

San Diego Privacy Advisory Board

Minutes of Special Meeting – April 30, 2026

A recording of the meeting is available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvACQbUnjH0>

The meeting was held in the City Administration Building - 202 C Street, San Diego, CA 92101, 12th Floor – Council Chambers

Attendance:

In-Person: Tim Blood, Ted Womack Jr, Ike Anyanetu, Lee Duran, Joann Chen - Quorum reached

Via Zoom: Magdalena Donea

Absent: Matt Stamper

Motions Made:

- Unanimous acceptance of the minutes of meeting dated April 9, 2026.
- The PAB unanimously agreed to split the San Diego Police Department (SDPD) 54 surveillance technologies into one PAB report for the Automated License Plate Readers (ALPR) and one report for the remaining 53 surveillance technologies.
- The PAB unanimously accepted the SDPD report on the 53 surveillance technologies with the conclusion to Accept the continued use of the technologies with the expectation that the SDPD will immediately and fully address the PAB's written recommendations in the report.
- The PAB unanimously agreed with the conclusion to Reject the continued use of SDPD's use of ALPR until such time that the SDPD fully addresses the PAB's written recommendations in the report. This wording was adopted to emphasize the PAB and communities' concerns with the surveillance risks inherent in the system.

Other Matters Discussed and of Note:

- Kohta Zaiser noted that the City will be presenting about 24+ technologies to the PAB with expectation to complete review and approval by September 2026. The City departments are still working on the related documents to be presented to the PAB.
- The public and PAB noted media coverage of a potential Flock Nova contract with the City. The City attorney noted to the PAB that this agreement was only a trial and not a surveillance technology for the PAB.
- Lee Duran noted that there are artificial intelligence matters coming down the road which may have significant surveillance impacts. The PAB requests the City to notify PAB of potential contracts to help facilitate discussion of potential scope and surveillance impact.

Public Comments:

The TRUST SD Coalition provided several documents to support its concerns regarding the San Diego Police Department's Annual Surveillance Report. A copy of the documents may be found at: <https://www.sandiego.gov/pab/meetings> and <https://sandiegotrust.org/>

Verbal comments noted April 30, 2026 are as follows:

- Seth: Provided a packet of information to the PAB noting information provided through the public access is heavily redacted. This redaction reduces transparency. Further, a media article noted that there were 14 instances where police have reportedly used ALPR to stalk romantic interests. Finally an Axios article noted that SDPD signed a new Flock tech deal.
- Kenny: Rising authoritarianism. Look critically at tools used by SDPD. Concerned that SDPD contracted with Flock in secret.
- Shinpai: Trying to keep PAB accountable. Noted concerns with City Heights community about potential data breaches.
- Bella: Technology is only as good as the people who use it. There are good and bad people. Will people be protected or targeted?
- Lucky: Surveillance is sold as protection but is actually opposite. PAB should not just rubber stamp the technology.
- Humarya: PAB is to deeply analyze the technology. Not rubber stamp.
- Keyana: Flock is a tool to harass the community. We must reject this technology.
- Carrie: Concerned with Flock watching us.
- Ben: Allowing Flock systems to monitor public goes against accountability.
- Patricia: Law enforcement is breaching down because they are using improper tactics. People are afraid to be in public.
- Aryan: City surveillance technology hurts the vulnerable community. PAB should not rubber stamp its usage.
- Daniel: Major City budget deficit but keeping expensive surveillance technology. A law that costs nothing to break is not a law.
- Jasmine: strongly opposed to use of surveillance technology. Much data collection can be misused. PAB must uphold privacy.
- Gabriella: strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology. PAB must protect privacy rights.
- Anthony: strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology. Community can see how the tech is potentially misused.
- Priya: strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology. Misuse and data breaches hurts the public.
- Ken: PAB is not someone who should soft handle SDPD. Community is deeply involved because of concern.
- Daniel: Data does not reduce crime but has shown to hurt people. PAB must represent the community.
- Rehya: Cameras allow data to track, store and share. People feel less safe. PAB is allowing this and putting people at risk.
- Angelica: People feel less safe with the surveillance technology. Governance is real and PAB must uphold the governance.
- Wahxin: strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology. Massive violation of privacy. Data is being gathered and tracked. PAB must remove Flock.

- Thora (?): strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology. Mass misuse of privacy as data has been misused to track people. SDPD contract made national news. Flock is making secret deals and PAB must stop the use of Flock.
- Anthony: Concern for blatant misuse of technology. Surveilling the entire community. Same concept with advertising surveillance without consent. Why does Flock get to monopolize. Surveillance will hurt art and culture.
- Online: protocols for granting access is wholly inadequate. Flock data can be used/scraped by others.
- Online: Looking at lobbying activity for Flock. Flock paid \$150,000 to state.
- Online: Been uneasy with surveillance cameras. 3 million license plates tracked. Start of surveillance state. Flock signed contract in secret.
- Online: Transparency is decreasing. PAB earlier recommended ceasing the use of Flock but now appears to approve.
- Online: Echo other comments. Listen to the public concerns. PAB must listen.
- Online: PAB must feel empathy with community. Contract got signed in secret.
- Online: Concerned citizen. Surveillance is bad for marginalized community. PAB must end use of Flock.
- Online: PAB must take action. Surveillance does not make us feel safer. This is improper use of information.
- Online: We pass by many surveillance cameras each day. My movement is predictable and monitored.
- Online: community strongly opposed to the City's use of surveillance technology and especially Flock. Surveillance leads to authoritarianism.
- Online: System can and will be used against you. 14 cases of stalking that we are aware of....Do not let Money go into surveillance.
- Online: We are passing cameras on a daily basis. Action can be seen improperly or as criminality.
- Online: Concerned about surveillance of the students. All impacted by the technology. PAB must stop use of Flock.
- Online: Values should be for civil liberties and not just facts. Private rights of actions (such as lawsuits) alone is not effective.
- Online: It is very difficult to understand the law and regulations. If someone wants to bring a lawsuit, they need to be provided counsel. Leaders have a moral responsibility to protect the community.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

/s/ LMD as Recorded for the PAB