

Public comment on
G.I.
(included in meeting day of)

Fw: Flock

From Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Date Sat 5/30/2026 7:17 AM

To Maffei, Kaleigh <kmaffei@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Cc Honsal, William <WHonsal@co.humboldt.ca.us>

For the record.

Mike Wilson P.E.
Humboldt County Supervisor, District 3

From: Georgia O'Barr <georgiaobarr@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 29, 2026 11:15:17 PM

To: Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Flock

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hi Mike,

I am a concerned member of the community, specifically regarding the unnecessary and unsafe surveillance we are experiencing from the Flock cameras stationed around Humboldt County. I demand that they be removed; all 12 of them, including the 7 that the Sheriff operates. Furthermore I demand that the Sheriff's Office be held accountable for their illegal behavior of allowing outside law enforcement including the F.B.I. and I.C.E. to access the data recorded by these A.I. surveillance systems. This is despicable and, frankly, disgusting behavior.

Please consider the impact this has on our small community. We do not need mass A.I. surveillance to keep us safe-- in fact, the implementation of this surveillance puts us at risk.

Thank you for taking the time to read this message.

Sincerely,

Georgia

Flock Cameras

From rivndell7@proton.me <rivndell7@proton.me>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 1:54 PM

To COB <COB@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

I would like to give my vote to no longer use these Flock cameras.

These LPR are making our privacy public; it is also not a way to enable trust in our law enforcement; I have read that Flock, as a company, uploads to their website, and no matter what the Sheriff says about not allowing other agencies to use the information, Flock can and does download to ICE and the government; that is in the contract that they signed.

Imagine, if you will, a woman driving from Texas to California to have an abortion, and Flock cameras following her, to finally stop her here, and arrest her. Our Sheriff has disobeyed laws before, and from what I am aware, has let ICE know about certain people detained in a jail, who were migrants.

Quote:....."[investigation](#) revealed that the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office had allowed outside law enforcement agencies to conduct hundreds of thousands of monthly searches through the county's ALPR data, often without obtaining legally required information for the search.

Data logs reviewed by the *Outpost* last year revealed that hundreds of searches by local and state law enforcement agencies referenced federal agencies, including Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE), which is a direct violation of [SB 34](#). (A [CalMatters investigation](#) found that the law is routinely violated by law enforcement agencies across the state.)"

I have also become aware that law enforcement has also used these cameras to follow people for their own personal reasons, IE, following a girl friend!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Considering the way the contract is written, Flock WILL download to it who likes, no matter whether the BOS or HCSO want it or not.

I read Sheriff Honsal's rebuttal; how did these cameras help if there was no facial recognition? It appears to me that he wants more sheriffs, and if he does, they should have the proper education, for these people have weapons, can kill people, and they have, and I think if someone has life or death control, they should have at least a bachelor's degree, for they act as judge and jury

Yes, I understand that, as in the population as a whole, you will find corrupt characters, however, in law enforcement, if there is one bad person, they are all, for the good will not walk across that blue line; this I know from seeing men who have tried to prove corruption and been fired for it, please keep that in mind.

Quote:

"Since Flock Safety began partnering with law enforcement, a growing number of officers have been found abusing the surveillance system. In one instance, a [Kansas police chief used](#) Flock cameras 164 times while tracking an ex. In another case, a [sheriff in Texas lied](#) about using Flock to "track a missing person," but was later found to be investigating a possible abortion. In Georgia, a [police chief was arrested](#) for using Flock to stalk and harass citizens. In Virginia, a man sued the city of Norfolk over purported privacy violations and discovered that Flock cameras had been used [to track him 526 times](#), around four times per day.

That collaboration has grown more complex. As Democratic Senator Ron Wyden from Oregon stated in an [open letter to Flock Safety](#), "local" law enforcement isn't that local anymore, especially when 75% of Flock's law enforcement customers have enrolled in the [National Lookup Tool](#), which allows information sharing across the country between all participants.

"Flock has built a dangerous platform in which abuse of surveillance data is almost certain," Wyden wrote. "The company has adopted a see-no-evil approach of not proactively auditing the searches done by its law enforcement customers because, as the company's Chief Communications Officer told the press, 'It is not Flock's job to police the police.'"

As I work nights, I will find it hard to attend this meeting, but I will try, as this is a very important item, especially considering our present political atmosphere.

Pat Kanzler, RN

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



Outlook

Comment re 26-264 - Automated License Plate Reader Program

From Kiley Finch <kileyfinch@gmail.com>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 9:35 PM

To COB <COB@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bohn, Rex <RBohn@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bushnell, Michelle <mbushnell@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Arroyo, Natalie <narroyo@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Madrone, Steve <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>

 1 attachment (325 KB)

Summary of Flock-related actions by other California jurisdictions.pdf;

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Humboldt County Supervisors,

I appreciate county staff preparing the document "File #: 25-264 - Community Responses to Flock Safety ALPR Programs". This document, attached to the June 2nd agenda and to this email, outlines seven jurisdictions in which Flock or other similar ALPR deployments were restricted, reviewed, or rescinded in 2025. However, 2026 has seen further developments, as the potential for illegal and abusive use of this technology has become more clear.

