

Public Comment
on G.1
- Post Meeting



Supplemental Public Comment – Agenda Item G.1 – June 2, 2026

From Sarah Shipley <srs511@icloud.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 1:55 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.

To the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to supplement my earlier comment on Item G.1 with information that bears directly on the Board's decision about next steps.

Flock Safety has a documented pattern of continuing to operate cameras after being told to stop.

In Eugene, Oregon, the city terminated its contract with Flock in December 2025 and directed the company to deactivate all 57 cameras. Weeks later, a community member checking Flock's own public transparency portal discovered that at least one camera was still actively capturing vehicles. An audit was launched. When the city asked Flock to remove the cameras by December 12, the company said it would not begin removal until January 26. The city ultimately removed the cameras itself.

In Cambridge, Massachusetts, the City Council ordered 16 cameras deactivated. Flock then installed two additional cameras without the city's knowledge, on a work order that should have been cancelled. Cambridge called it a material breach and terminated the contract.

In Evanston, Illinois, officials asked Flock to turn off cameras after a state audit found the company had shared data with federal authorities in violation of state law. Flock later reinstalled cameras in Evanston. Officials ultimately had to physically encase them in plastic bags to stop data collection.

The pattern is clear: a direction to deactivate is not the same as cameras actually going dark. The city of Eugene made this point explicitly: officials there noted that municipalities have no mechanism for independently controlling when Flock devices are on or off. That functionality is not built into the system. The company controls it.

Flock also recently changed its contract terms in a way every Board member should know about.

On February 16, 2026, Flock rewrote its terms and conditions to grant itself a perpetual, irrevocable license to use and disclose all customer data, and deleted the prior contractual promise not to sell that data. Flock's marketing website still states the company will never share or sell data. The contract now says the opposite. Humboldt County's contract runs through July 2027, which means the county is currently operating under these revised terms.

Taken together, these facts have a direct bearing on what the Board decides today. A direction to conduct a compliance review is not sufficient if the cameras remain active in the meantime. The county has no independent ability to verify what data is being collected or shared while the review proceeds. And Flock's behavior in other jurisdictions demonstrates that a request to deactivate is not reliably honored.

The only way to ensure Humboldt County data is not being collected, searched, or shared during a review period is to require physical removal of the cameras now, not to rely on Flock's cooperation.

Thank you.

Sarah Shipley
Briceland, CA 95542

Public Comment – Agenda Items G.1 and I.2 – June 2, 2026

From Sarah Shipley <srs511@icloud.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 10:13 AM

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.

To the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors:

My name is Sarah Shipley. I am a resident of Brice Land in southern Humboldt County, submitting this comment in opposition to the continued operation of the Flock Safety ALPR program and in response to the ICE access data hearing.

Re: Item G.1 – Automated License Plate Reader Program

I am calling on the Board to direct the immediate suspension of the Flock Safety ALPR program and the removal of all cameras. A compliance review, however warranted, is not a substitute for suspension. The cameras should come down now, and here is why.

The Humboldt County Sheriff's Office has already demonstrated that it cannot be trusted to operate this program lawfully. In October 2025, the Lost Coast Outpost published an investigation revealing that the Sheriff's Office was allowing outside law enforcement agencies to conduct hundreds of thousands of searches per month of Humboldt County ALPR data, routinely without obtaining the legally required justification for each search. Thousands of searches included no stated reason whatsoever. Tens of thousands more listed only a single digit, or vague terms like "crime" or "investigation." Both of these practices violate California law and the Sheriff's Office's own written policy.

More seriously: data logs reviewed by the Outpost showed that hundreds of those searches were conducted by agencies that explicitly referenced ICE as the basis for accessing the data. Sharing ALPR data with federal immigration agencies is a direct violation of SB 34. This was not a hypothetical risk or a policy gap. It happened, and it happened here.

The Sheriff's Office's response to these findings has been inadequate. Rather than a substantive accounting of what went wrong and how it would be remedied, the community received a response that local advocates described as copy-pasted from Flock Safety's own promotional materials. The department's ALPR policy itself has been identified as a boilerplate template, containing provisions the agency was not following, and the updated version of that policy was not conspicuously posted on the department's website as required by California Civil Code.

