detection and similar); minor concerns arise over

data transmission and/or centralization challenges (2MTechnologies, 2026). A student-faculty led project should meet data storing and sharing requirements, employ little to no edge AI features, and be relatively feasible.

Other vendors were eliminated based on factors reflected in their criteria-matrix scores, specifically data sharing and excessively invasive AI features. Motorola has a history of collaboration with ICE, Genetec and Avigilon enable data-sharing with 3rd parties (Kimery, 2025; Ettachfini, 2019; Avigilon, 2024, 2026), and Verkada and Axon use facial recognition (Verkada 2026; Axon 2024), to name a few. Neither these nor any similar vendors should be considered remotely viable as Flock Safety alternatives.

Recommendation and Conclusion

Surveillance presents challenges beyond vendors and architecture; responsible platforms must be accompanied by responsible policy to ensure safety and compliance (ACLU, 2026). In alignment with previous statements and policy implementations of California Polytechnic State University, such as ASI resolution #26-11 (Resolution Calling for the Removal of Flock Safety Cameras from CAL POLY Campus, 2026) , this report recommends the above alternatives to Flock Safety along with transparency and oversight policies for the Cal Poly Police Department including but not limited to: a student-faculty review board with enhanced visibility into the department and input on any new campus safety initiatives, an accessible website detailing surveillance and campus safety measures on campus with regular updates on how they are being used, and transparency and reporting standards beyond California legal compliance. These strategies balance law enforcement with privacy and work to create a safe and welcoming campus environment for all students; however, their implementation should ultimately be at the

discretion of the community. This report concludes that representatives of the community, including Academic Senate and Associated Students Incorporated, are best equipped to make the final decision. It is not an exhaustive list of all potential alternatives but provides a framework by which other potential alternatives may be judged. The final list of alternatives presented to Academic Senate and ASI may be materially different from those which are presented in the report so long as they demonstrably meet or exceed the outlined criteria the authors anticipate little to no community objection.

Sources

American Civil Liberties Union. (2026, August 5). *Fight creepy ALPR cameras*.

<https://www.aclu.org/campaigns-initiatives/get-the-flock-out>

Avigilon. (n.d.). *Genetec (Synergis) access control review: App, cameras, cost*. Retrieved August

7, 2026, from <https://www.avigilon.com/genetec-access-control-review>

Avigilon. (2024). *Avigilon commercial buyers guide* [eBook].

<https://security.avigilon.com/hubfs/Avigilon/Gated%20Content/Avigilon%20Commercial%20Buyers%20Guide%20eBook.pdf>

Ettachfini, L. (2019, November 15). Motorola Solutions has made \$25 million this year working with ICE and CBP. *Vice*.

<https://www.vice.com/en/article/motorola-solutions-works-with-ice-cbp/>

Ingraham, C. (2026, April 27). Police have reportedly used license plate readers to stalk romantic

interests dozens of times in recent years. *Institute for Justice*.

<https://ij.org/police-have-reportedly-used-license-plate-readers-to-stalk-romantic-interests-at-least-14-times-in-recent-years/>

Kimery, A. (2025, November 18). ICE's license plate app quietly expands a nationwide

surveillance web. *Biometric Update*.

<https://www.biometricupdate.com/202511/ices-license-plate-app-quietly-expands-a-nationwide-surveillance-web>

Langley, G., & Feury, M. (2022). *System and method for object based query of video content*

captured by a dynamic surveillance network (U.S. Patent No. 11,416,545 B1). U.S.

Patent and Trademark Office. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US11416545B1>

Maass, D., & Alajaji, R. (2025, October 7). Flock Safety and Texas sheriff claimed license plate

search was for a missing person. It was an abortion investigation. *Electronic Frontier Foundation*.

<https://www EFF.org/deeplinks/2025/10/flock-safety-and-texas-sheriff-claimed-license-plate-search-was-missing-person-it>

Verkada. (n.d.). *Person detection compliance and availability*. Retrieved August 7, 2026, from

<https://www.verkada.com/cameras-availability/>

COMMUNITY FACT SHEET

Think Before You Sign: A Coalition Call to Pause on Verkada

Prepared in reference to: Analysis of Flock Safety Alternatives, Technology 4 Liberation, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo , July 29, 2026

Presented by: A Coalition of Central Coast Community Organizations in Partnership with Santa Barbara Residents

Who We Are

We are a coalition of civic and community organizations that has been meeting with the City of Santa Barbara's City Manager and Chief of Police on issues connected with the presence of federal immigration forces in our community. The issues discussed in these meetings include the presence of Flock Safety technology in the City and whether the City should deploy automatic license plate reader (ALPR) technology of any kind.

Why We're Here

The City of Santa Barbara has ended its contract with Flock Safety. That was the right call. Now, before rushing into a new contract with Verkada, our coalition is asking the City to pause, listen to the public, and do this right.

We understand you have our community's best interest at heart. So do we. That's why we're asking you to slow down.

Who Is Verkada And Why It Matters

- Verkada is a surveillance technology company with documented connections to the Trump administration and its immigration enforcement apparatus
- The identity of Verkada's leadership and financial backers raises serious questions about whose interests this technology ultimately serves
- Verkada's platform uses facial recognition technology, one of the most invasive and error-prone forms of AI surveillance available today
- An independent academic analysis from Cal Poly SLO (Technology 4 Liberation, 2026) evaluated Verkada against four key privacy and safety criteria and gave it an overall score of 2.5 out of 5, making it a non-viable alternative to Flock Safety

Data Breaches & Liability Risks

- Verkada has a documented history of significant data breaches, exposing sensitive footage and user data
- Contracting with Verkada exposes the City of Santa Barbara to serious legal and financial liability

- Surveillance technology with poor data security creates reputational harm for the City and erodes public trust
- The Cal Poly report flags Verkada specifically for its data sharing practices and invasive AI features, both of which violate recommended privacy criteria
- Signing a contract with Verkada is not just a technology decision, it is a liability decision.

What the Research Says: Verkada's Scorecard

Based on the Technology 4 Liberation Criteria-Matrix (Cal Poly SLO, July 2026):

Criteria-Verkada Score (out of 5)

AI Invasiveness (facial recognition, tracking) (1)

Data Sharing with Third Parties (2)

Local Data Storage (5)

Technical Feasibility (-)

Overall Rating: 2.5 **NON-VIABLE**

A score of 1 = full violation of privacy criteria. Verkada received the lowest possible AI rating.

Our Coalition's Recommendations to City Administration

- No New Surveillance Contracts, Not Yet
- Do NOT sign any new surveillance contract, including with Verkada, until the steps below are completed
- The end of the Flock contract is an opportunity to reassess whether expanded surveillance serves Santa Barbara residents at all

Examine the Budget Implications

- Any new surveillance system carries **significant ongoing costs**, hardware, software licensing, data storage, legal compliance, and liability insurance
- The public deserves a **transparent accounting** of what this will cost before any commitment is made

Mandate an Extended Public Comment Period

- **No contract should be signed** until the public has had a full and meaningful opportunity to weigh in

- We recommend a minimum **60-day public comment period** with accessible, multilingual outreach, consistent with the spirit and letter of State law requirements for deployment of ALPR technology (California Civil Code § 1798.90.55)
- Community members deserve time to **research alternatives** and bring their own recommendations forward

Review & Update All Privacy Data Ordinances

- Current City privacy ordinances may be **outdated and inadequate** to govern modern surveillance technology. For example, the City's "ALPR City Policy 2024 council approved update" allows the City's ALPR data to be stored "In the ALPR vendor's regional database" for up to 30 days after it is collected. This provision of policy is contrary to our understanding that Verkada ALPR data will be stored on a system under exclusive City control. Moreover, the 30-day retention period provided in the City's policy is considerably longer than the 7-day retention period that's now the standard default for Flock's ALPR system.
- Any new surveillance contract must be preceded by a ****comprehensive review and update**** of all relevant data privacy policies

Schedule Future Discussions at 5:00 PM

- All future agenda items related to surveillance technology must be **scheduled no earlier than 5:00 PM**
- Working residents, parents, and community members **cannot attend daytime meetings**. Democratic participation requires accessible meeting times

We Are Your Partners, Not Your Opponents

Our coalition has shown up, at meetings with the Chief of Police, with the City Manager, and in this room today, because we care about Santa Barbara. We believe in public safety AND civil liberties. These are not opposing values.

The Cal Poly research demonstrates that **privacy-respecting alternatives exist**. The community deserves the chance to explore them.

Full report: [Analysis of Flock Safety Alternatives. Technology 4 Liberation. Cal Poly SLO, July 29, 2026](#)

This fact sheet was prepared by a coalition of Central Coast community organizations. All research citations are sourced from the Technology 4 Liberation report and its referenced academic and investigative sources.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment regarding Surveillance and Facial Recognition Software
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 5:30:03 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

As an IT professional, I would like to comment on the city's consideration of using Verkada, Flock or any other surveillance state solutions in our city.

