
FW: Oppose Agenda Item 4.1 - Terminate the Flock Safety Contract. San Jose Deserves Better!

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Wed 3/11/2026 7:56 AM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: samuelguz41 [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 6:22 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Oppose Agenda Item 4.1 - Terminate the Flock Safety Contract. San Jose Deserves Better!

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

City Clerk Toni Taber,

For this upcoming March 10 San Jose City Council Meeting, I urge you to oppose Agenda Item 4.1 and permanently terminate the Flock Safety Contract.

Despite specific directives regarding who could access our information, Flock Safety's system violates our community's trust by neglecting our restrictions, allowing external access without the City's knowledge or consent. We must refuse to work with a private corporation that has granted CBP access to their systems (such as Denver), has endangered the safety of our San Jose residents, and has circumvented our local governance.

In recent weeks, Mountain View, Santa Clara County, Los Altos Hills, and Santa Cruz have all removed Flock and have reconsidered their ALPR programs. Santa Clara County voted that Flock can no longer be their provider for ALPRs, and Mountain View unanimously and bravely decided to cancel their contract with Flock and will not seek the services of any other ALPR vendors. While we strongly oppose any mass surveillance system in our community, we support the community's guardrails, such as requiring a valid judicial warrant on all data searches, on any potential ALPR vendor. If an ALPR vendor cannot guarantee our safeguards, then we must cease operating all ALPR networks unless and until an alternate ALPR vendor can be found that meets all of the guardrails. San Jose should join our neighboring cities and aim to be a community defined by trust and freedom, not constant monitoring.

Please vote to permanently kill this Flock contract and reject the normalization of invasive surveillance in our city.



,

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Fw: Oppose Agenda Item 4.1 - Terminate the Flock Safety Contract. San Jose Deserves Better!

From City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Date Thu 3/12/2026 12:55 PM
To Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Main: 408-535-1260
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Caitlyn Sullivan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 11:57 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Oppose Agenda Item 4.1 - Terminate the Flock Safety Contract. San Jose Deserves Better!

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

City Clerk Toni Taber,

For this upcoming March 10 San Jose City Council Meeting, I urge you to oppose Agenda Item 4.1 and permanently terminate the Flock Safety Contract.

Despite specific directives regarding who could access our information, Flock Safety's system violates our community's trust by neglecting our restrictions, allowing external access without the City's knowledge or consent. We must refuse to work with a private corporation that has granted CBP access to their systems (such as Denver), has endangered the safety of our San Jose residents, and has circumvented our local governance.

In recent weeks, Mountain View, Santa Clara County, Los Altos Hills, and Santa Cruz have all removed Flock and have reconsidered their ALPR programs. Santa Clara County voted that Flock can no longer be their provider for ALPRs, and Mountain View unanimously and bravely decided to cancel their contract with Flock and will not seek the services of any other

ALPR vendors. While we strongly oppose any mass surveillance system in our community, we support the community's guardrails, such as requiring a valid judicial warrant on all data searches, on any potential ALPR vendor. If an ALPR vendor cannot guarantee our safeguards, then we must cease operating all ALPR networks unless and until an alternate ALPR vendor can be found that meets all of the guardrails. San Jose should join our neighboring cities and aim to be a community defined by trust and freedom, not constant monitoring.

Please vote to permanently kill this Flock contract and reject the normalization of invasive surveillance in our city.

Caitlyn Sullivan



San Jose, California 95125

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Re: Public comments: item 4.1 (ALPR) of City Council meeting on March 10

From Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Date Fri 3/20/2026 9:49 AM

To kathleengiskeer [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Cc City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Hello Kathleen,

Your public comment was originally posted under "Letters from the Public – 4 of 4, pages 27–28." We have also posted it again today under "Letters Received Post Meeting." Please find the [link](#) to the 3/10/2026 City Council Agenda for your reference.

Thank you for reaching out!

Agenda Desk

City of San José | Office of the City Clerk

200 East Santa Clara St. – Tower 14th Fl.

San José, CA 95113-1905

Phone 408.535.1260 | Fax 408.292.6207

agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov

From: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 9:01 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Fw: Public comments: item 4.1 (ALPR) of City Council meeting on March 10

Office of the City Clerk | City of San José

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14th Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

From: Kathleeniskeen <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2026 10:47 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: kathleengaffney [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Public comments: item 4.1 (ALPR) of City Council meeting on March 10

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

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

Hello,

I do not see my below email in the letters from the public section of the minutes? Could you please make sure it is added in? I sent the email prior to the meeting and see that the minutes have been updated to include Letters received post meeting?

Best,
Kathleen

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026, 11:53 PM Kathleeniskeen <[REDACTED]> wrote:

To the San Jose City Council,

I am writing to urge you to terminate the city's contract with Flock Safety and discontinue the use of automated license plate reader (ALPR) technology. I am extremely concerned about the SJPD's warrantless, limitless access to the intrusive data collected by the nearly 500 flock cameras installed in San Jose. Recent reports of the use of local ALPRs by federal agencies to track immigrants and protestors make me even more nervous.

I understand that from the SJPD's perspective, violating the privacy of the innocent 99% is worth it to track down the 1% that is guilty of a crime. This is a short sighted view the perceived good of the mass surveillance of San Jose residents does not outweigh the astonishing tyranny that can come from the misuse of this data by bad actors. Police officers and federal agents have been caught using ALPR technology to track protesters (<https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2025/11/how-cops-are-using-flock-safety-s-alpr-network-surveil-protesters-and-activists?ref=404media.co>), women accessing reproductive care (<https://www.404media.co/a-texas-cop-searched-license-plate-cameras-nationwide-for-a-woman-who-got-an-abortion/>) or to stalk ex wives (<https://www.kwch.com/2022/11/04/kechi-police-lieutenants-arrest-puts-flock-technology-under-scrutiny/>). To make matters worse, there's no independent research proving that ALPRs can actually reduce crime.

I also want to note that the California Constitution guarantees the people's right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures as well as the people's inalienable right to privacy. San Jose's warrantless ALPR database searches clearly violate this and are therefore illegally expending taxpayer funds.

52 communities (including Santa Clara county, Mountain View, Los Altos Hills and Santa Cruz) have deactivated their flock cameras so far, I believe that San Jose can be the 53rd if we can show a commitment to protecting our community members' right to privacy.

Best,
Katy G.
San Jose resident

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.