

Taylor Whittingslow

From: Patti Galle [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 5:53 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Public comment for meeting

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

CAUTION: External sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender. **Suspicious?** Use the "Report" button in Outlook.

Taylor, reading at a steady pace, not too fast, not slow, it times at just 3 minutes. Thanks.

I am asking you to take a proactive step regarding the proposed "post-surgical respite house" for homeless individuals in Grass Valley. Although the Planning Commission did not vote on the project and has requested additional information, I urge you to contact the applicant now and advise him not to pursue this proposal further.

This project is unnecessary, duplicative, and unsupported by any demonstrated community need. **First**, transportation to and from medical appointments is already provided through existing county and nonprofit programs. **Second**, the County already utilizes motel placements and Hospitality House for individuals who require short-term recovery after medical procedures. **Third**, there has never been a documented case, emergency, or unmet need that would justify creating an entirely new facility of this type.

What is most concerning is the applicant's lack of experience, lack of understanding of homeless services, and lack of any operational plan that meets even the most basic standards of safety or oversight. His own statements made clear that he hoped to run the facility himself during the day, leave residents unsupervised at night, and rely on "house rules" and the police department to manage any problems. That is not a service model — it is a liability.

The fact that several commissioners expressed support for this concept was deeply troubling. Grass Valley does not need yet another service that does nothing to reduce street homelessness and instead adds another layer of complexity, cost, and risk. This proposal is misaligned with actual needs, and places an unfair burden on law enforcement, who are already stretched thin responding to issues created by poorly conceived programs.

When a service has no clear purpose, no regulatory framework, and no qualified operator, it inevitably becomes a police problem. Why would you knowingly add another avoidable strain to an already overextended department?

Allowing this proposal to continue — even at the discussion stage — signals that the system has outmaneuvered you, and that the City is willing to entertain ideas that lack logic, data, or compassion-based reasoning. Grass Valley deserves better than to be treated as a testing ground for ill-considered projects driven by property owners seeking government funding rather than genuine community need.

I urge you to end this discussion now. Redirect your time, energy, and resources toward strategies that directly reduce street homelessness, not toward creating yet another service that solves nothing and risks becoming a long-term problem.

Thank you.

Patti Galle

Certified Plant Based Nutritional Coach

Taylor Whittingslow

From: Kristy Cortright [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 4:20 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Flock cameras/arrangement

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

CAUTION: External sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender. **Suspicious?** Use the "Report" button in Outlook.

Hi,
Can't make the meeting tonight.

Concern is not for law enforcement using flock cameras to catch criminals, but for this current administration to mis-use data and go after their 'liberal' opponents and law-abiding foreigners. Also, if the government can't be transparent about what they are using the data for then cancel the contract, please. I love our democracy and see it sliding towards Putin's Russia where citizens only have rights in name only. Thank you,

Kristy Cortright
Veterinarian in Grass Valley

Taylor Whittingslow

From: Victor Sanchez [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 4:20 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Flock cameras

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

CAUTION: External sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender. **Suspicious?** Use the "Report" button in Outlook.

To Whom it may concern,

I am generally opposed to the use of constant surveillance. Although I do recognize the benefits of such a system. It's when the data collected is accessible to any agency or entity outside our community is when a system like this is susceptible to misuse. With that, I might be ok with it if you can guarantee this will not happen. If it ever does, it's local resources that search for the data requested, and the exact circumstances and details are shared or easily accessible to residents. But even with such systems in place, there is still room for abuse by the information collected. There needs to be some type of checks and balances no matter what.

Thank you for listening.

Victor Sanchez

Taylor Whittingslow

From: Don Frazer [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 3:48 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: deflock Grass Valley

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

CAUTION: External sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender. **Suspicious?** Use the "Report" button in Outlook.

Hi,

I want to offer some public comment in regards to the flock cameras in Grass Valley. 50 years ago if someone had made a suggestion to have 30+ surveillance cameras in place in Grass Valley they would have been completely ostracised.

This is not only an invasion of people's privacy, but it is Big Brother in action. The excuse of "public safety" does not even begin to stand up to the fact that the data from these cameras is not only accessible by numerous government agencies, but in fact has been accessed thousands of times by agencies that no one in city government is even aware of. This is of course completely unacceptable.

I believe that when the use of these cameras was initially put forward not only did the City Council not only not understand the implications of putting these cameras in place, but that they had absolutely no idea about how these cameras and their accompanying data would be misused.

It is time for the City to revisit this issue and remove these cameras! At the very least restrict access to GVPD and NCSO ONLY. No one else period. You are in office to stand for the Citizens of Grass Valley. No one else's interests count in the least bit.

The basic fact is the Citizens of Grass Valley and Nevada County are being spied on everyday by various government agencies. NOT OKAY, not even close.
Don Frazer

Taylor Whittingslow

From: Maxwell Pingeon [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2026 3:39 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Flock camera public comment

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

CAUTION: External sender. Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender. **Suspicious?** Use the "Report" button in Outlook.

To whom it may concern,

My name is Maxwell Pingeon. I'm a resident of Grass Valley, and I'm here to ask you to terminate our contracts with Flock Safety.

Public records obtained through the California Public Records Act show that the Flock cameras owned by NCSO, Grass Valley PD, and Nevada City PD have been searched over 13 million times by 4,654 different outside agencies, with more than five million of those searches coming from agencies outside California, which directly violates California Civil Code Section 1798.90.55(b).

The same data shows 1,175 searches by federal immigration enforcement, every one of them happening after the California Attorney General explicitly prohibited that kind of sharing in October 2023.

Over thirty communities have already ended their Flock contracts, with Santa Cruz becoming the first city in California to do so, and we are asking you to make Nevada County the next.

Thank you.

Max Pingeon

Get [Outlook for Mac](#)