Through Pete Hegseth's suspension of CMMC phase II requirements, these companies are not required third party assessors to certify their cybersecurity maturity leaving our data vulnerable to foreign nations or malicious actors, both internal and external to the city employee pool. Ronald Reagan's adage of trust but verify should be used here, we cannot take the words of a for profit company with no ties to our community at their word when there is nothing to substantiate their security claims. Moreover, there are countless reports of police and other government employees using these systems illegally:

- >A Milwaukee officer secretly used Flock to learn the location of his romantic partner 124 times and that partner's ex 55 times.
- >A Kansas police chief was fired after tracking his ex through Flock and sneaking up on her while she was intimate with another man.
- >In Massachusetts, two officers in Lynn were placed on leave after an audit flagged a concerning search pattern, an officer in Stow was set to be fired and criminally charged for allegedly tracking his ex-girlfriend, and a New Bedford officer was placed on leave for allegedly stalking her ex-girlfriend.
- >In Wisconsin, one officer faces felony misconduct charges for installing a department-owned pole camera on his own property during a contentious divorce and is also accused of destroying evidence.
- >Over half of the roughly 50 documented misuse cases involve surveillance tied to romantic partners, prompting researchers to flag this as a domestic-violence-adjacent tool as much as a policing one.

Why does the city feel the need to give tools to these unwanted actors to cyberstalk our community? Please reconsider this.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Tuesday August 25 City Council Meeting – thanks for action on ALPR Contracts
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:05:16 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED] >
Date: Sun, Aug 23, 2026 at 11:22 PM
Subject: Tuesday August 25 City Council Meeting – thanks for action on ALPR Contracts
To: Santa Barbara City Council <SBCityCouncil@santabarbaraca.gov>, Kristen Sneddon <ksneddon@santabarbaraca.gov>, Wendy Santamaria <wsantamaria@santabarbaraca.gov>, Meagan Harmon <MHarmon@santabarbaraca.gov>, Oscar Gutierrez <ogutierrez@santabarbaraca.gov>, Mike Jordan <Mjordan@santabarbaraca.gov>, Eric Friedman <efriedman@santabarbaraca.gov>, Randy Rowse <rowse@santabarbaraca.gov>

City Council: Thanks for indicating that Santa Barbara will be terminating its contract with Flock Safety for ALPR surveillance. I am concerned, however, that the city will be jumping from the frying into the fire. An ALPR contract will Verkada or another surveillance company will not solve the problem of misuse of the technology, unauthorized sharing of data with agencies other than SBPD and other problems with lax security.

Are the supposed crime-fighting benefits really worth the erosion of privacy and civil rights that inevitably accompany these technologies? I think not.

Don't rush into a another bad deal. We don't want and don't need ALPR surveillance in our neighborhoods.

[REDACTED]
4th City Council District

--

--



From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Verkada contract
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:07:34 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am writing as a resident and business owner in the city of Santa Barbara, California to urge the city council to NOT sign a contract for any new public surveillance cameras in the city. These companies not only do not make any of us safer (there have been multiple instances of police officers being arrested for accessing the data for their own personal use; there are multiple notable instances of the systems "misreading" license plates and mistaking one person's face for another person's face - leading to unlawful detainment and catastrophic consequences for law abiding citizens), but they cause a rift in our communities.

Santa Barbara is a small town and it would be much more cost effective to have police officers be part of the communities they police - out talking with citizens, tourists, business owners, and truly understanding what is happening in the community - rather than having them sit behind a computer looking at AI data which may or may not be accurate and making (often, life or death) decisions based on that.

Please listen to the community members who know that some things don't require technological solutions. Keeping us safe is a function of all of us knowing each other, working together to make Santa Barbara a vibrant city. Not paying tech companies to watch our every move.

[REDACTED] (she/her)
Founder of Connective Tissue Coaching & Consulting
Author, Coach, Mediator, Podcast Host

- ◇ [REDACTED]
- ◇ [REDACTED]
- ◇ Santa Barbara, CA (unceded Chumash territory)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:20:54 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members, Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council: Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.

Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.

Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.

Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.

Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.

Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people.

When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment- Surveillance
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:33:21 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am writing to express my opposition of the license plate reader and facial recognition cameras that are being considered to replace the flock cameras. While it is great that the city has ended the contract with Flock, signing with an alternative company with similar capabilities has the same issues involved. These cameras are unnecessary and potentially dangerous. The risks outweigh the benefits. Most members of the community that I know and have spoken with are against the surveillance cameras. America is not a surveillance state. How can we be ensured these cameras would not be used to collect and sell data? That they won't be used improperly or inaccurately?

These cameras are reminiscent of 1984 by George Orwell. "Big brother is watching." Studies have shown systems like this with facial recognition technology are prone to inaccurately identifying individuals, and are even MORE likely to inaccurately identify individuals who are not white. This is EXTREMELY problematic. Thank you for taking the time to consider these issues during the meeting this Tuesday.

Thanks,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No to Verkada
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 6:43:40 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I am grateful that we are shifting away from Flock systems but please do not simply go to another alternative with Verkada.

The risks far outweigh the pros for appropriate usage of these technologies and do not make our communities inherently safer.

There are a multitude of other measures we can take to make SB safer but this third party technology is not one of them.

Best,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No Surveillance Technology
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 7:00:34 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

To The City Council of Santa Barbara,

I am writing to urge you to not put any surveillance or facial recognition technology in Santa Barbara, as well as, on the Central Coast. We do not want Verkada or any surveillance network in our communities. We do not need surveillance companies recording our faces and our information and making people of our community feel unsafe.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Commenting on Agenda Item 5 - hideous Verkada spying
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 7:43:38 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Commenting on Agenda Item 5

Dear Mayor and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I am writing to strongly oppose the City's plan to replace the Flock automated license plate reader system with another system from Verkada.

My concern is larger than which company supplies the cameras. I do not believe our local government should be routinely tracking and storing the movements of ordinary citizens who have done absolutely nothing wrong.

This is creepy government overreach in search of a problem.

There is an important difference between using technology to investigate an actual crime and building a system that continuously records where thousands of innocent people are going, stores that information, and makes it available in case someone decides it might be useful later. The fact that technology now makes this kind of surveillance inexpensive and easy does not make it appropriate.

We should be particularly skeptical when we are told that giving government another surveillance capability will make us safer. These systems create their own very real risks: misuse of information, unauthorized access, data breaches, sharing with outside agencies, incorrect identification, and the inevitable expansion of how the information is used once a large database exists.

Those aren't theoretical concerns that can simply be balanced away by choosing a different vendor. They are consequences of collecting the data in the first place.

If police are investigating a crime, there are established legal processes for obtaining information relevant to that investigation. That is very different from recording everyone first and asking questions later.

Santa Barbara should not normalize a system in which simply driving down a public street creates a government-accessible record of where you were, when you were there, and potentially where you have traveled over time.

Before deploying technology this intrusive, the City should be able to identify a specific and substantial problem that cannot reasonably be addressed through less invasive means, demonstrate that the benefits outweigh the considerable privacy risks, and establish meaningful public oversight. The burden should be on government to justify surveillance—not on citizens to explain why they don't want to be tracked.

Ending the Flock contract was an opportunity for Santa Barbara to reconsider whether automated mass license-plate tracking belongs in our community at all. Simply replacing

Flock with Verkada misses that opportunity.

Please do not approve a replacement ALPR system. Protecting public safety and protecting the privacy and civil liberties of innocent people are not opposing goals. A city that values both should be extremely reluctant to build a database of its residents' movements in the first place.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.

Santa Barbara

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [Talhia Dorado](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 7:56:56 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,

We the people who live/commute/visit in Santa Barbara are not interested in switching surveillance companies. We are rejecting mass surveillance completely!

We deserve public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and do not invest in surveillance tools that contribute to the continued criminalization of Black, brown and indigenous communities! We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council: Schedule this agenda item at or after 5:00 PM so working families, youth, and community members have a meaningful opportunity to participate.

Support staff's recommendation to Cancel Flock contract (s) AND do not contract with any other ALPR vendor! Switching to another vendor does not eliminate the risks of errors, misuse, or data breaches. The backlash against Flock is not about a specific brand of camera, it reflects public opposition to dragnet surveillance.

Remove all ALPR mass surveillance from Santa Barbara City jurisdiction as immediately as possible to prevent further community harm.
Require transparent, independent public and internal audits and annual reporting for any surveillance technologies to ensure accountability, accuracy, compliance, and the protection of civil rights.

Strengthen and review the current data protection policy to ensure no personal data information is shared to outside third parties without judicial warrant.

Invest in proven community safety strategies including mental health services, tenant protections, youth development, and prevention instead of expanding mass surveillance.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.
Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

[REDACTED]
Santa Barbara County resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 5 - August 25, 2026, 2:00 PM Meeting
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 8:01:45 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

Please accept this email as a public comment regarding agenda item 5 - Nonrenewal of Flock Contract.

While I support the termination of the City's contract with Flock Cameras, the consideration to sign a contract with an alternate surveillance company (Verkada) would be against the best interest of the City. I would like to voice my opposition toward this measure because my issues are with the whole surveillance network rather than with Flock alone. The implications of the facial recognition component of this system is alarming due to potential for data breaches and Verkada's partnership with the federal government. This data harvesting of our whereabouts and facial recognition is undemocratic and anti-community. I believe the budget requested for this system could be better allocated to social programs that would actually address the root cause of crime rather than a reactionary policing system.

Please reconsider moving forward with this agenda item and keep these predatory surveillance companies out of Santa Barbara.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Commenting on Agenda Item 5
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 8:13:22 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Commenting on Agenda Item 5

Dear Santa Barbara City Council,

I am writing because I am angry and, frankly, exhausted by the continued expansion of surveillance in the name of public safety.

I have spent years being active in my community and speaking up for civil rights and accountable government. I am tired of having to fight the same police-state thinking over and over again—the idea that the answer to every possible problem is more cameras, more tracking, more data collection, and more information about innocent people stored somewhere just in case the government might want it.

