
From: Stella Aslibekyan
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 11:29 AM
To: City Council
Subject: No to Flock Cameras in Mountain View

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Mountain View City Council ,

Hello Council,

I am writing to express my opposition to the installation of cameras in the city of Mountain View. I am concerned about costs, data security, and the priorities our city is choosing to pursue. Our funds are best invested in serving our community, not surveilling it.

Stella Aslibekyan

From: David Javier
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 11:38 AM
To: City Council
Subject: No to Flock Cameras in Mountain View

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Mountain View City Council ,

Hello Council,

I am writing to express my opposition to the installation of cameras in the city of Mountain View. I am concerned about costs, data security, and the priorities our city is choosing to pursue. Our funds are best invested in serving our community, not surveilling it.

David Javier

From: Andrea Nevarez
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 12:16 PM
To: City Council
Subject: No to Flock Cameras in Mountain View

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Mountain View City Council ,

Hello Council,

I am writing to express my opposition to the installation of cameras in the city of Mountain View. I am concerned about costs, data security, and the priorities our city is choosing to pursue. Our funds are best invested in serving our community, not surveilling it.

Andrea Nevarez

From: Lucy Barnes Barnes
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 12:21 PM
To: City Council
Subject: No to Flock Cameras in Mountain View

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Mountain View City Council ,

Hello Council,

I am writing to express my opposition to the installation of cameras in the city of Mountain View. I am concerned about costs, data security, and the priorities our city is choosing to pursue. Our funds are best invested in serving our community, not surveilling it.

Lucy Barnes Barnes

From: Tim MacKenzie
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 1:10 PM
To: City Council; Showalter, Pat; Matichak, Lisa; Ramirez, Lucas; emily.ann.ramos@mountainview.gov; Kamei, Ellen; Hicks, Alison; Abe-Koga, Margaret
Subject: Agenda Item 6.2 Flock Public Safety Cameras

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Greetings Council,

I have already reached out with regards to this agenda topic, but now that the staff report is available, I have a few more specific comments with regards to the proposed program in light of the new information provided. These can be added to my previous comments sent before the item was given an agenda number.

I have very serious concerns about the format of the staff recommendation. Within the staff report, this project is referred to as a "one-year trial period". However, the staff recommendation does not give the impression that is the case. As currently constructed, the staff recommendation would allow for the city manager to continue and expand the program at the request of MVPD without any council oversight. There are no metrics laid out to describe what successful implementation of the system looks like. How can we decide whether to continue to spend tens of thousands of dollars per year if we don't know what success looks like and do not have pre-defined goals or metrics? How is it a trial period if there is not an opportunity for democratic oversight by our elected officials at the end of the trial period?

On Tuesday May 21, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors had a request from the sheriff's office to purchase tasers. This was presented as two options - buy more than a thousand tasers or buy a few hundred as a "pilot program". Supervisors did not adopt the program. Instead, they directed staff to perform an assessment of what a pilot program would truly look like - what are the metrics for success and what is the appropriate number of tasers for testing the system (the exact number was chosen somewhat randomly and not based upon an analysis of what a pilot program would look like).

The lack of pre-defined metrics and request for the city manager to be able to continue the program without future council input needed do not give the sense that this is a trial period. If there is a desire to move forward (which I oppose personally), I ask that council follow the example provided by the Board of Supervisors and ask for metrics to be decided upon in advance to evaluate the program, and that council not cede its oversight powers by empowering the city manager to continue and expand the program without council input.

Tim MacKenzie | he/him/his
Postdoctoral Researcher
Snyder Lab | Stanford University Department of Genetics

From: Hugh McLaughlin
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2024 1:34 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Allyson Smith
Subject: Flock license plate readers -- endorsement

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members,
My wife Allyson and I would like to endorse the proposal to install the license plate readers. WE heard that there might be people with privacy concerns.

We are not that concerned with privacy compared to managing crime. Since other cities have adopted such readers, we don't want to be the only city without them, otherwise it might become known that Mountain View is more safe for criminals to drive around stolen cars.

In the proposal we read about, it states that we will receive 24 such readers. Why not 50 like other nearby cities? Mountain View is a pre-eminent technology hub, so why not be a leader and not a follower.

Thank you for considering our opinion.

Very best regards,
Hugh McLaughlin and Allyson Smith