The Board should note that these are not hypothetical compliance concerns raised in advance of a program launch. They are documented, after-the-fact violations of state law by an agency that had

already promised the Board it would respect residents' privacy rights. The Board received that assurance at the April 2024 meeting when this program was introduced. Those assurances did not hold.

I urge the Board to:

1. Direct staff to immediately suspend the Flock ALPR program pending a full independent legal and policy review.
2. Direct that all cameras be taken offline and removed during the suspension period.
3. Require a full public accounting of all searches conducted to date, all agencies granted access, and all instances in which data was shared with or referenced by federal agencies.
4. Commit to meaningful community engagement, including from rural and immigrant communities, before any future ALPR program is considered.

Re: Item I.2 – ICE Access Data / Measure K

The ICE issue raised under this item cannot be considered in isolation from Item G.1. The documented use of Humboldt County ALPR data to facilitate ICE access is precisely the kind of cooperation Measure K was designed to prevent. The voters of this county made clear that they do not want local law enforcement serving as an arm of federal immigration enforcement. That mandate is being circumvented, whether intentionally or through negligence, by a surveillance system that shares data with hundreds of outside agencies with insufficient oversight.

Humboldt County is a rural, agricultural county. Immigrant workers are part of our workforce and our communities. Enforcement operations enabled by data sharing with ICE tear families apart and create a climate of fear that extends far beyond any individual target. In a county where many people already have fraught relationships with law enforcement, that fear has real consequences for public health, community trust, and economic stability.

I urge the Board to treat this hearing as a genuine accountability mechanism, not a paperwork requirement. The Board should direct the Sheriff's Office to provide a specific accounting of any instance in which Humboldt County ALPR data was accessed by or shared with federal agencies, and to certify strict future compliance with the Values Act and Measure K. If that certification cannot be made with confidence while the Flock system remains active, that is additional grounds for immediate suspension.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sarah Shipley
Briceland, CA 95542



Outlook

FW: Public Safety = Surveillance self defense

From Damico, Tracy <TDamico@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 10:11 AM

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

Cc Hayes, Elishia <ehayes@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Miles, Scott <SMiles@co.humboldt.ca.us>; Honsal, William <WHonsal@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Please see the below public comment. Kaleigh to include with the final meeting record.

Thanks

Tracy

From: Sean Taketa McLaughlin <seantaketa@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 10:01 AM

To: Arroyo, Natalie <narroyo@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>; Madrone, Steve <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Cc: Damico, Tracy <TDamico@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Subject: Public Safety = Surveillance self defense

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

Aloha Supervisors & Clerk of the Board -

As people's trust in our federal government erodes, I am hoping you will consider supporting and adopting local protections to ensure community safety in local regulation of surveillance technology.

Some years ago, thanks to Electronic Frontier Foundation, I learned of Santa Clara County's ordinance that could serve as a model for transparent and accountable adoption of surveillance technology:

Santa Clara County's Surveillance Technology and Community Safety Ordinance
<https://justicereforms.santaclaracounty.gov/initiatives/surveillance-technology-and-community-safety-ordinance>

Alas, no traction for County adoption at that time ... but perhaps the authoritarian ground has shifted enough so now is a better time?

Thanks for your thoughtful consideration of local policy actions that can ensure community safety by making surveillance technology transparent and accountable.

Aloha,
Sean

--

Sean "Taketa" McLaughlin
e: seantaketa@gmail.com
c: 808-595-4877

TAKE DOWN ALPR FLOCK CAMERAS

From Misael Ramos Carrasco <misaelramos83@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/2/2026 9:25 AM

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.

Good day,

I write to you albeit in a tardy manner, to express my unequivocal opposition to public surveillance infrastructure for any and all purported purposes.

Additionally, my understanding is that the installation of the equipment that supports this public surveillance Network is out of compliance with regulations that require breakaway bases for roadside installation.

Public surveillance infrastructure in use at large should be decommissioned post-haste.

Misael Ramos C.
5592876315