Ending the contract with Flock and then replacing it with Verkada does not solve the problem. **The surveillance itself is the problem.**

I should be able to drive through my own community without the government recording where I went simply because the technology exists to do it. I have done nothing wrong, and neither have the overwhelming majority of people whose movements these systems collect.

When did routinely tracking innocent people become an acceptable price for the vague promise that it might make us safer?

I am tired of watching our privacy and civil liberties chipped away one supposedly reasonable piece at a time. At some point our elected officials need to say **no**.

Please make that point now. Do not replace Flock with another license plate.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

SB

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No Verkada surveillance system in SB
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 8:46:42 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

My comment regarding Verkada :

We do not need these surveillance cameras in our community.

Verkada has been hacked before and hackers were able to view video footage from public areas and within private companies. The company Verkada has had controversy in the past of employees using the technology to capture images of female coworkers to send alongside sexually explicit messages. Their contracts have come under scrutiny for potentially "bricking" the devices if the contract was to expire. What is Santa Barbara's plan in relation to the terms of the contract? This needs to be considered more before just trying to throw money at a different company that already shares many of the issues and criticism that Flock has faced.

This level of surveillance is not necessary or reasonable. We can solve crime without creating a culture where mass surveillance is the norm. I want to walk down the street without feeling that someone is watching me. It is unsuitable to normalize and encourage this level of surveillance in our beautiful city. I have worked for businesses with security cameras and seen how they are misused. Think about any random group of "professional" individuals and consider whether you would trust them to have this level of access. That these cameras are even being treated as normal or necessary is very unsettling.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [Talhia Dorado](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on item 5 for tomorrow's meeting
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 8:53:45 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear members of the Santa Barbara city council,

Unfortunately, I am teaching during tomorrow's meeting. So, I suppose my first request is that future discussions about ALPR contracts be scheduled at 5pm or later so that the vast majority of your constituents have a better chance of attending and allowing their voice to be heard in person.

First, I would like to thank you for cancelling the Flock contract.

I know that the narrative from those in support of ALPRs from another company is one of safety. I would ask that you carefully examine that claim. I will outline some concerns.

1. Surveillance (even something as seemingly "safe" as a license plate reader) comes with a very high risk of misuse. The costs associated with misuse creates at least as much damage (I would argue much more) than the benefits of that surveillance. I'm certain you're aware of the ongoing cases of misuse of ALPR-gathered data.
2. We are fortunate that Santa Barbara is a relatively safe place. We have been a safe place for decades. And we have been safe without this technology. The idea that surveillance is essential for safety is a social construction. It is not, especially in a relatively low-crime community like Santa Barbara.
3. John Palmenteri reports a plan to replace the Flock contract with the Verkada license plate readers. **Verkada license plate readers and others like it have a record of data breaches and data misuse.** Moreover, there have been well documented violations of civil rights through misuse of ALPR technology, including Interstate Data Sharing and Retaliatory Law Enforcement. **Concerns include** (1) out-of-state or federal law enforcement accessing local driver data to track individuals seeking out-of-state reproductive healthcare or targeting undocumented residents without local judicial approval, (2) False Matches and Unreasonable Search/Seizure (e.g., misreading a plate or misidentifying a state have caused law enforcement to execute felony stops at gunpoint on innocent drivers, amounting to unreasonable searches under the Fourth Amendment), and (3) cases of stalking and insider abuse (e.g., across multiple jurisdictions nationwide, officers have occasionally misused ALPR search portals to track former personal partners or private individuals, violating due process and privacy protections.
4. Please look into the culture of Verkada, including massive sexual harassment in their company through [misuse of their own surveillance equipment against their female employees](#). See also [this](#). You don't need to go outside of the company itself to find how surveillance will be misused to harm vulnerable populations. I assume you're aware of the [DOJ's lawsuit against Verkada](#) for a host of issues, which was resolved after Verkada paid a mere \$2.9 million and agreed to some steps. **Please tell me we're not going to give out community's funds to this company!**

Verkada or other ALPRs company simply are not needed here. Their potential misuse far

exceeds their potential benefits. We have long been safe without them. Please refuse any ALPR contracts.

██████████ PhD

--

██████████ (he/him/his)
Professor, Dept. of Communication
University of California at Santa Barbara

Past President (2023), National Communication Association
Distinguished Scholar, National Communication Association
Fellow, International Communication Association

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 9:23:17 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

No estamos de acuerdo con las camaras FLOCK/ALPRy la vijilancia maciva..eso no es justo para jente que solo trabajadora para un mejor por benie de californi

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No surveillance systems! No Flock OR Verkada!
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 10:33:48 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello City Council,

My name is [REDACTED] and I live in Mike Jordan's district on Mountain Ave. It's great that the Santa Barbara city council has decided to end its contract with Flock surveillance, but we don't want a different surveillance system—we don't want ANY surveillance system.

The concerns everyone has with Flock are the same concerns we will have with **any** surveillance system. Police and other law enforcement have proved themselves to not be trustworthy with this data, as there have been numerous stories of officers using surveillance data inappropriately, especially to stalk women. This is extremely concerning! See here: <https://ij.org/police-have-reportedly-used-license-plate-readers-to-stalk-romantic-interests-at-least-14-times-in-recent-years/>

Additionally, there have been multiple reports of surveillance systems flagging the wrong vehicles and license plates, leading to pursuits of confused, innocent people by law enforcement, who then accuse these innocent people of crimes they did not commit. Recently there was a story of officers who held an innocent person at gunpoint because of a Flock error: <https://www.yahoo.com/news/us/articles/wrong-person-wrong-car-innocent-165054399.html>

These issues will **not** go away if you decide to simply change which surveillance company to sign a contract with.

Many of us in opposition to this surveillance are also aware that Verkada does have the ability to use facial recognition technology, just like Flock. This is an even more concerning issue than license plate readers, in my opinion. There is no reason for these cameras to be scanning my face every time I pass one while walking my dog or riding my bike into downtown. It's extremely unnerving when I have to pass the two Flock cameras while riding my bike over the Micheltorena overpass or when I pass THREE cameras while riding on Mission from the Westside east into downtown.

We've all read 1984, right?! We don't need or want facial recognition technology used while we are simply existing in public places within the city. This is very arguably a violation of our fourth amendment rights under the US Constitution.

It is my opinion that the **only** places these ALPR cameras should (maybe) exist are on certain on-ramps or exits of major freeways, managed by the state, **not** within the intersections of cities where citizens live, work, and play.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public notice-
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 10:54:47 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hello,

I'm a local resident of Santa Barbara for the last 30 years. We do not want nor need Surveillance cameras and facial recognition in Santa Barbara. We do not want a surveillance system, it is the network not just the company. We do not consent. This does not make anyone feel safer it makes us feel haunted. This is an invasion of our autonomy and sovereignty to move freely and should be declared unconstitutional.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#)
Subject: CC Item 5: Non-renewal of Surveillance Systems
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 11:27:27 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I'm writing to share my concerns about the direction of public safety spending in Santa Barbara, particularly around surveillance technology. I believe our community is best served by investments that build genuine trust, address why harm happens in the first place, and uphold everyone's civil rights.

Specifically, I'd like the Council to take the following steps:

End the Flock camera program. Please remove the existing ALPR cameras and refrain from signing on with a different surveillance vendor. Simply changing providers doesn't solve the underlying problems — misuse, errors, data breaches, and the broader risks of mass surveillance remain regardless of who runs the system.

Slow down before signing anything new. Any future surveillance contract should wait until residents have had real, substantive input. That means a longer public comment period so people can actually research the alternatives and weigh in with informed feedback — not just check a box.

Strengthen privacy protections first. Before any new technology is considered, the City's existing data protection and privacy ordinances need to be reviewed and reinforced so residents' personal information and rights are genuinely safeguarded.

Look hard at the budget. I'd ask the Council to conduct a clear, public accounting of the full costs of any proposed ALPR system — along with available funding and what else that money could accomplish — before committing public dollars.

Build in real oversight. Any surveillance technology the City does use should come with independent audits and consistent public reporting, so there's actual accountability rather than a black box.

Redirect resources toward prevention, not policing technology. Housing stability, tenant protections, youth programming, and mental health services do more for long-term safety than cameras will.

Make participation possible. Please schedule any future hearings on this topic at 5:00 PM or later, so working families, young people, and others who can't attend during the day have a real chance to be part of the conversation.

I believe true safety comes from investing in people — stable housing, strong

communities, and opportunity for young people — not from expanding surveillance infrastructure. I'm asking you to vote against renewing the Flock camera contract and against entering into any new ALPR agreement. Santa Barbara can be safer and healthier by choosing community investment over surveillance.

Thank you for your time and for your service to this city.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

93101 - District 2 Santa Barbara

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: End Surveillance Program
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 11:52:14 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I'm writing to share my concerns about the direction of public safety spending in Santa Barbara, particularly around surveillance technology. I believe our community is best served by investments that build genuine trust, address why harm happens in the first place, and uphold everyone's civil rights.

Specifically, I'd like the Council to take the following steps:

End the Flock camera program. Please remove the existing ALPR cameras and refrain from signing on with a different surveillance vendor. Simply changing providers doesn't solve the underlying problems — misuse, errors, data breaches, and the broader risks of mass surveillance remain regardless of who runs the system.