In January 2026, citing privacy concerns, out-of-state access to data, and risks to community members, the Santa Cruz City Council voted to become the first California city to cancel their Flock contract outright. Days later, the Los Altos Hills Town Council voted to terminate their Flock contract as well, ordering all Flock cameras taken offline immediately with physical removal to follow.

Two weeks later, the city of Mountain View turned off their Flock cameras on February 2nd after an internal audit found they had been used by federal agencies in violation of city policy and state law. This was followed by a meeting in which the city council voted unanimously to terminate the contract with Flock, both to protect the safety of their residents and to protect the city from lawsuits for violation of SB 34 like the one currently involving El Cajon.

And the El Cajon and San Jose/SIREN lawsuits have not gone away. Continued presence of ALPRs like Flock in our county opens Humboldt up to wasteful litigation taxpayers should not be expected to foot the bill for. When the state sues the county, the ratepayers lose.

You have the power to solve this issue. Protect our residents, workers, and ratepayers by removing Flock and any other publicly-funded ALPRs from Humboldt County government.

Sincerely,

Kiley Finch

District 1 Resident, Worker, and Taxpayer

1) <https://www.kqed.org/news/12069705/santa-cruz-the-first-in-california-to-terminate-its-contract-with-flock-safety>

2) <https://www.losaltoshills.ca.gov/455/Automatic-License-Plate-Readers-ALPR>

3) <https://www.mountainview.gov/Home/Components/News/News/1211/284>

Community Responses to Flock Safety ALPR Programs

California Jurisdictions That Have Taken Action

The following California cities and counties have taken formal action regarding Flock Safety ALPR programs in the past 18 months:

- Oakland (2025): City Council voted to terminate its Flock contract following concerns about data-sharing with federal agencies and ICE. The decision followed community organizing and a Council audit finding gaps in oversight.
- Hayward (2025): Suspended use of Nationwide Search feature and initiated a compliance review after the AG's El Cajon enforcement action.
- South Lake Tahoe (2025): Terminated contract following community opposition and concerns about immigration enforcement use.
- Santa Cruz County: Adopted a Surveillance Use Policy requiring Board of Supervisors approval before any surveillance technology is deployed using County resources.
- Alameda County: Adopted similar surveillance oversight ordinance; Flock deployments within county subject to review.
- San Jose: Subject to a verified complaint (SIREN v. City of San Jose, Nov. 2025) alleging SB 34 violations related to data-sharing practices.
- El Cajon: Sued by Attorney General Bonta in October 2025 for sharing ALPR data with federal and out-of-state agencies in violation of SB 34.

National Examples

Outside California, several jurisdictions have also taken restrictive action:

- Minneapolis, MN: City Council voted to terminate Flock contract following community campaign citing civil liberties and immigration enforcement concerns.
- Takoma Park, MD: Terminated contract; city passed resolution prohibiting use of ALPR data for immigration enforcement purposes.
- Several jurisdictions in Washington, Colorado, and Illinois have adopted or are considering ALPR oversight ordinances in response to Flock-related controversies.

Common Themes

Across jurisdictions that have taken action, several themes recur:

- Data-sharing with federal immigration enforcement was the most frequently cited concern, followed by Flock's conduct as a vendor (unauthorized camera installations, failure to honor deactivation requests, lack of proactive disclosure of network capabilities).

-
- Scope creep: ALPR data has been documented as being used to track individuals crossing state lines to access abortion services and for other purposes beyond local crime investigation.
 - Effectiveness questions: Research on whether ALPR cameras reduce crime is inconclusive. Studies show modest improvement in clearance rates for some property crimes near cameras, but no consistent evidence of broader crime reduction.

End of Attachment A



Outlook

Comment re 26-264 - Automated License Plate Reader Program

From Kendall Finch <kendallpfinch@gmail.com>

Date Mon 6/1/2026 10:40 PM

To COB <COB@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bohn, Rex <RBohn@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Bushnell, Michelle <mbushnell@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Madrone, Steve <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Wilson, Mike <Mike.Wilson@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Arroyo, Natalie <narroyo@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Caution: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Humboldt County Board of Supervisors,

I know that many of my neighbors have written or will be speaking at the meeting about the myriad reasons flock cameras should not be used in our community. Like them, I strongly believe that this surveillance technology has no place in our community and should be removed.

However, I am writing to you today to emphasize that as the Board of Supervisors, you do not have your hands tied on this issue - you control the budget for the sheriff's office. As far as I am aware, the new budget will go into effect on July 1 and it does not appear to have been approved yet. I urge you to consider revising the budget to include language prohibiting use of funds for any ALPR or for any new surveillance technology without approval at a public hearing of the County Board of Supervisors, preferably one held at a time the working majority can attend for public comment.

We are a sanctuary county and it is clear that Flock cameras are being used across the nation to target immigrant communities, as well as other vulnerable groups. We are not just talking about a potential for misuse of this technology, we are talking about a precedent for misuse that can cause real harm to our community members. You do have the power to influence the actions of the sheriff's office by adjusting language in the budget, if not by adjusting the budget itself to withdraw funds for this technology.

I appreciate your time and the effort you put into this issue.

Thank you,
Kendall Finch
Eureka resident