Slow down before signing anything new. Any future surveillance contract should wait until residents have had real, substantive input. That means a longer public comment period so people can actually research the alternatives and weigh in with informed feedback — not just check a box.

Strengthen privacy protections first. Before any new technology is considered, the City's existing data protection and privacy ordinances need to be reviewed and reinforced so residents' personal information and rights are genuinely safeguarded.

Look hard at the budget. I'd ask the Council to conduct a clear, public accounting of the full costs of any proposed ALPR system — along with available funding and what else that money could accomplish — before committing public dollars.

Build in real oversight. Any surveillance technology the City does use should come with independent audits and consistent public reporting, so there's actual accountability rather than a black box.

Redirect resources toward prevention, not policing technology. Housing stability, tenant protections, youth programming, and mental health services do more for long-term safety than cameras will.

Make participation possible. Please schedule any future hearings on this topic at 5:00 PM or later, so working families, young people, and others who can't attend during the day

have a real chance to be part of the conversation.

I believe true safety comes from investing in people — stable housing, strong communities, and opportunity for young people — not from expanding surveillance infrastructure. I'm asking you to vote against renewing the Flock camera contract and against entering into any new ALPR agreement. Santa Barbara can be safer and healthier by choosing community investment over surveillance.

Thank you for your time and for your service to this city.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public comment on agenda item 5
Date: Monday, August 24, 2026 11:53:56 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

Please accept this email as a public comment regarding agenda item 5 - Nonrenewal of Flock Contract.

I fully support the termination of the city's contract with Flock Camera as I believe the mass surveillance of our community in this manner is irresponsible and dangerous. Facial recognition and tracking data collected by this company and by other surveillance companies, including Verkada, which is presently being considered to replace Flock Cameras in Santa Barbara, are not protected, often leaked and misused, and jeopardize the safety of community members. Please acknowledge my opposition toward this measure and please consider using the proposed budget for this system towards something that actually benefits the people of our community instead of private corporations.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: comment on Agenda Item #5, City Council meeting Aug. 25, 2026
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:04:39 AM

RE: Agenda Item #5, City Council meeting Aug. 25, 2026

Thank you very much for cancelling the contract with Flock surveillance. However, it is not acceptable to replace this with more surveillance.

The technology is unreliable, known to misidentify individuals. And it is unlikely that any camera system will not be abused by being shared in ways that we might not even consider.

Just appearing in City Council meetings could be used as information for tracking any individual.

Our citizens will not benefit from a surveillance system. Please represent our citizens and do not subject us to this!

Thank you very much for considering our requests,

[REDACTED]
resident of Santa Barbara

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 8/25 Meeting: Verkada Still Raises 4th Amendment Concerns
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:15:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

My name is [REDACTED], and I live in East Mesa. I want to speak on the proposed switch from Flock to Verkada.

I'll say upfront, keeping the data city-owned and off a shared network is a real improvement. That addresses many of the misuse and data-sharing problems we saw with Flock, including the risk of information ending up with agencies like ICE.

But I don't think this solves the core problem. Whether the cameras are run by Flock or Verkada, the city is still logging every car that passes, all day, whether the driver has done anything wrong or not. That's still a searchable record of where residents go and how often. Swapping vendors doesn't change what the system actually does.

This matters constitutionally, not just as a policy preference. In *Carpenter v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled that detailed location tracking by the government counts as a search under the Fourth Amendment, specifically because that kind of data reveals too much about a person's life to go unchecked. Flock is currently being sued on that same theory in *Schmidt v. City of Norfolk*, and that case isn't about who Flock shares data with. It's about whether building this kind of searchable movement database is a warrantless search in the first place. A closed system doesn't answer that question. It's built the same way.

So before approving Verkada, I'd ask the Council to require a warrant standard for any historical search of this data, not just internal policy and audit logs, and to put a hard cap on retention shorter than 30 days by default. Owning the system responsibly starts with us, not by trusting the vendor's promises.

Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Terminate use of Flock, no replacement with Verkada cameras
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 6:18:10 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please terminate the use of Flock cameras. Do not replace those cameras with Verkada cameras.
The police state and those who facilitate it are becoming increasingly unpopular. People do not take kindly to being spied on and unjustly treated.
[REDACTED] Ojai, CA

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Say No to Verkada and ALPRs
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:19:41 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear City Council,

Please do not allow ALPRs to be installed in our city. It is important that we do not allow mass surveillance systems to permeate our community.

ALPRs have a lack of transparency and oversight that is dangerous to our residents' right to personal privacy.

Imagine someone being able to find out what doctor you visit, house of worship, AAA meetings, or political protests you attend. This level of oversight that ALPRs have the power over is easily abusable and unnecessary for our city.

Please SAY NO to Verkada and all ALPRs.

District 1 Santa Barbara resident,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: NO FLOK
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:27:35 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

No surveillance state. No facial recognition.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Surveillance System
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:51:05 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

To whom it may concern,

Public Comment

Santa Barbara does not want a surveillance system in our city. Additionally we don't not want Verkada or any other networks with a license plate recognition/ facial recognition system. Thank you for dismantling the Flock system but please don't replace it with a network using the same technology to track our citizens license plates or faces.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Verkada Camera Decision
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:53:29 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I wanted to express my concerns with the potential of introducing Verkada camera systems here in town.

This decision to sign a contract with them can lead to a lot false arrests, just like the Flock cameras have been known to do, and has the potential of being abused for the purpose that may be stated.

I hope this descion to sign any form of contract/agreement/ECT with Verkada as well as any other network based surveillance system is not to be considered due to the harm it can do to our community.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: Protect Our Community - No Mass Surveillance
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 10:06:54 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,

As a Santa Barbara resident I do not approve of ANY surveillance contracts. I reject mass surveillance completely!

We deserve public safety investments that build trust and address the root causes of harm. Do NOT invest in tools that further criminalize minorities and people of color.

I demand the Santa Barbara City Council to do the following:

- Remove all Flock cameras immediately and refrain from any future contracts with ALPR vendors.
- Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.
- Invest in housing, mental health, youth programs, and community safety efforts for long term stability and restorative change!

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Flock and Verkada
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 10:10:29 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Most honorable clerk and city council members:

I am unable to attend todays discussion about replacing the city's contract with Flock surveillance with Verkada, but please accept my input. We do not need any surveillance systems in our city. Do not authorize a replacement, just end unconstitutional surveillance and respect our 4th amendment rights.

Thanks you,

[REDACTED]

WebRep



Overall rating





From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Item 5. Nonrenewal of Flock Contract
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 10:14:29 AM

Sent from my Galaxy

I support the nonrenewal of the Flock surveillance contract. However, I DO NOT support signing ANY new contracts with camer surveillance networks.

YES, break the Flock contract.

NO, do not immediately sign with another company.

[REDACTED]

Santa Barbara

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public comment for Regular City Council Meeting on 8/25/26
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 10:28:07 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor and Members of City Council:

I, like many residents, deeply appreciate the cancellation of the city's contract with Flock. However, replacing it with a similar system like Verkada that supposedly silos data within internal systems is not a better solution - it's the exact same thing with a slightly more palatable (but not inviolable) pretext. Citizens do not want to be surveilled, period. And if 'solving crimes' is the justification, where are the stats proving that Santa Barbara's are any safer with these cameras than we were before they were installed? And what say you to the documented cases of citizens in other jurisdictions being arrested erroneously for crimes they did not commit, based on faulty data?

We beg of you, reject the "spy net" dystopia that is sure to follow such a blatant violation of the right of lawful citizens to travel as they please without fear of an ambiguous, corporation-profiting all-seeing eye.

Passionately,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Flock cameras out of SB
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 10:53:00 AM

Please, remove all Flock cameras from SB and do not replace them with alternate forms of license plate/facial recognition surveillance. Public trust has been severely damaged in law enforcement due to Ice activity in SB. This would be a good way to start earning back trust.

We have already heard of numerous accounts of abuse when this type of surveillance has been used around the country.

We want this to be a safe and welcoming community that backs our law enforcement officers. Mass surveillance works against that goal.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to ALPRs
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 11:18:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Santa Barbara did the right thing by ending the contract with Flock.

I am writing to encourage Santa Barbara to stay on the right path and to oppose contracting with a different surveillance system.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No Verkada Please
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 11:19:09 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Submitting a public comment to please urge you to not use Verkada in SB! Or facial recognition softwares/surveillance systems like this. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Nobody wants mass surveillance of any kind in Santa Barbara
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 11:33:07 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon Councilmembers,

I am grateful for the decision to discontinue service and remove all Flock cameras from our city. However, the decision to install an alternative system is misguided. The City should ban, and discontinue use of, any and all automated license plate recognition (ALPR) technology, including the Verkada system.

First and foremost, there is very, very little public support for any type of ALPR system. The Council, as our representatives, ought to make its decision pursuant to the public interest in the issue. We as voters will remember who voted for mass surveillance, and vote you out of office.

Second, nobody trusts mass surveillance technology no matter what promises the providers may make. The instances of unauthorized system access for personal ends, criminal activity, and targeting of vulnerable groups and political protesters will continue no matter what brand of system is installed. All ALPR systems will be hacked, and all ALPR systems will be abused. Under an authoritarian federal government, as we find ourselves today, the risks far outweigh the potential gains which could be achieved by conventional policing.

Lastly, Verkada has its own history of negligence with data security. Hackers gained access to 150,000 of their live camera feeds in 2021; Verkada suffered a denial-of-service attack in 2020, and went unaware of it for two weeks; and they only implemented basic internal security measures like complex passwords and two-factor authentication after being fined by the FTC for their negligence. For more information visit <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2024/08/ftc-takes-action-against-security-camera-firm-verkada-over-charges-it-failed-secure-videos-other> - this is a company that responds to being caught and fined, rather than taking a proactive approach to data security. More issues can be expected in the future.

I urge you not to proceed with the usage of *any* mass-surveillance tools in our city.

Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 6:20:19 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,
Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.

Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.

Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.

Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.

Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.

Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: August 25 General Meeting, Agenda Item #5, Flock replacement
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 7:23:33 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Santa Barbara City Council Members:

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the use of surveillance and facial recognition technologies and equipment in our city.

I believe these technologies raise significant concerns regarding privacy, civil liberties, and accuracy. I urge you to consider these impacts and reject the implementation or expansion of such systems in our community.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our city.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public comment
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 7:42:50 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello! To the counsel members.

I am against the alpr in our city or any mass surveillance of any kind. We do NOT need this. There is enough surveillance as there is, which should not justify just one more.

"The means of defense against foreign danger historically have become the instruments of tyranny at home," James Madison (fourth president of the United States) in his speech to Congress on June 1, 1812.

Please fight for what is right. We believe in you as our elected representatives.

Best,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment for August 25th City Council Meeting RE: ALPRs
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 7:43:13 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon,

My name is [REDACTED], and I'm a resident of Santa Barbara in the 93111 zip code. I'm writing to thank the City Council for deciding to break its contract with Flock cameras in our city. However, I would like to urge the City Council to ***NOT*** replace that contract with a similar company. It's not just the specific company (Flock) that residents have a problem with; it's that we do not want to live in a surveillance state. ***ALL*** ALPRs are an unnecessary invasion of privacy, and do little to actually improve public safety. I'd also like to urge the City Council to ***NOT*** invest in any facial recognition technology for the purported reasons of public safety, especially as time and time again, these technologies have shown that they are too prone to error, especially when it comes to Black people and People of Color. The stakes are too high to have such an error-prone system.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: No to ALL ALPR vendors
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 8:07:13 AM

August 25, 2026
Re: Agenda Item 5

Hello City Council members.

My name is [REDACTED] and I'm a resident of Santa Barbara. I am asking you to reject continued reliance on automated license plate reader surveillance in our city.

I was happy to hear that the contract with Flock was canceled, but saddened to hear you are thinking of replacing the surveillance contract with another ALPR vendor. Swapping one company's logo for another doesn't solve the underlying problem. Every ALPR system carries the same risks — mass surveillance of innocent residents, data misuse, algorithmic error, and the ever-present threat of data breaches. The vendor name changes; the risk to our civil liberties does not.

Second: hold off on any new surveillance contract until residents have had real time to weigh in. Extend the public comment period. Give this community the chance to research alternatives and bring informed recommendations back to you, rather than rushing a decision through.

Third: before any new contract is even considered, strengthen our existing privacy and data protection ordinances so residents' personal information and civil rights are actually protected on paper, not just in principle.

Fourth: review the public safety budget in full. Before spending another dollar on ALPR technology, the City owes residents a transparent accounting of total costs, available funding sources, and what else that money could do.

Fifth: require real accountability — independent audits and regular public reporting on any surveillance technology the City uses, not vendor self-reporting.

Finally: invest in what actually keeps us safe. Housing. Tenant protections. Youth programs. Mental health services. Prevention. Not mass surveillance.

We are asking you to choose community safety over surveillance expansion.

Thank you,

--

 (she/her)

"Hope is invented every day." ~ James Baldwin

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Flock
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 8:13:33 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

All flock cameras gone

[REDACTED] Santa Barbara 93013 California [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Santa Barbara City Council](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: No Surveillance
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 8:41:54 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Mayor and Council,

I am more afraid of what can be done with modern surveillance tech than the threat of violent crime without surveillance tech in this community. Let's focus on building positive relationships between neighbors then supporting fear-based technology. From my understanding is violent crime was down before the installation of cameras.

Best,

[REDACTED] District 4 resident

Sent from [Proton Mail](#) for iOS.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:08:51 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,
Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.

Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.

Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.

Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.

Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.

Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

Enviado desde mi iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#); [City Clerk](#)
Cc: [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [FPCcomments@santabarbaraca.gov](#)
Subject: Protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:08:52 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,

Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

- **Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor.** Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.
- **Hold off on any new surveillance contracts** until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.
- **Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first** to protect personal information and civil rights.
- **Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor.** Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.
- **Require transparency and accountability**, including independent audits and

regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

- **Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance.** Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.
- **Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later** so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:09:11 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,
Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.

Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.

Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.

Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.

Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.

Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

Enviado desde mi iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 5 Public Comment for 8/25/26 at 2pm
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:13:00 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

This is for public comment on Agenda Item 5 for 8/25/26 at 2pm.

Hello and Thank you,

I want to start by making something very clear. I am not anti-police. I am not anti-camera. And I am not anti-technology. I support giving our police department tools that help them do their jobs. If cameras help solve crimes, identify suspects, find missing people, or respond to emergencies, I think those are legitimate and valuable uses of technology.

My concern is much narrower. Like Flock, I don't think Verkada is a company that the City should entrust with this responsibility. If Verkada were a person applying for a sensitive position with the City, I don't think this resume would get them the job.

Let's look at that résumé. In 2021, Verkada suffered a major security breach. According to a federal complaint, the attacker was able to access approximately 150,000 live customer cameras. The federal complaint specifically alleged that cameras at psychiatric hospitals and health clinics were among those accessed. The complaint also alleged failures involving basic information-security practices, including password requirements, encryption, and network security. This resulted in action by the Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice and ultimately a federal order and fine.

I'm not claiming that Verkada is necessarily insecure today, but if someone were applying for a job with the City involving sensitive information, and their previous employer had suffered a security failure that exposed access to approximately 150,000 cameras, that would disqualify them for the position.

Then there's the way Verkada sells its products. Much of these sales tactics are reported on by IPVM. IPVM is a specialized surveillance-industry research and investigations. They are like "consumer reports" for surveillance professionals. They have done investigations into how Verkada sells to public institutions and I highly suggest the city invest the \$200 to subscribe to their reports.

In 2024, IPVM reported that a Verkada sales director told a school district that Verkada's cameras were "open source", which they are not, while helping secure a

deal worth approximately \$1.2 million. So they lied.

I don't think taxpayers should have to discover years later that something important about the system wasn't quite what they thought they were buying. The City shouldn't be relying on sales promises. The City should be buying a system based on objective requirements and independent evaluation.

Tying directly into these false sales claims is the issue with vendor lock-in. We're not simply buying cameras. We're buying into Verkada's cloud platform and licensing system. Verkada's own current legal terms state that without valid licensing, customers can have limited or no access to their data and software, and that the hardware will not function as designed. IPVM has independently investigated and tested Verkada's licensing model and reported that customers can be locked out of normal camera functionality when licenses expire.

That creates a fundamental problem: The City can own the physical camera while Verkada retains control over whether the camera remains fully useful. That is not the kind of dependency a city government should voluntarily create. Imagine buying a police vehicle and then being told that the manufacturer gets to decide whether the engine works based on whether you paid them a yearly software subscription. The City should own infrastructure that it can continue to operate.

A camera can remain physically useful for many years. But once the City builds its entire surveillance system around a proprietary cloud platform, switching vendors becomes increasingly difficult. Officers learn one system. Years of footage accumulate in it. Policies and procedures are built around it. Integrations are created around it. The City becomes dependent on it. And then the vendor has enormous leverage when the next renewal comes around. That's exactly when taxpayers are most vulnerable to price increases and unfavorable contract terms. The City should not knowingly create that situation.

There are also serious questions about how Verkada's own employees have treated surveillance footage. IPVM reported an incident in which photographs of female Verkada employees taken from Verkada's own surveillance system were circulated by sales managers with sexual commentary. I am not saying every Verkada employee is the devil, but we're talking about a company whose entire business is built around surveillance. When a company asks the City to trust it with footage of our residents, employees, businesses, and public spaces, how that company has historically handled their surveillance footage matters. It is part of their résumé... Those employees were not fired by the way.

To recap, if Verkada were a person applying for a job with the City, here's what their résumé would say: Major security breach: approximately 150,000 customer

cameras accessed, including cameras at psychiatric hospitals and health clinics. Federal enforcement: the FTC and DOJ took action over its security practices, resulting in a federal order and roughly a \$3 million penalty for a \$6 billion company, that's basically the equivalent of a \$50 fine for someone worth \$100,000, by the way. Vendor lock-in: its own licensing terms make continued payment integral to full system functionality. Sales practices: IPVM documented Verkada executives calling its cameras "open source" while selling a roughly \$1.2 million government contract. Surveillance culture: employees reportedly used Verkada's own cameras to obtain and circulate images of female coworkers with sexual commentary. And beyond those individual incidents, Verkada's business model gives it a financial incentive to keep the City dependent on its platform.

That's the résumé. If this were a person applying for a sensitive job with the City, I don't think they'd get the job. So why should a company with that résumé get our surveillance contract?

So my position isn't "don't use cameras." I want the City to find a better camera system. I want our police officers to have effective tools. I want technology that helps solve crimes. I want the City to have a modern public-safety infrastructure.

I think the City should establish what it actually wants before choosing the next vendor.

The City should look for a system that:

- doesn't make the City permanently dependent on one vendor;
- doesn't require perpetual licensing to use equipment the City already purchased;
- allows the City to migrate to another system;
- gives the City direct control over its own data;
- uses open and widely supported standards;
- minimizes centralized storage of sensitive surveillance footage;

- has strict limitations on employee and vendor access;
- has transparent, predictable long-term costs;
- has strong cybersecurity requirements;
- has meaningful retention and deletion policies;
- doesn't make it technologically or financially prohibitive for the City to walk away.
- And doesn't support a scummy company with a dubious track record.

Those should be requirements for the replacement system, not things we hope a vendor voluntarily provides. I think the City should reject Verkada and find an alternative that gives our police the tools they need without reproducing the same structural problems we've already seen with Verkada and Flock.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

SB Resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda item 5
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 9:16:21 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

No Flock. No Verkada. There are now more than 120,000 ALPR cameras nationwide, and the data they capture can and has been abused: for example, by police officers threatening former domestic partners or harassing their critics, There are documented cases of ALPR technology making errors reading license plates, resulting in innocent families being pulled over at gunpoint and children being handcuffed. Camera footage goes to ICE as well as to our good police.

I patrol our streets in the early morning, to alert our neighbors about the presence of ICE in the neighborhoods and at the County Jail. I am not afraid to confront ICE, even as an 80 year old grandma. But having cameras track my movements and report them to law enforcement terrifies me. PLEASE: No Flock. No Verkada.

[REDACTED] on behalf of myself and
the Social Justice Ministry, Live Oak Unitarian Universalts Congregation
"Tell me, what do you plan to do with your one wild and precious life?" Mary Oliver
"Of all the paths you take in life, make sure a few of them are dirt." John Muir

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Verkada Hearing
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 11:37:14 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

We as the residents of Santa Barbara do not want a surveillance system put in place. The issue is the network not just the company. We do not want facial recognition technology on the central coast of California at all. Verkada still deals with data breaches just like flock and they are also partnered with the trump administration. The network and surveillance state is the issue not the specific type of camera. We don't want the women and children of our community stalked and followed by people who use this technology to stalk their exes as has happened with Flock already. Please do not allow our beautiful community to become a surveillance state living in fear.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 11:49:22 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,
Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.

Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.

Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.

Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.

Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.

Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.

Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 8/25 council meeting against all ALPR's
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:03:25 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I am writing to urge the Council to reject all current and future contracts for Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology, including proposed alternative systems like Verkada.

While letting the Flock Safety contract expire was an important step, replacing one mass surveillance provider with another does not solve the underlying issues of privacy, security, and public trust.

I urge you to consider the following risks before approving any new ALPR platform:

- **Hardware & AI Analytics Risks:** Verkada hardware utilizes advanced AI capabilities—including feature searching and potential facial analytics—that go far beyond basic plate reading, deepening the scope of automated tracking.
- **Cybersecurity & Data Vulnerabilities:** Verkada has a documented history of major security breaches that exposed thousands of live camera feeds. Storing location data on vulnerable cloud networks creates unnecessary cybersecurity and legal liabilities for Santa Barbara.
- **Out-of-State Data Sharing & SB 54 Constraints:** Despite local restrictions and California SB 54 protections, automated location tracking creates persistent risks for out-of-state travelers, immigrants, and individuals seeking reproductive or gender-affirming healthcare in California.
- **Mass Surveillance of Innocent Residents:** Dragnet monitoring treats law-abiding community members as continuous targets without cause or suspicion, delivering minimal proven safety returns relative to the privacy lost.

Santa Barbara should not participate in building or expanding infrastructure that tracks its residents. I ask the Council to set a precedent for civil liberties by declining to sign, renew, or fund any ALPR camera contract.

We do not want to be on the wrong side of history on this topic.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Resident of Santa Barbara, Bel Air Knolls

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: City Council Agenda Item #5, Tuesday Aug 25 2026
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:21:35 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Honorable Councilmembers:

It is important to prevent arrangements that could do unintended harm.
Nationally, we have seen ALPR technology misused and abused to violate citizen rights.

As a society, over time, many abuses, dangers, even forms of violence have been corrected by rearranging things rather than by improving any person.
To your credit, you ended the contract with Flock and are considering how to rearrange things.

Institutional realism means you can't count on permanent good companies, or permanent good laws.

Practice good civic hygiene. We've built water infrastructure to keep our water clean, hygienic, and safe.

We need civic infrastructure to keep our civil rights safe.

Poor civic hygiene is an arrangement that produces harm not intended or perceived at first glance.

Don't rush to install mass surveillance technologies like ALPR that could some day be used by a potential police state.

The sales pitch surveillance technology companies make is based on convenience and so-called security.

We get ubiquitous data collection: biometric IDs, ALPR, face recognition in public space, mass location tracking, "lawful access" backdoors.

We see that software inevitably has bugs and security vulnerabilities that can be compromised. There is danger here.

Police states are built gradually. In our era, they accumulate through infrastructure: databases, cameras,

standards that normalize access, and legal exceptions that become precedent.

Such states become low-trust societies.

We don't just need rights on paper; we need an environment that make rights hard to violate.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Santa Barbara (Mesa)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#); [Holly Perea](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#)
Subject: 8/25 Public Comment on Agenda Item 5
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:31:25 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am writing in regards to wanting to replace Flock with another Automatic License Plate Reader (ALPR) technology and ongoing discussions with a different company, Verkada Inc. I have reason to believe that Verkada is just as bad as Flock for [potential abuse](#) and [lax data security](#). **Importantly, I oppose mass surveillance no matter who's doing it.** Furthermore, data shows that [fewer than 1%](#) of scanned cars are connected to any sort of wrongdoing, but ALPRs still store everyone's detailed travel history. This leaves an opportunity for law enforcement and other agencies to target protestors, minorities, immigrants, abortion seekers, journalists, as well as allowing side door access to agencies like Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) and ICE.

I call on the city council to cancel Flock contracts and do not contract with any other ALPR vendor!

Best,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED] (she/they)

UAW 4811, Field Organizer

PhD, UC Santa Barbara Materials

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment on item 5
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:31:59 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Mayor Rowse and City Council Members

I'm writing to say that I very much appreciate the city ending the contract with flock, and writing to urge you not to enter into any contract with any similar company. As a woman in the community I find the ability to be tracked by police anywhere, as well as the possibility of data leaks terrifying. As you know from paying attention to the national news, the number of times that these data systems have been used inappropriately by people in authority is absurd. Even one time is too many and we know about way more than one time, For reference please see the linked article

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2026/08/02/how-police-officers-used-vast-network-cameras-spy-their-exes/>

Please take the safety of women into account and do not allow our data to be collected for simply moving around the city in a lawful manner.

Thank you for your consideration.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 5 Comment
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:32:34 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

To all City Council members,

As a lifelong resident of the area, I am glad it has been brought to your attention that there are risks and unsafe practices that have taken place with Flock cameras around the country. That said, replacing one ALPR with another does not address most residents' concerns. The fact that they can be accessed by ICE and police without valid reason is the main concern. On top of that, there have been many cases where the ALPR has misread license plates, causing families to be pulled over at gunpoint for stolen vehicles when it is actually one or two letters off on the license plate. There is a recent case where a man picked up a \$20 bill someone had dropped, and they are now looking for him through an ALPR database; that is not a crime. The number of police who have abused the easy access to information to also stalk their ex-partners is yet another reason we do not need these in our community. Overall, there are non-AI license plate readers that have been useful enough for law enforcement to still do their job. One more time, Santa Barbara residents do not like the illegal kidnappings of our fellow community members by ICE, and allowing them to stalk people who have committed no crimes and have helped create Santa Barbara into what it has become would show us where you all stand, ESPECIALLY with upcoming elections. I highly recommend **NOT** replacing Flock cameras with another ALPR, and also to **REMOVE** any Flock cameras still up, as they are still recording our citizens without consent.

Please listen to our community, as you are our chosen representatives,
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Comment on Agenda Item #5: Nonrenewal of Flock Contract
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:34:04 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council Members,

Thank you for cancelling Flock — that was the right call, especially given its ties to Peter Thiel. I also appreciate that staff considered Axon and Motorola and ruled them out partly due to more limited privacy controls. That shows privacy was already a real factor in this decision, which is really good to hear.

Because Verkada's LPR is the same category of technology as Flock's, preventative safeguards still need to be locked in now instead of waiting for futures problem to arise.

The following are some vulnerabilities in the current SBPD LPR policy, and proposed requests to fix them.

1. "Not open to public review" (Policy 415.2) means there's no public audit trail. The report claims accountability through "audit logging" and "role-based permissions," but that data is explicitly shielded from public review. You can't verify a closed system stays closed if you can never see the logs.

A functioning democracy requires the public subjected to the surveillance—even if it is intended for the greater good and safety—to audit the surveillance apparatus for full transparency. This helps ensure bipartisan consistency overtime regardless of leadership and politics.

- **The fix for this would be an annual public audit report (redacted as needed to protect confidential/privacy info) showing who accessed the data, how many searches, for what stated purpose**

2. Policy 415 is a police department–authored, department-controlled policy — not a city ordinance. That means it can be revised by the department without a public hearing or council vote. Nothing in the report requires future changes to data-sharing scope to come back to council. If the department decides in two years to join a regional network "for investigative efficiency," this same report's privacy language provides zero protection.

San Francisco requires surveillance technology policies like this to be adopted by ordinance through its Board of Supervisors specifically so changes require public process. Santa Barbara should do the same:

- **Elevate the no-sharing, closed-system commitments in this report to binding ordinance status.**
- **require that any future change to data-sharing scope, retention, or system configuration return to council for a public hearing and vote (not just an administrative decision) before taking effect**

3. Policy 415 never mentions ICE, CBP, or immigration enforcement. Given that Flock's scandal happened *despite* California's Civil Code §1798.90.5 restrictions on sharing with out-of-state/federal agencies — through informal officer-to-officer sharing, not the platform's formal network), **we need to get more specific about complying with applicable privacy laws means, to**

prevent a repeat of the illicit searches that happened under Flock.

- Specifically, we ask to have a written council-approved (not just PD-internal) policy stating this **Verkada system will never be linked to Flock's network**, any regional/multi-agency ALPR database, or provide access to ICE/CBP/DHS, directly or indirectly — enforceable at the ordinance level, not just department policy.

4. This is a 5-year, ~\$57k contract with no mention of a public review checkpoint. Once purchased, there's no built-in moment where the public or council revisits whether it's still operating as promised.

- **Request having an explicit sunset/reauthorization clause — council revisits this contract publicly before any renewal past the initial term.**

At the end of the day, the idea of surveillance cameras are questionable at best in a democracy like the US that prides itself on protecting freedom and privacy. Even when made with the best of intentions, the issue is that it opens up a flood of problems larger than the one it proposes to solve, particularly if the technology gets into the wrong hands.

So while many are advocating to remove all cameras, which is also an option to consider, at the very least, the ONE THING that must be done if we are to stay a democracy is to enable the public to be able "watch the watcher", to be able to audit the systems, know how it's being used, who is using it and ensuring that data does not get into the hands of anti-democracy nefarious actors. Without this kind of oversight and proper safeguards, our country risks turning into "communist" surveillance states like Russia and China, where human rights and privacy become subordinate to autocratic leaders.

Please do the right thing and listen to the people warning of camera abuse and create the proper safeguards.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Research Consultant, Strategy
Santa Barbara, CA, 93105

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Santa Barbara City Council](#)
Subject: Writing to oppose ALPRs in Santa Barbara
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:43:13 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

I'm writing in opposition to any ALPRs in Santa Barbara.

We don't need them. If the goal is to prevent speeding, streets can be designed to prevent speeding. Do that. That will make us safer. Speed cameras ticket people after the dangerous driving has occurred. That's too late.

We don't need to live in a surveillance state, use the funds to design and implement safer streets.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]
Garden St., Santa Barbara

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: AGENDA Item 5: Non-renewal of Surveillance Systems
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:48:13 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I'm writing to share my concerns about the direction of public safety spending in Santa Barbara, particularly around surveillance technology. I believe our community is best served by investments that build genuine trust, address why harm happens in the first place, and uphold everyone's civil rights.

Specifically, I'd like the Council to take the following steps:

End the Flock camera program. Please remove the existing ALPR cameras and refrain from signing on with a different surveillance vendor. Simply changing providers doesn't solve the underlying problems — misuse, errors, data breaches, and the broader risks of mass surveillance remain regardless of who runs the system.

Slow down before signing anything new. Any future surveillance contract should wait until residents have had real, substantive input. That means a longer public comment period so people can actually research the alternatives and weigh in with informed feedback — not just check a box.

Strengthen privacy protections first. Before any new technology is considered, the City's existing data protection and privacy ordinances need to be reviewed and reinforced so residents' personal information and rights are genuinely safeguarded.

Look hard at the budget. I'd ask the Council to conduct a clear, public accounting of the full costs of any proposed ALPR system — along with available funding and what else that money could accomplish — before committing public dollars.

Build in real oversight. Any surveillance technology the City does use should come with independent audits and consistent public reporting, so there's actual accountability rather than a black box.

Redirect resources toward prevention, not policing technology. Housing stability, tenant protections, youth programming, and mental health services do more for long-term safety than cameras will.

Make participation possible. Please schedule any future hearings on this topic at 5:00 PM or later, so working families, young people, and others who can't attend during the day have a real chance to be part of the conversation. I believe true safety comes from investing in people — stable housing, strong communities, and opportunity for young people — not from expanding surveillance infrastructure. I'm asking you to vote against renewing the Flock camera contract and against entering into any new ALPR agreement. Santa Barbara can be safer and healthier by choosing community investment over surveillance.

Thank you for your time and for your service to this city.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5 Nonrenewal of Flock Contract- Take action and protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:51:29 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members, Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community.

Surveillance cameras, be it flock or you're proposed replacement has nothing to do with safety and everything to do with creating a surveillance state

That has been, and will continue to be a conduit for abuse and misuse and does not belong in a free country.

It is what would normally be seen in a fascist state. Community, not surveillance is a path to a better world and a safer city and country.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: People of SB do not want or approve Verkada
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:57:55 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi my name is [REDACTED]. I live in Santa Barbara county and have most of my life. I work here and I have 2 children who attend a Santa Barbara district school and preschool. I am emailing today to comment at today's city council meeting and voicing my concern on the surveillance system that has been placed here. The people of Santa Barbara never approved using Flock. We have 12 operating Flock cameras here in the city, supposedly operating to identify suspects and missing people. Yet I have never heard one news story update of Flock actually doing this. However, our sheriffs are openly working with ICE agents in disappearing members of our community. We have seen pedestrians hit, many stories of recent hit and runs in just the last few months, stabbing unsolved for months. If Flock did its duty, one would think these crimes would be solved surreptitiously!

Now today your contract with flock is up and you want to replace it with Verkada immediately. Another known system that is breached by hackers and leaving our citizens at risk. Verkada was fined \$3 million dollars by the Federal Trade Commission due to alleged security and privacy failures. This company failed to secure customer data. These are facts. These are dangerous systems all around. We don't know who is hacking these cameras, what info they are using.

It is the whole network not the individual system that the people of Santa Barbara do not agree to. We are asking you today to please not sign this new contract, do not sign any new contract with surveillance systems. It is a waste of tax payers money and honestly downright dangerous. Thank you

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Verkada cameras
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 12:58:01 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am writing to object to the possibility of a contract with Verkada to replace the Flock cameras.

Verkada is apparently a company with a bad record of workplace sexual harassment, data breaches and association with companies in Trump's trail of corruption. We want Flock REMOVED, not REPLACED.

[REDACTED]
Santa Barbara residents

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Subject: ALPRs
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:00:25 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmembers,

I'm writing to ask the City Council to end the Santa Barbara Police Department's use of automated license plate readers (ALPRs). Switching vendors is not an adequate response to public concerns about Flock.

Effectiveness?

The evidence for the effectiveness of ALPRs is much weaker and more mixed than the public is often led to believe.

Flock cameras were installed by SBPD in late 2023. I looked at the available SBPD motor vehicle theft [data](#) before and after installation:

(Start date is Jan 2022 because 2021 data is missing)

For the 21-month period from January 2022 through September 2023:

- 295 motor-vehicle-theft offenses
- 53 clearances
- Clearance rate: 17.97%

For the 22-month period from October 2023 through July 2025:

- 302 offenses
- 50 clearances
- Clearance rate: 16.56%

The clearance rate did not improve after ALPRs were installed; it actually declined slightly, though this difference is not statistically significant (two-proportion test, $p \approx 0.63$). The results were similar when I tried other reasonable ways of dividing the available data.

Research elsewhere also shows mixed results. [This study](#) found modest improvements in the time required to recover individual stolen vehicles, without finding an increase in the overall rate of vehicle recovery. [Other research](#) and [reporting](#) has found that very few ALPR hits produce useful investigative leads. Even [very high investment](#) in surveillance tech may not yield meaningful results.

Security

With that being said, [opinion polling](#) suggests that many people disapprove of police use of ALPRs *despite* believing they are effective. Clearly, many people feel that tracking the movements of ordinary people without a warrant crosses a line with regard to privacy and civil liberties.

There is no excuse for Flock's endangerment of immigrants and sloppy/sneaky data sharing, but Verkada has its own history of [lax security](#) and [dishonesty toward customers](#).

ICE has a demonstrated interest in accessing ALPR data and is investing heavily in [surveillance](#) and data collection. The federal government's recent behavior is erratic and coercive. If SBPD does not collect this information, it cannot later be pressured to release data or have it otherwise fall into the wrong hands. A simple but important security principle applies here: the most effective way to protect sensitive data is to

avoid collecting it in the first place.

Transparency

Public records also do not allow meaningful insight into SBPD's use of ALPRs. Search records contain numerous redactions, and explanations such as “criminal investigation” and “investigative intel” are too broad. For comparison, SBSO's data is much more specific.

Building real public trust requires meaningful accountability and responsiveness to public concerns. I have a hard time understanding why ordinary people would want to strengthen a system that can turn relatively minor incidents (i.e., whatever led to the recent uptick in arrests at Fiesta) into a cascade of potentially life-altering consequences, including loss of public housing or increased exposure to ICE, while more substantive harms and the actual threats to people's safety and ability to thrive tend to go unaddressed.

Protecting Civil Liberties

Recent polls indicate that ALPRs are unpopular: a poll in AZ found that 54% of Republicans and 73% of Democrats oppose ALPR use by police. If we assume these figures are similar among Republican- and Democrat-leaning Santa Barbarans, that would translate to a rough estimate of 68% of voters (a substantial majority) opposing police use of ALPRs.

I understand the backlash against Flock as a reaction not only to ALPRs but also as a symbolic response to the expansion of surveillance more broadly. I am cautiously hopeful that this could lead to a broader shift in social norms and the regulatory environment regarding privacy, surveillance, and data collection. In fact, the legal and regulatory environment surrounding ALPRs and surveillance technology does seem to be rapidly changing, so I also question whether it is wise for the City to make a long-term investment in this infrastructure at this time.

Participatory democracy and civil liberties are aspects of the US political tradition worth preserving, and the expansion of surveillance threatens both. Protecting these traditions requires drawing a line and rejecting warrantless dragnet surveillance.

Thank you for your consideration,



From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to cameras
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:15:35 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Rowse and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I am writing to urge you NOT to approve a replacement automated license plate reader camera system for the City of Santa Barbara.

I appreciate the City's decision not to renew its contract with Flock Safety. However, replacing Flock with another vendor does not resolve my fundamental concern. I question whether the routine collection and retention of information about the movements of thousands of law-abiding residents is an appropriate function of local government.

I recognize that license plate readers can assist law enforcement in particular investigations. But there is an important distinction between using surveillance technology in response to a specific crime and creating a system that continuously records the movements of everyone who happens to drive past a camera.

The fact that a new system may keep the data under greater City control is an improvement over widespread data sharing, but it does not answer the larger question: **Should this information be collected on people who are not suspected of any crime in the first place?**

Before entering into another multi-year surveillance technology contract, I believe the Council should require a much broader public discussion of necessity, effectiveness, privacy, data retention, access, oversight, and the potential for future expansion of the system.

Santa Barbara can support effective law enforcement without normalizing the continuous tracking of its residents and visitors.

I respectfully ask the Council to reject the proposed contract and reconsider whether an automated license plate reader network is necessary or appropriate for our community.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Santa Barbara Resident

--

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Flock and other surveillance cameras
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:21:18 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I strongly oppose ANY surveillance cameras installed in Santa Barbara. This is a violation of my privacy and is being done WITHOUT my consent. I do not want to replace FLOCK with any other surveillance system.

Respectfully

[REDACTED]
Santa Barbara Resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Proposed Verkada Contract
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:22:58 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Sent from my iPhone
SB City Council

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Flock and other ALPR companies
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:29:19 PM
Attachments: [Public Comment on Flock and other ALPR companies.docx](#)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

Enclosed is my public comment for August 25th, 2026 Santa Barbara City Council meeting.

Thanks you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Opposition to ALPR in Santa Barbara
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:48:22 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Rowse and Members of the Santa Barbara City Council,

I am writing as a Santa Barbara resident to express my strong opposition to ALPR surveillance cameras in our city.

Residents of Santa Barbara going about their daily lives should not have their movements systematically photographed, recorded, stored, and made searchable when they are not suspected of committing a crime. By entrusting a private company's technology with data about our residents' movements, the City is inherently creating a privacy and security risk. No government or private company can guarantee that a database containing sensitive information will remain completely secure or will never be misused.

Surveillance systems that indiscriminately collect data operate on a principle fundamentally at odds with the presumption of innocence: **collect information about everyone, then search that information later for evidence of a crime.**

SBPD's own policy states that reasonable suspicion or probable cause is not required before using an ALPR. The proposed Verkada system allows officers to search historical vehicle detections. **Why should the City collect and retain information about where an innocent resident's vehicle has been when there is no individualized suspicion that person has committed a crime?** Public safety matters, but so do privacy, civil liberties, and the freedom to move throughout one's own community without being systematically tracked and recorded. "It may someday be useful to law enforcement" is not sufficient justification for routinely collecting information about our community.

I appreciate the City's decision not to renew its contract with Flock, but replacing Flock with another license-plate surveillance system does not resolve these concerns. **The City would still be creating a searchable record of innocent residents' movements, while relying on a private company's technology to maintain sensitive data.**

I urge the Council to reject the installation of any alternative ALPR or LPR surveillance system. Thank you for considering my comments.

[REDACTED]
Santa Barbara resident

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 5
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:48:49 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council Members,

We have reason to believe that Verkada is just as bad as Flock for potential abuse and lax data security. The Council should oppose the City rushing into a contract with Verkada before doing its due diligence and allowing much more time for community input.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Concerned citizens

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: deeply concerned about warrantless surveillance
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 2:02:15 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Santa Barbara City Council:

I am deeply concerned about warrantless surveillance in Santa Barbara. I congratulate you on terminating the contract with FLOCK. However, there are serious concerns about Verkada, which has been in the news lately for not firing its own employees who exploited and abused its systems.

Because there are major concerns over potential abuse and lax data security, the Council should oppose the City rushing into a contract with Verkada before doing its due diligence and allowing much more time for community input.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] Ph.D.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Clerk](#); [Nicole Grisanti](#); [Kelly R. McAdoo](#)
Cc: [Randy Rowse](#); [Wendy Santamaria](#); [Mike Jordan](#); [Oscar Gutierrez](#); [Kristen Sneddon](#); [Eric Friedman](#); [Meagan Harmon](#); [F&P Comments](#)
Subject: ITEM 5: Protect our community from mass surveillance!
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 2:32:27 PM

Một số người nhận được thư này thường không nhận được email từ [REDACTED]. [Tìm hiểu lý do tại sao điều này lại quan trọng](#)

Dear City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and Santa Barbara Mayor and Council Members,

Santa Barbara deserves public safety investments that build trust, address the root causes of harm, and protect the civil rights of every community.

We urge the City to reject mass surveillance and instead invest in solutions that strengthen community safety without contributing to the continued criminalization of Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities.

We are demanding City Administrator Kelly McAdoo and the Santa Barbara City Council:

- Remove all Flock cameras immediately and do not contract with another ALPR vendor. Switching vendors does not eliminate the risks of mass surveillance, misuse, errors, or data breaches.
- Hold off on any new surveillance contracts until the public has had a meaningful opportunity to weigh in and extend the public comment period so the community can participate, research alternatives, and make informed recommendations.
- Review and strengthen all current privacy and data protection ordinances first to protect personal information and civil rights.
- Review the current public safety City budget before contracting with any new surveillance vendor. Before spending public funds on another ALPR system, the City should conduct a transparent review of the full costs, available funding, and alternative uses for funding.
- Require transparency and accountability, including independent audits and regular public reporting of any surveillance technology.
- Invest in community safety and not mass surveillance. Prioritize housing, tenant protections, youth programs, mental health services, and prevention.
- Schedule any future discussion of this item at 5:00 PM or later so working families, youth, and community members can participate.

True public safety is built through transparency, accountability, and investments in people. When we invest in stable housing, healthy communities, and opportunities for young people, we create lasting safety that benefits everyone.

I urge you to vote not to renew the Flock camera contract and not to contract with any other

ALPR vendor. Instead, prioritize community-centered investments that make Santa Barbara safer, healthier, and more resilient for all. Real safety means investing in community NOT surveillance.

Thank you for your time, your leadership, and your commitment to serving our community.

Respectfully, this concerned citizen and parent,

[REDACTED]

Public Comment on Flock and other ALPR companies

Last year, this state and the country saw a surge of federal agents assaulting, gassing, and even killing Californians. We continue to see those agents working hand-in-hand with local police to round up **non-criminal** immigrants. People who work, raise families, and build their lives in our community. And yet, based on essentially no meaningful public data, only the say-so of a private company looking to profit and a police department that will always find a reason to spend more taxpayer dollars — this city decided, without public approval and without hearing from residents first, to replace Flock with another ALPR vendor. In doing so, it is choosing to collect residents' location data without a judge's approval and without anyone having committed a crime, all in service of a threat that the data does not actually support.

Does the city of Santa Barbara see immigrants as criminals? Is crime so high here that we need this technology? Then why the hell are we wasting money and resources on a problem that doesn't exist? You know what people encounter every day that impacts us the most? **AFFORDABILITY CRISIS**. The people of Santa Barbara did not ask for this, do not support it, and will hold accountable anyone who does not end the contract with Verkada.

Verkada, the company known for:

- 2021 breach that gave hackers live access to 150,000 cameras – followed by an FTC enforcement action finding **the company misled customers about security and HIPAA compliance**: [Link](#)
- A [well-documented internal culture problem](#), including a scandal in which male employees used the company's own surveillance cameras to secretly photograph female coworkers and shared sexualized commentary about them.
- Verkada's technology partner, **Axon**, holds an enterprise-wide federal contract letting every Department of Homeland Security law-enforcement agency — including ICE and CBP — acquire its cameras and software, plus [a direct \\$13M contract equipping Border Patrol agents](#). Verkada's ALPR cameras and license plate data [now integrate directly](#) into Axon's Fusus platform, the same real-time crime center infrastructure Axon is selling into DHS.

So, on behalf of myself and many others in this city, I'm demanding the council directly: end all contracts with ALPR companies and actually invest in real issues, not another fun toy for police to abuse. I'll close with words from Anaya Robinson, Public Policy Director at the ACLU of Colorado, spoken about a nearly identical situation in Denver — a city trading one surveillance vendor for another:

“The city cannot simply move from one dragnet surveillance company to another and trust that these for-profit companies will put people’s civil liberties first. The city must implement critical protections around data retention, information sharing, access limitations, and meaningful community input and legislative approval policies to prevent abuses from government agencies and law enforcement. Continuing to operate this risky, unregulated surveillance technology in the city carries far greater risks than pausing the ALPR program.” – Anaya Robinson

